



Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente

On Swāt. The Dards and Connected Problems

Author(s): Giuseppe Tucci

Source: *East and West*, Vol. 27, No. 1/4 (December 1977), pp. 9-103

Published by: [Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente \(IsIAO\)](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29756375>

Accessed: 27/11/2013 15:12

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente (IsIAO) is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *East and West*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

On Swāt. The Dards and Connected Problems

by GIUSEPPE TUCCI

with appendixes by K. ENOKI and B. BRENTJES
on the occasion of the 65th birthday of Prof. H. Hoffmann

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Discoveries of the Graves

Prof. Dani published in 1967, as a special number of *Ancient Pakistan* (1967) the results of his important excavations in Timargarha and Balambat. The book (in collaboration with F. A. Durrani, Muhammad Sharif and Abdur Rahman), deserves our best praises for its layout and its content; the discoveries have been carefully described and illustrated. Without entering into many details, I may be allowed to remark that a larger collaboration with some technologists (paleobotanists, paleozoologists etc.) might have greatly contributed to supply a more complete idea of how people lived in that country and in those times, what kind of seeds or trees they knew, the clothing they wore; e.g. I do not think that the dead were interred naked, but at least partially covered with pieces of woollen material. Uḍḍiyāna, like the country of the Kambojas, was known in India from ancient times for its fine woollen blankets (*kambala*). That is the method followed by us in Sistān and that now we extend to Swāt, where we have discovered many prehistoric graveyards, but only one large settlement (1966) ⁽¹⁾ so far; this method is needed in order to get a more adequate idea of the ecological surroundings in those old times.

During my daily wanderings in Swāt, the first week of September 1957, in the collapsing slope of a cretaceous hillock near the village of Kātelai, which was being dug by labour-

(*) In the following notes, which supplement my Preliminary Report, *EW*, 1958, I have collected some facts, some results of my researches, as well as some hypotheses which I submit to my disciples and my colleagues to be worked out. Indeed, mostly "working hypotheses" represent the main content of these notes: let my successors examine them, thoroughly criticize them, revise my conclusions. But I felt it my duty to send to the press the results of some researches, I dare say also some intuitions, which one may deem to be worth considering, at least partially. In conclusion, the article wants to be an attempt to put in writing some of the ideas which flashed upon

me from meditations on Swāt and its connected problems during its long period of existence.

It is my duty to express my deepest thanks to Prof. L. Lanciotti of the University of Venice whom I am proud to have had as my pupil, and now is my colleague; to Prof. A. Gargano, Director of the cultural activities of the IsMEO; to Prof. Maurizio Taddei, of the Istituto Orientale of Naples, who all helped me in the research of the bibliographical material, in the revision of the text, and in valuable suggestions. Any mistake which may be discovered in the article is to be attributed only to me, always a very inefficient proof reader.

⁽¹⁾ On the large settlement of Aligrāma cf. now STACUL and TUSA 1975, p. 291.

ers for building a house, I noticed some holes indicating the presence of tombs. My first impression was that they were Islamic; but, when I examined them closely, I found that they were not at all Islamic; they contained pottery of gray or black, occasionally of red colour, of different shapes and sizes: small and big cups, the so called brandy bowls etc. (now described by SILVI ANTONINI and STACUL 1972). They had no relation with the pottery discovered in the Mauryan layer of Uḍegram. A few days later I found identical graves and potteries near Gumbatuna, on the right bank of the river, and a funerary urn in Chahārbag to the North of Saidu Sharīf. Therefore, we started the excavation of some of these graves in Butkara and Kātelai near Mingora (TUCCI 1958, p. 285) while the digging of the Buddhist settlement was in progress. Provisionally, I called those graves prebuddhistic, pending more appropriate designation, because some *stūpas* are built upon them. I seize this opportunity to note that there is very frequently a connection, I should say an almost regular one, between the *stūpas* and the graveyards; in the sense that near every isolated *stūpa* or group of *stūpas*, which are scattered all over Swāt, one discovers the presence of the same tombs: at Kātelai, Chahārbag, Dangrām, Loebanr, Jāmbīl, Ali-grāma, Gumbatuna, Gōgdara, provided there is the same cretaceous soil on the sloping side of a hill and some water or streamlet nearby. That is why my further localization of other graveyards has been mainly anticipated by the accurate survey of the land surrounding the *stūpas*. There is no doubt that when Buddhism spread in the country, during or shortly after the time of Aśoka, who has left his edicts at Shāhbāzgarhī, Mānsehrā, and Kandahar in Afghanistan ⁽²⁾ the building of a *stūpa* on or near the graveyards was a sort of sign that the new religion was going to supersede the old one, which survived in villages or places far removed from the main trade routes and the major urban centres.

2. Name given to the Graveyards

Prof. Dani calls the graveyards Gandharan. And here I raise a question. Are we really in a condition to state that Swāt was subject to the Achaemenian administration either as a district within the Satrapies or as a separate ethnic group? We know from Herodotus III 91, that the seventh Satrapy comprised four peoples that are separately named: Sattagýdai, Gandarioi, Dadíkai and Aparýtai. Thus a single satrapy included peoples of different extraction, belonging to different or may be also related ethnical entities; some were bound to pay tributes, others to supply soldiers. The Dadíkai are the Dards, the *Daradas* of the purāṇic geographical lists, the Daedala of Curtius, who — after dealing with the story of Nysa ⁽³⁾ (see below p. 40) and with the orders given by Alexander to Hēphaistíōn and to other generals to go ahead in order to build the bridge on the Indus — writes « and then he went to Daedala » (*ad regionem, quae Daedala vocatur*, VIII, X, 19) and narrates the events of war in that territory against the Assakenói.

⁽²⁾ According to the inscription discovered by Prof. Scerrato: PUGLIESE CARRATELLI and LEVI DELLA VIDA 1958 and 1964; new ed., PUGLIESE CARRATELLI and GARBINI 1964. The inscription

is dated « the completion of the 10th year from coronation ». Cf. THAPAR 1961, pp. 32 ff.

⁽³⁾ TUCCI EW 1963 p. 27-28.

The province of Gandara (a.p.), Gandhāra, ran in those times along the Kabul ⁽⁴⁾, Cophés (Kubhā, RV V 53, 9; X 75, 6) towards Puskalāvātī (Arrianus [c. 95 d. 175], *Indiké* 1, 8; Peukelatīs; Peukolaitis, Strabo XV, 1, 27; Poklāeis, Ptolemaeus VII, I 44; Peucolatis, Plinius VI 62, 78 (its inhabitants being called Peucolitae), Skr. Puṣkalāvātī, Puṣkarāvātī, Pāli Pokkaravatī.

3. *Swātis and Daradas*

Swāt has no doubt been under the influence of Gandhāran culture, especially during the Buddhist period; even in later times, Uḍḍiyāna-Swāt presents itself, in the different periods of its history, with its own petty rulers (perhaps many of them), or under the domination of the Kuṣāṇas, but it should not be considered as being identical with or included in Gandhāra or in Kapiśa, Afghanistan (see below pp. 75); though later it lost its independence to the Turki Šāhi. The language of the Swātis being Dardic (see below p. 34), they were not separately named, but comprised in the denomination of Dards, generically, though the Dards were spread over a very large territory (but Arrianus knows Sóstos not Souasténē) ⁽⁵⁾ (see below, p. 44). Leaving aside, for the time being, the Sattagýdai and the Aparýtai, let us go back to Gaṇḍara in the Achaemenian inscriptions: Elam. Gan - da - ra, KENT 1958, *Lexicon* p. 183, 1).

Already at the times of Darius, the dependence of the tribes near the extreme eastern borders of the Achaemenian empire on the Central power had become very slack (JUNGE 1941, pp. 5, 27 below, p. 16); moreover, the boundaries of the region we know as Gandhāra are well delimited by Arrianus, as we shall see (below, pp. 43-45). Thus, we may conclude that Swāt had a position by itself, as a particular ethnic group of the Dadíkai, separate from Gandhāra; the people had only to pay some tributes and to send contingents of troops, as agreed upon, in case of war. We must therefore refer to the division into districts on the basis of the tributes due (*Steuer-Berzirk*) or of their ethnic identity rather than on that of Satrapies.

Although there is no representation of the Dadíkai on the bas-reliefs of Persepolis, nor any mention of them in the Achaemenian inscriptions, there is no doubt that Dadíkai, Daradas, Dards, according to the Herodotean list, were for reasons of administration, connected with the seventh satrapy equally subject to tribute (Herodotus VII-66).

In the Purāṇic description of India, the Gandharans are listed (KIRFEL 1954, pp. 116, 131) along with the Kashmirians and other N. W. peoples: « Daradāṃś ca sa-Kāśmiriān Gandhārān Aurasān » (Hazara). Cf. also SIRCAR 1960, p. 24 and LAW 1943, pp. 86. Varāhamihira, 1895, 97 V, 29, 30 enlists them along with the Abhisāra, Taṅgaṇakulūṭa... Kirāta, Cīna.

In the Tibetan work *dPag bsam-ljong bzan*, ed. Sarat Chandra Das, 1908, I, 9 the Dards are called Darta from Darada, Mm. 763 = T'o-lo-t'o.

⁽⁴⁾ But for another division of the territory, see below p. 42.

⁽⁵⁾ For Souasténé cf. Ptolemaeus I, 42. Cf.

Pāṇini IV, 2, 77: Sauvāstavam, name of a town. (?)

Many a quotation of the Darada is found in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Saddharmasmṛtyupasthāna* in LÉVI 1918, p. 48. They are the last ones in the list; along with them are the Odra = Uḍḍiyāna, the Kuru and the Madraka^(5a) (cf. *ibid.*, p. 125). This list according to S. Lévi cannot be older than the 2nd century B.C. nor later than the 1st A.D.

In the *Candragarbhasūtra* (S. Lévi, 1905b p. 263) the Daradas are mentioned near the Kia shê, Kāṣa, Khaṣa.

4. Achaemenian Influence in Swāt?

Prof. Dani is of the opinion that some receptacles laid upon platforms or benches in Balambat (Op. cit. 41 and Plate XLIII a) might be fire altars and he considers them to be a testimony of the presence of Achaemenian influence. In one of them a lamp was found with traces of some burning. But I am afraid this is not a conclusive proof that those platforms have something to do with the Achaemenian religion. Those receptacles may have been connected with some cults (and fire was involved in many of them), but nothing indicates that they were fire altars. At most, I should call them family chapels; from the finds it is difficult to draw a precise conclusion; the presence of a lamp may or may not indicate their sacred character; all lamps may be employed for any domestic use. On the Indian side we know that fire worship was limited to three fire mounds (*maṇḍala*) Gārhapatya, Āhāvānīya and Dakṣiṇāgni, which were circular, square and semicircular respectively: e.g. (*Āpastamba-Srautasūtra* V, 4). Neither can any connection be found with the *pyreia* discovered by the Italian Archaeological Mission in Dahan-i Ghulāmān in Sistān, to which Professor Dani refers. I think that even in this case it is perhaps not quite exact to call the big temple a fire temple. (See SCERRATO 1966, pp. 14-15)⁽⁶⁾:

In appearance, these structures seem to be ovens; but their real purpose was simply to contain the fire and we shall refer to them as "pyraea"; they must have played a very important role in the religious and ritual practices that took place in the building. There are two parts in each pyraeum: a lower compartment of rectangular shape which was the combustion chamber, provided with a mouth for lighting, and an upper one covered with slightly pointed vault roofing in the same fashion as that of the porticoes.

A clay diaphragm, supported by four corner brackets, divided the compartments which were, however, inter-communicating since there was a large slot in the diaphragm to the left. The flames kindled in the lower chamber came up through this opening, seared the underside of the covering and reverberated on to the diaphragm. The pyraea between the pillars were separated from the court by a thin wall. Opposite each pyraeum in the "aisle" facing the court, six rectangular benches were built plus a seventh, square in shape, placed in front of the point of access to this portico. Traces of combustion existing in small patches have been detected on them and they were clearly used as sacrificial tables or altars.

The north portico has identical features — the same number of pyraea and sacrificial benches: but a distinctive element is a cylindrical oven in terracotta embedded in a thick layer of crude clay; its appearance — and, we think, its function — is very similar to those of the *tanur* which are still used

^(5a) The Mo-tu-lo p. 363 are not = Mathurā but correspond to the Madras, another northern tribe.

For the Mo-lo-po also S. LÉVI proposes Mo-lo-so = Mālava *ibid.*, p. 28.

⁽⁶⁾ GNOLI G. see *addenda* n. 1.

in the region. Another peculiarity worth noting is the existence of very low platforms, no more than 10 cm. high, resting against the inner pillars. All these features are probably later additions, still of a ritual character.

When we come to the west portico, we are faced with a quite different arrangement of the cult-installations. The portico is open on the court side; but an altar-oven like those referred to in the south portico is placed against the court-facing side of each pillar of the inner row. They consist of two projecting walls with side-pieces open in front, and originally provided with a square block covering with chamfered corners and — very probably — a hole in the top. At least four of these are fitted with two or three steps: sometimes there is just one small stairway, sometimes two.

In the first and second altars from the left, a number of cylindrical-conical goblets were found in orderly array: they belong to a type that is very common at Dahān-i Ghulāman, but they were deposited here at a secondary stage.

The portico “aisle” closest to the outer wall is quite filled up by the presence of three large “tanks” measuring about 1,30 m. in height, 90 cm. in width, and 55-60 cm. in depth. The southernmost one is divided into two unequal parts by a partition. The latter tank, and the longest one, are both fitted with steps. In the corner of the third tank on the shorter side facing the court a small fireplace is to be found. The inner surface of the tanks is burnt by fire, and on the bottom of them a good deal of blackish sticky combustion remains, heaped in tiny piles, was found. Tiny fragments of burnt bones were mixed with the ashes. The whole of the pavement of the portico contained similar bone fragments both burnt and unburnt, which were also mixed with the plaster covering the portico walls — a proof that animal sacrifice was indubitably part of the religion practised in the temple.

5. *The Pyreia of Dahān-i Ghulāmān*

There is no indication that the *pyreia* or hearths were used for a fire kept continually burning; the triple row of fire-hearths and a tank meant for animal sacrifices, filled with burnt bones, all this seems to suggest a temple dedicated to three different deities or group of deities, (e.g. Ahura Mazdā, Mithra, Anāhitā, cf. the three groups of gods: Vasus, Rudras, Ādityas ŚB. 14, 1, 1, 15).

This implicitly would also seem to indicate the probable presence of a tripartite society, each class indulging in a peculiar cult; this would agree with the well-known theory of Prof. Dumézil. The recent researches of Prof. GONDA (1976) have revealed a much wider and deeper motive underlying this triadic classification. Prof. Gonda calls it “*triadic mode of thought*” as a *fundamental archetypal intuition of the I. Aryans*. I invite the reader to a thorough study of the above quoted book; we may choose a few examples out of the many hundreds collected by Prof. Gonda: The Śrauta Sacrifice RV. 10, 105, 9 *gārhapatya*, *āhavanīya*, *dakṣiṇa*, Agni’s three seats RV. 8, 39, 8 etc. A very important discovery, so we may call it, upon which we shall come back again. Anyhow as regards the sacred building of Dahān-i Ghulāmān, it certainly shows evident connections with Achaemenian architecture; there is nothing in it which lends support to the theory of its being Sasanian, advanced by some scholars, as soon as the discovery was announced. Though the edifice seems to belong to the 6th century B.C., its typology has something unique in it; all this leads me to suppose that we are confronted with a cult which did not object to the slaughtering of particular animals, and that did not request a perpetual burning of fire. It is quite possible that in these regions, at the extreme boundaries of Iran, there had descended some Indo-Aryans (later submerged by or conquered by an Iranian wave)

still having particular cults which might show some affinities with certain Vedic rituals as described in the *Brāhmaṇas* (⁷).

But I do not want to trespass in this paper on the field of my collaborators, and discuss archaeological problems. Up to now Dahān-i Ghulāmān stands unique; more than a provincial expression of a well-defined religion, it may be considered as a document of some religious background which is yet unknown in its real context. When exploration will be extended to Afghan Sistān or as well as to Khorāsān, there is the chance to verify if this hypothesis proves wrong or corresponds to real facts. For the time being, I may only say that also Prof. Shippmann, after reading the preliminary report of Prof. SCERRATO, seems to conclude that the temple of Dahān-i Ghulāmān stands by itself (⁸).

6. *The Graves of Swāt and the Assakenói; Shifting of Tribes*

Prof. Dani disagrees with my stating that the tombs discovered by the Italian Mission in Swāt belong to the Assakenói of the classical authors. Of course, I agree that the expression does not exactly express my thought: I only wanted to say that the graves discovered in Swāt were to be attributed to the people against whom Alexander fought: at the time of his invasion, they were partly Assakenói, but certainly they belonged also to other tribes, related or not to them. Moreover, further digging confirmed that some cemeteries are much more ancient than Alexander's expedition (⁹). The Assakenói were settled chiefly in the lower part of Swāt (Chakdarra), then Bājaur, Bunēr. Their capital was Mássaga.

If we compare the list of Herodotus either of the satrapies or of the regions subject to the payment of the tributes by each ethnic group included in them, with the list of the peoples whom Alexander met in his expedition, we find some noticeable changes concerning this part of Asia in which we are interested: e.g. we no longer find any mention of the Aparýtai, nor of the θatagus (Sattagýdai) nor of the Paktuiké Khora (mentioned in Her. III, 102) along with Kaspátyros. It may be that these peoples were not in the proximity of the route followed by Alexander; it may also be that they had merged in other political and social entities, assuming a different name. Or again, they had perhaps shifted, in the lapse of time intervening from that of Herodotus to that of Alexander, from a former location to another one or possibly they had taken the name of a prevailing tribe. According to Herodotus (III, 91) the Aparýtai paid together one hundred and seventy talents; they may be identified with the *pouruta* (*Iskətam pourutəm* of the *Mibir Yašt* 14).

GERSHEVITCH (1959, pp. 80-81) locates them to the south of Western Hindukush, between Hairava and Gandhāra; MARQUART 1905, Eran II, 74, 175 places them to the East of Ghor. There is nothing to wonder at, because, I insist on this point, there are indications

(⁷) See the article of BURROW 1973, p. 139, on the possibility that Iranians here superimposed themselves on a previous I.A. migration.

(⁸) SHIPPMANN 1971, pp. 50 ff.

(⁹) Loebanr (first half of the 2nd millennium B.C.).

that during that time there took place a movement southwards and eastwards of many tribes and new associations ⁽¹⁰⁾.

When these waves of migrating tribes settled down, it may be that the Aparýtai ⁽¹¹⁾ became the ancestors of the present-day Afridis, a suggestion advanced by Sir Olaf Caroe. The name of the leader of the confederation who tried to harass the troops of Alexander after the battle of Áornos, moving towards the bridge on the Indus, was Ὠφρίκης said to be the brother of Assacános (according to others the name of the leader was Erix). The name, Assacános (of the dead king of Mássaga) is not only a proper name but chiefly an ethnic name: Afri-kes may equally well be connected with Aprīta, Afridis: it seems to me that this derivation is more probable than the one proposed by Eggermont from Urđi, Aurddāyānī, Aurđi, Auđđi ⁽¹²⁾.

As regards the Πακτύες we must recall that there is twice mention of them in Herodotus; once III, 95 he places them near the Armenians, an obvious mistake, and a second time near Kaspápyros (or: tyros) III, 102. « Other Indians dwell near the town of Kaspápyros and the Paktúe country, northward of the rest of India: they live like the Bactrians; they are of all Indians the most warlike, and it is they who are charged with getting of gold ». (The story of the gold-digging ants follows, on which see below.)

CAROE 1958, p. 357, maintains his opinion: *paktues* = *pakhtun* in spite of the different ideas of BAILEY 1952, p. 430 based on linguistic grounds and of MORGENSTIERNE in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, s.v. « Afghan ». Prof. Bailey (Ibid.) suggests a connection between modern Kalash Pātu with Greek πακτύες and is skeptical about any relation between Pātu and Pashtu ^(12a).

MARQUART, *Eran*, II Heft, 1905, pp. 177 ff. is also of the opinion that the Πακτύες have no relation at all with the Pakhtun and proposes a connection of their country πακτυική γῆ with a Greek “Umbildung” from a Prakrit form of Puskalāvati, Πευκλαοῖτις a bold but to my mind improbable hypothesis. In the Achaemenian inscriptions there is no mention of them. JUNGE also, 1941, p. 37, n. 7, places Paktuiké in Gandhāra: Naqš-i Rustam A. 1, 24. Zraka, Harauvatiš, θataguš, Gadāra, Hīduš, Sakā haumavargā, Sakā tigraxaudā, KENT 1953, p. 137, Persepolis, E l. 16: Bāktriš, Suguda, (Sug^uda) Gadāra, Uvārazmīy, θataguš, Harauvatiš, Hīduš, Gadāra, Sakā (KENT 1953, p. 136, cf. *ibid.*, *Lexicon*).

The Sattagýdai correspond to the θataguš of the inscriptions, and this word does not mean the “(people) of seven rivers” as proposed by Hertzfeld, but most probably stands for the people “having hundreds of cattle” (KENT 1953, s. v.). It is not possible to follow Marquart, who locates the θataguš north of Arachosia and west of Gandhāra.

⁽¹⁰⁾ This subject will be discussed more in detail in another article.

⁽¹¹⁾ I think that the Aparýtai are the same as Pāṇini's Aprīta (*Rājanyādigana*) mentioned in the *Gaṇapāṭha* IV, 2, 53.

⁽¹²⁾ EGGERMONT 1975, pp. 182 f.

^(12a) It is worth noticing that MORGENSTIERNE 1973, p. 345, writes on Pātū: Pātū may be derived from Pārthau « which may originally have been applied to a group of Parthian who found their way in Chitrāl ».

When Alexander had reached Peukelāoitis, Puskalāvati, his campaign in Swāt had come to an end. Nearchos was going to keep ready his fleet in order to follow the course of the Indus, and then proceed to the Persian Gulf to meet Alexander there. Skylax locates in Gandhāra the place where, under the Achaemenians, he was ordered to achieve the same feat according to a fragment preserved by Hecataeus, MÜLLER, G.G.M. I, XXXV. Γανδαρικῆ πόλις Κασπάπυρος Σκυθῶν ἀκτὴ: the short passage is very important for the mention of a place in Gandhāra which was the *aktè* of the Scythians. *Aktè* is not a port, it is a shore with easy access, a bay.

Kaspápyros cannot certainly be Multān, as proposed by Foucher, and accepted by Herzfeld. According to Foucher the name derives from that of an ancient Upanishadic seer Kaśyapa: Kassapīya, Kassa<pu>riyas, Kassapyros. HONIGMANN and MARICQ 1953 also reject this identification. Nor can I hold valid the opinion of MARQUART (Eran II, p. 246, n. 2) who supposed a derivation from Prakrit Kusuma (flower), Kus(u)vapura, Kusumapura, Puṣpapura, Peshawar. But Kaspápyros cannot be Peshawar, which would imply an unexplained change of the Kaspā into Paska. There is also a much more valid reason for rejecting this assumption; in this part of its course, the Kābul river is not navigable, the real navigable portion of it beginning a little westwards of Naushera. (See map of CAROE 1958, facing p. 30). After that place, affluents of the Kābul — including the Swāt river — empty into this last part of it, called now Landai ⁽¹³⁾.

The building of a fleet demands the storage of large-size timber, ample space, the proximity of a populated town for hiring labourers, and in which plenty of iron, nails, all sorts of material for sails, implements, tools, and suchlike are available. But why was the shore where the fleet was prepared called: shore of the Scythians? MARQUART places Kaspápyros near Puskalāvati, and he locates the latter near the Sakā Haumavargā quoted in the inscriptions of Darius as living on the borders of Gandhāra to the North, between Gandhāra and Bactria.

JUNGE 1939, p. 60: « Die Länderliste in der Inschrift am Grabe Darius I. in Naqsch-i-Rustām hat als Nr. 14 and 15 hinter der indischen Gruppe Saka Haumavarga und Saka Tigrauda ». ID., p. 66: « Die Saka Haumavarga, ferner gelegen und schwerer zu fassen treten nur auf den Thronträgerreliefs auf, haben demnach wohl, wie schon zur Zeit des Kyros und noch zur Zeit Alexanders, nur in Bundesgenossen Verhältniss gestanden ». On a settlement of the Sakā in Northern India since the time of the first Achaemenian period see SCHEFTELOWITZ 1933, p. 294. BAILEY H. W. Languages of the Sakas. Handbuch der Orientalistik IV, Linguistics 1958, p. 137: « Three groups are distinguished in the Achaemenian inscriptions. The *Saka paradraya* in the Pontic steppes, the *Saka Tigraxauda* “with pointed caps” and Saka Haumavarga to the south-east and in the Pamirs ^(13a). This latter name is likely to have survived in *bray-i Mrung*, and *mung* of the name Braγúgo, Mrūngul, Mungān for the Munjān people closely allied to the Yidg ». We may here recall to mind

⁽¹³⁾ STEIN (1900) *Ancient Geography of Kashmir* II, p. 353: « The notice of Hekataios makes it clear that Kaspápyros (Stein: Kaspátyros) must

have been situated in that territory where the Indus first becomes navigable ».

^(13a) Cf. passage of Strabo quoted below p. 52.

that while, according to the Avesta, the *haoma* grows in the mountains, the Vedas know of two places where the *soma* is found, as a god in Heaven, as a plant in the mountains. The mountain where it grows best is called Mūjavant and therefore a name of *Soma* is Maujavata; in AV. Mūjavant is the name of a people mentioned along with the Gandhāris and the Balhikas, MACDONELL and KEITH, 1958 s.v. Perhaps the mountain has left its record in Chitrāl and nearby countries (e.g. Kati: Mrungul (*gul* = valley). Prof. Morgenstierne who has dedicated a very fine study to this subject is inclined to accept the theory of MARQUART (ERAN, p. 86, p. 137) who identifies Munjan (^{13b}) with the country of the Sakā Haumavargā. (MORGENSTIERNE 1930-32, pp. 440, ff. and additional note 444).

Also nowadays, timber collected in the mountains is thrown into the rivers, to let it drift down by the speedy running waters until it can be brought ashore in a bend of the river by experienced labourers and heaped up for sale. A good portion of it gets lost, because the logs may be stopped by the bends of the river, or by rocks or it may even be stolen. This method was followed in Swāt up to a few years ago.

When there were no roads, this was the cheapest and the only way for sending down to the trading centres of the valley the best qualities of all sorts of timber, for bartering it for goods not available in the secluded mountains; any bend of the Kābul river with ample and shallow waters (*aktè*) would offer ideal conditions for heaping up the timber, letting it dry, have it ready for selling: it could be put to a variety of uses, in a market in which goods were bartered, and even ships built.

I think that we can hardly dissociate Kaspápyros (or - tyros) from the Káspioi mentioned by Herodotus (III 93) and from the Sacae though they were included in the fifteenth satrapy (Herodotus III, 93) located to the north-west and west of Bactria; in another place Herodotus (VII 66-67) refers to them after the Gandhārians and Dadícae (¹⁴). (Cf. MARQUART, Eran II, p. 140).

All this leads to the probable conclusion that some Scythian tribes were pressing on Gandhāra.

Moreover all the hilly or mountainous ranges north of Gandhāra and the neighbouring tracts were inhabited by people speaking different dialects, warlike, difficult to classify by a foreigner, who, from their being neither Iranians nor Indians, but speaking languages which possessed some elements similar to both, were generally named by strangers: Skythians.

Before closing this paragraph it seems necessary to add that up to recent times we knew little about the peoples living between the Alingar or the Alishang and the Kōè or the Swāt, except that they were Kāfirs or Dards, divided into different tribes, secluded in their mountains. Much less do we know whether their tribes ever coalesced into a kind of confederacy, or a kingdom as the Dards of Baltistan later did (see below, p. 77). Which

(^{13b}) On a probable reference to Mūjavant in the Yašts see BURROW 1973 p. 138 n. 31.

(¹⁴) In addition there are other Indians who border on the city of Kaspápyros and the country

of Paktuikè; these live to the north and in the direction of the north wind, as compared to the remaining Indians.

were the original names of some of those tribes that took shelter in the seclusion of the Hindukush? As an example, I think it is of interest to resume briefly what Prof. SCARCIA (1965, pp. XCII ff.) proposes about the name Kāfir. He vocalizes the name found in the Arabic sources: *Ktw*, usually read Kator (= Chitrāl, according to some scholars) or “Katwar” (*ktw* in Baihaqī, Bābur etc.) and, with other authors, he locates them to the east of Kābul and to the north of Ġalālābād (Masson: Ketwer or Kata’war). Prof. Scarcia quotes Munshi Mohan Lāl (1834) who says « they confess to the Mullā to be Kāfir » and adds that the Siyāhpūš call themselves Kāfir without being ashamed. (ROBERTSON 1896 reprint 1970, pp. 193-194). Robertson states that the Kāfirs accept the name Kāfir, but they are unable to pronounce it. BIDDULPH registers the word Kappra saying that: it is a deformation of Kāfir. But Prof. Scarcia asks himself why not argue that things may be the other way round? He assumes the preexistence *in loco* of a word phonetically similar to Kāfir, which suggested the present denomination of these people. Thus Kappra ⁽¹⁵⁾ may well be traced back to an original *Ktwr*, Kat-pra, Kat-par (cf. Capperstan of Benedict Goës (YULE 1915-16 Cathay, II, 554, n. 2).

A support to the theory of Prof. Scarcia may be found in Chinese, chieh = *Kiäp (KARLGRÉN 1923) Kap, a name given to Kāfirs inhabitants of some parts of Chitrāl as it has been shown by Prof. Enoki, with whom I completely agree, at p. 5 of his “remarks” published as Appendix II at the end of this article.

To this suggestion I may add that perhaps Pāṇini might confirm the theory of Prof. Scarcia; in fact, who are those people whom he mentions along with the Dards: the *Gab-dikas* (IV 3, 93) ^(15a), and of whom Pāṇinī says that their abode was outside the Āryāvarta, that is, outside the Indian soil? Āryāvarta is so defined by RĀJAŚEKHARA 1934, ch. XVII, p. 96 *pūrvāparayoḥ samudrayor himavad-vindhyāyoś ca antaram āryāvarta*, « the territory between the two oceans, the Western and the Eastern, and between the Himālaya and the Vindhya is called Āryāvarta ».

What precedes seems to confirm the conclusion which may be drawn from the lists of Herodotus; i.e. that Swāt was included among the Daradas (Daedalaē of Curtius) and that soon after Alexander’s expedition other ethnical situations had developed; in the Persian inscriptions, the Dards are not mentioned, because most probably they were mistaken as a peculiar branch of the Saka groups.

7. Gold Tributes and Gold Diggers

The Hiduš, Hindus are said to offer as tribute gold. They are located North of *Κασπάτινος Κασπάτινος* (cf. above, p. 16) and are certainly Dards, as has been already

⁽¹⁵⁾ On the probable relation between Kāfirs and Caspioi see MARQUART (Eran II, pp. 141-142).

^(15a) Quotations from Pāṇini imply references to *Bhāṣya* and *Vārttika* commenting on them.

anticipated by Marquart, (*Eran* 1905, p. 178). The traders in gold were people who could reach the middle and upper course of the Indus.

There were near the Indus source, as there are even now, great mines of gold in the region of the Manasarovar and in Thokjalung⁽¹⁶⁾; in ancient times that part of Western Tibet was probably a part of *Žaň Žuň*, the women kingdom, extending from south-west to north-east of Tibet (see TUCCI 1956, pp. 92 ff.; PELLIS 1961, pp. 674 ff.); it corresponds to *Suvarṇabhūmi*, *Suvarṇagotra*, *gser rigs*, « the golden family » in the *Chronicles of Ladakh*. It was, no doubt, a long journey, if compared to that leading to the middle course of the Indus and to Kargil. Nor do we know the names of all the places along or near the Indus⁽¹⁷⁾ where the bartering or the selling of gold took place, though we may safely conclude that the trade was in the hands of the local tribes, mainly Dards. Certainly they did not push so far merely because that was the agreement with the Achaemenians but chiefly because such a trade, extremely valuable to them, had been going on since old times.

When the sixth volume of the *Imperial Gazetteer of India* was published in 1908, Kargil, midway between Kashmir and Leh, was still said to be the centre of the gold trade. The Dards of the Kishangaṅgā and the Indus valleys were known to have been gold merchants since old times. STEIN A. 1961, vol. II, p. 280, n. 5: for other references see *ibid.*, p. 287 n.; but gold might have also come by trade from Western Tibet proper: the above mentioned Thokjalung and the zone near the Manasarovar, where I found some traces of gold digging, then forbidden by the Lhasa Authorities (TUCCI 1937, p. 61, fig. facing p. 65). The mountains of the Daradas, to which Strabo and Ptolemaeus refer, and the plateau to the east of the mountains clearly point to the Indus valley and the deserts of the plateau of Ladakh. But other parts of the Pamirs cannot be excluded (JETT-MAR 1975, p. 1974); e.g. we know of Burushos traditions which mention the Golden Country and the Golden Mountain, though, as rightly recognized by Prof. Jettmar, this may be a survival of Buddhist or *Žaň Žuň* folklore⁽¹⁸⁾.

As to gold being found in Swāt there are valid testimonies in the records of the Chinese pilgrims: Hsüan-tsang writes that Swāt produces gold. Sung Yün describing the Buddhist settlement of T'o-lo⁽¹⁹⁾ speaks of six thousand gold (gilt) images (some editions write 60.000!). Also in the protohistoric tombs excavated in Swāt gold earrings have occasionally been found.

It is true that Herodotus tells us how such gold was procured by the Indians: « To the east of them there is a large desert, and in this desert live some big ants not so big as

⁽¹⁶⁾ As regards the Himalayan gold cf. Hataka, of the traditional Indian geography from *Mahābhārata* to *Rāmāyaṇa*, LÉVI 1918, p. 79.

⁽¹⁷⁾ In the itinerary in Khotanese Saka (published by BAILEY 1936, p. 258) from Gilgit to Chilas and Kashmir (written between 958-972) the Indus is called: *Ysarniji ttāji* 'the Golden

river' which is here certainly not a mere poetical attribute.

⁽¹⁸⁾ According to B. ANSARI *Encyclop. Islamica* s.v. Dardistān, Hunza and Nagar, used to send to the Mahārāja of Kashmir handfuls of gold dust.

⁽¹⁹⁾ T'o lo, d'a lā; Mm. da, dra, ḍa, dha, ḍha; - ra, la.

dogs, but bigger than foxes. These ants make their dwellings underground, digging out the sand ... It is after this sand that the Indians set forth into the desert ... When the Indians come to the place with their sacks, they fill these with the same and ride away back with all speed; for ... the ants forthwith scent them out and give chase, being, it would seem, so much swifter than all other creatures, that if the Indians made not haste on their way while the ants are mustering, not one of them would escape ». (Transl. A. D. Godley).

We may add to what we have said a quotation from Strabo XV, I, 44, who connects the story of the gold digging ants with the Δέρδαι, the Darada, Dards, an *Indian tribe living "in the mountains", to the east, where is a large plateau*; the gold miners are there; the digging takes place in winter. Ptolemaeus locates the Dards below the Indus adding that their mountains raise right above them. Lastly, Plinius, *Nat. Hist.*, VI 67 writes that the Dards produce gold ⁽²⁰⁾ and the Setae also silver. Prof. Eggermont interprets Setae as Soustené; this is possible, but needs confirmation.

We are here confronted with a well-known tale, that of the gold-digging ants (LAUFER, 1898, p. 429 ff.). The Indians too are aware of the same story, but for them, the gold ^(20a) is chiefly a trade of the Khaṣi or Khāśa (on whom see TUCCI 1956, pp. 92 ff. and here below, cf. PELLIOT 1963, p. 671 ff.); they were a people living in Chilas, or nearby and N. W. of Kashmir. Later, spreading eastwards, they conquered Western Tibet and Western Nepal. This tale can also be found in China, Tibet and Mongolia. A living tradition has also been collected by A. H. Francke in Kalatze, a village in which Dard was still spoken by some of its inhabitants in 1927 when I was there (HERMANN 1939, pp. 10 ff.). Therefore, I do not think that the desert of Tharu has something to do with this tale. Herodotus was told the story by the Iranians, but neither he nor his informants had a clear notion about the exact situation of the easternmost boundaries of the Achaemenian Empire. The Dards spread in early times not only in Chitrāl, Swāt, Kōhistān, Gilgit and Dardistān but also up to Ladakh, as will be shown below.

The Indians, Hiduś of the inscriptions of Persepolis, are said to bring as a tribute gold bags, i.e. gold dust (Herodotus, III 98 and 192 ff.). I quite agree with Dr. WALSER (1966, pl. 25, 71-73, 86, pp. 94 ff.) that those containers do represent vases rather than bags; their content was pure gold; the Achaemenians wanted metal ready for being worked; I think that the representations of Persepolis are here more realistic than the narrative of Herodotus, III 98, 102 ff. The offering of the donkey, a majestic donkey (or an onager?) is quite peculiar, not a common one. Donkeys were not unknown in India, they were certainly there before the introduction of the horse.

⁽²⁰⁾ *Auri fertilissimi.*

^(20a) *Mbh*, II 52, 4 Bombay ed. This gold is called *pipilika* from *pipilika* 'ant'. LASSEN, *Indische Altertumskunde*, I, p. 848, was the first, to my knowledge, to bring to the attention of scholars a passage of the *Mahābhārata*, according to which the Khāśa and their neighbours brought the gold

dug by the "ants" to king Yudhiṣṭhira: *tad vai pipilikam nāma uddbr̥tam yat pipilikaiḥ*

The Khāśa, K'ie shê lo shih, * g'ja śja - lâ zi äi = Kāṣyārāja, Khāṣyārāja (cf. Śyāmarāja) below, p. 62 in the description of the "Western Countries" of Shih Tao-an (312-385). PETECH 1966, p. 173.

II

BURIAL

8. *Inhumation and Cremation*

In Swāt, concerning the disposal of the dead, there coexist different types of burials: inhumation in bent position, combustion, secondary burials etc., combusted or non-combusted bones contained in big jars with a cover etc. in small rectangular urns (for a detailed treatment of this problem, cf. SILVI ANTONINI and STACUL 1972 and the bibliography quoted in that volume) ⁽²¹⁾.

The big jars and sometimes the urns often show two holes indicating the two eyes and a protuberance meant to suggest the reproduction of a nose. I think that if no other elements are available it is hazardous to draw any chronological conclusion from the different types of burials.

It is attested that inhumation was not unknown in Vedic India (*AV* 5, 30, 14): *Mānu bhūmigrho bhuvāt*, « may not be reserved for one an earthen house »; in *RV.* the expression: *anagnidagdhāb*, « those who have not been burnt by fire » hints at burial or exposure. So also *RV.*, VII 39, 1 « May I not go to the earthen house »; of course even now there are exceptions to cremation (today incineration); such is the case, among other ones, of ascetics or of babies. More evident is the reference in *AV.*, XVIII 2, 34 (transl. Whitney, revised and edited by LANMAN, H.O.S. p. 840, XVIII 2, 34): « They that are buried and they that are scattered away ⁽²²⁾, and they that are set up (*uddhitāḥ*) all those Fathers, O Agni, bring thou down to eat oblation »; p. 836, XVIII 2-19: « be pleasant to him, o earth, a thornless resting place, grant him broad refuge »; p. 837, XVIII 2-20: « In the unoppressive wide space of earth be thou deposited »; p. 838, XVIII 2, 25: « Let not the tree oppress thee »; p. 843, XVIII 2, 52: « I cover thee excellently with the garment of mother earth ».

It would be easy to extend the exemplification. Some scholars, as KANE (1941, p. 232), intend *uddhita* as « deposited above »; but he adds also « on trees or in caves ». I think that « deposited in a high place » is to be preferred to « deposited above », though we know of some tribes, like the Licchavis, who used to suspend the dead also on trees (See LAW 1943, p. 302). Nor was the custom unknown of depositing cremated bones in some urns, which were subsequently buried (for references, KANE 1941, pp. 232 ff.). This practice is still followed in some cases, when the relatives bring back home the ashes in an urn, and lay them down in the earth ⁽²³⁾.

⁽²¹⁾ In these volumes and in the many articles published by Prof. Stacul the problem of the various systems of burial are carefully examined. I want only to propose some comparisons with other peoples of the Hīndukush and the Pamirs

and to investigate some possible reasons of the second burial and of the cremation.

⁽²²⁾ *dūradeśe kaṣṭhavad parityaktāḥ*.

⁽²³⁾ KEITH 1925, p. 418 asserts, perhaps unduly exaggerating, that the Vedas do not make

On the contrary, in the Upanishadic literature, inhumation appears as a disposal of the dead condemned being a practice peculiar to the Asura (*Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, VII 8, 5: « Therefore, even here they say one who is not a giver, who has no faith, who does not offer sacrifices, that he is a demon [Asura], for this is the doctrine of the demons [Asura]. They adore the body of the deceased with what they have begged, with the clothes and ornaments, and think that thereby they will win the yonder world » (RADHAKRISHNAN, p. 504).

Thus, all this shows that ancient Indian sources point to the contemporaneity of the different ways of disposing of the dead.

9. *Secondary Inhumation*

Many tombs have been certainly opened, after a corpse had already been laid there, for placing another body in the same grave, near him; sometimes, the bones of the former burials were heaped in a corner, in which case no trace of the precedent grave furniture is left. I am taking into consideration only the tombs that have not been damaged, as it occurs when, at a later time, another grave was cut into the former.

There might have been a *sema* on top of each tomb to facilitate the location of the family tomb (see ROBERTSON 1896, fig. facing p. 648); the *semata* might have been in wood or in stone (two of them, in stone with rough designs, have been found near Loebanr) ⁽²⁴⁾. Relating the story of Nysa, Arrianus writes that when the encampment of the Macedonians was set up near the graveyard of those people, a great fire developed in the latter; this suggests that the tombs of Nysa, as I already anticipated (TUCCI 1963, p. 157) had wooden structures on them, of which the tombs of Chitrāl with images of men and horsemen may still be an example. Some Islamic tombs of upper Swāt showing the stylised head of a horse at the upper end and the wooden enclosures of such tombs finely decorated, can be considered as a survival, which Islam has not been able to cancel.

But there are also tombs with no trace of having been used, that is to say, with no hint of a previous burial. The double burial, when a skeleton is disposed of anatomically, and the heap of bones of another corpse is found in a corner, without any grave furniture, presents many problems. It seems to indicate not only the probable existence of a family grave, it may lead to suppose also the practice of a well-known custom, that of exposing a corpse until the flesh is completely consumed, and then the bones are collected and laid in the family grave.

The existence of family graves and the accumulation of rough coffins in which the

any difference between burning and burying. The body was washed and anointed, before burial or combustion.

⁽²⁴⁾ *Loebanr* 'great forest' is the survival, in Pashtu, of the name of the Mahāvana 'great

forest'; probably it started at the head of the Jāmbīl and extended to the mountains bordering the Yūsufzai territory up to Buner (cf. LÉVI, 1915 Mm. p. 72).

dead had been enclosed, so badly made that they can crash down and let the corpses fall to the ground, is attested among some tribes of Kāfiristan (ROBERTSON 1896, p. 641: « Several bodies are put in the same receptacle »; BIDDULPH 1893, p. 14; JETTMAR 1975. A good photo of crumbled and crashed coffins in SCHOMBERG 1938, facing p. 42). The same is repeated by SNOY 1962 (« Man kann annehmen, dass es Familien-Bestattungen waren », p. 189).

10. *Other Burials*

On this subject of multiple burials in Swāt, I have already referred to SILVI ANTONINI-STACUL and to the articles of Prof. Stacul; nevertheless it is not out of place to add here a short report of Prof. Maurizio Taddei, which he very kindly sent me, on a trial trench dug by him in Butkarā IIb, below the necropolis of Butkara II.

« In the course of the excavation campaign of 1963, conducted by the Italian Archaeological Mission in Swāt, I had the opportunity of throwing light on some schist funereal structures, in the area of Butkara II, that proved at once to lack homogeneity with the tombs of the necropolis of the same site, published by SILVI and STACUL.

« The structures in question lie downstream of the necropolis, along the mule-track that skirts the left bank of the river Jāmbil. From a stratigraphic point of view, they proved to be of later date than other structures, of an entirely different character with respect to their function, which, on the basis of the masonry technique, I was led to attribute to a well-established Gandharan epoch (Kuṣāṇa?); therefore they appear to be contemporary with or later than the Buddhist sacred area that, on the slopes of the hill, is superimposed in its turn to the necropolis published by SILVI and STACUL.

« We have to deal with three tombs, that I marked at the time with numbers 49, 50 and 51. Of these, tombs 49 and 50 belong to earlier times, while tomb 50 is clearly later inserted between the two preceding ones, making use of one side of the outer masonry of tomb 51 as if it were a wall of its own. Tomb 49 is severely damaged, and I therefore restrict myself to report on the main features of tombs 50 and 51.

« *Tomb 51.* At the outside, it is clearly divided into two parts, the lower one larger, so as to give place to a large offset: however, I have been unable to ascertain whether this was an offset connected with the foundation, or whether both structures were on view, as the analogy of the masonry technique would lead us to suppose. There is no doubt, anyhow, that the upper structure was above ground level.

« In the interior, two superimposed chambers have been found, their division being marked by an offset corresponding to the one on the outside. In the upper chamber a skeleton was laid, in anatomical connection, together with scattered bones belonging to other skeletons (including two skulls). The lower chamber, overlaid with a slab of schist resting on the offset, contained an ossuary proper.

« *Tomb 50.* This tomb consisted of an only chamber, whose floor corresponded to the level of the exterior offset of tomb 51. It contained a skeleton in anatomic connec-

tion (excepting the skull, found at the level of the pelvis), and bones belonging to other skeletons (among which fragments of skulls), heaped up at the feet of the first one.

« No funerary furniture was found in any of the tombs ».

Of course the absence of any funeral furniture seems to exclude a family burial, though the presence, in the upper chamber, of one skeleton with fragments of other ones, might indicate (with little probability) that the chamber was reserved for a further burial of another eventual dead. The lower chamber being full, they deposited the last skeleton on the upper part of the tomb. Certainly the case is not so simple. We notice that tomb 51, a monumental grave, is divided into two parts; a lower one which is a mere ossuary; in the upper one we find only one skeleton, scattered fragments of other skeletons and two skulls. Tomb 50 contains one skeleton with the skull placed at the level of the pelvis; other bones have been heaped at the feet of the skeleton itself, along with fragments of skulls. It seems to me that we have here the example of a hurried up ceremony in the course of which bones have been collected without caring to ascertain to whom the skeletal remains belonged. Skeletons have been unceremoniously collected and buried in a well-built ossuary; in the upper chamber there is a skeleton with fragments of other skulls which seems to imply that the deceased was laid there for his last definite rest along with casual fragments of unqualified remains. But it is also possible to argue that an entire family or clan had formerly buried its dead in its own graveyard (on the possibility of the existence of clan graveyards see below, p. 32) in Butkara; when the land passed into other hands, for instance to a new landlord or to a monastic Buddhist settlement for building a *stūpa* or a *saṅghārāma* (as in fact happened), since it was not propitious to erect a sacred edifice on a place contaminated by death, the clan emptied its old graves and built a receptacle for the remains of its ancestors; the upper place might have been reserved for the most recently deceased of the family whose memory was still alive, or of the supposed ancestor around whose tomb the cemetery had slowly developed.

Something of this kind happens among the Khasis in Assam. They cremate the bodies, collect the bones in a square cist, to be placed somewhere near the house, and after an indeterminate time, they remove those cists to the family's graveyard. Only the number of the dead is recollected and only the name of the oldest ancestor is recorded. They then heap stones on them (ROY 1963, pp. 520 ff.).

That the complete disposal of the dead and the definite laying out of a tomb could take place at any time, after burial, is shown also by some practices of the Kāfirs. Among them the wooden image of the deceased is « not erected till a year after his death » (SCHOMBERG 1938, p. 51).

In one of his articles Prof. STACUL (1975, p. 323) advances various hypotheses; some of them certain, others possible. One may also suppose that the upper chamber, i.e. the empty space in the middle of which the real grave is dug, might have been used for the consumption of the flesh, and that, when this was over, the bones were disposed in the grave itself. It is not to be excluded that some of the graves containing more than two

skeletons, might be open at no fixed date collectively on some special occasions (STACUL 1975, p. 375) as it is practised among the Khasis » (See above, p. 24) ⁽²⁵⁾.

The flesh of a corpse in decomposition is a pollution, while bones are the essential part of an individual. Among the Tibetans *rus* means, at the same time, bone and clan. That was perhaps the reason why the corpses of the Tibetan kings were closed in an isolated room and left there one year or even longer after death, before being laid in their tomb.

11. *Decomposed Flesh is Pollution*

Also in Mahāyāna Buddhism, in certain rituals meant to eliminate the evil *karma* of the dead, and introduced in the liturgy of the Kun rig cycle (Vairocana) (in Tibet, perhaps with no Indian prototypes) the dead is represented by a fragment of his bones (*rus* = bone, family) or by a piece of paper or wood, on which his name has been written (TUC-CI 1970, p. 218).

We may recall the bones deposited in vases in Baluchistan, perhaps after having cut off the flesh. Bones painted with ochre have been found in Kashmir at Burzahom (GUPTA 1972, pp. 82 ff.).

The main idea was that of burying bones without flesh: it is the background of a vast Indian literature in which the decomposition of our body is described with an almost morbid obstinacy, in order to induce in the mind of the reader a deep *contemptus mundi* (e.g. some pages of the *Bodhicāryāvatāra* of Śāntideva). In Swāt so far there is no trace of incineration, but only of combustion.

The bodies of *sādhus* as well of criminals were exposed in lonely places, frequented by *yogins* for meditation; according to Buddhist tradition the most famous cemeteries (*śmaśāna*) ⁽²⁶⁾ were eight; Uḍḍiyāna itself was famous for its eight graveyards.

The Tibetan followers of the gCod school use to retire in cemeteries for their spiritual exercises. The *Mahāparinibbānasutta* shows that the funeral rites followed for the Buddha, on which scholars have discussed so much, were meant chiefly for the destruction of the flesh.

According to tradition, the Mallas of Kusināra (Kuśinagara) wrapped the body of the

⁽²⁵⁾ On the collective burials still practised in Dardistan, see JETTMAR 1967, pp. 63-88.

⁽²⁶⁾ In *Indo-Tibetica* III, ii, pp. 174 ff. I have published two small treatises of the *aṣṭaśmaśāna*; they are situated in the four quarters and the intermediate space: each one of them has a particular tree, the god corresponding to the point of the space, where he is located and the vehicle of the same god, a snake (*nāga*), a cloud,

a *stūpa*, a mountain. In a book attributed to Naropā *Yul ŋi šu rtsa bai rgyu mts'an*, bTan agyur, sNags section, U rgyan is situated in the west and it is a place blessed by the mk'a' gro ma (ḍākinī). In the *dPal U rgyan gyi rnal abyor mai ran gi loṅs spyod kyī rlog pa* of Bir ba pa (sNags section), the eight *śmaśānas* in Uḍḍiyāna itself are enumerated.

Buddha in many sheets of cotton, and placed it in an iron pot, of the kind that are used for storing oil; then they covered it with another vase of the same kind, and placed the pot on the fire. In this way, burning the body, « what was skin or integument or flesh or nerves or humours of the junctures, of all these *no ashes nor dust of ashes* were seen, but only the *bones remained*. Just as when butter or oil are burnt, no ashes nor dust of ashes can be seen, so of the body of the Buddha there were neither ashes nor dust of ashes » (DN XVI, VI 23, RHYS DAVIDS, 1910).

Such a belief and the resulting rites may help us in solving the problem of some tombs of Swāt. They are empty, except for a few very small fragments of small bones; these apparently show that a corpse had been laid in the grave for a certain period, and then taken off. I therefore accept the solution proposed by Prof. Stacul; the body was kept there until its full consumption was over, then the bones were collected and buried in another empty grave kept ready for that purpose or placed in an urn. It was, as we have seen, the practice followed by the Tibetan kings and other peoples. Such a rite may explain the peculiarity of some other tombs in which the body is not found in its usual bent position: instead of that, there is a heap of bones on which the skull has been laid (²⁷).

I must add that almost all the cemeteries discovered are near rivers or streamlets; this fact is certainly not a mere coincidence, but it indicates that the washing of the body was an essential part of the ceremonial as it has frequently been; in India too the body was washed and anointed (KEITH 1925, p. 418).

III

RELIGION

12. *Mountain Worship*

Can we say anything about the religion of those ancient Swātis of whom, so far, only the graveyards and a few habitations have been found? Very little indeed, and this also cannot but be largely hypothetical. If what is narrated about Nysa has some truth in it, and we keep in mind that the Ilam and the Tirič-mir have been or still are sacred for some conglomerations of tribes, we may suppose that, when the immigrants settled down in a territory, they chose some mountain as a sacred centre of the community; we are there-

(²⁷) Bone stripping of flesh with a knife is testified by the Proto-Scythian Timber-Grave Cul-

ture: MERPERT 1942, pp. 56, 41.

fore confronted with some primeval cosmological ideas, a common belief of the Proto-Indo-Aryans, which later were better codified especially in India (perhaps also under the impact of Near Eastern conceptions); the mountain patron of the tribe, the seat of the ancestor, the place upon which the ancestor or a patron god had descended became the centre of the Universe, the Meru of Indian cosmology.

The Meru is often identified, after the expansion of Hinduism, with the Kailāsa; it is an idea which from India spread over many parts of Asia, where the Meru and the Kailāsa emerged, with the diffusion of Buddhism and Shaivism in a not rare collusion with local traditions ⁽²⁸⁾. The Mongols, the Buriats, the Kalmücks call the World-mountain, the centre of the Universe: Sumbur, Sumur, which is nothing else but Sumeru, Meru (U. HARVA 1938, pp. 59 ff.). Temples are also called Meru or Kailāsa, the famous mountain of Western Tibet near the sacred lake Manasarovar. There is a multiplication of these Holy Mountains. Besides the Kailāsa in Western Tibet, we have also an Indian Kailāsa to the west of Cīni in the Sutlej Valley also called Kanaur (Kinnaur) Kailāsa, (TUCCI 1971, p. 548; KULLAR 1972, p. 105) and a Chamba Kailāsa (*ibid.*, fig. 30).

Another Kailās Range lies north-east of Gilgit, south of Hunza, east of Punyal, the highest peak being the Dumani or Rakaposh, 25, 550 feet high.

The *Meros* of the Nysaei has been identified by G. Morgenstierne with the Tirič Mir in Chitrāl; all survivals of an ancient cosmological Indo-Aryan intuition, which each people transferred in the highest part of the place where it settled (MORGENSTIERNE 1930-32, p. 443).

On the Mountain Munjavat, see above p. 17.

The Meru of Swāt was the Ilam (Chinese I-lo, Tibetan Hilo). This explains why the graveyards are generally dug on the slopes of hills and looking towards higher mountains: this reminds me of what happened in Tibet ⁽²⁹⁾ where almost each tribe worshipped its own mountain because it was the place where the ancestor or the forefather himself of the tribes was supposed to have descended from heaven to earth, it also was the place of sacrifices and seasonal cults. In another article dealing with Śiva mountain in Gandhāra (TUCCI 1963, p. 159) I dealt with the same subject and indicated that as Śiva is called Gāndhāra, the goddess is Gāndhārī. This cult of the mountains, or cosmic mountain or the mountain as a God or a Goddess, is still alive among the Kāfirs: e.g. the goddess Kime (Kushumai) rose from a lake. According to others she appeared in the mountain Tirič-Mir. Goats are sacrificed to her (SNOY 1962, p. 84) ⁽³⁰⁾. The Peris in Chitrāl have their castle on top of mountains (JETTMAR 1975, p. 442 and *passim*). The same cult can be found among the Shinas. On the sacredness of Ilam of Swāt during the Buddhist period and also nowadays, cf. below, p. 54.

⁽²⁸⁾ The interrelation of mountain, God, ancestor, king has been investigated from Mesopotamia to Indonesia by QUARITCH WALES 1953.

⁽²⁹⁾ STEIN 1962 p. 170; TUCCI 1970, pp.

239 ff.; HOFFMANN 1975, pp. 93 ff.

⁽³⁰⁾ Many examples of relationship between a fairy and a mountain in Chitrāl in SCHOMBERG 1938.

On his way to Udabaṇḍha, Hsüang tsang speaks of a mountain which one meets; it is the Karamar, and a very steep one. It was sacred to Bhīmādevī, as we are told by FOUCHER 1942, p. 303. She was considered to be very powerful and Maheśvara (Śiva) had a temple below the mountain itself; in the temple there were many *sādhus* who used to besmear with ashes their bodies. The image of the goddess of which no description is given was self-made *svayaṃbhū* (Tib. *ran̄ abyun̄*); it was perhaps formless, but the centre of great attraction. The informer of Foucher told him a very interesting story. Some enemies of a fakir had thrown him from the top of the rock down into the abyss; but he remained suspended in the void taking hold of the branches of a tree, until a woman fakir let him fall down into a basket she carried. This fairy was Sher-bānu the “lion-woman”; which name corresponds to Siṃhavāhinī, an epithet of Durgā. We have here four themes; the cult of the mountain, the cult of its goddess or fairy aniconically represented, the assimilation of an aboriginal *devī* to the mountain and to Durgā, the survival of the same cult under Islam.

The introduction of Hindu Gods in the Buddhist *maṇḍalas* of Vajrayāna is a well known fact. See the indices to TUCCI 1941: Indra, Indrāṇī, Umā, Gaurī, Camuṇḍā, Māhā-lakṣmī, etc.

Another holy mountain of Swāt, which I cannot identify, was Muruṇḍaka, hard to ascend and famous because it was the theatre of a magical contestation between Kambala and Kukkuripā (TUCCI 1958, p. 324) ⁽³¹⁾.

13. Lakes

According to Sung Yün, in Swāt, west of the river, there lies a lake which is the seat of a *nāgarāja*; near the lake there is also a temple. When the Nāgarāja performs a miracle, the king throws into the lake gold and other precious things and stones; when these precious things come out of the lake, they are taken over, at the request of the king, by the monks; the monks of the temple are supported by such resources as are provided by the lake.

Among the Ashkun Kāfirs there are some tanks full of precious things which nobody can get hold of, because they are protected by fairies (SNOY 1962, p. 84). In the Kāfir traditions there are some magic lakes which may cause great floods: hence the custom of throwing an iron arrow into them; this story reminds us of the floods caused by Apalāla in

⁽³¹⁾ On the Muruṇḍas as a people see EGGERMONT 1966. Muruṇḍa was the name of the Śaka chiefs. Cf. LÉVI 1935; KONOW 1929, p. XXI;

LÜDERS 1961. According to some legends told by the local people Gullisar 9477 feet facing Loebanr is said to have been a holy mountain.

Swāt though, I agree, the two stories seem to have no close connection as regards the details, but imply the demoniac or divine character of the lakes.

Mention of other sacred lakes is found also in Uḍḍiyāna, the most celebrated one being that from which, on a lotus, was born Padmasambhava the lake was called Dhanakoṣa. It may be one of the lakes in the basin of the Daral river in Kōhistān.

14. *The Horse*

Many of the tribes that Alexander had to pass through bear names derived from that of the horse; such a toponymy reminds us of the peculiar devotion of the Scythians for the horse; hence the tribal names of many tribes: Aspasioi, Assaka, Assakenói etc. hence also the skeletons of two horses discovered near the tombs in Kātelai⁽³²⁾, hence too the handle of the cover of a funerary urn from Loebanr (SILVI ANTONINI and STACUL 1972, pl. XIX, 1). Nor should the horse figurines found in Kātelai be forgotten (*ibid.*, pl. LIII a). It is not completely out of place to mention the bronze cauldron with handles and a projection representing a horse head found in Gilgit (STEIN 1944, pp. 15-16). Among the Prasun the horse of Imra is of gold (but also the demon is a horse of iron) and it is the horse who lets the Sun free: a horse is sacrificed in Kushteki near the temple of Imra (SNOY 1962, p. 128⁽³³⁾). Also among other peoples the horse is connected with sun worship (See KOPPERS 1936, pp. 282 ff., 311. In addition, it possesses a « herrenkulturelle oder aristokratische Note, welches Pferdekult und in besonderen dem Pferdeopfer eigentümlich zu sein scheint »). Horses were killed during the funerary ceremonies also in Tibet: TUCCI 1949, pp. 716-17; STEIN 1962, pp. 485 ff.; PELLLOT 1961, p. 9.

Also the Massagetae worshiped the horse Strabo, XI, 8, 6. « The Massagetae regard Helios alone as god and to him they sacrifice horses, and they consider the best kind of death when they are old to be chopped up with the flesh of cattle and eaten mixed up with that flesh. But those who died of disease are cast out as impious and worthy only to be eaten by wild beasts ».

15. *Fertility Goddesses*

The figures which have been found in the graves cannot be classified as totems, as Dani seems inclined to think. I suppose that they should be considered as varieties of lo-

⁽³²⁾ Others have been found in the excavations of Aligrāma (kind information supplied by Dr S. Tusa).

⁽³³⁾ Besides SNOY, see ROBERTSON 1896 (see now JETTMAR 1975) on the legends on the horse and its worship. Indices s.v.

cal goddesses or hypostases of the so-called Magna Mater, or more simply goddesses of fertility. I think that it will be useful to add here the detailed description contained in the book by SILVI-ANTONINI and STACUL 1972 (p. 36):

Type FT1 — Anthropomorphic female figurine with high diadem (?) above the head; face characterized by protruding nose; rhomboid bust and breast achieved by hemispherical relief-work; lower limbs consisting of two conical or cylindrical appendices (pl. XLVII a, b, c and d; colour plate; pl. XLVIII a and b; pl. XLIX a and b; pl. L a, b, c and d; colour plate). Variant: FT1I anthropomorphic male figurine (pl. XLVIII c and d).

Type FT2 — Anthropomorphic female figurine with flat body and protruding nose; breast achieved by hemispherical relief-work; arms consisting of curved lateral projections and lower limbs joined together outlined by semicircular profile (pl. LI c). Variant: FT2I with eyes marked by small holes and with lower limbs outlined by triangular profile (pl. LI a and b).

Type FT3 — Anthropomorphic female figurine with high diadem (?) above the head; face characterized by protruding nose and breast achieved by hemispherical relief-work; arms consisting of small curved lateral projections and lower limbs joined together outlined by rectangular profile (pl. LI d).

Type FB4 — Small anthropomorphic figurine with flat body; head just outlined by circular profile and eyes indicated by single transverse hole; arms and limbs carved on both sides (pl. LII a).

Type FB5 — Small anthropomorphic figurine with long neck and head just outlined by triangular profile; eyes indicated by single transverse hole; limbs carved on both sides (pl. LII b).

Thus these female images are bidimensional; they represent some imprecise presences which should anyhow be propitiated, because their anger may be dangerous to man (for their survivals see JETTMAR 1975, p. 219). The dots on the two sides of the head are probably earrings with a central large plaquette surrounded by smaller stones (cornelian?); in some cases the hair descends on the back (SILVI and STACUL 1972, pl. XLVII) in parallel lines; as it is still found occasionally among the Kāfirs and among Tibetan women (Western Tibet). What is rather surprising is the scarcity of a relevant indication of the sex, though one statuette, here not reproduced, has the pubic region marked by a large rosette as an ornament to cover it (or the pubic hair?). The presiding deity of Puskalāvati⁽³⁴⁾ was Ambā, Ambī; Gāndhārī was the most popular goddess of Gandhāra, as we easily infer from the name itself; one may quote a great number of similar other local goddesses in Gandhāra, Afghanistan, Baluchistan, of which mention is made in Sanskrit literature (see TUCCI 1963). Thus, from later Indian texts preserving old popular traditions we may conclude that also in those regions the cult of such female deities was widely spread; they survive now among the Kāfirs, the Shīnas, Chitralis where their connection with the mountains is very strict, they become the *ḍakinīs* of Vajrayāna, and are still alive, with different forms and names, Peri, Rui, Rūi, etc.

The breast is represented, though in general it is not very prominent. Hips are sometimes very large so that some of these images assume the form of a violin, or a flat representation of a steatopygic female.

⁽³⁴⁾ On the coins of Puskalāvati, Pukhalāvati the names found are Ambī, Ambikā, Ambā. But

Puskarāvati was also the name of a river (*Kāsikā*, on IV, 2, 8, VI, 1, 219; VI, 3, 119).

16. Sun Worship

The object described as pendant type (SILVI and STACUL vol. I, p. 44, fig. 27e) may be a symbol of the sun, as divided on its surface by crossed lines into four quarters. The same solar symbol is visible in some petroglyphs found by the Alpine expedition of Mr Bergamaschi on some rocks in the valley of Barpu on the way to Hunza. The carving has been made by poking on an isolated rock in the middle of the valley itself. The figures of ibexes are predominating. The petroglyph which I take as the symbol of sun cannot be a shield because no image of men is visible near it.

These engravings are therefore completely different from those discovered in Gōgdara where the ibex is absent.

Also in some rituals of the *Brāhmaṇas* the sun is represented by a golden disk: (*Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa*, VII 4, 1, 10) «He, then, puts the gold plate [which the sacrificer wears round his neck during the ceremony: VI 7, 1, 1 ff.] thereon. Now this gold plate is yonder sun for he shines over all the creatures here on earth ». And again, XII 4, 4, 6: « verily oh those rays (of the sun) are the All-gods (*viśve devāḥ*) », Sūrya in RV, I 115, 1; VI 51; X 37, 1) is called the Eye of Mitra, Varuṇa and Agni ^(34a).

Another object which is of religious significance is an arrow in bronze found in our excavations and reproduced in DANİ 1967, pl. Lb, fig. 1a (now in the Museum of Saidu Shārif); JETTMAR 1967 describes it as a laurel leaf with three ribs, and compares it with some ribbed daggers found by the Russian archaeologists as productions of Ural metallurgists. (See for other examples LITVINSKIJ 1972, p. 70). It is certainly a ritual or sacral thing, not a functional arrow: the arrow is a symbol of the sky or of the lightening, pregnant of so many archetypes in different religions (see JETTMAR 1975, Indices *s.v.* « Pfeil »; ELIADE 1970, pp. 59-60).

Two skeletons, one of a man and the other of a young woman lovingly embraced have been found in one tomb. It is impossible to argue that this rite is an anticipation of an (unburned) *satī* of the Hindus, or that the couple died at the same time, or that the fact of their facing one another embraced suggests a self-immolation. But we must consider that such a disposal of two skeletons of a man and a woman lovingly embraced, is documented likewise in some tombs of Turkestan, and also in one discovered in Shahr-i Sokhta in eastern Iran, Grave 112 (see PIPERNO and TOSI 1975, p. 186). Two skeletons that, though not embracing each other but lying side by side very closely, are reproduced in fig. 5 of *Uspehi sredneaziatskoj arheologii*, Leningrad, 1975 ^(34b). Thus, we may tentatively surmise that there might have existed occasional practices of immolation of some girls (the one of Shahr-i

^(34a) It may be interesting to quote here what we read in the *Hudūd-al-'Ālam* (1937, p. 121) that the kings of Bolor claimed to be the descendants of the Sun.

^(34b) In the Dahginai song (MORGENSTIERNE IIFL. (2nd ed.) vol. IV p. 51), a young man in

love with a girl, when she died, committed suicide « lying face downwards on the body of the dead girl. After many attempts to separate the bodies unsuccessfully they were finally left in the same position ».

Sokhta seems to be about twenty years old); the tomb of Swāt is now in the Museum of Saidu Shārif, but no anthropological examination has been made possible so far ⁽³⁵⁾.

17. *The Slabs Covering the Tombs*

Another fact is worth noting; the general structural scheme of the grave has been described by SILVI ANTONINI and STACUL 1972. It is useless to repeat here what they have diligently written; but one fact should be mentioned. The real grave, meant to contain the corpse or the skeleton, is in most cases covered by three slabs of stone ^(35a). The usual presence of the three slabs of stone cannot be casual. It has certainly a cultural implication which now appears evident after the “triadic mode of thinking” has so well been elucidated by Prof. Gonda. This fact establishes a link with the people of which the tombs have been dug, and the tripartite intuition which dominated the mental and cultural vision of life homologous to the Vedic one (see above, p. 13).

Meanwhile Dr S. SALVATORI has published in *EW*, 1975, pp. 333 ff. an interesting study « Analysis of the Association of Types in Protohistoric Graveyards of the Swāt Valley » in which he has proven, successfully to my mind, that the graves of Period I (= P.V. of Stacul) at Kātelai « are concentrated in the central-eastern area of the burial ground ». The graves of P. II (= VI Stacul) show « that besides the areas used in P. I the southwestern part also begins to be used, with an extension of the area of the graveyard, or with a change in the area of concentration » (p. 351). From this examination of the burial situation some facts may be evinced; the circular arrangement of the graves, or of some groups of them, « or the particular concentration of graves in a single period ». This may lead us to think « of a link between certain areas and family or interfamily groups ». This seems to reinforce some of my ideas which I will expound in the section on the tribal system practised in that region.

18. *Drinks*

The people to whom the tombs belong used to drink and perhaps, implicitly, to offer libations during the funeral ceremonies. So it appears from the “brandy bowls” and other drinking vessels found in the tombs (and also in the houses so far excavated). Some of these vases have been brought to Italy for the examination of their contents.

⁽³⁵⁾ The *satī* practices (recorded by some travellers - Biddulph, Drew, etc.) have disappeared after Islamization, but the tradition of it survived among the Shinas when Dainelli was there (BIASUTTI and DAINELLI 1925, vol. IX, p. 80).

It cannot be excluded *a priori* that the *satī* sacrifice had been approved by some Dardic tribes converted to Hinduism, on account of even rare

survivals of an ancient immolation of the wife in the tomb of the husband. Naturally, this is a mere hypothesis which should be further investigated. (Chiefly undertaking excavations in Balistan).

^(35a) « There are usually three of these schist slabs ». SILVI ANTONINI and STACUL 1972 p. 11.

But from the flotation of the earth in the habitat of Aligrāma the presence of seeds of grapes is documented. This is confirmed by the story of Nysa which shows that its inhabitants used to drink wine or other intoxicating liquors probably extracted from rhu- barb *haoma-zairi-gaono* of the Avesta, the *soma* of the Vedas; we know that the Kāfirs, untouched by Islam, are still very fond of drinking it (see A. STEIN 1928-30, pp. 501 ff.; MOR- GENSTIERNE 1950-53, p. 34) ⁽³⁶⁾.

In the year 1969 Mr. Gordon Wasson, Honorary Research Fellow of the Botanical Museum, Harvard University, published a book on « Soma divine mushroom » (WASSON 1969), in which he asserted that *soma* is a red mushroom with white spots common in the birch and pine forest of Eurasia; its botanical name is *amanita muscaria*. His views were not generally accepted; the criticism was advanced by Prof. BROUGH in *BSOAS*, XXXIV, Part 2, pp. 331, 362 and F.B.J. KUIPER in his review of Mr. Wasson's book in *Indo-Iranian Journal*, XII 4, 1970, p. 784. Mr. WASSON published a rejoinder to Prof. Brough, « *Soma and the Fly agaric* », in 1972, Botanical Museum Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. The question is still unsolved: that *soma* was intoxicating is certain; more probably exhilarating and hallucinogenic ^(36a).

The problem concerning the drinks of the old tribes of Swāt may be solved by paleo- botanists by the flotation of the earth of early habitations. I can add that in the Tantric schools the first of the five *makaras* (words beginning with the letter *ma*) is *mudrā*, one of the ancient necessary elements of every esoteric ceremony; alcohol is enlisted separately in the five *makaras*. The original meaning of *mudrā* seems to be that of an hallucinogenic plant. The preparation of the exhilarating drinks used in some tan- tric ceremonies is represented on some sculptures (Khajurāho). But I cannot find the botanical name of the *mudrā*. Buddhism also seems to have been compelled to allow, in those countries, some exceptions to its prescriptions concerning the prohibition of drinking alcoholic beverages (as was the case also in Tibet, Nepal and China).

The Indian names for grape show that some qualities of grapes were introduced from the North: *gostanī* from Gostāna, Khotan; *harabaurā*, another name for *drākṣā* from the name of the Harahaurakā (LÉVI 1965, p. 260); *Bṛhatsambhitā* (with Comm. of Utpala, XIV 33): *Siddhasauvīro rājā ca Hārabauro Madreṣās cānyas' ca Kauniṇḍaḥ* ⁽³⁷⁾.

⁽³⁶⁾ Cf. JETTMAR, 1975, p. 90.

^(36a) The identification of *haoma*, *soma* with the rhu- barb, the yellow golden plant (*zairi gaono*) endowed with strengthening hallu- cinating power proposed by STEIN (On the ephedra, the Hūm plant and the soma, *BSOS*, VI, p. 501 f.) is accepted also by Morgenstierne, 1973 p. 276, who adds that an identification of Soma with *Amanita muscaria* would not exclude the local substitution of rhu- barb. The opinion of R. Gordon Wasson received the support of Prof. GERSHEVITCH 1974 p. 45-78 (see also FUSSMAN 1977 p. 41 f.).

⁽³⁷⁾ Sanskr. *drākṣā* is postvedic, the Vedic

svātrā: RV, X 46, 7 *svātrābhājā vayasā* "with strengthening food"; *svātrā* (MONIER WILLIAMS: "strengthening, invigorating" may refer to *soma*, rhu- barb, for which later also grapes were sub- stituted. See discussion by MORGENSTIERNE 1954, p. 30. It is not to be excluded that *hārabauro* is a mistake for *hārabūno*. See also Amarasimha 1954, Khaṇḍa II, n. 107 *mṛdvikā gostanī drakṣā svādvī madhuraseti*; etym. of the pandits: *drāti rasa- vattvād drakṣā*. That *drākṣā* was imported to India from Kapiśa is confirmed by PĀṆINI IV, 2, 99: *Kāpīśayinī drākṣā*.

In the *Vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins we are told that during the journey of the Buddha to the north-western part of the Subcontinent, the Yakṣa Kuṭīla sent to a temple, where the Buddha was resting with some *bhikṣus*, grapes and other fruits. The monks had never seen the grapes and they asked the Buddha how they could be eaten. The Buddha replied that they are to be eaten after having purified them, touching them in three different points with a hot coal. Later the Buddha explained that one can press them and make a juice out of them; this juice can be preserved in the store room; it could be used by the Saṅgha as a syrup (PRZYLUŚKI 1914, p. 494).

Though the reply rests with the analysts who are examining the earth excavated from the houses of Aligrāma, I do not think that we are wrong in surmising that juniper was known as a plant employed in certain rituals, as it happens also today among the Kāfirs; also today in Swāt juniper is burnt on some fire-stands for the *suffimenta* practised by the witches: MORGENSTIERNE G. 1947, Id. 1973, p. 320, FUSSMAN 1977, p. 34, p. 44, SNOY 1962, index, s.v., TUCCI 1963, p. 155 note ^(37a).

The *suffimentum* by means of burnt juniper is essential in the Bon po cults of Tibet and in the popular religion of Tibet. (TUCCI 1970, p. 188 ff.).

Among the Na-khī juniper is not only used in the liturgy but it is deified (uncle of Heaven. ROCK 1948, p. 42. The Na-khī ceremony inspired one poem of Ezra Pound, LANCIOTTI EW, 1970, XX, p. 375).

Nothing so far has been found of imposing diversity among the tombs or the houses till now explored, I am therefore inclined to imagine some tribal confederations living in a condition of common equality: up to now no hint at a centralized power; wheat was collected in pits in the houses; no trace of accumulation of goods of general use to the entire community. Therefore we cannot say if there was a division into classes during the periods so far explored. From the material so far discovered such conclusion seems excluded.

Of course, we cannot say that all of the migrating tribes settled here; many must have pushed their way down towards the plains of India. It is also possible that some of the first Dardic tribes reached the Indus and then they were repulsed back by IA settled there or by other peoples. Fighting among the first settlers may also have compelled some of them to abandon the previous settlements in order to find out a quieter place. In the Vedic literature, the rivalries of the different tribes are often testified: the south-eastwards migrations, however, did not succeed in obliterating the traces of the former origins and relationships, and the analogies in customs and habits; though gradually, as the march for the conquest of the Subcontinent progressed, together with the contacts with other ethnic groups and cultures, the former social and cultural similarities might have been loosened in the course of time.

Thus, from the excavations so far undertaken in the prehistoric and protohistoric graveyards of Swāt it seems that on some more ancient population or populations, whose

^(37a) On the "twig-putting juniper" ceremony GENSTIERNE 1973, p. 175. and the "head-hoof juniper" ceremony see MOR-

identity cannot be determined (one of them may well be an ethnic group of which a) we have a survival only in a language which cannot, as yet, be connected with any known language, like the Burushaski or b) single words in modern dialects, of which no relation with any other known word of whatever language can be proposed), various migrations frequently spread, mainly, not only, from the north, with certain hiatuses generally representing different cultures testified by other types of ware.

I have in mind chiefly Central Asia as the place of origin of the majority of these migrations, which continued up to periods more recent than those testified by the early settlement of Loebanr 1700 B.C. Some of them, as I have said, being already in the Pamirs, might have shifted south-wards driving away other people in the unsettled and unstable ethnic map of the region.

In a very interesting article « The Proto-Indo-Aryans » (*JRAS*, 1973, pp. 123 ff.) T. BURROW argues that « an ancient conglomeration of tribes of Proto-Indo-Aryans, that cannot be brought down earlier than 2000 B.C. split itself *in different periods* into two main branches: Indo-Aryan and Iranian ». Linguistically, Proto-Indo-Aryan refers to « that stage of language existing before the migrations into India after the separation from Iranian ». Some of these tribes of the linguistically Proto-Indo-Aryan period went westwards, settled in the Near East (Mitanni), and eastwards in North and Eastern Sistān. The Iranians « began to move South and by degrees, took over the territory previously occupied by Indo-Aryans ».

About 1400 B.C. (BURROW 1973, p. 140) the Iranians came down and occupied the Iranian and Afghan Sistān, places where the Indo-Aryan previous migrations had settled. This fact brought to the possible expulsion of Indo-Aryans ⁽³⁸⁾ settled in Sistān (Iranian as well as Afghan) or to a possible coexistence of the two groups for a certain period; this is a fact of great importance which cannot be forgotten when the study of Dahan-ī Ghulāmān will be taken up again or new excavations will be undertaken in that place.

Dahan-ī Ghulāmān may be a town and a temple built by the Indo-Aryans — while settled in Sistān — a fact that would direct its reading and interpretation more to Vedic literature and lore. It is also a fact which also the archaeologists should consider because some Indo-Aryans compelled by the Iranians might have migrated westwards introducing in Swāt cultural elements of Iranian inspiration.

The occupation by the Iranians of this part of Sistān already inhabited for some time by the Indo-Aryans took place according to BURROW 1973 (p. 135) not later than the 14th century B.C. when already a numerous and important migration had descended to India.

⁽³⁸⁾ By Proto-Indo-Aryans Prof. Burrow refers to the stage of the language existing before the migrations into India and after the separation from the Iranians. Its phonology can be partially

reconstructed by the comparison of Indo-Aryan and Kāfir which is not to be regarded as a separate branch of Aryan but as descended from the Proto-Indo-Aryan (BURROW 1973, p. 125).

But we may acknowledge that, on the whole, in spite of the many migrations, we can safely affirm that in Swāt we are confronted with a series of homologous cultures; notwithstanding the evident differences, in space and time, and of some details in shape and colours of the artefacts. I think that we must agree with Prof. Stacul, when he writes “Starting from the 14th or the 13th century B.C. the majority of the north-west regions of the subcontinent *came under the sway of a relative unitary culture*. The first evidence, relating to the latter fact was gathered in the Swāt Valley and then in the settlement of Chārsaḍḍa. It was followed by further evidence from Dīr region, the district of Kālām, and the neighbourhood of Peshawar. The same culture with some variants can be attested also in northern Baluchistan”. (STACUL 1974, p. 241).

This article was in the press, when I received the very important book of R. Ghirshman *L'Iran et la migration des Indo-Aryens et des Iranien* (Leiden, 1977). My learned colleague on the basis of the archaeological finds is of the opinion that a large branch of the Indo-Aryans (who introduced the black ware) had already settled about 3000 B.C. in the N.E. of Iran; but about the middle of the second millennium it was compelled by new nomadic incursions to abandon the places it had occupied. There is a difference in chronology and other details between linguists and archaeologists, but both agree on the presence of Indo Aryans in N.E. Iran and (the linguists) in East Iran generally; both suppose that about the middle of the second millenium B.C. they were driven away by other peoples. Russian archaeologists (see Kuzmina 1976) and their excavations have also shown that without any doubt other migrations came down in successive waves from the north; thus apart from certain differences in chronology it seems ascertained that we can come to the conclusions that a) Indo-Aryans [or Proto Indo-Aryans ⁽³⁹⁾] departed from a previously occupied territory in East Iran and North East Iran, b) that the Iranians drove them away or superimposed themselves on their predecessors, c) that other waves descended through the Pamirs and the Hindukush. These are the problems which archaeologists should now solve.

We cannot as yet determine the time of arrival of different migrations of the Dards and of the other tribes which followed them and assign each wave to any of the periods established by Prof. Stacul. But we may well date the first migrations a little before the middle of the 2nd millennium B.C.; this chronological conclusion is not contradicted by the theory of Prof. Burrow nor by the datation through C. 14 (oldest Loebanr 1700 c.: thus also oldest Aligrāma).

The Hindus did not forget their relationship with these tribes, but on account of the seclusion of the Dards and related tribes within the mountains (*pārvaṭīya*), the Dards are said to have forgotten many fundamental Vedic prescriptions or rituals and were therefore considered as impure Kṣatriyas (though some of them were later partially rehabilitated) ^(39a).

We know that some Dardic dialects (Kalash and Khowār) « represent the most

⁽³⁹⁾ Kāfirs.

^(39a) See p. 37, quotation from Manu (BÜHLER 1886).

ancient wave of the I.A. penetration in the region of the Hindukush » (MORGENSTIERNE *Encycl. Islam. s.v.* « Dardiques et Kāfires, langues »). Though « they do not contain any feature which could not be derived from ancient I.A., they have preserved a certain number of notable archaisms which have disappeared in the prakrit dialects ». This does not imply that we have to suppose that from the beginning to the end, Swāt was the habitat, as well as older settlements, of the Dardic tribes only; other related groups might have joined or followed them coming down from the Central Asian reservoir, through the same or parallel routes. On the whole they represent one of the most impressive migrations in extension and in time which took possession of the Pamirs, the Hindukush, north up to Gilgit, east to Baltistan and Western Tibet, south down to Kashmīr, west up to Chitrāl.

In *Mbh*, XV 207, 42, 44, those peoples in the mountains and in the North-West like the Yaunas, the Gandhāras, the Kirātas of the Uttarāpātha, the Barbaras, are considered to be criminal tribes, hunters; and *Manu*, X 43-44 adds: « in consequence of the omission of the sacred rites ... the following tribes of Kshatriyas have gradually sunk in this world to the condition of Śūdras; (viz.) the Pauṇḍrakas, the Coḍas, the Draviḍas, the Kāmbojas, the Yavanas, the Śakas, the Pāradas, the Pahlavas, the Cīnas, the Kirātas, and the Daradas » (transl. Bühler). The list in Pāṇini, V 3, 114-115 says that they were organized in *saṁghas*.

Mbh. and *Manu* state that many of those tribes were *āyudhājīvī*, « they are living on the use of weapons », and organized in *saṁghas*: a) Vāhika (not to be confounded with the Bāhlika) (TUCCI 1963, p. 162); b) Pārvata (Pāṇini, 14, 3, 112 living in the mountains); c) Pūga associations under a *grāmaṇī*; d) Vrāta⁽⁴⁰⁾. We know fairly well the organization of Vedic and postvedic *jana*: their *gaṇas* with their *sabhā*, etc., but little about these tribes of warriors of whom some were allowed, in later times, to enter into the class of the Kṣatriyas; while some others were considered as outcast Kṣatriyas for having persisted in their unorthodox practices. Among the Pūgas, under a council of Elders who elected a leader, there are the Kumāra-Pūgas “youth congregations” (Pāṇini, VI 2, 28). Some were called « having an iron standard ». It is quite possible that many of these mountain tribes, « living by their own sword », were closed military organizations to which one was allowed after some initiation ceremonies, something similar to the “Männerbunde” of Iran so well studied by Wikander^(40a).

AGRAWALA 1953, pp. 438-39 has briefly dealt with this problem and referring to some passages of the epics is inclined to locate them on the banks of the Indus and extends their localization up to the N. Western Frontier. But many of his proposed identifications deserve revision, which is beyond the scope of the present research. It is anyhow certain that the elders of the Pūgas elected a chief *grāmaṇī*. His main duty was to be responsible for the Kumāra-pūgas, the youth of the tribe; the name Kumāra was followed by the family name: some of these names are peculiar like Kumāra-Lohadhvajah, “Kumāra-iron flag”.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ KANE 1961-62, vol. II, pp. 67-68; vol. III, p. 281.

^(40a) WIKANDER 1938.

The warlike character of these peoples is attested by Herodotus and Arrianus and confirmed by the petroglyphs representing war chariots ⁽⁴¹⁾ (cfr. ZIMMER, *Altindisches Leben*, 1879, p. 294 ff.); in a few skeletons examined by Prof. Alciati a group of four show traces of healed traumatic accidents.

Any hypothesis on the organizations of these groups once they settled down, on account of the scanty material we possess, can be only a mere guessing. That they were divided into tribes composed of different clans seems to me the most probable; they must have had a kind of a council of elders for the solution of any problem involving the interests of the community; delimitation of pasture grounds and such like eventual disputes. In case of necessity the tribes united their forces and selected a most able man to be the leader. It is possible that a tribe like that of the Assakenói, asserted its supremacy over the others and assumed a kind of hegemony. They fought because their independence was at stake. As soon as Mássaga fell and Áornos was captured the confederation collapsed.

It is interesting to record what Sung Yün says concerning the penal law enforced in Swāt. Criminals were not killed or executed, but sent to a desert, or to a mountain and left there, free to seek out water and eatable herbs or fruits or other things necessary for their survival; in doubtful cases, a drug was given to them, whose scope was to detect the culprit and the innocent. The same custom still exists among the Kāfirs ⁽⁴²⁾: a murderer is exiled approximately towards Badakhshān in the north, in a desolate plain where he can find only millet and wheat; he may take with him his wife if she is willing to follow him (MORGENSTIERNE 1933, p. 298).

In later times, we find the mention in a Buddhist text of a *yakṣa* specially worshipped by the Dards; he is called, according to the *Mahāmāyūrī*, Mandara. LÉVI 1915. It may be the Sanskritization of a local deity of some Dardic tribe. But which one?

From the coins of the Aśvakā (Assakenói) that survived for some time we may infer that at least the Assakenói might have practised totemic cults; the totem giving the name to the tribe was the fig-tree Vāta (see below p. 46). In the Mauryan period in what we called the "bazaar" in the valley beneath the castle of Rajgīra, the skull of a bovine (a young cow? a calf?) was found painted with carminium; it may be a testimonial of a sacrifice, and of the presence of families not yet converted to Buddhism: it is known that among the Kāfirs and the Dards a cow was not considered to be sacred but not rarely it was an impure animal; sacrifices of cows and calves were practised by the Kāfirs and some Pamir tribes up to recent times. The presence of Hinduism in Swāt is certain (see p. 58, note 72).

⁽⁴¹⁾ On the petroglyphs of Gōgdara representing war chariots and flags see appendix by Prof. Brentjes at the end of this article.

⁽⁴²⁾ Cf. *T'ang-shu*, where it is said that the persons suspected of some infringement of the Law were subject to an ordeal. They were given a drug: if their urine was clear the punishment

was light; if it was not, the punishment was heavy (*T'ang-shu*, ch. 171; CHAVANNES 1903, p. 128). Prof. L. Lanciotti calls my attention to the *Pei-shih* ch. 97 where we find the same statement: to the suspected culprits a drug is given: if one maddens one is guilty. A murderer is not executed but banished to a mountain.

IV

RIVERS

19.

If we follow the itinerary of Alexander to Swāt we meet a series of tribes, (and some of them having homologous names): Aspásioi < Aspioi? >, Assakenói, the Guréioi; Swāt is Soasténē for the Greeks, Suvāstu “having good dwelling” for the Vedas and Pāṇini IV, 2, 771 (Hu-asp for the Iranians?). But we find in Swāt another people: the Urđi, Aurddi, Uđi (TUCCI 1958, p. 326); then a name Wu ch’a, which could be taken as an older transcription, is found in the Commentary (*chū*) by Li Tao-yüan († 527) on the *Shui-ching-chū* “The classic of the Waters” (written in the 3rd century): « Kuo I-kung [lived under the Chin dynasty (265-420)] says that west of Wu ch’a (ṽo-d’á, Uđa) there is the country of “the hanging passages” » (cf. Hsüan-tsang).

In another passage Kuo I-kung also says that after crossing the “Hanging passages” there is a plain, which prof. Petech (⁴³) identifies, rightly to my mind, with Gilgit (or better Yasin?). Wu ch’a here = Uđa; but it has nothing to do with Uđđiyāna (⁴⁴) which is much to the south of it. Possibly it corresponds to Sarikol (so HERMANN in *Sven Hedin* 1916-1922, vol. VIII, pp. 19 and 451: south of Yarkand and Prof. Petech seems to accept his view). But if Uđa has no relation with our Ora, Urđi, the Yü ti yen mentioned by *T’ang shu* (CHAVANNES 1903, p. 160 and LÉVI in *Mm.*, p. 167) certainly refers to our Uđđiyāna: if there is some difference as regards the products of the soil and the climate, it contains a detail which points to the penal laws, similar to those described by the Chinese pilgrims (see above, p. 38). S. LÉVI *ibid.* compares also the name Yü tien na, Uđđiyāna with that of Khotan, in Chinese Yü tien. Uđi, Urđi, Udri, Uđe is the name of another tribe which confederated with the Assakenói and probably represents an ethnic group related to them, but quite separate.

As regards the Urđi (inhabitants of Ora) we quote from the Vārtika in IV, 2, 99 Kapisyāh sphak; in Kapiśi the suffix ± —, a with feminine in ī: *Babhyurdibhyās ceti vaktavyam: bāhlāyanī aurddāyanī pārdāyanī* (Patañjali, vol. IV, p. 185). The change of a dental *d* into *ḍ* can be explained considering that Uđđi may be a local pronunciation which accounts for the Ora of the Greek historians influenced by the frication characteristic of those dialects.

The Tibetan name Orgyan is so explained by Buddhagupta, a Tibetan pilgrim who went to Swāt in the 16th century: « The name Orgyan is derived from Uđđiyāna on account of the similarity [in pronunciation of *ḍ* and *r*] » (⁴⁵); the insertion of an *r* is frequent in N. W. *padriyamśae* (KONOW, in *CII*, 5, 4, *s. v.*); *pratithavitra*, Bājaur casket (*EI*, XXIV,

(⁴³) PETECH 1950, p. 18.

(⁴⁴) As LÜDERS thought 1940, p. 496.

(⁴⁵) Is there any relation between Urđi, Aur-

ddāyanī and uddāi, ura ‘above, up’? MORGENSTIERNE 1956, III, 3, p. 63.

(TUCCI 1958, p. 324, n. 1). This implies a fricative intervocalic change: cf. $t < r$ in modern Kowar.

20. *Nysa Once More*

Before entering the territory of the Assakenói, Curtius introduces the story of Nysa (VIII 10, 71) which Arrianus (V 1 ff.) tells at the beginning of the next chapter, after Alexander had crossed the Indus and defeated the Assakenói. The story goes back perhaps to Megasthénēs, or to some other old source, because it is reported by other Greek and Latin writers. The location of the place is uncertain (⁴⁶): « between Kophēs and the Indus » is too vague. The connection of the place with Dionysos and the classical Nysa, seems to support the doubt that here the context has been exaggerated by the Macedonians, in their desire to flatter the aspiration of Alexander to be deified. But the existence of an historical Nysa or of a place of a similar name in this part of the world seems to be certain. Also Strabo mentions the Nysáioi, evidently the inhabitants of Nysa, located near the Ippásioi (Asp<ás>ioi). « Between Kophēs and the Indus there are the Astakenói, (⁴⁷) Masianói, Nysáioi, Yppásioi (⁴⁸), Massóga (⁴⁹) capital of Assakános; near the Indus there is Peukelaóitis » (XV 1, 27). The story goes that the people went to meet Alexander, and said that they were descended from Dionysos, who was born in a cave from the femur (*merós*) of Jupiter. This means first of all that near that place there was a mountain whose name sounded to the Greeks like *merós* (i.e.: Meru, the centre of the world according to Indian cosmography; see above, p. 27); what induced the Macedonians to accept the story was the fact that in that place there grew ivy and grapes, though, on account of the climate, they did not ripen well (but Diodorus speaks of the good climate of the place); thus Alexander ascended the mountain, followed by people wearing ivy on their heads and drinking wine.

Nysa is probably to be found in a land where Kāfirs or Dards were living; Kāfirs and Dards were and still are generally fine-looking, especially the women, and before Islamization they remained quite isolated, and specially the Kāfirs with a religion of their own. Be that as it may, the tradition concerning the inhabitants of Nysa, as recorded by Arrianus, is that they considered themselves to be foreigners, immigrated there and different from the Indians: Νυσαῖοι δὲ οὐκ Ἰνδικὸν γένος ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἅμα Διονύσῳ ἐλθόντων ἐς τὴν γῆν τῶν Ἰνδῶν

Some travellers have been so surprised by these facts that they have spread a theory, which certainly has no historic background, but is none the less indicative: they imagined that the Kāfirs were the descendants of the soldiers of Alexander. (On the tradition that

(⁴⁶) The problem of Nysa has been discussed by SMITH 1914. Cf. T.A. HOLDICH, *The Gates of India*, 1910, who identified Meros with Koh-i-Mor, followed by Smith; but the identification can hardly be accepted. On the other hand MORGENSTIERNE 1931 thinks it to be the Tirič Mir in Chitrāl. See above, p. 27.

(⁴⁷) Perhaps, through an Iranian intermediary,

from Hastakéne from Astis, Astes, former unreliable governor of Peukelaóitis; the separate mention of Massóga excludes the identification of the Astakenói with the Assakenói.

(⁴⁸) Tzschucke emends: *Ippasioi*; Corais; *Aspásioi*.

(⁴⁹) Tzschucke and Corais emend: *Mássaka*.

« the 'White Kāfirs' of Kafiristan were descended from Alexander's Macedonians », see TARN 1938, p. 170. According to SCHOMBERG 1935, p. 106 the Mir of Nagir claimed to be a descendant of Alexander).

A similar story is told regarding the people of Kunar, by one of the informers of MORGENSTIERNE 1956, I.I.F.L. vol. III s.v. "Kunar": according to A[bdur] R[ashid] the people are Germans who have sought refuge there and embraced Islam ».

Is the name of Nysa surviving in Nisai, Nisa'i (Kunar dialect, also registered in the dictionary by Prof. MORGENSTIERNE, p. 215)?

21. *The Kōphés*

Having left Tiriases as satrap of the Paropamisadae and the remaining part of the country up to the Kōphés (Kabul) river, Alexander reached Nicaea, which Foucher places near Mundrawar in Laghman, where near Karglai, the Alingar and the Alishang after their confluence empty themselves in the Kōphés. In that place he sacrificed to Minerva and then he proceeded to the Kōphés, from where he sent for Taxiles the ruler of Taxila; the latter arrived soon with his elephants, and Alexander gave orders to Hephaistíōn to conquer Peukelaóitis and then to proceed to the Indus in order to build there a bridge near Udabhāṇḍa⁽⁵⁰⁾ (Ohind, Vahind). To sum up the account of the itinerary of Alexander, he did not follow the course of the Kabul river, but went northwards: « considering that the rivers to cross, all flowing southwards, represented a difficulty he cut straight through the country ». Strabo XV, 1, 26 writes: « accordingly, he returned, passing over the same mountains by other and shorter roads, keeping India on the left; he turned immediately towards India and its Western boundaries and the Kōphés river and the Choáspes, which latter empties into the river Kōphés near a city Plemýrium⁽⁵¹⁾ after going past Gorys, another city, and flowing further through both Bandobéne and Gandaritis ».

He wanted to reach first of all Mássaga, the capital of the Assakēnoi. Many theories have been advanced concerning the location of this town. Stein did not commit himself on this point, Dani places it near the *ziyārat* of Mujawar Baba. Sir Olaf Caroe placed it near the Katgala pass between the Talāsh and Adinazai pass, about 8 miles from Chakdarra, on the way to Dīr. This is possible, but perhaps other archaeological excavations on a large scale, are needed to prove it. Curtius refers to the fact that it was difficult to capture the town, not only on account of its fortifications but also because, on the east, it was protected by a violent river with high banks: (« qua spectat orientem, cingitur amne torrenti, qui praeruptis utrimque ripis, aditum ad urbem impedit » (VIII 37)⁽⁵²⁾).

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Udabhāṇḍa may also have two alternative spellings: Udakhāṇḍa and Udabhāṇḍa; the first survives in the name of the village Khunda (according to Colonel Deane in FOUCHER 1901, p. 367, note and Mm., p. 73). It is to be added that Bhaṇḍu and Khaṇḍu are quoted in *Gāna-*

pāṭha 4, 2, 77. See also EGGERMONT 1975, pp. 139, 176. In Udakhāṇḍa, *khāṇḍa* is a Saka word for 'town, village'.

⁽⁵¹⁾ *Variae lectiones: Pligyrion and Plēkērion.*

⁽⁵²⁾ The expression of Curtius *currenti amne praeruptis ripis* indicates what today is called a

Maśākāvati mentioned in the *Bhāṣya* (IV 2, 71) must be here recorded because its name cannot be isolated from that of Mássaga; it is quoted as the name of a river, though the suffix-*vati* can be applied also to a town (Puskalāvati). But the important fact is the presence of such a toponymy in the NW part of the subcontinent. It is also interesting that near Aligrāma there is a *khwar* which is now called Mahak > Masak.

22. Mássaga

Also the spelling of Mássaga differs in the various texts: Mássaga (*Indikē*, I, 8), Māsōga (Strabo XV 1, 27), Mazāga (Curtius VIII 10, 22). Also the name of the Assakenói (Arrianus IV 30, 5) is variously spelt: Assakános is their king, Arrianus IV 27, 4, 30, 5; Strabo XV 1, 27 Assákenos. In Arrianus IV 27, 5: Massakanōn evidently from the name of the capital (IV 27, 5).

According to Arrianus, when Alexander saw the imposing fortifications of the town, in order to deceive its defenders and to force them to evacuate the fortress, he ordered his troops to retire about seven *stadia* from the place where he had pitched his camp; this seems to indicate that the town was not very far from the Panjkora which he had just crossed.

Now we must reconsider the itinerary of Alexander from Afghanistan to Swāt and enumerate the rivers which he had to cross.

23. From Afghanistan to Mássaga

Hēphaistíōn and Perdicca had already accomplished their tasks to subdue by force or compel to surrender the towns met on their way, and to gather provisions in Embólíma etc., before undertaking the building of the bridge; they killed the traitor Astes, Astís (see above, p. 40), the governor of Peukeláoitis and his territory was then put under the command of Taksiles, who was on friendly terms with the Macedonians. Alexander himself proceeded first along the Kōphés (Kābul) river and then, as we saw, turning northward, he subdued some tribes called Aspíi (Arrianus IV 23, 1, corrected by Roos into Asp<ás>ioi); Strabo XV 1, 21 has Ypasíoi (Tzschucke emends into *Ippasioi*, Corais into *Aspasíoi*: (see above, p. 40). We must remember what has been already said that the importance of Mássaga was such as to give the Assakenói also its name: Massagenói (Massagenōn). The confederacy under the dominion of the Assakenói was called Assakíē: ἐν Ἀσσακηνοῖσι δὲ Μάσσακα, πόλις μεγάλη, ἵναπερ καὶ τὸ κράτος τῆς γῆς ἐστὶ τῆς Ἀσσακίης καὶ ἄλλη πόλις Πευκελαίτις,¹ μεγάλη καὶ αὐτὴ οὐ μακρὰν τοῦ Ἰνδοῦ. ταῦτα μὲν ἔξω τοῦ Ἰνδοῦ ποταμοῦ ὄκισται πρὸς ἐσπέरण ἔστε ἐπὶ τὸν Κωφῆνα, τὰ δὲ ὀπὸ τοῦ Ἰνδοῦ πρὸς ἔω τοῦτο μοι ἔστω ἢ τῶν Ἰνδῶν γῆ, καὶ Ἰνδοὶ οὗτοι ἔστωσαν, This passage shows that both Massaga and Puskalāvati were the greatest towns of Assakíē: “great town was Mássaga”; and the « other town » Peukel. It is a fact that the name Gandhāra does not appear

khwar, an impetuous torrent, which runs violently in spring, or in the rainy season: it digs in the cretaceous soil deep ravines, difficult to cross;

it usually dries up in the hot months; Alexander was in Mássaga in about November of 327 B.C.

in Arrianus. The Assakenói settling in the main parts of the land which is usually known as Gandhāra gave to this country their own name: Assakíe up to Puskālavatī, between the Indian territory to the east and the Assakenian possessions to the west of the Indus.

In the "Daedala" territory, Swāt was known to the Greek writers by the name derived from that of the river: Soastēné (for the formation of this name cf. p. 45) from Vedic Suvāstu 'having fair dwellings' (Ptolemaeus VII 1, 42: « Below the sources of the Sóastos ⁽⁵³⁾ is Souastēné »).

Now we must go back a little and say a few words on the territories which Alexander had to pass through and on the rivers he had to cross.

The problem of the identification of the rivers is complicated; in the *Anábasis* there is no mention of the Choáspes, which has been generally identified with the Kunar; on the other hand Curtius says that Alexander invaded the Darada (Daedala) country after having crossed the Choáspes; he sent Coenos to besiege Beira = Bazíra ⁽⁵⁴⁾, Barikot on the left bank of the river and only then he himself went to Mázaga.

According to Arrianus the first river crossed by Alexander was the Xoē (IV 23, 2). In Strabo already quoted (see above, p. 40), the itinerary is more inaccurately described, and many names are misspelt. Strabo XV 1, 27: « Now after the Kophés follows the Indus; and the region between these rivers is occupied by the Astakenói, Masianói (other MSS. Basianoí) Nysáioi and Hipásioi (Tzschucke emends into *Ippasioi*, Gorais into *Aspasioi*) and then one comes to the country of Assákenos where is a city of Másaga, the capital of the country; and now near the Indus again one comes to another city, Peukoláitis ».

But in *Indikē* I 4-12 Arrianus writes: Κωφήν δὲ ἐν Πευκελαϊτιδί, ἄμα οἱ ἄγων Μαλάμαντόν τε καὶ Σόαστον καὶ Γαροίαν, ἐκδιδοῖ ἐς τὸν Ἰνδόν. καθύπερθε τούτων Πάρρενος καὶ Σάπαρνος, οὐ πολὺ διέχοντες, ἐμβάλλουσιν ἐς τὸν Ἰνδόν.

Evidently this passage poses some problems: the insertion of Malámantos, which runs into the Kōphés along with the Panjkora and the Sóastos (Swāt); if Malámantos corresponds to Bandobéne, etc., as Eggermont surmises, it has nothing to do with the Kābul basin but it has with the Indus; then only two solutions are possible: a) that the theory of Prof. Eggermont, at least here, that Malámantos = Bandobéne = Udabhāṇḍa is not valid; b) that the Malámantos probably corresponds to the Kalpāni Nāla running into the Kabul near Nowshera.

The two rivers mentioned at the end cannot but be included in the Udabhāṇḍa district (South-eastern Bunēr). One of them Saparnos (Suparṇa?) must be the Barandu. As to Párrenos I propose to identify it with the Puran in proximity of Dard and flowing near Sondāl, Kulāla, Khānai: it empties into the Indus near Chūrānai.

Nevertheless the two passages of Arrianus *Indikē* (cf. p. 42) though erroneous in some details, are very important. The Kōphès is like the spine of the region

⁽⁵³⁾ Cf. below, p. 45.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Original name, as we infer from the

inscription of Jayapāladeva (Tucci 1958): Vajirasthāna.

which is called Gandhāra: its eastern part and boundary is Peukelaóitis, Puskalāvātī: the whole territory to the east of that town is India proper; the part to the west of it is traversed north-south by many rivers which run into the Kōphés: Malámantos, Souástos, Gorúaiá: about Souástos there is no doubt = Suvāstu, Swāt; Gorúaiá corresponds to Goréis near the Panjkora. Malámantos cannot be Malámantos = Bandobēnē (the river of Uda-bhāṇḍa) because any river near Bandobēnē runs into the Indus not into the Kōphés (cf. above, p. 43); Arrianus himself says that these rivers flow into the Indus, above its junction with the Kōphés^(54a).

Here it is useful to see how Ptolemaeus (RENOU 1925, p. 12) describes the succession of the rivers in this part of the world and to compare the statements of the various sources.

26 Ἡ δε τάξις τῶν εἰς τὸν Ἰνδὸν ῥεόντων ποταμῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰμάου ὄρους οὕτως ἔχει.

Κῶα ποταμοῦ πηγαί Σουάστου ποταμοῦ πηγαί τοῦ Ἰνδοῦ ἢ πηγή

28 ἐκτροπή τοῦ Κῶα εἰς τοὺς Παροπανισάδας ἐκτροπή τοῦ Ἰνδοῦ εἰς τοὺς Παροπανισάδας.

42 ὑπὸ μὲν γὰρ τὰς τοῦ Κῶα ποταμοῦ πηγὰς ἴδρυνται Λαμβάγαι καὶ ἡ ὄρεινὴ αὐτῶν ἀνατείνει μέχρι τῆς τῶν Κομηδῶν, ὑπὸ δὲ τὰς τοῦ Σουάστου ἢ Σουαστηνῆ, ὑπὸ δὲ τὰς τοῦ Ἰνδοῦ Δαράδραι, καὶ ἡ ὄρεινὴ αὐτῶν ὑπέρχεται· καὶ ὑπὸ μὲν τοὺς Λαμβάβας καὶ τὴν Σουαστηνὴν ἢ Γωρυαία καὶ πόλεις αἶδε·

43 Καρνάσα

Βαδοράνα

Γωρυά

Ναγάρα ἢ Διονυσόπολις Δραστόκα

44 μετὰξὺ δὲ τοῦ Σουάστου καὶ τοῦ Ἰνδοῦ Γανδάραι καὶ πόλεις αἶδε

Ποκλαίεις

Ναυλιβί

We have therefore the following comparative scheme of the rivers:

Arrianus, <i>Anab.</i> , IV, 23, 2	Rivers which empty into the Indus Arr. <i>In.</i> I, 4, 1	Strabo, XVIII, 26	Curtius	Ptolemaeus
Chóes	Kōphén Malámantos Sóastos Gorúaiá Párennos Sáparnos Indus	Kōphes Choaspēs Plemyrion ⁽⁵⁵⁾ Gōruda Bandobēnē Gandarītis	Choáspes	Chōa Souástos Indus

^(54a) Sir Olaf Caroe kindly informs me that the Kalpāni has a tributary of its own called Mukam.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ As to Plemyrion MARQUART 1896-1905, p. 117 proposed that it can be Salātura now Lahor the birth place of Pāṇini (EGGERMONT 1970, p. 108 and p. 117, note 207).

It is easy to recognize in Goráia, Gōruda and Gōrúiaia the Gouráioi of Arrianus, then the main of the geographical description concerning the Kōphès River, in which the Choáspes has emptied (flowing forth to Bandobénē and Gandarītis). Gandarītis is no problem: it is (see above) the region west of Peukelaōitis, Puskalāvātī. Bandobénē whether it has any relation with Malámantos or with Udabhāṇḍa corresponds roughly to SE Buner and nearby territories and its rivers do not run into the Kābul but into the Indus to the north of the junction of the Kābul and the Swāt rivers.

Then, πορευθεῖς δὲ παρὰ τὸν χόην καλούμενον ποταμὸν (*Anab.*, IV 23, 2) Arrianus, follows Alexander in his march to Mássaga, crossing first of all the Khoé river subduing the Aspásioi, and then the Gouráioi.

Ptolemaeus VIII 1, VII 1, 26, VII 1, 42, states that, so far as our region is concerned, from the Imaios mount the following rivers descend: Chōa, Souástos, Indus: the Lampākas (Lāmbágai, inhabitants of Laghman) are mentioned twice: in the beginning (below the river Chōa) and at the end (below Swāt, Souasténē); no mention is made of the Kābul river, though of the Chōa is mentioned its “divarication” towards the Paropami(*ms.ni*)sadaí.

24. *Aspásioi and Assakenói*

The Aspásioi, Ippásioi of Strabo can be compared to *asp* or Kāfiri *ašpu* or to other local dialects: cf. *The Gāndhārī Dharmapāda*: *ašpaveka* = *ašvamedha* (BROUGH 1962, p. 103). The correspondence of *Ašvayana* with Pāṇinian *Ašvāyana* is certain: *ašvādi-bhyaḥ phañ*: *ašva* becomes name of family by adding *āyana* (4, I, 110). More difficult to explain is the suffix *-sioi* of *Aspásioi*. But we must not forget that in other readings we find *aspioi*.

From *Ašva*, *Ašva-ka* is derived (Pāṇini, IV, 2, 131 with *taddhita* — — *ka*) and from *Ašva-ka*: *Ašva-ka-āyana* “pertaining to a certain family, a remote descendant” (*āyana*, Pāṇini, IV, I, 99): in conclusion *Ašva-ka-āyana* (⁵⁶); but the relation between Skr. *Ašvakāyana*, or Prak. *Assakāyana*, and Greek *Assakenói* is doubtful. Easier, to my mind, is the following sequence: *Ašva-ka*, *Assaka*, *Assakía*, *Assakēnē* (as *Massagenói* from *Mássaga*) with the usual Greek suffix *énos* (like *Paritakēnē*, *Soastēne* etc. (^{56a})). We must remember that the form *Ašvaka* is found in some coins discovered in Taxila and datable 3rd-2nd century B.C.: *Vaṭasvaka*.

On these coins the inscription *Vaṭasvaka* was interpreted by Bühler and Smith as the

(⁵⁶) The form *ašvakāyana* is nothing else than the Pāṇinian indication of a patronimic; it does

not interest us here.

(^{56a}) PIEMONTESE, 1970, p. 109.

“Aśvaka of the Vaṭa”, the fig-tree, considering this plant as their totem. Recently Dr Kalyan Kumar Dasgupta took up again the study of this problem (DASGUPTA 1974, p. 29), complete with all bibliographical references and a clear statement on the actual situation of researches on this subject. The learned author makes a clear distinction between the Aśvakas, Āśvakas and the Āsmakas (both in Prakrit *Assaka*, *Āssaka*) and locates the Āsmakas, perhaps after a migration from a previous settlement, near the Godāvarī, as they appear in list of the Ṣodaṣajanapadas (^{56b}). Of the Āsmakas no coins are known so far.

Dr K. K. Dasgupta also proposed the interpretation of *Vaṭa* as ‘cowrie shell’, used as a means of exchanging commodities: so the formula *Vaṭaśvaka* could correspond (see Pāṇini II 2, 31) to *Aśvakānām Vaṭaḥ* ‘coin of Aśvaka’. But after discussing this possibility, he concludes that the real meaning should be “the Aśvaka tribe of the *vaṭa* or fig-tree clan”. In the same paper is also discussed the problem:

$$\text{Āssaka} = \begin{cases} \text{Āsmaka} \\ \text{Aśvaka} \end{cases}$$

Dr Dasgupta and myself agree on the different location of the two tribes (⁵⁷) and their reciprocal difference.

In his book, *Dates and Dynasties of Earliest India*, R. Morton Smith (1973) has tried to establish a chronological series of the principal dynasties and kings, as it may be reconstructed from the *Purāṇas*. I too, in a paper now republished in *Opera Minora* have hinted at the possibility that even in fairly old times there existed certain reliable lists of such kings; but I have some doubts about the reliability of the chronological dates, because I do not know how we can rely on documents on which to build up an irrefutable chronology. I think that we are chiefly confronted with *Vamśavalīs* of different traditional value, and we have not yet established an unquestionable documentation on the Purāṇic tradition. According to SMITH 1973, an Aśmaka mother or wife of Anādrṣṭi and a second one wife of Prācinavant, and still a third one, wife of Śūra, are dated 1200 B.C. and 1300 B.C.

Nothing can be inferred from this, except that, as already stated, at a certain time there was a tribe of the Āsmakas of old extraction, in the list of *Purāṇas*.

25. *Again the March of Alexander*

There are still other points not easy to interpret (⁵⁸). Alexander keeps in the beginning India to his left, i.e. descends from Bactria by mountain tracks, then he marches in the direction of India and the Kābul river, which means that he followed the same direction of the Kābul river; but as regards the Choaspes he had no other solution than to

(^{56b}) The *Bṛhatsamhitā* XIV v. 21 locates the āsmakakulūṭas (Kulu) in the NW quarter: therefore they are considered by that text or its sources to be different from the āsmakas along the Godāvarī. It may also be that it interprets Āssaka, Āsmaka as the Aśvaka in the N.

(⁵⁷) It is another indication pointing to the

fact that after Alexander’s times there took place certain events which provoked a southward - or south-eastward movement of some peoples.

(⁵⁸) Strabo also writes: « he reached out for India too, since many men had been describing it (the itinerary) to him, though not clearly ».

cross it; we know that the Choaspes empties in the Kābul river, near a town called Plemyrium, but it is said to be παρὰ Γώρυδα past the territory of the Goráioi, which means beyond the Panjkora.

Therefore the Chōa or Khoa cannot but be the Kunar, which runs west of the Panjkora; this empties in the Swāt; and runs into it; as a result the Choaspes of Curtius, as the boundary of the territory of the Dedalai - Daradas, could be interpreted - as was proposed by Marquart and accepted by Stein - as an Iranization: *Hu-aspa* 'good horse', of the name *Suvāstu* known in the Vedas ^(58a).

I therefore think that the Chōa of Arrianus and Ptolemaeus corresponds to the Kunar ⁽⁵⁹⁾; its name suggests that of the Dardic tribes Kho, living in Chitrāl (Kho) and ancient Swāt. Their language is « die Verkehrsprache of the Kafiri in Chitral » (SNOY 1962, p. 86), and it is called Khovar. « In many respects [it is] the most archaic of all modern Indian languages, retaining a great part of Sanskrit inflexion » (MORGENSTIERNE, *EIs.*) ⁽⁶⁰⁾.

The same idea was again accepted by A. STEIN (1921, I, p. 4, note 2). Already in 1927, p. 424, STEIN wrote: « There is good reason to believe that the languages then spoken in that region and in the adjacent hill tracts including Swāt were not Indian, but belonging to that independent branch of Aryan speech, designated as Dard or Dardic, which has still its representatives in valleys South of the Hindukush from Kafiristan to Kashmir ». Many factors contribute to render complex and difficult the problem of the identification of the different places. The interpreters and informants were Persians, Indians, local peoples of different intelligence and sometimes also of relative knowledge of the places of which they were speaking.

26. *The Conquest of Mássaga*

On his way to Mássaga Alexander, as we saw, had captured Andraka (identification uncertain) ⁽⁶¹⁾. Here in the critical edition of Roos IV 24, 1 is indicated a lacuna: Ἐवास . . . πόλεος προῦχώρει, ἵνα ὁ τῶν Ἀσπασίων ὑπορχος ᾗν.

The editor expresses the view that in that lacuna the name of the town must have disappeared, as it seems evident from the sentence immediately following: « where the chief of the Asp(as)ioi resides »; other editors, with less probability, inserted here the name of the river Swāt. Thus Evaspla should be deleted from the list of the rivers crossed by Alexander.

^(58a) The IA, having mainly wooden or mud houses (see BURROW in BASHAM 1975, p. 25) must have been greatly impressed by the stone-houses of Swāt; therefore the traditional interpretation of *Suvāstu*: « The place of fine dwellings » may appear, in the light of the recent excavations, equally adequate.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ This indication was already proposed by LASSEN (*Indische Alterthumskunde*, II, 2nd ed., p. 137) who was a great forerunner in the

field of ancient Indian geography and on many points can still be considered an invaluable source of information.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ On the position between Dardic and Kafiri according to later researches, see MORGENSTIERNE, *EIs* s.v. Dardistan and Kafir.

⁽⁶¹⁾ We may perhaps connect Andraka with a Kowar word, *adrakax* (< Kalaśa *adrakh* 'hillside, forest'): MORGENSTIERNE 1973, p. 332.

Reaching then a burnt and abandoned town, Arigaion, he entered the territory of the Guráioi on the river by the same name (Gouráios p. 44) and marched towards Mássaga.

About the Guráios river which has been identified, I suppose rightly, with the Panjkora, Prof. DANI (1967, pp. 49-55) develops an interesting theory which, I am afraid, can hardly be accepted. He thinks that the Guráioi correspond to the Kurus, who are not mentioned in the Vedas (only in some derivative forms), and in Panjkora he sees a survival of Pāñcāla-Kuru.

But if Pāñcāla and Kuru are generally quoted jointly and are considered to be strictly connected, the usual expression is Kuru-Pāñcāla and not Pāñcāla-Kuru.

Moreover we know that the Greek transcription of the name Kuru is Korrhai (see e.g. in Ptolemaeus *Ottokorrhai* = Uttara-kuru, VI § 1 and 6; Plinius IV 60, Attacori).

The identification of the Guráioi has been discussed since the times of LASSEN, who states that the name of this river corresponds to old Gaurī, so also STEIN 1921, I, p. 2, note 2); much more acceptable is Garuhā or Guruhā quoted as being in the north-western quarter in the *Bṛhatsaṃhitā*.

The Uttarakurus, mentioned in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* (VIII 14) as an historic people are located *pareṇa Himālayam*, beyond the Himālaya. In the lists of the *Saddharmasmṛtyu-pasthāna* and of the *Rāmāyaṇa* (LÉVI 1918, p. 48) the Kurus are placed along with the Mādrakās; S. Lévi suggests that they should be located near the subHimalayan Northern Tribes (*ibid.*, p. 124). Later their land becomes in Hindu cosmography a kind of paradise on earth. Also in some Buddhist texts, as noted by LAW 1943, p. 21 there seems to have lingered the memory of an historical country in Uttaradvīpa (MALALASEKERA 1937, p. 355).

However if the "Guráioi" have nothing to do with the Kurus, there are in Chitrāl, two summer hamlets whose names are Harigram and Kuru. Harigram, as Prof. Morgenstierne suggests, is certainly a small Hindu colony or settlement; but near it there is another summer hamlet called Kuru, and the important village of Panagrām; Prof. Morgenstierne (^{61a}) adds that it is very tempting to think of the Kuru-Pāñcālas of the Indian Epics: the Kurus seem to have come after the other tribes, to be a later wave of the I.A. migrations; they are not mentioned as a people in the RV. (but a prince Kuruśravaṇa and a Kaurāyaṇa are recorded). They occupy a great place in the Brāhmaṇas and in the Mahābhārata they are quoted as allied of the Daradas. LAL, 1943, p. 86. Uttarakurus settled beyond the Himālaya (*pareṇa Himālayam*) are said to speak the finest language. There is a village Kuru on the road from Skardo to Kapalu in Baltistan.

According to Curtius, Alexander after the events of Nysa entered the country of Daedala. Thus, we are now in no part of the old seventh satrapy, but in a place independent of Gandhāra of the Achaemenian list preserved in Herodotus; we are among the Daedala (^{61b}), Dadikai, Dards (JUNGE 1941, p. 44).

(^{61a}) Notes on Dameli, a Kafir-Dardic language of Chitrāl, p. 116. MORGENSTIERNE 1942b.

(^{61b}) Ptolemaeus § 49, Δαιδάλα.

27. *Some Details in Curtius*

Ptolemaeus occupies some smaller towns, and Alexander the most important ones (Acadira and Arigaion). When this task was accomplished, Alexander rallied his troops that had been distributed in various directions, in view of the impending military operations. Having crossed the river Choáspes, so Curtius says, he left Coenus to lay siege to a rich town called Beira (Bazira of Arrianus, now Barikot) while he proceeded to Mázaga, whose King Assacánuš died in battle; then the king's mother took his place and surrendered, presenting him with rich gifts and was recognized by Alexander as a queen.

The Macedonian in so doing was « More moved by her beauty than by a feeling of benevolence »; anyhow, as the story goes, she bore him a son, and this son was called Alexander. All this seems a mixture of historical facts and romantic stories. But according to Diodorus XVIII, LXXXIV, « the women of Mássaga, when they realized that there was no hope of salvation for their men, took their weapons and went to fight ».

Notwithstanding his tendency to colour as a pleasant romance his stories, in certain cases, Curtius used, I think, practically to copy certain passages from works written by some chronicler well acquainted with the place, and a keen observer, as the following description of the fortifications of Mássaga, gives evidence; its seems to be written by an expert in military architecture (VIII, ch. 37, XXXV): « stadia murus urbis complectitur, cuius inferiora saxo, superiora crudo latere sunt structa. Lateri vinculum lapides sunt quas interposuere, ut duriori materiae fragilis incumberet simulque terra humore diluta. Ne tamen universa consideret, impositae erant trabes validae, quibus iniecta tabulata muros et tegebant et pervios fecerant ». (« The city was besides surrounded by a wall 35 stadia in circumference, which had a basis of stone-work supporting a superstructure of unburnt, sundried bricks. The brickwork was bound into fabric by means of stones so interposed that the more brittle material rested upon the harder, while moist clay had been used for mortar. Lest, however, the structure should all at once sink, strong beams had been laid upon those, supporting wooden floors which covered the walls and afforded a passage among them »: transl. Mc Crindle in R. G. MAJUMDAR 1960).

This manner of building is still in use in many parts of the mountainous parts of Afghanistan, Kōhistān and the Pamirs.

28. *Castles and Villages*

Towns were walled (sometimes double-walled) and built on top of steep hills (^{61b}), where imposing traces of walls and buildings are still extant; just as Curtius writes, the basement is made of stone bricks, upon which mud walls were superimposed; the working people lived there and in the plains; tillers, labourers, silver- and goldsmiths, potters: in case of danger they might have taken shelter within the walls of the citadel.

Naturally, what is now left on top of the hills is not protohistoric, except in a few cases; only parts of the old stone basements are preserved, because after the *pax kushanica*

(^{61b}) *En petrais* like in Bactria.

(air photographs have revealed a big town of orthogonal plan near Mingōra) urban centres along the main trade routes were largely abandoned; new invasions ravaged the country, and the population retired again on top of the hills, and rebuilt fortified villages on the remains of the old ones; there is a chain of high hills on the right side of the Swāt opposite Mingōra, overlooking the village of Aligrāma and its cultivated land. On those hills there are heaps of ruins and the highest one was partially excavated by Dr. Faccenna. The upper parts of those ruins go back to the time of the Hindu Śāhi: when the excavations reached the rocky soil, fragments of the same pottery as that of the graveyards were discovered, and can still be found all along the slopes of the hill mixed with potsherds of the Kuṣāṇa period. Unfortunately, the name of the village is recent; it is now called Aligrāma 'the village (*grām*) of Ali'. If one day we discover the census of the Yūsufzai Sheikh Malli who conquered Swāt (around the 16th century), distributed the lands enforcing a sound programme of rotation and ordered a census to be made, we might be in a condition to know the old name of the same village. We can say that houses, with pottery belonging to the various periods of Prof. Stacul's chronology, have been found at the bottom of the hill overlooking Aligrāma and some of them very near to the river.

Many things had changed from the times of Herodotus. The confederacy of the tribes under Assákanos gave its name to the country itself, Assakíē, gravitating towards the Kōphès; territorially, it corresponds roughly to Gandhāra, its eastward limit is Puskalāvati; the Indus being the boundary between the two countries Assakíē and India. The real Indians are beyond the Indus: no mention of the other peoples of the 7th Herodotean Satrapy except for the Daedalaē, Dadíkai. The war events relating to the invasion of Swāt are introduced by Curtius VIII, X, 37 by the sentence; « hinc (Nysa) ad regionem, quae Daedala vocatur perventum est » which means that Alexander entered the Dardic country. Where then do the Sakā go situated north or east of Gandhāra? (above, p. 16). Can it be definitely excluded from consideration that there is some relation with the Massagetae and the Assakenói, also called Massagenoi⁽⁶²⁾ after the name of their capital, and who were so powerful as to give their name to a large part of Gandhāra (Assakíē)? Is this too another hint at the migrations and intermingling of migrating tribes which presumably took place in the regions of HinduKush, Pamir and northern Gandhāra, during the times intercurrent between the last period of the reign of Darius and the expedition of Alexander?

If what Curtius writes, i.e. that Alexander left Coenos to besiege Beīra (Bazíra, a rich town, *urbs opulenta*) and himself went to Mázaga (Mássaka) and the Choáspes is Suvāstu, Swāt, the doubt may arise that he crossed the river near Barīkot in a place which we cannot identify and from there he reached the left bank of the Swāt⁽⁶³⁾. There might be a reason for this, because Bazíra had a great strategic importance since it controlled the routes to Buner (Karāhar pass): a reason which induced Alexander to fortify the city, as he wanted to prevent any attack by the troops of Abisares, requested to come to the rescue

(62) Cf. above p. 42.

(63) Also to-day there is a ford near Barīkot.

of the Assakenói. I am giving rise to a doubt, I repeat, I am not solving a problem.

The name of the capital of the Assakenói: Mássaga, Mássaka, Mázaka, Másoga (Strabo XV 698) reminds me forcibly of the Massagetae (see references from classical sources in *RE*, s.v. the Massagetae and the Scythians). ALTHEIM and STIEHL 1970, p. 128 connect the name of the Massagetae with the Ossetic word *mäsüg, mäsug* ‘tower’, MARQUART with av. *masyō* (exactly: *masya*, Bartholomae, p. 1155; Skr. *matsya* ‘fish’) (1905, p. 78).

Among the Massagétæ women enjoyed a great freedom and could be leaders in war; such was the case of Tomyris (or Tamyris) who took command of the Massagetae in the battle where Cyrus was killed.

Concerning the queen of Mássaga, Arrianus says only that after the death of Assacánuš his mother with his son surrendered. He does not add the name of this queen, but Curtius calls her Cléophis (gen. Cleophídís) a name which reminds us of some better-known names of the classical tradition, e.g. Cleobis, etc. Curtius Rufus adds that she, accompanied by her son and many women of Mássaga carrying golden gifts, went to the camp of the Macedonians and asked for mercy. She requested to be reinstated in her former position; Alexander consented, inspired more by her beauty than by a feeling of compassion. According to Diodorus Siculus, the Scythian women, when their men died or were no longer able to fight, took their place in the battle. This was the behaviour of the wives of the mercenaries of Mássaga whom Alexander allowed to leave the town and to join him; but they fled at the dead of night and when attacked by the Macedonians, women fought strenuously along with their men. According to Justinus and Trogus, Queen Cleophis lost her honour among her subjects for having conceded herself to the enemy, and was therefore called by the local people « the harlot queen ».

Near Barīkot, on a hill overlooking the Kandak valley, there are many ruins, the most important ones being those of a Buddhist settlement; nowadays, some ruins of a building nearby are locally called Kanḡar or Kančor Koṭ: (^{63a}) the *koṭ* “of the shameless one”, of the “harlot” or the procuress. It would be interesting if Mr Inayatur Rahman (INAYATUR RAHMAN 1968) who has collected many folk tales of Swāt (and some of them containing records, even if vague ones, of real old facts) could enquire of the local people about the origin of such a name and what kind of tradition, if any, is underlying it.

After what I said above concerning the Saka Haumavarga I am even less inclined to abandon my former idea that there is a connection between the Massagetae and the Assakenói, also called Massakenói, from Mássaga, I have also referred to some documents which indicate the presence of Scythians in the proximity of Gandhāra; I have equally referred to some practices of the Assakenói which are found among the Scythians, the most warlike tribe of the place. We know from Herodotus I 212, that the Massagetae worshipped the sun (by which they used to swear as by their Lord) and that they used to sacrifice horses to it. The horse is not killed by any weapon, so that no drop of blood may be

(^{63a}) Stein A. *MASI* n. 42, 1930, p. 14.

produced by the execution, but by means of a rope round the neck of the animal, slowly and gradually tightened with the help of a stick.

A few facts can here be recollected; the possible documentation of sun worship by some of the peoples whose graveyards have been explored (p. 29 and p. 31), the burial of two horses near a tomb in Katelai, the proximity of Scythian tribes near Gandhāra at the times of the Achaemenian empire, and also their probable descent towards Gandhāra, see above, p. 16. We must also not forget what Strabo says: « The Massagetae and Sakas stood for the easternmost of the Scythians though each people *per se* bore a name of its own » (XI 8, 2).

V

ÁORNOS

29. *Aornos Un'a sar or Ilam*

I do not wish to appear as possessed by a mania for raising doubts; I only mean to say that to many a problem concerning Swāt there might be alternative solutions. Let us consider e.g. the question of the Áornos. After the conquest of Ora the inhabitants of Bazíra, discouraged, fled at the dead of night along with people of other tribes and took shelter in the *petra*, “the rock” which Arrianus calls *Aornos* (and Curtius *Aornis*) which is = Prakrit *āvaraṇa*, a common name for any sheltered place (cf. also Pashai *war* “wall”) ⁽⁶⁴⁾.

Sir A. STEIN (1927, p. 432) considers that the Ilam was the place where the inhabitants of Barikot, Bazíra (Vajīrasthāna) took shelter when they fled from their town; but he thinks that the Áornos is not identical with the Ilam, because he reads the passage of Arrianus in the following way: the people of Bázira « lost heart and at the dead of night abandoned the town and fled to the rock. Thus the other barbarians, too, leaving their towns, they all fled to the rock in that country called Áornos ».

Arr., *An.* IV 28 1: Καὶ ταῦτα οἱ ἐν τοῖς βαζίροις ὡς ἔμαθον, ... ἀμφὶ μέσας νύκτας τὴν πόλιν ἐκλείπουσιν, ἔφυγον δὲ ἐς τὴν πέτραν, ὡς δὲ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι βάρβαροι ἐπραττον ἀπολιπόντες τὰς πόλεις ξύμπαντες ἔφευγον ἐς τὴν πέτραν τὴν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τὴν ἄορνον καλουμένην

STEIN (*ibid.*, p. 61) follows the reading of Gronovius Lugduni Bat. 1704 who cancelled the sentence ἔφυγον ἐς τὴν πέτραν and writes « on hearing of the fall of Ora abandoned their town ». But the most recent edition by Roos maintains the reading « they fled to the rock »; the following sentence adds that on hearing this, all the inhabitants of other towns fled to the *petra* (concerning which we cannot state with certainty that it is a different one from that of Barikot), which in the country is called “Áornos” (Curtius, *Aornis*).

The Áornos has been identified by Sir Aurel Stein with Un'a sar, Pir sar to the north

⁽⁶⁴⁾ ALTHEIM-STIEHL 1970, p. 166, derives *Aornos* from a *bu-varan* which does not seem to me to be acceptable; *āvaraṇa* is also in Skr. a

fortified place. We find another Áornos in Bactria: Arrianus, *An.* III 29, 1.

of Chakrēsar, overlooking the Indus; we should remember that Alexander had already sent in advance Hēphaistíon and other generals to build a bridge at Udabhāṇḍa (Ohind, Vahind, Und) where he would have met them. He soon went to Peukelaōitis (Puṣkalāvātī, Chār-sadda) (passing through Orobatis, which Eggermont proposes to identify with Ariṣṭapura). Then, before proceeding to the Áornos, he went to *Embólima*, now Ambela, in Bunēr; large supplies had been stocked there and everything else which might be required; in order to prevent any attack from that side he decided to dislodge the enemy from the *petra*, the Áornos, which according to Arrianus was very near to Embólima. Prof. Eggermont does not take too literally the statement that Embólima was a town near Áornos, because the term “near” may be taken rather loosely and should be interpreted with some caution. I add that concerning the Áornos (Áornis), Curtius writes (VIII 11): « Multa ignobilia oppida deserta a suis venere in regis potestatem quorum incolae armati petram Aornis nomine occupaverunt »; then he adds that « Radices ejus Indus amnis subit » (*ibid.*).

In Justinus there is no mention of the Áornos; he only writes: « cum ad saxum rarae asperitatis et altitudinis, in quod multi populi confugerant pervenisset, cognoscit Herculem ab expugnatione ejusdem saxi terrae motu prohibitum »⁽⁶⁵⁾; which refers to the legend of the unsuccessful expugnation of the Ilam by Hercules.

Arrianus (*An.* IV, 28, 1) does not mention the Indus. But Strabo does (XV, I, 8): « When Alexander, at one assault took Áornos, a rock at the foot of which the Indus river flows near its sources »; “near its sources” is certainly an incorrect statement.

The connection of Sindhu, Indus with the Daradas, and therefore the distinction between an upper (Darada) part and a lower Indian part is implicit: as it appears from the expression *Dārādī Sindhubḥ, Prabhāvātī ad* Pāṇini IV 3, 83; AGRAWALA 1953, p. 43^(65a).

The “petra” is so described by Curtius (VIII, XI 39): « Petra non a modicis ac molibus clivis in sublime fastigium crescit, sed in metae maxime modum erecta est, in cuius ima spatiosiora sunt, altiora in artius coeunt, summa in acutum cacumen exurgunt. Radices ejus Indus amnis subit⁽⁶⁶⁾ prealtus, utrimque asperis ripis; ab altera parte voragine eluviesque praeuptae sunt ».

Such indeed does the Ilam appear from Barikot; Arrianus narrates that Alexander started from Embólima, encamped in a suitable place, and next day was at the bottom of the Áornos. According to me, the time is too restricted for an army in full equipment and carrying war engines etc. to reach the Pir sar distant, as the crow flies, at least 60 miles with two passes, though not very high to cross, in a hilly tract. Then there is another reason which made me always uncertain about the identification of Áornos with Pir sar; according to modern strategy this could be a magnificent fortress and afford large defensive power of artillery. The reason that gives rise to my doubts is not only that of the relative

⁽⁶⁵⁾ On this legend which concerns Ilam = Áornos see TUCCI 1963, p. 171.

^(65a) Here *dārādī* indicates the place where the

rivers was supposed to have its origin outside the borders of India.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ Curtius and Strabo obviously draw here their information from the same source.

distance between *Embólíma* and the Pir sar, considering that more than 70 Km. in those parts cannot be taken as a short distance, but another one still. I am trying to think not in terms of modern strategy, but rather of the beliefs of those people who, when in difficulty, had recourse to their gods. What man cannot, the gods can do, and the Hilo mountain of the Chinese, the Ilo parvata of the Tibetans, the Ilam of today, is a holy mountain, the seat of a god. Just in front of Barikot one can admire the peak of the Ilam, abode of gods from the oldest times up to now. Arrianus followed by Justinus and Strabo ⁽⁶⁷⁾ here introduces the story of Hercules who vainly tried to conquer it, thus praising Alexander as a human hero who had succeeded where a god had failed. This means that the mountain was, at that time, consecrated to a god and was even a place on which some legends or myths had been centred. And it has continued to be a holy place till our times. It was sacred during the Buddhist period when the pilgrims were shown the square stones like couches made by art [which] form an unbroken series of gulleys. It was here that the Buddha once, in a former birth, gave up his life for the hearing of a half “stanza of the Doctrine”. (Photo in STEIN 1929, fig. 97).

Those “square couches” might have been used as altars from prehistoric times ⁽⁶⁸⁾; however, Ilam has remained a holy place to the present day. Nowadays on the highest spot there is written on a rock the name of Śrī Rām (Rāma, incarnation of Viṣṇu). Hindus, Sikhs and even Muslims go there. When I reached the top, (and the last approach can be some what dangerous because one has to walk on a spur, overhanging the abyss), my guide, who was a very devout and orthodox Muslim, knelt down turning his face towards the *qibla* and recited the ritual prayers. The sacrality of the Ilam goes back to prehistoric times, and has survived the changes of religions; the graveyards of Bazira have been dug in front of it. A little below there are a spring and some ponds. The difficulty of the ascent is marked by STEIN 1929, pp. 168 ff.

In ancient times, it was usual to take shelter in the sacred mountains which in addition to the natural difficulties due to their asperities, were the abode of the gods, the ancestors, the tribal deities. Moreover, another fact must be taken into consideration: before attempting the ascent and the capture of the *petra*, Alexander ordered that Massaga, Ora, Bazira should be fortified, thus preventing any attack from the Karāhar pass, in order to be safe from that side, as he had done in *Embólíma*.

I do not see any serious objection to the identification of *Embólíma* with the Ambela of today; phonetically also Ambela is nearer to *Embólíma* than Amb.

Moreover before attacking the *petra* Alexander left one of his generals at *Embólíma* with army and supplies in case a siege might have taken place. I refer to the passage of Arrianus IV 28, 7 in which after the events of Em-

⁽⁶⁷⁾ Hercules was assisted by the ancestor of the Sibai. Strabo, XV, I 8.

⁽⁶⁸⁾ That is most probably what remains of the old mountain worship of the early inhabitants

of Swāt. Were these stones used also by Alexander for his sacrifices, recorded by Arrianus? On stone altars among the Dards, see JETTMAR 1975, p. 335.

bólíma, he writes ἀφικόμενος δὲ ἐς Εμβόλιμα πόλιν ἢ ξύνεγγυς τῆς Πέτρας τῆς Ἰάρονος ᾧ κείτο “he went to the town of Embólíma which is situated near the *petra* Ἰάρονος”. Moreover from that side the ascent is easier (STEIN, 1930, p. 102).

Besides, if one wants to reach from Embólíma the bottom of the *petra* one meets a small river, not certainly to be compared to the Indus, but a river all the same, (and the Indian interpreter might have used *sindhuḥ* in the sense of “river” as it is usual): the Buryonkanrai Khwaḥ has its sources near the *petra*, the Ilam itself, and runs into the Barandu which flows into the Indus.

Since Suvāstu is known in the Vedas, the opinion of DAHLQUIST 1962, that the Ἰάρονος may be identified with *Aurṇavābha* (who, according to him, is the same as Vṛtra, against whom Indra fought so as to let the waters free), cannot be ignored though *Aurṇavābha* appears to be mainly a teacher. Be that as it may, the sacrality of Ilam is very old, *ab illo tempore*; so the story of Alexander recalled a local tradition, according to which a god or a demon identified by the Greek with Hercules, had vainly tried to conquer it.

When the Assakenói had been defeated, their territory, which probably included also that of their allies during the war, was put under the command of an Indian satrap, Siskottos (Śaśigupta): Arrianus IV 30, 4; V 20, 7. When Alexander came back from Ἰάρονος he invaded — according to Arrianus — the land of the Assakenói, that is, their other territories which had not yet been conquered, the remaining parts of Buner, and a consistent part of the lands of the confederation of tribes upon which the Assakenói ruled; the people, however, had fled to the mountains. Nevertheless, Alexander met with some difficulties, because about 20,000 soldiers had been mustered there, by the brother of Assacános, who might be the same as Ericos, or Aphrikés of Trogus and Diodorus) ⁽⁶⁹⁾ in order to harrass him on his way back (Curtius VIII 12, 1, 37).

To sum up, besides the hypothesis: Unṛa sar = Ἰάρονος ⁽⁷⁰⁾, the identification of Ἰάρονος with Ilam cannot a *priori* be excluded. Just a few words more about Dyrta: somebody (AGRAWALA 1953) proposed Dīr, but I think that an expedition to Dīr would have delayed and rendered more dangerous the plan devised by Alexander, who was anxious to reach India. Perhaps he might have pushed as far as Mingora and the Jāmbīl valley. But this too is a surmise. EGGERMONT 1975, p. 182 suggests that Dyrta (a name which he connects with that of the Dards) can be located in Bunēr, more precisely that it corresponds to modern Daggar: it is possible but, to my mind, Daggar would not fit a fortified town: better on the hills north-east of Daggar, Hissar Ghar. But further archaeological surveys in Bunēr are needed to clear this point.

When Alexander had reached Peukelāoitis, Puṣkalāvati, his campaign in Swāt had come to an end.

⁽⁶⁹⁾ See p. 15.

⁽⁷⁰⁾ Though, as we saw, another Ἰάρονος is found in Bactria.

VI

INTRODUCTION OF BUDDHISM

30. *Apostles during Aśoka's Times*

The missionaries of Aśoka in their apostolic work went up to Afghanistan a few years after his conversion, and found on their way and there too, populations of different ethnic extraction and different languages or dialects. Many of them were considered to be outside the pale of Vedic tradition (see Manu quoted above) though always belonging to the Indo-Aryan group. Certainly the dialects which they spoke were different from those of Central India. The Indians called the majority of these dialects *paśācī*; now the name Gāndhārī or N. W. dialects has taken its place (BAILEY 1946, pp. 764 ff.; BROUGH 1962).

KONOW 1929, p. XCIV states that « The North-Western Prakrit was itself at an early date used for literary purpose » and also maintains that certain quotations from the Buddhist texts contained in the inscriptions of Wardak and Kurram show that such works were translated from a more eastern language which might have exercised « a slight influence on the local vernaculars in written records. But the chief influence was exercised by the North Western Book Language itself ». Of course, the Gāndhārī was or was to become a kind of *lingua franca*, up to the boundaries of China, but it was subject to many local varieties which derive from the dialects spoken in the various regions in which it spread, from the N.W. frontier to Central Asia. Indian grammarians called these dialects *paśācī*, so did also Grierson and we have some texts still preserved in this Gāndhārī dialect of which the most important document is the Dharmapada; this text in some points already differs from that of Aśoka's inscriptions in the N.W.

The diaspora of Buddhism in the N.W. territories has been so clearly expounded by LAMOTTE that I can do no better than reproduce here what he has in a masterly way written on the subject (LAMOTTE 1958, pp. 366-369):

Un autre indice de la pénétration bouddhique est la localisation sur le sol du Nord-Ouest, et plus particulièrement du Gandhāra, de l'Uḍḍiyāna et du Penjab occidental, de quantité de légendes empruntées aux vies antérieures du Tathāgata. L'Inde gangétique avait été le théâtre de l'existence dernière du Buddha; le Nord-Ouest prétendit que ses vies antérieures s'étaient déroulées sur son sol. Chaque ville, chaque localité eut bientôt sa légende à elle, et son stūpa pour la commémorer. A Nagarahāra (Jelāl-ābād), Śākyamuni avait reçu la prédiction du buddha Dīpaṃkara, et étendu sa chevelure sous les pieds du Tathāgata. A Puṣkarāvātī (Shāh-Ḍhērī et Chārsadda), Śibi avait fait don de ses yeux à un mendiant, et Śyāma, alors qu'il cueillait des fruits pour ses parents aveugles, avait été frappé par une flèche empoisonnée. A Varṣapura (Shāhbāzgarhī), Viśvantara avait cédé à un brāhmane insatiable son éléphant blanc, son royaume, son attelage, son épouse et ses enfants. A Shāh-koṭ, le ṛṣi Ekaśṛṅga, séduit par une courtisane, l'avait ramenée en ville sur ses épaules. A Maṅgalapura (Manglaor), Kṣāntivādin s'était livré, sans une plainte, aux coups du roi Kali. Sur le mont Hi-lo ou Hidda (Ilam, sur la bordure du Swāt et du Būnēr), un jeune brāhmane s'était précipité du haut d'un arbre pour avoir communication d'un verset de la Loi. Au Mahāvana (Sounīgrām), le roi Sarvada, voulant faire l'aumône alors

qu'il était dépourvu d'argent, s'était livré à prix d'or à son ennemi. Au Masurasamghārāma (Goumbatai, près de Toursak dans le Būnēr), Dharmarata avait transcrit un texte de la Loi en utilisant sa peau comme parchemin, un de ses os comme calame, et son sang en guise d'encre. A Girārai, le roi Śibi avait racheté, au poids de sa chair, un pigeon poursuivi par un faucon. Au monastère de Sarpauṣadhi dans la vallée du Sānirāja (Adinzai), Indra, transformé un serpent, avait sauvé la population de la famine et de la peste, tandis qu'un serpent industriel faisait jaillir l'eau d'un rocher...

Les zélés propagandistes avaient donc puisé dans le riche répertoire des Jātaka où le Bodhisattva, sous une forme d'existence humaine, animale ou divine, avait pratiqué les grandes vertus de son état, et notamment la générosité, la patience, l'énergie et la sagesse, non sans tomber parfois — comme ce fut le cas pour Ekaśṛṅga — dans d'inévitables faiblesses humaines. Avec Bénarès qui revendiquait également siens quelques Jātaka (l'Éléphant blanc à six défenses, la Perdrix, le Cerf et le Lièvre), le Gandhāra fut le seul à pratiquer le jeu — un peu puéril, mais profitable pour les lieux de pèlerinages — de l'acclimatation des légendes. Encore cet engouement n'eut-il qu'un temps. Le fait que des stūpa aśokéens, comme celui du Don du corps sur le pic de Banj, du Don de la chair à Girārai, du Don des yeux à Chār-sadda, du Don de la tête à Takṣaśilā, de Viśvantara à Shāhbāzgarhī, etc., furent édifiés dès l'époque Maurya prouve que l'annexion des légendes débuta dès l'introduction de la Bonne Loi dans les marches du Nord-Ouest...

Notons pour terminer que la Bonne Loi ne connut pas le même succès dans tous les districts du Nord-Ouest indistinctement. Les renseignements fournis par les pèlerins chinois et les trouvailles archéologiques montrent que seuls les districts du Penjab occidental, du Gandhāra, de l'Uḍḍiyāna et sans doute aussi du Jāgudā (qui n'a pas encore été exploré systématiquement) furent véritablement bouddhisés dès l'époque Maurya. Il n'en fut pas de même pour le Kapiśa (Kohistān de Kābul) où Hiuan-tsang ne signale qu'un unique stūpa aśokéen, ni même pour le Kaśmīr où l'on n'a retrouvé aucune trace des fondations aśokéennes du Śuśkaletra et du Vitastrāta mentionnées par les voyageurs et Kalhaṇa. Que quelques bouddhistes s'y soient aventurés à l'époque ancienne, nul ne songe à le nier; mais une hirondelle ne fait pas le printemps et, à la lumière des nombreux indices que nous aurons à examiner plus loin, on peut croire que le Kapiśa et le Kaśmīr ne devinrent de véritables fiefs bouddhiques qu'à l'époque Kuṣāṇa, grâce à l'active propagande menée par Kaniṣka. C'est plus tard encore que la Bactriane, séparée du bassin de l'Indus par la haute barrière de l'Hindūkush, devint à son tour une terre sainte du bouddhisme. C'est ce qui ressort, entre autres indices, du témoignage de Hiuan-tsang qui attribue la plupart des fondations bouddhiques du Trans-Hindūkush, non pas à Kaniṣka et moins encore à Aśoka, mais plus modestement et plus tardivement, à des « Anciens Rois » (*kieou wang*), c'est-à-dire à des Kuṣāṇa tardifs (c. 231-390 p.C.), où même à des Kidārites (c. 390-460 p.C.).

E. Lamotte also adds: « le succès sans précédent rencontré dans le milieu populaire par la littérature des Jātakas et des avadānas, avait grossi considérablement la légende bouddhique; chaque ville, chaque localité importante du Nord-Ouest était représentée dans le folklore religieux et prétendait avoir été illustrée autrefois par les exploits du futur Buddha, la visite de Śākyamuni ou la présence de quelque grand disciple » (LAMOTTE 1947-1950, p. 159).

But the first missionaries met, no doubt, with some difficulties in their work; first that of communicating with the people they choose to convert and then to select the texts more accessible to the eventual converts. They certainly did what the early apostles to China had done: they must have selected simple elementary books, which offered for consideration some outline of the life of the Buddha, and resorted to the *jātakas* and the *avadānas* inculcating the inflexibility of the law of karma. This procedure had the advantage of condemning the practices that Buddhism prohibited and of expounding the main tenets of Buddhism, not in a dogmatical way, but in a narrative, easy discourse.

We know that the Buddha did not enjoin to the apostles — sent to evangelize the different regions of India and later of Asia — to teach and to preach in the same language he

had himself spoken: each preacher was allowed to preach: *sakāyaniruttīyā* “in his own dialect”. This point too has been already elucidated by Prof. LAMOTTE 1958, p. 613; the Buddha authorized the use of the local dialects concerning the pronunciation as well as the vocabularies. Thus, the *Vimalaprabhā* (a commentary on the Kālacakra), states that the Piṭakas were written in 96 different languages. Such a question was debated also in the *Vibhāṣāsātra* where we find a very interesting passage translated for the first time by S. Lévi « The Buddha employs only one word for preaching his doctrine; then the people, each one according to his own category, understands it. Everybody says: the Bhagavat has spoken for me, it is only for me that he preaches this or that subject ». This is what happened when he spoke to the T’o lo t’o, Ta la t’o, Daradas, to the Khasas (Chia sha), to the Mo lo p’o Mālava, etc. (See above, S. LÉVI 1905, 6, p. 286 ff.). In fact, as I have already said concerning our region, the Chinese have preserved the tradition that many books in Uḍḍiyāna were written in *paiśācī*.

It is therefore certain that the Indian missionaries, must have first of all learnt the local languages, and asked for the help or cooperation of some local learned man, conversant with other Indian dialects, probably merchants ⁽⁷¹⁾ as it every-where happened in the early times of the Buddhist diaspora. Though Uḍḍiyāna later became inclined more towards Mahāyāna than to Hīnayāna, old schools were represented there at the times of Fa hsien; Hsüan-tsang says that they had preserved some ancient Vinayas: Dharmagupta, Mahīśāsaka, Kāśyapīya, Sarvāstivādin, Mahāsāṃghika ⁽⁷²⁾. (Cf. BAREAU 1955, p. 31; LIN 1949, pp. 208 ff.).

We may safely assume that the missionary work in Swāt coincides with the building of the big stūpa which has been excavated by the Italian archaeological mission (FACCENNA 1964); the construction was most probably begun about the middle of the third century B.C. enclosing a nucleus housing the relics.

This monument, consecrating the beginning of a Buddhist community in Swāt, reminds us of the Greek-Aramaic inscription of Aśoka found in Kandāhar (tenth year of reign of Aśoka since his consecration) (PUGLIESE CARRATELLI 1964) and of the other stūpas which Hsüan-tsang (see LAMOTTE quoted above) attributes to Aśoka in Ghaznī and Jāgudā.

⁽⁷¹⁾ Buddhism from the very beginning travelled along with caravans and traders.

⁽⁷²⁾ Li Yen-shous’ redaction (about 629 A.D.) of *Pei-shih* ch. 97, after having situated geographically Uḍḍiyāna, Wu-ch’ang, contains a very important information. The Hu Brahmins are said to be the higher class, great experts in astrology and in telling past and future events. This means that Hinduism was well alive with its class system, and the Brahmins were the privileged ones: the fact that they were experts in astrology and in foretelling future events or in recording past happenings shows that they are the fore-runners of later Tantrism. Not

less interesting is the name given to the leading class of the place; Hu: Hu is a name which was originally used for “barbarians”, then for foreigners of Central Asian and chiefly of Iranian origin or language. This shows that in the source from which the *Pei-shih* derives its information “language” refers to a “dialect mixed with Iranian words”. Evidently such a definition is not exact, because though Iranian words can be found in Dardic, the author of the *Pei-shih* wants to say that they did not speak a language very much similar to Sanskrit or to m.i. Prakrit (Cf. also *Wei-shih*, ch. 97). On the meaning of Hu see: PULLEYBLANK 1951 p. 319.

It was called, as we gather from an inscription in kharoṣṭhī on a pot (PETECH 1966, p. 80), Dhammarājika, a name attributed to the oldest ⁽⁷³⁾ stūpas.

But once we have established that the first translations were laid down in a language generally understood in those parts, and eventually, in the dialect spoken in certain regions, we should ask what happened to them. We have no document which may lead us to the conclusion that they were immediately put into writing, because we have no indication of the existence of any written literature in those parts. I therefore surmise that in the beginning these translations were mainly circulating orally. Later the life of Buddha, *avadānas* and *jātakas* were made to converge into the archetype of a Vinaya, within the scheme of the *uddānas*. We know that there exists a Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādins, and another one known as the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvādins “Vinaya of the original Sarvāstivādins”. It is an enormous collection which at the times of its Chinese translator I tsing had become extremely rare, though it has constituted the source from which e.g. the *Divyāvadāna* has been extracted. Now, as shown by S. Lévi, this work contains some texts which cannot be more recent than the third century A.D. (*Aśokāvadāna*) or the *Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna* to be dated at least at the beginning of the same century. All the Vinaya was put almost certainly into Sanskrit at the times of Kaniṣka: I say: at those times, not later, because the prophecy and the praises of Kaniṣka, the enlightened ruler who protected Buddhism, could persuade the king to bestow upon the Community major benefits if he or his immediate successor was alive. Then there are parts which show the interest of the redactors of the Vinaya in concocting the legend of a visit of the Buddha himself to Kashmir, Chitrāl and Swāt ⁽⁷⁴⁾. Another legend concerns an apostolic visit to the N. W. regions of a prominent disciple of the Buddha, Mahākatyāyana. In an *avadāna* which, as we shall later show, is perhaps the elaboration and mixing up of two different stories, is described a rather anomalous journey of the holy man to a town Roruka (not yet located to a certainty) and then his return back to Śrāvastī. Both these narratives are very important because they could have been elaborated nowhere else but in the N. W. regions.

31. *The Saṅghabhedavastu*

Portions of the Vinaya of MSV ⁽⁷⁵⁾ were found in Gilgit, and published by S. Dutt. Some year ago I bought in Rawalpindi another bulky part of the same text (*Saṅghabhedavastu*).

⁽⁷³⁾ I shall deal with this subject: the meaning of Dhammarājika in Oriental Notes V. In the excavations of Uḍegram the Greek name: NOY has been found inscribed on the fragment of a rim of a vessel: « [belonging to] Noūs », as PUGLIESE CARRATELLI, 1966, p. 35 interprets it. The potsherd can be attributed to the Mauryan period.

⁽⁷⁴⁾ The fact of there being two *Vinayas*, one of the Sarvāstivādins and another of the Msv,

has been explained by Vinītadeva in his *Varṣāgraparipṛcchā*, by assuming that Sarvāstivādin is the name of a number of groups and Msv. the name of one of them. (See FRAUWALLNER 1936 p. 25 ff.).

⁽⁷⁵⁾ On the Sarvāstivādins and Mūlasarvāstivādins and their *Vinaya* see BAREAU 1955, p. 154; PRZYLUKSKI, 1923; HOFINGER, 1946, pp. 235-411; LÉVI S., 1897; LAMOTTE, 1958; BANERJEE, 1931; FRAUWALLNER, 1959.

vastu and of the *Sayanāsanavastu*) and I handed it over to the Archaeological Museum of Karachi; I, then, was kindly allowed the loan of the MSS, on condition of its being restored and published. The book is now being edited by Prof. R. Gnoli; its first volume is out. This work written in good Sanskrit with a very few occasional intrusions of hybrid Buddhist Sanskrit contains some peculiarities e.g. the birth of the Buddha happening in a natural and not miraculous way).

The revision and the translation into Sanskrit was made at the times of Kaniṣka; however, this does not preclude that in Swāt and adjoining countries might have, for a long time, been circulating, in various forms, the primitive texts; according to Indian dialectology, they were in *paiśācī*, as is also confirmed by the Chinese ⁽⁷⁶⁾.

There have therefore been, I presume, different stages in the compilation of the huge corpus of the Vinaya MSV.; new insertions, abridgements in a word we have here a *corpus in fieri* in which such manipulations can be discovered as it happens also in a small text like the Dhammapada. It is natural, therefore, considering the various changes in the political events, the evolution of the dialects themselves, the increased interest in other texts of the different collection of the Buddhist scriptures, the spreading of the apostolate in the neighbouring countries that the Vinaya suffered various changes. I shall not be astonished at all if we should discover one day precise testimonials A) of a primitive redaction in some Dardic dialect, B) then an adaptation in Gāndhārī, with new manipulations and variations, C) other sections of the Sanskrit translation now partly discovered.

The Sanskrit translation is the last setting up of different elements put together after a long elaboration following the sequence of the *uddānas*, a real indexing in which the names are enumerated of the persons, deities, goblins, that are dealt with in the following chapters, in order to testify to the origin of certain Vinaya prescriptions explained and formalized by the Buddha in his present or in his previous births, and chiefly the inevitable Law of karma. But it happens that in some cases in the prose section ⁽⁷⁷⁾ the stories deal with subjects other than those enunciated in the *uddāna*, or that some stories announced in the *uddānas* are not found in the prose section; all this evidently implies a work of revision: the arrangement of the subject matter has also been occasionally modified.

The *uddānas* represent not only, as I said, the nucleus and the sequence of the *avadānas* told by the Dharmabhāṅakas but certainly they were used as well as the scheme which inspired the artists in their plastic evocation and representation of the various events of the Bodhisattva's previous achievements or of the life of the Buddha himself which are the subject treated by Gandharan art. The persistence of the NW texts whether of the MSV or of others was such that « the extant Buddhist literature of Khotan has been translated from Buddhist Sanskrit, but the technical terms of the religion which became a living part of the Khotanese language were not from Sanskrit but from the Northern Western Prakrit such as was also written in Krorayina », BAILEY 1961, p. 14.

⁽⁷⁶⁾ Also in the opinion of BAREAU 1955, p. 154 the Vinaya of the MSV, seems to present a character more archaic than that of the SV and

also of most of the other Vinayapīṭakas.

⁽⁷⁷⁾ The term is inappropriate because many prose chapters contains also metrical portions.

32. *Legends on the travels of Buddha and his disciples to the N. W.*

Then as soon as Buddhism spread, the local communities certainly stimulated by the waves of new missionaries imagined and began to tell people to convert and pilgrims that Buddha had blessed Swāt with his own presence and left evident traces of it. Thus the foot-prints with Karoṣṭhī inscription were considered as the undeniable testimony of the truth of this tale.

He had left them for the spiritual elevation of the pilgrims (KONOW 1929, p. 1; TUCCI 1958, fig. 8). And the local monks could also show to the pilgrims the rock on which he had laid to dry in the sun his robes, wet after the contest for the submission of Apalāla. In Darel, the first capital of Swāt according to the local tradition ⁽⁷⁸⁾, or possibly capital for a certain time of Swāt, the image of Maitreya, about which many adventures and air travels are narrated, has certainly its importance on the expansion of Buddhism in those parts.

In Darel was a famous wooden image of Maitreya (80 ft. high). According to the tradition its sculptor had ascended to heaven (according to some sources, he was an arhat) in order to be perfectly sure that his work corresponded exactly to the original. Other pilgrims who saw the image are quoted by P. DEMIÉVILLE 1954, p. 379 and n. 4. As for Darel, the name itself contains the name of the ethnic group of the Dards.

Without insisting on the visit by the Buddha himself ⁽⁸⁰⁾, I shall add a few words on the story of king Udāyana, Udrāyaṇa ⁽⁸¹⁾ (Tib. U-tra ya na) who was converted to Buddhism by Mahākātyāyana; Udayana, Udrāyaṇa was the ruler of Roruka, Rauraka, and Mahākātyāyana was sent to him by king Bimbisāra. The arhat took with him five hundred monks, and the nun Śailā followed him with five hundred nuns. The king was converted, went to Rājagṛha, entered the order, and met king Bimbisāra. Before leaving Roruka he had appointed as king his son Śikhaṇḍin who, under the influence of two perfidious ministers, persecuted Buddhism and went so far as to send some killers to murder his father who, meanwhile, had attained arhatship. Thus having committed parricide and being the murderer of an arhat, he was as a consequence bound, after his death, to fall in the depth of the Avīci hell. Accepting the advice of the two bad ministers, Śikhaṇḍin persecuted all the Buddhists, who therefore left the town with the exception of Mahākātyāyana and Śailā. One day, Śikhaṇḍin met Mahākātyāyana and saw that the arhat immediately turned away from him, fearing that he might be contaminated by the encounter with a parricide. The king was so angry that he ordered his own people to throw upon the holy man handfuls of earth, until he was completely smothered by it; but that heap of earth turned into a hut.

⁽⁷⁸⁾ Now in the Swāt Museum at Saidu Sharif. The inscription is in Kharoṣṭhī: Bodhasa Sakamunisa padani, « foot prints of the Buddha Śākya-muni ».

⁽⁷⁹⁾ According to the *T'ang-shu* (CHAVANNES 1903, p. 129) the ancient territory of Swāt began

in Darel. In *Oriental Notes* V I shall come back to this subject.

⁽⁸⁰⁾ On which see TUCCI 1958, p. 327.

⁽⁸¹⁾ On this fricative spelling see above p. 39.

Some shepherds reported the event to the two good ministers of Udrāyana; Heruka and Bhiruka⁽⁸²⁾, and these set free the Arhat; the latter requested them to leave the town, because in seven days' time it would be buried under a sand-storm. Thus they did, but, before leaving, Heruka handed over his son Śyāmāka to Mahākātyāyana, and Bhiruka requested the nun Śailā to take his daughter Śyāmavātī to his relative Ghōṣila in Kauśāmbī.

Then Mahākātyāyana leaves the town buried by the sand, followed by the goddess patron of the town. In his travel Mahākātyāyana reaches Kharavana (the donkey forest); then he proceeds to Lambaka, Lampāka, Laghman⁽⁸³⁾ and thence to Śyāmāka (Chinese *Sbê mi*) so named because the young Śyāmāka, the son of Heruka, was elected king of that place since the local king had died. This is not the end of the journey, because Mahākātyāyana goes to Vokkāṇa, Wakhān his native country, in order to convert his mother⁽⁸⁴⁾. A *stūpa* was built and upon it the arhat fixed his stick; this is the reason why the *stūpa* is called the "stūpa of the stick". Then from here he reaches Śrāvastī. In the Chinese translation of I-tsing the mention of Kharavana is missing and there is no trace of the country Śyāmāka, but of a "little country"; the same translation adds that on the way back from Vokkāṇa, Wakhān, he had to cross "a snow pass" and that the local gods of the northern regions requested him to give them a souvenir of his passage. He gave them a leather shoe upon which a *stūpa* was built; then he reached the Oxus, and thence he returned to Śrāvastī. As regards the two ministers, they dug a canal up to the river Sindhu. In a certain place Heruka founded a town called Herukaccha and Bhiruka founded another one, Bhirukaccha.

The Roruka-*avadāna* has been the object of many researches; from those of Sylvain LÉVI, *T'oung-pao*, 2nd Series, Vol. 3, 1907 p. 105 to those of WATTERS *ad* Hsüan tsang II, 287, HÜBER 1906, p. 335, LÜDERS 1940, p. 641, LULIUS VAN GOOR, quoted in J. NOBEL 1955 and recently of EGGERMONT 1975. It has been argued that Roruka is not in Central Asia (Ho lao lo kia). Now it is generally admitted that Roruka was the Capital of the Sauvīra, Sindhu-Sauvīra, near the delta of the Indus, approximately comprising the lower part of Baluchistan and Makram⁽⁸⁵⁾. But let us not forget that the *Avadāna* of Udāyana, Udrāyana is a part of an ancient Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādins (see above p. 59) which in my opinion, was composed, originally at least, in some parts of the N.W.

(82) In the *Mahāmāyūrī*, 17, Bhiruka and Bhiruka.

(83) On Laghman, Lamghan etc.

(84) Mahākātyāyana in the Pāli canon is celebrated as one of the most conspicuous disciples of the Buddha, but nowhere is there a record of his connection with the North or with the Sauvīra. Many differences are also traceable between the *Divyāvadāna* and the translation of I-tsing. NOBEL J. 1955, introduction.

(85) EGGERMONT, 1976, pp. 147 ff.

But it must be noted that Hemacandra in his *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* IV, 22-27, places the Sauvīras after the Lampākas, adding Lampākas, Mu-

ruṇḍas syuḥ: he defines them as Kumālakāḥ = kum = pṛthivīm malayanti, kumālakāḥ; on the other hand, Vinayacandra (quoted by the editors of the *Kāvyamīmāṃsā* of Rājaśekhara (p. 248) in his *Kāvyaśikṣā* — at present not accessible to me — places the Sauvīra in the Uttarāpātha near the Auśīrāḥ and Vākāṇa, Wakhān. If other sources (and there are), come to support the latter location, the problem of Roruka should be taken up again. So also *Bṛhatsambhitā* XIV, 35 (with Utpalāś Com.) mentions the Siddhasauvīro rājā with Hārahauro Madreśo anyas ca Kauniṇḍa in the north. In the Mbh. III, 51,25 they are placed between Kashmir and Gandhāra. Cf. LÜDERS 1940 p. 650.

in or soon after the Mauryan times, either in lower Chitrāl or in Swāt. Let us now summarize the itinerary of Mahākātyāyana and Śyāmāka: Roruka (lower Indus) Kharavana (not identified) ^(85a) Lambāka (Laghman), Śyāmāka (Chitrāl) (from the name of the young Śyāmākā), Vokkaṇa (Wakhān) birth place of Mahākātyāyana [Ch. translation adds ‘snow pass’ (Hindukush), the Oxus] Śrāvastī.

The two ministers moved southwards, sailed on a river (Sindhu) and founded Bhirukaccha, Broach (in Kathiawar) and Herukaccha, identified by Eggermont with Barbaricum of the classical authors. But it might as well be Bambhore (Sindhī) whose excavations were undertaken SW. of Tatta in the mouth of an old channel of the Indus about 60 miles north of Karachi and where the imposing remains of a fortified harbour have been found ⁽⁸⁶⁾. The oldest layers of these ruins so far excavated go back to the Parthian period. The itinerary of the two ministers is of no interest to us at present. They represent a separate section of the *avadāna*, which after the identification of Roruka with the capital of the Sauvīra, is contradictory, because the two of them navigated on a river downstream, from north to south. They did not go with Mahākātyāyana; they went southwards, while from Roruka the latter moved northwards. We must therefore admit that the equation Roruka-Sauvīra cannot be maintained if the story of Mahākātyāyana and that of the ministers belong to the same *avadāna*. Indeed, no connection can be found between the two itineraries: that of Mahākātyāyana and that of Heruka and Bhiruka. The itinerary first led the arhat to Lampāka; accompanied, by Śyāmāka, he went to Laghman, where Śyāmāka, who flew in the air, held on to the dress of Kātyāyana. When the local people saw him flying in that manner, they said: “Lambate, lambate, he hangs down”; this was the origin of the name of Lambāka, Lampāka (also Lan̄kā). All this means that the local Buddhists wanted to connect the origin of their name with a marvellous event, which could warrant the antiquity of their communities, though the radical of Lampāka is Dardic; paśai: lam.

Mahākātyāyana went to Śyāmāka (Shê-mi in Chinese; it corresponds to Chitrāl), then to Wakhān ⁽⁸⁷⁾.

The itinerary he followed is certainly not the shortest way to reach Śrāvastī. It is rather the story of the apostolic mission sent to the N.W. provinces. The story supposes that when it was introduced in the Vinaya of MSV, Buddhism had already penetrated in Chitrāl, if Śyāmāka — a fervent Buddhist — was offered the kingship of the country; if Shê-mi corresponds, as it seems certain, to Chitrāl, Shê-mi is connected with Śyāmāka which meant that Śyāmāka was considered the eponym of the country. Hui-ch’ao (FUCHS

^(85a) A place in the North mentioned by the *Candragarbhasūtra* near the Uraśa and Daradas there is *K’ia lo p’o lo*: LÉVI 1905b p. 283 proposes Kharavara; shall we think that there is a mistake in the Chinese transcription? *p’o lo* for: *p’o na* = Kharavana?

⁽⁸⁶⁾ [F.A. KHAN], Excavations at Bambhore,

PkA 1, 1964, pp. 49 ff.

⁽⁸⁷⁾ Mahā-Kaccāna, Kaccāyana (Kaccāna) is said to have established the Buddhist Law in Avanti (MALALASEKERA 1938, p. 469); he was born in Ujjenī, but had travelled much (When he was among the Avantis he went regularly to hear the Buddha preaching).

1939, p. 447) calls Chitrāl Sāmāharāja (FUCHS: or Sāmarāja) ⁽⁸⁸⁾. Here is repeated the same pattern of the learned etymology of the name of Lampāka.

Thus, this section of the *avadāna* seems to belong to a set of *Mahātmyas*, eulogies, meant to connect those N.W. regions with the very beginning of Buddhism.

We can draw no conclusions from the name of Kapphiṇa ⁽⁸⁹⁾ (Mahākappina in Pāli), because from his story we can only infer that he was born, see MALASEKERA s.v., in a frontier town, called Kukkuṭavatī, of which he was the king; his wife had been Anojā from Sāgala (Śākala, Sialkot) in the Madda (Madra) country; then, in order to meet the Buddha and to take his vows from him, he left his country and met the master near the Candrabhāgā (Chenab).

The same story with some variants in the Dhammapada's commentary (BURLINGAME, 1921, p. 101). On the other hand, according to the Sanskrit version of the *Avadānaśataka*, Kapphiṇa was a king of Dakṣiṇāpatha. He wanted to subdue six kings, that of Śrāvastī etc.; then those kings went to see the Buddha asking him for his advice; Kapphiṇa paid a visit to the Buddha who performed some miracles. Kapphiṇa was converted, became a *śrotāpanna* and, later, an arhat.

In the first case, he might have come from the border of Kashmir and neighbouring countries (he crossed the Chandrabhāgā, Chenab); in the second, from South India. On Kapphiṇa there is a fine poem written by the Kashmiri poet Śivasvāmin (Kapphiṇākyaudaya ed. Gauri Shankar, Lahore 1937). According to Śivasvāmin the capital of Kapphiṇa was Lilāvatī on the Narmadā in the Vindhya region; among the kings with whom he had relations, Śivasvāmin mentions: Āsmaka, Nisāda, Śivi, Sauvīravarṇa, Ruru, Madraka. The only conclusion that we can draw from all these references is that there were two centres in which the legend of Mahākapphiṇa was elaborated: one in the South, more vague and implying great geographical difficulties concerning the itinerary followed by the king from the South to Śrāvastī; as to the second one, if we follow the Pāli tradition, his birthplace could be located in Madradeśa, capital Sākala, today Sialkot.

The final syllable of his name: ṇa is found in the Onomasticon of South India, Sāyaṇa, Bukkaṇa etc. in Kashmir: Kalkaṇa etc.

When the story of the travels of the Buddha in the N.W. and of the journey of Mahākātyāyana or Madhyāntika were introduced, Buddhism was at the height of its fortunes in those parts. Then communities did no longer appreciate the fact that in the diaspora of Buddhism they could not vie with the parts of India where the Buddha had lived, preached, transmitted the Law to his pupils, and had died. They wanted to create a nobility for themselves, to have been honoured by a visit of the Buddha himself and of some of his most famous disciples; their intention was to cancel the impression that they had been new-comers to the faith: and they found a visible document of all this in the footprints at Tirhāt and such like relics.

⁽⁸⁸⁾ Cf. the name of Shamelai, a ridge above Mingora in Swāt.

(The story is at the same time an eulogium of the Country and of the royal family. For such

examples of the name of a king instead of that of the people alone cf. *Bṛhatsaṃhitā*, above p. 33, note 37; p. 62, note 85.

⁽⁸⁹⁾ See PETECH 1950 pp. 66-67.

33. *Uḍḍiyāna Script*

According to the “Life of Hsüan-tsang”, Uḍḍiyāna ^(89a) is taken in the meaning of “garden” (*udyāna*); in it there was the park of the king Cakravartin, evidently Aśoka. As regards the language spoken in Swāt Fa-hsien writes that it was that of Central India. A mistake probably due to the fact that he used to meet chiefly monks or people coming from the plains; Hsüan-tsang, on the contrary, makes two very important statements a) that their language was different, but similar to a certain extent to that of India and b) that the “rules of their written language was in a rather unsettled state” (Watters 1904 I p. 225). The translation of Watters is here not exact.

Similarly that of Beal: “Their written characters and their rules of etiquette are also of a mixed character as before” (Beal p. 120) I would propose “their writing and their etiquette have to some extent scarce conformity with those of India”. That the language was different from the main dialects of India, but the same as that of Chitrāl that is to say Dardic (as it is also now from Bārhein northwards) is testified by Hui-ch’ao travelling in 726. As regards the scripture the statement on the peculiarity of the alphabet of Swāt is confirmed by what we read in the *Lalitavistara*; this book enumerating the *lipis* (mode of writing) known by the young Bodhisattva, quotes first of all the *Darada lipi*, the Dardic scripture, followed by the *Khāsyalipi* ^(89b) and the *Cīna lipi* (TUCCI 1971).

All this is confirmed by the Tibetan tradition; some *gter ma* (books hidden at the time of Padmasaṃbhava) were written in the characters and in the language of Orgyan = Uḍḍiyāna, but then the tradition survived and so-called examples of the Uḍḍiyāna language and *lipis* are found as titles of some Bon po or rñiñ ma pa books. There is also a booklet printed in Tibet which reproduces the *lipis* of many countries and among them there is that of Uḍḍiyāna. We cannot assuredly rely on it and affirm that it has faithfully reproduced the original characters used in former times in Swāt: what is important for us is that the tradition never died out. That the languages of Swāt and Chitrāl (Dardic) were identical is confirmed also by Hui-ch’ao (726) who adds that the people of Swāt and Chitrāl not only spoke the same language, but also wore the same dress.

It is not perhaps out of place to recall some coins (both in copper and in silver) of the last Hindu Śāhi King of Udabhāṇḍa and Gandhāra which are very common in Afghanistan and in the NW. frontier, including Swāt. Those minted under the rule of Spadapati-deva (and, on that pattern, of some other rulers) bear on the obverse the image of

^(89a) The first ones to find out that the real name of Swāt was not Udyāna but Uḍḍiyāna were F.W. THOMAS JRAS 1905, p. 461, and S. LÉVI Mm. J.A. 1915, p. 103 ff. See also TUCCI, 1949.

^(89b) Cf. SHIRATORI K. 1957. The Khasas are well-known, according to the Purānas, as mountain tribe *parvatāśrayiṇab*; they are listed with the Cīnas among the peoples of the Pamirs (LÉVI S.

1918, 118). They are the same as the Kakkha of Kashmir. Some tribes of them about the 10th-11th centuries migrated eastwards, and conquered a great part of Western Tibet and Western Nepal, as I think to have shown in TUCCI 1956b. About them, and the correspondence between Khasa and Kashmiri Kakkha see STEIN 1961, vol. I, 47 note to I, 317. See below.

a king with a spear; there is on it an inscription which has been a puzzle for a long time and then has been read by GHIRSHMAN, 1948, p. 40, n. 1 (and with some corrections by MACDOWALL 1968, p. 192): Σρι Σπαλαπατι. Such coins recall to my mind some inscriptions of the Museum of Lahore which are labelled "inscriptions in unknown language and alphabet".

Those inscriptions were chiefly collected by Major Deane who was not an expert, but inflamed by a great enthusiasm; he used to pay for any inscription brought to him. This liberality may have aroused the greed of some clever clerk, inducing him to submit to the Major some fakes of his own fabrication: but the clerk must have started from some basic document, leaving to his fantasy new modulations. When I saw the inscriptions I had the impression that there is a certain variety among them. I took some rubbings, which are now under examination. Inscriptions in what is called Tocharian (or late Kuṣāṇa) are known from Tochi along with another bilingual inscription in Arabic and Sanskrit published by HARMATTA 1966, I, p. 449 ff.; 1969, p. 208; HUMBACH, DANİ, GOEBL, 1964 (90). MUKHERJEE 1973, pp. 56 f.f.

When the news of the discovery of these inscriptions reached the orientalist they roused a great interest; they took them all for good ones (90a); the general view was that they should have been connected with the Turkish rulers of Afghanistan. I am very sceptical about this solution, I hope that the comparison of them with the mason marks written on the back of many architectural pieces found in Butkara may give some useful hint to the solution of the problem. They will be the object of another article (*Oriental Notes*, V).

In such a note the mason marks will be alphabetically arranged (as they are written on the stone); any deviation from the usual ductus will be reproduced, side by side, in order to facilitate the comparison. Photo of the inscriptions not yet deciphered and scattered in different museums of Pakistan will also be published.

(90) DEANE H.A. *Note on Udyāna and Gandhāra*. JRAS 1896.

On the inscriptions found in Swāt by Col. Deane, see SENART 1894 p. 333, S. LÉVI-Ed. CHAVANNES, 1895, pp. 341 ff. The latter authors seem inclined to accept the thesis of V. THOMSEN (Bulletin Acad. Royale Sciences et Lettres de Danemark, 1893, pp. 285-299, Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne V. fasc. 1894) who finds that more than twelve characters are similar to some letters of the Orkhon inscriptions. At that time prince Kül-Teghin who died in 731 was the ruler of Afghanistan; I am afraid that such a hypothesis can hardly be endorsed.

(90a) Now see the inscriptions found in Afghanistan, FUSSMAN *BEFEO* 1974 p. 8.

Nor should we forget the inscription published by me in *E.W.* vol. 20, 1970, p. 104 after the reading of Prof. Raniero Gnoli: it refers to a

king Vijayapāladeva and mentions the construction of a *maṭha* in Marmalika. The most important information which it supplies is that the king was *kirāta-pakṣābbimukha*, «siding with the Kirāta». Kirāta as known indicates tribes of hunters or marauders, warriors outside the pale of orthodoxy.

They are not only located in the East but chiefly in West and North West along with the Daradas, Kambojas, Cīnas, Sakas, Yavanas etc. MANU X, 44. Sometimes they are said to be degenerated Kṣatriya. Considering the possible datation of the inscription 8th-9th century, one may think of the Tibetans or of the Arab conquests by Fadal b. Sahal 814-815 who subdued the Kabul Shah, and went up to Tibet and Bolor (GHAFUR, A.P. 1955-66, p. 6 ff. On the Kirātas. RONNOW, *Monde Oriental* vol. XXX, S.K. CHATTERJEE J.A.S.B. 1951. I hope to come back to this inscription in a future note.

One point seems certain to me i.e. that according to Hsüan-tsang the alphabet of Swät is not completely different (nor was the language) from that used in India but scarcely conform to it; therefore we may perhaps exclude the cursive Greek alphabet used by the late Kuṣāṇa or the Ephtalites ^(90b); we must understand his words as if Hsüan-tsang wanted to say that such an alphabet contained certain peculiarities not to be found in the Indian scripture: if it had been completely different as it was in Jāguḍa, he would certainly have said it, as he did when speaking of Jāguḍa (WATTERS 1904-5 II, p. 284). It is more probable that it contained variations of Kharoṣṭhī, as D III of FUSSMAN. A solution may be proposed, I insist, after the reading of all the mason marks of Swät.

VII

HISTORICAL PROBLEMS

34. *The decay of Buddhism*

It is not easy to explain the decrease of monasteries after Fa-hsien (399-414 A.D.) (1400 monasteries) and the fact that at the times of Hsüan-tsang (he travels from 629 to 645) many of them were in ruins, and monks were no longer interested in study and meditation but specially inclined to Tantric practices. Sung Yün (he travels from 518-523) speaks in high terms of the Buddhist community and does not anticipate the different statements of Hsüan-tsang. 1400 monasteries imply not only a widespread devotion, but also great wealth necessary for their maintenance.

Most probably Swät (or its petty chiefs) had been a tributary of the Kuṣāṇa: nevertheless under the Kuṣāṇa period Uḍḍiyāna reached the apex of its culture and wealth ⁽⁹¹⁾; the best testimonials of such a welfare are the *stūpas*, the monasteries then built, the ability of the craftsmen and artists, masons and sculptors, or the learning of his monks too: famous monks and artisans were invited to China. There were also in Swät occasional local mints ^(91a).

The Sasanians had passed there before Sung Yün, and perhaps took control of Swät for a certain period; the Ephtalites followed and might have caused other damages ^(91b); Buddhism was still prosperous at the times of Sung Yün; something had, then, happened between the visit of Sung Yün and that of Hsüan-tsang. I suppose the cause may be attri-

^(90b) In Jāguḍa inscriptions in cursive Greek have been found.

⁽⁹¹⁾ The *Pei-shih* ch. 97 confirms the prosperous economical conditions of the country, the forests, the cultivation of fruits, the irrigation of the fields, the production of rice and wheat. The people are devoted to the Buddha; there are

many gorgeous temples and *stūpas*.

^(91a) In case of shortage, subsidiary coinage was occasionally tolerated. GÖBL, 1976.

^(91b) I believe that the ravages attributed to the Ephtalites have been somehow exaggerated. Another problem to be deeply investigated.

buted to natural calamities and social unrest: earthquakes and floods documented by the excavations, at Butkara and elsewhere, greatly impoverished the country, then the decrease of trade with the plains and with Central Asia, *via* Gilgit, the probable attempts by the Turki Śāhis to control Swāt, a fact which was realized in the year 747, the division of the country among different petty vassals chiefs.

In spite of his praises for the piety of the Swāti monks, their inborn inclination to magic is confirmed also by Sung Yün; but it had increased at the time of Hsüan-tsang, who, as I said, does not seem to have a high opinion of the monks of Uḍḍiyāna. Sung Yün speaks of their austerity. But their inborn inclination to magic was well-known long since in Tashkurgan (Han - p'an - t'o); when a brahman was killed by a nāga, whose abode was in a lake on the border of which the brahman was resting, the king left his kingdom into the hands of his son and went to Uḍḍiyāna in order to learn magic incantations. (Sung Yün, p. 399).

Down to the later general decay of Buddhism, except for the unique image of a goddess (TUCCI, 1963, p. 307 fig. 26) and even an image of Śiva, there are not many traces of a great diffusion of Hinduism in Swāt⁽⁹²⁾, a fact confirmed by the Chinese travellers; Hsüan-tsang speaks of ten Deva (Hindu) temples⁽⁹³⁾, but a very important Śaiva school, the *Kramasampradāya*, was originated or had some of its most famous authors in Swāt (TUCCI 1963, p. 283). It is to be noted that one of the first revealers of this school was *Khagendra* "the lord of those flying in the air", the Śaiva match of the Ḍāka, masculine form of the Ḍākinīs⁽⁹⁴⁾.

35. Diffusion of Vajrayāna, and revival of aboriginal cults

The country seems to be then dominated by Vajrayāna, opening the way to the revival of the aboriginal, cruel presences and of the magic rituals for which Swāt had been famous from its origin.

Traditional Buddhism in the end could not satisfy the aspirations of the people any more; the *Gubhyasamāja-tantra* is attributed to Indrabhūti, king of Swāt; many Tantric books were recovered — so the tradition goes — by Vajrapāṇi who handed them over to the Nāgas; Indrabhūti wrote them down, changing the Nāgas either in "heroes" *dpa' bo* (*vīra*)⁽⁹⁵⁾ or in flying entities *mk'a' agro ma, ḍākinī* (TUCCI 1949, I, 121, 212).

(92) In the inscription of *Paramabhaṭṭāraka-mahārājādbhirājā parameśvara śrī Jayadevapāla* found at Barikot, mention is made of some foundation (temple, statue ?), but the inscription is so badly damaged that we cannot say whether it refers to some Buddhist or Śaiva monument. I am inclined to accept the latter view.

Among the statues found in Butkara there is none which recalls Tantric iconography, with the exception of the fragment of a door-jamb that represents a deity with six arms; but it belongs

to the 1st-2nd century A.D. and, as shown by Prof. Taddei, it has been most probably inspired by Palmirean iconographic models. TADDEI, EW, XV, pp. 174-8.

(93) But see *Pei shih* quoted above p. 58 note 72.

(94) This shows that the rulers were equally tolerant towards Buddhism and Hinduism.

(95) On the *dPa' bo* see BERGLIE ARNE, Preliminary remarks on some Tibetan « spirit medium » in Nepal. *Kailash*, vol. IV, 1976, n. 1, p. 85.

Uḍḍiyāna was therefore considered one of the most famous Tantric places in India; It is one of the *pīṭhas*, holy centres of Tantrism, the *Uḍḍiyānapīṭha* and it turned into a kind of Mecca for the Tibetans, as the birthplace of Padmasambhava, and the home of the *ḍākinīs* ⁽⁹⁶⁾ (in Tibetan: *mk'a' agro ma* “sky-flying”). Though possessing great powers they are said to be, as a rule, the retinue of most important gods. They are ambivalent, good or mischievous, according as they are suitably worshipped or offended. The monks, assailed by the same impact of the aboriginal beliefs and practices, embraced Vajrayāna; in it the old aboriginal, sometimes humble village deities, were accepted as symbols of some esoteric truths of Vajrayāna; eroticism penetrated into it. Each god embracing his own *pa-redra*, ancient godlings of which we often find the parallel in the religious tradition of the Kāfirs, in the popular religion of Tibet (TUCCI 1970, p. 230), among the Shinas, in Dardistan — though not escaping the influence of some Buddhist implication — made once more of Swāt the country of the fairies, the witches, and the wizards that are still surviving under different names as far as Gilgit (the ambiguous Peri, and Daiyāl). The ill-disposed *ḍākinī* became the « flying Rui » ^(96a), capable of hurting men at the dead of night. They leave their bed, not with their material body, but with their « subtle » or astral body, and fly capriciously; many of them may be very dangerous to any one who meets them. I assisted to a trance of one of these Ruis and Hapiḍei which I described elsewhere (TUCCI 1973, p. 155 note). We could also go further.

Our knowledge of the folk religion of the Kāfirs and some of their neighbours untouched by Buddhism, or having had scarce contacts with Buddhism, makes me believe that the fairies, the Peri and the Daiyāl are not a survival of the *Ḍākinīs*, or of the *Ḍākas*; they are rather the same primeval religious entities, the ambiguous powers chiefly, but not only, female whom Buddhism accepted in its Tantric esotericism as *ḍākinīs*; Vajrayāna codified them within the frame of the Buddhist gnosis and when it disappeared, then their resurrection took place. They were, in fact, so deeply rooted since times immemorial in the mind of the people that not even sunnite Islam succeeded in eliminating them: they survived in the Ruis or the Hapiḍeis or the Daiyāls and in the more dignified but equally ambiguous Peris ⁽⁹⁷⁾.

36. *Swāt a place of pilgrimage for Tibetans*

In spite of this situation well documented by literary tradition it is a fact that during the excavation no image or symbol belonging to Vajrayāna schools has so far been discovered in Swāt.

In the 10th century Swāt was plundered by Mahmud of Ghazni and then by his suc-

⁽⁹⁶⁾ *Ḍākinī*, according to Tantric schools, from the root: *ḍai*, to fly. *Cakrasaṃvara* fol. 2, b *ḍākinīyā ākāśagaminyāḥ: vaihāyasyām, gatau ḍiyanta ity arthaḥ. Lakṣābhīdhānatāntrāṭikā* fol. IV, *ḍai vaihāyasā gamanam iti dhātupāthāt.* (TUCCI 1971b): I, p. 226. Cf. W. WÜST, PHMA 1957,

p. 28 ff.

^(96a) Cf. Kalasha *r'uzi* witch. MORGENSTIERNE II.FL. (2nd), vol. IV, p. 158.

⁽⁹⁷⁾ See LORIMER. The supernatural in the popular belief of the Gilgit region. JRAS 1929, p. 507.

cessors. They inflicted a great blow on Buddhism and Hinduism. But its fame as a sacred place induced some Tibetan pilgrims to a long and dangerous voyage.

It was the attraction of meeting the *ḍākinīs* that persuaded a Tibetan *siddha* of the 13th century (and others after him) to leave his country and to undertake a perilous journey to Swāt.

The Tibetan Sādhu, Orgyan pa (1230-1293) says that he met a Yoginī and accepted some water from her; then the earth began to quake; he states that the most important *ḍākinīs* of Uḍḍiyāna were Sonī, Gasurī, Matangī, Tasasī and adds that Sonī corresponds to the *ḍākinī* that in Tibet is known as aGro bzañ. The women of Orgyan know "how to turn themselves by magical art into any form they want; they like flesh and blood, and have the power to deprive every creature of its vitality and its strenght". (TUCCI 1971b, p. 398). Just what is said also today of some Ruis. Relating the story of Lāvapā, (Kambala-pā), the Tibetan pilgrim writes that, by his magic power, that ascetic had changed all women into sheep; he was then requested by the male population to let the women assume their former aspect: he accepted, provided they promised to adopt a different attire; women should wear their shoes upon their head⁽⁹⁸⁾, insert a ring in the nose, use a girdle in the shape of a snake (TUCCI 1971b, p. 399). Is that a remembrance of the fact that the newcomers, Turki or other peoples, forced the women folk to change their way of dressing?

The centre of Orgyan was, at that time, Dhu ma t'a la (cf. the greatest Buddhist settlement of Uḍḍiyāna called by the Chinese T'a lo, T'o lo (see p. 19, note 19).

At the time of Orgyan pa, Swāt was under the Hor, literally Mongols, but with such a term Orgyan pa indicates also the Muslims.

While at the time of Orgyan pa it seem that small Buddhist or Hindu islands still survived, all traces of them had disappeared at the times of sTag Ts'añ ras pa (first half of the seventeenth century).

During the invasions by the Ghaznavides and their successors many inhabitants of Swāt fled to Hazara (so the tradition goes); others were converted to Islam.

37. *Swāt and Gilgit*

When things began to be worse and the country continued to grow impoverished, under the threat of the Arab and then of the Tibetan incursions, the village magician and the belief in fairies and witches took the upperhand; it seems likely that some monks left Swāt, went away and took shelter in other places which afforded better prospects or commodities. Gilgit was near: they might have gone there and also farther, to Central Asia, to Kashmir, to China, to Baltistan, where Buddhists had since long penetrated and people, according to Hui-ch'ao, were prevalently Buddhist.

Gilgit was one of the doors which opened to Swāt the Northern routes. It had already

⁽⁹⁸⁾ Some head-covers and ornaments of Kāfiri women may appear with some imagination as having the shape of an inverted shoe.

accepted Buddhism. Manuscripts of the 6th-8th centuries have been discovered ⁽⁹⁹⁾ there; I refer chiefly to those which were saved by Sir Aurel Stein, a very important part of a perhaps complete Tripiṭaka hidden in a *stūpa*, which local people had demolished.

Prof. N.P. Chakravarti studied the paleography of the colophon of a fragment of the *Vajracchedikā* discovered along with the *Saṅghabhedavastu* and published in: TUCCI 1956a p. 175 ff., and he came to the conclusion that it was written in 5th century A.D. Not all the manuscripts found in Gilgit belong to the same age: they go from the 6th up to the 8th century A.D. In the colophons of some MSS. there are written the names of a king and of the donors and also of the copyist. One king was Śrīdeva Śāhi Surendra Vikramāditya Nanda (Cf. DUTT 1939, I, p. 32) along with his wife Śamidevī ⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ Trailokyadevī Bhaṭṭārikā. The scribes were Ārya Sthirabuddhi and Narendradatta, who might be the same as Mahābhāṅaka Narendradatta, who copied the *Ajitasenavyākāraṇa* (DUTT 1939).

On another MS. there is the name Paṭoladeva Śāhi Vajrāditya Nandin. The name of another Paṭoladeva is found in an inscription incised on a rock near Hunza, celebrating the foundation of a town: *Makarapura*, by a chief of a district (called *Hanesarā*, Hunza) and a *Mahāgaṇapati* of Paṭoladeva Śrīdeva Surendrāditya. Dr. Chakravarti states that this inscription is not later than the 7th century A.D. or even earlier. A MSS. found by M.S. Kaul in 1938, later than the MSS. of the *Vajracchedikā* and the *Vinaya* texts, records Śāhi Śāhānuśāhi Paṭoladeva.

The Hatun village, in which the above mentioned inscription was found, is situated about three miles from Gilgit in Pūnyal, on the right bank of the Ishkuman river.

We cannot know for certain whether the name is Buddhist or not; rather, it looks like as a Hindu name on account of the reference to Surendrādityanandideva, his lineage descending from Bhagadattavaṃśa. On Makaradeva and Makara as an epithet of Śiva see: TUCCI, 1963, p. 170.

Chakravarti comparing the characters of the Hatun inscription with those of the MSS. comes to the conclusion that we know of two kings named Paṭola ⁽¹⁰¹⁾ (the one recorded in the MS. of M.S. Kaul and of whom we do not know the full name); Nandi may be Viṣṇu or Śiva; Śiva is also called Nandideva, Nandīśvara after the name of the bull *nandin*, his vehicle. But the so often recurring Aditya may also point to devotees of the Sun.

Therefore, we here have valid documents in Sanskrit which testify to the existence of two dynasties ruling in Gilgit, called at that time Gilagitta.

In Gilgit (in the Hatun inscription Gilagitta, in the Scythian itinerary: Giḍagītti, in Chinese “little P’u-lü”) people speak Shina, a Dardic dialect, but their kings in their

⁽⁹⁹⁾ We have some few but precious documents of Buddhist paintings from Gilgit. BANERJI R.D. Painted covers of two Gilgit manuscripts, *Oriental Art* NS. 1968.

⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ Perhaps to compare with Śyāmāka the dynastic name of the ruling family of Chitrāl:

on Śyāmavātī see above p. 62 and the story of Śyāma, located in Puskalāvātī, LAMOTTE, 1958 p. 366.

⁽¹⁰¹⁾ Palola is the name of a Dardic tribe. MORGENSTIERNE, 1936, ID., 1973, p. 242.

inscriptions used Sanskrit names, as did the Mallas who ruled over Western Tibet and Western Nepal ⁽¹⁰²⁾, tolerant towards Buddhism as well as Hinduism.

I think it is useful to add here a table of the results of the researches of Dr. Chakravarti and of the conclusions which he reached in: TUCCI 1956a, p. 175 ff. and in *EI.* 1958, XXX, p. 226.

- 1 Paramabhaṭṭāraka, Mahārājādhirāja, Parameśvara
Paṭoladeva — Śāhi — Śrī Nava Sur[e]ndrāditya Nandideva
EI. XXX p. 229 (7th century or even before: according to Chakravarti).
- 2 MS. of *Mahāmāyūrī* found by Mr. Kaul: Paṭolaśāhi Śāhānuśāhi Śrī Nava - Surendrādityanandideva, identical with that of n. 1; the name of the queen was Anaṅgadevī *EI.* XXX, p. 229.
- 3 Śrīdeva Śāhi Surendra Vikramāditya Nanda
wife: Śāmidēvī Trailokyadevībhaṭṭarikā. DUTT, 1939 Intr. p. 40; *EI.* XXX p. 229 but according to Chakravarti no connection with the *Bhaiṣajyagurusūtra*, earlier than the MSS. of *Mahāmāyūrī*. *EI.* XXX 229.
- 4 Paṭoladeva Śāhi Vajrādityanandi (on a loose leaf) not identical with n. 1 (Chakravarti calls him Paṭoladeva III).

All these names can be divided into the following groups:

- Nava Surendrāditya Nandi (Paṭola)
- Nava Surendrādityanandi deva (Paṭola)
- Surendra Vikramāditya Nandi
- Vajrādityanandi (Paṭola)

and into the following three onomastic designations *Surendrāditya*, *Vikramāditya*, *Vajrāditya*.

It is difficult to ascertain the exact date of those Gilgit rulers because in some of these documents the *Laukika* era is employed, and the fundamental element for chronological determination can only be based upon paleographical criteria which are always relative. We shall see that the Chinese sources may contribute to establish the date of some of them.

According to the Chinese Sources, besides Gilgit, "little P'u-lü", there was a Great P'u-lü where Buddhism prevailed. (FUCHS 1938, p. 443; HANEDA 1957, p. 618) writes that to the north of Kashmir there are the Great P'u-lü, Yang t'ung and So-po-tz'u ^(102a). They are all subject to the Tibetans: the above-mentioned three countries differ in dress, language and customs. There are in them temples and monks while the king and the people of Tibet do not embrace Buddhism.

This information of Hui-ch'ao is precious. There is only one point on which he seems to be mistaken; I mean what he writes about the Yang-t'ung whom he claims to be Buddhist. If Pelliot and myself are right in considering Yang-t'ung a part of Žaň Žuň,

⁽¹⁰²⁾ TUCCI, 1956a, *passim*.

^(102a) FUCHS wrongly: Nepal.

as the Suvarṇagotra, or the Women-kingdoms, they were at that time preeminently Bonpo not Buddhists (¹⁰³). But in Gilgit and in Baltistan and probably, in a lesser degree, in Ladakh there were Buddhists (¹⁰⁴), though the fact that in Žaṅ Žuṅ there were Bonpo does not exclude the possibility of temples and priests of this religion also (^{104a}).

Here we must recall what we have already said about the expansion of the tribes speaking Dardic dialects (or dialects influenced by Dardic) up to the boundaries of Tibet, or better the boundaries of Žaṅ Žuṅ conquered by the Tibetans in the years 620-649. In Ladakh, tombs similar to those found in Swāt have been discovered. TUCCI 1973, p. 51 ff.

Dardic dialects were spoken also in the Maknopa part of Ladakh, Hanu, Da, Kalatze down to 1931, at least when Dainelli first went there, and where I followed him a few years later.

We do not know the ancient name of Ladakh; when first mentioned by Hsüan-tsang, it is called *Mo lo so* (*muat lā sā*) which FRANCKE (JRAS, 1908, p. 189) interpreted as *Mar sa* "the low land". PELLIOU 1959-73, p. 706, proposed *Mra-sa*, *Mar sa*, *Mar-rāsa*. All such hypotheses have a weak point: they suppose that the name transcribed by Hsüan-tsang is a transcription of a Tibetan name (^{104b}). But another hypothesis is possible: we have seen that *so* sometimes is wrongly written for *po*; thus we cannot exclude an original reading *mo lo p'o*, *mā la va* instead of *mo lo so*. We know from the *Brhatsambhitā* XIV, 27, that in the North there are the Mālava and the Mādraka. Equally the *Dharmavibhāṣā* quoted by LÉVI, BEFEO 1905 and the *Rāmāyaṇa*, LÉVI JA. 1918, Tome XI, p. 125, mention Mālava, an Himalayan people. Since the Tibetan dynasty had not yet conquered Ladakh it is useless to search for a Tibetan original at the basis of "Moloso", "Molop'o".

According to Hsüan-tsang the country was also known under another name, San po ho, (Sām puā *ā *Sampāka) (said to be to the west of Žaṅ Žuṅ); shall we therefore deduce that Ladakh was divided into two parts: Mo lo so (or p'o) to the West, San po ho, *Sampāka to the East? Further researches are needed to clarify this point.

In Dras, three days march after crossing the Zojila (^{104c}), just to the left

(¹⁰³) PELLIOU, 1959-1973, pp. 671 ff. TUCCI, 1956b, pp. 92 ff.

(¹⁰⁴) The presence of Buddhist monasteries on the route to and from Gilgit is confirmed by the Sakā itinerary (BAILEY, 1936, p. 255); after seven days from a town Śaradūgi (which Morgenstierne reads Śarakūgi and identifies, rightly, I think, with Sarikol MORGENSTIERNE NTS, 1942, p. 269) one reaches a town called Icahanagari in which there are three Saṅghārāmas; other three Saṅghārāmas are near the « Golden River » (Indus), in a place called Syadim. Near the bridge, in proximity of river Sind (Indus), four Saṅghārāmas; four stone Saṅghārāmas in Giḍagitti (Gilgit); no mention of Saṅghārāmas in Śilathasa, Śidathasi, Śidatasi, Chilas.

(^{104a}) In Lamayuru I collected some old Bonpo manuscripts and the monks of that mo-

nastery told me that formerly Lamayuru was a Bon centre.

(^{104b}) In the Žaṅ žuṅ language, mar, mar zi, mar ti means gold (some žaṅ žuṅ words may be compared with those of Lahul), but the problem is: how far did the Žaṅ žuṅ people extend westwards of Western Tibet? STEIN R.A., *Langue žaṅ žuṅ du Bon organisé* BEFEO 1971, p. 244. This problem has been discussed anew by Prof. PETECH 1977. But this part of Baltistan and Ladakh and Western Tibet need a deep investigation: chiefly as regards the ethnic groups and their boundaries or succession: who were and which were the foundaries of the So-po-tzu of Hui ch'ao or the skal-Mon and the Mon or the K'ri-te, or the Ki-li-to or the inhabitants of Guge? Only a careful study of the dialects, of the toponymy of places, mountains and rivers and excavations can contribute to a solution of these problems.

of the track to Leh, I saw in 1930 two stelae the first one higher, and the other one lower, representing Lokeśvara and Maitreya. Both bear inscriptions which were reproduced by CUNNINGHAM 1848 pp. 119-201; Id. 1854 p. 381-382 Pl. XXIX, XXX, FRANCKE 1907, Pl. facing p. 52 fig. 1, BIASUTTI-DAINELLI 1925 vol. IX, p. 77 and Pl. XVII. The inscriptions, as reproduced by Cunningham, must have been copied by an illiterate pandit, and are hardly legible. The transcription made by the same pandit is meaningless for the most part: the only words which seem to be certain are *Lokeśvara* [*ma?*]*maitreya pratiṣṭhāpunyena bhavatu*. I had rubbings made of them, but they were lost when the pony that carried them, stored in a box, fell into the river. Anyhow, these inscriptions confirm what Hui-ch'ao writes.

But by the time of Hsüan-tsang the Tibetans had only reduced under control Žai Žuñ (the women's kingdom, Suvarṇagotra) and we have to wait for the dissolution of the Tibetan dynasty (after 842) for the beginning of the conquest of Ladakh by the Tibetans. Up to the time of the establishment of the royal dynasty, there is no reason to suppose that those people spoke Tibetan: some tribes might have already been converted to Buddhism through Dardistan or Kashmir, perhaps on account of the geographical proximity; their language and culture might also have been influenced in the Western or N.W. parts by that of Žai Žuñ, but Dardic must have predominated.

38. *Kings of Dardistan*

Most probably Hinduism spread in the course of time along with Buddhism. The religious situation of Ladakh is unknown until after the conquest by a scion of the Tibetan dynasty. Buddhism then widely spread. Kalhaṇa records many Dard princes who often tried to invade the Kashmir territory, and who bear a Sanskrit name. Under Ananta (1028-1063) it was Acalamaṅgala with seven Mleccha princes; here Mleccha means Muslim and it therefore shows that some understanding had already been established between Daradas and Muslims, and perhaps that the conversion to Islam had already begun to invade the country. Acalamaṅgala was killed in battle. Under Harṣa (1089-1111) the Daradas attempted a new incursion and were successful in the beginning; no name is given of their chief. In the times of Uccala (1101-1111) the Dard king Jagaddala went in aid of a rebellious party. King Sujjala (1112-20), went to meet Maṇidhara, ruler of the Daradas; when Jayasiṃha ruled in Kashmir (1128-49), a Darada prince was called to lend assistance to the underhand plotting of a minister. Later, the Daradas are called by Kalhaṇa: Mlecchas, which means that in the meantime they or their rulers had been for the most part converted to Islam. "Islam had already made great progress in the twelfth century". STEIN 1961, Vol. II, p. 217. If the names of the above-mentioned Dard rulers are Hindus, this does not imply that Buddhism had been altogether forgotten.

^(104c) The Tibetans interpret the name as *bdud bži la* "the pass of the four devils" on account of the dangers one is likely to meet in crossing it.

But evidently it is a learned etymology proposed by some Lama.

The information on Swāt, found in the records of the Chinese pilgrims is confirmed and completed by that supplied by the *T'ang Shu* (CHAVANNES 1903, p. 28). It is said that there were five major towns ⁽¹⁰⁵⁾. There had been missions from Uḍḍiyāna to China in the years 502, 511, 518, 521. (LÉVI, CHAVANNES J.A. 1895, p. 348 note). In the year 642 king Ta-mo-yin-t'o-ho-szu sent camphor to the emperor of China and in exchange he received the imperial seal of investiture.

In the year 665 ambassadors from Uḍḍiyāna went to the Imperial Court. Later, Uḍḍiyāna was, although indirectly, involved in the fights against the Arabs who had penetrated into the Pamirs (CHAVANNES 1903, p. 129 n. 2); the Chinese did not intervene at the moment, but in the year 720 they sent some ambassadors to confer upon the king of Uḍḍiyāna and other neighbouring states the investiture, as a reward for having opposed the Arabs ⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ (CHAVANNES p. 192).

In the year 745, China conferred upon the king of Ki-pin the investiture of King of "Ki-pin and Uḍḍiyāna", and in about 748 the king of Ki-pin sent tributes to China (CHAVANNES p. 132 and note) which means that Swāt had lost its independence to Kapiśa (ID. p. 294). We do not know why, but it is possible that, in the troubled situation of the Pamir states, when China and Tibet collided, Swāt might have sided with the Tibetans, who were at its very borders ^(106a).

39. *Swāt between China and Tibet*

The eight century was rich in events in the Gilgit (Chinese: Little P'u-lü) Baltistan (Chinese: Great P'u-lü) and Pamir area, and consequently also in Swāt, on account of the expansion of the Tibetans who aimed at the conquest of the "four garrisons" of Central Asia, while the Arab incursions represented for the Chinese another impending danger. China aimed at the control of Gilgit, which had a great strategical importance, since it was the meeting

⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ It is difficult to identify them all because their importance may have changed in the course of time. Mêng-chieh-li is certainly Mingora (not Mangalaor, as I have proven in the Report 1958); another town certainly was Uḍḍegram with its imposing castle (its ruins are called now Rājgira); a third one might have been Aligrāma. On the right side of the river there are some very large archaeological sites, which testify to the former existence of large urban centers, e.g. Tutano Bandai, Dangarkot, Shahdheri and Tangai near the Shor Khwar. Graveyards were found in Tutano Bandai and Dangarkot, TUCCI 1958, p. 327, note 24, I think to have identified some places of importance: in that note (second column) the passage « Another point... solve this problem » must

be cancelled.

⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ The name of this king is: Ta-mo-yin-t'o-ho-szu *d'at muâ iěn d'â χâ się. Perhaps the first four characters may transcribe a Prakrit Dhammenda (for Dharmendra); as to χâ się one may suppose, hâsa, joy, smile. But a name Dharmendrahâsa is hardly possible.

^(106a) I think it is interesting to add that some years ago I was shown, by Prince Aurangzeb of Swāt, a silver bullion with a Chinese date on it, corresponding, if I remember well, to 1903. It had been given him by the Nabab of Hunza. This shows that occasional exchanges of tributes and gifts between China and Hunza had been going on up to that year.

point of the roads and the tracks joining India to Central Asia via Kunar to the West, Gurais or Chilas, Astor, Bunji to the East. The Chinese, through diplomacy and military actions tried to check the Tibetan expansion, relying on the ability of a famous general, Kao Hsien-chih; but after his defeat by the Quarluq in 751 the situation changed. The Tibetans did not give up their programme of expansion. They moreover went so far as to occupy, even if for a short time, Ch'ang-an, the Imperial capital. In the treaty of 783 the Chinese acknowledged the Tibetan rule over the Central Asian regions they had conquered, including also the Tarim-basin.

The mention of the great P'u-lü (CHAVANNES 1903, p. 149), contained in the *T'ang shu*, is very concise; after having said that it was subject to the Tibetans, it adds that it had thrice sent ambassadors to China in the year 696, down to the period of K'ai-yuen, 713-741; it mentions its two kings.

These kings are: Su-fu-shê-li-chih-li-ni and his son, Su-lin-t'o-i-chih. CHAVANNES suggests (with a query) for the latter name an original Surendrāditya (which philologically is rather difficult); the Chinese seems to be based upon a Prakrit original * Surendaicca(e). In the list of the kings of Gilgit we have met two Surendrāditya of the Paṭola dynasty. One of them died in 720.

But from Hui-ch'ao passing in those parts about 726, we gather a very important information; the great P'u-lü was the original seat of the king of small P'u-lü; [being afraid of the Tibetans?] the above said king left "great P'u-lü" and retired to Gilgit. This king may quite well be Surendaicca. But those who followed his example were not many. *The upper classes and the commoners preferred to remain at home.*

After the death of Mo-chin-mang who succeeded him and that of his sons, the rulership passed over to Su-shih-li-chi, * Suo siṅ (Mm. śi) lji't'śi, who changed the politics of Mo-chin-mang and sided with the Tibetans.

Concerning the capital of Great P'u-lü we know from Hui-ch'ao that it was in what once was Great P'u-lü; it is logical to think that there being no news of any internal rebellion or any warlike intervention of the Tibetans, the capital of the dynasty of Great P'u-lü remained in the same place as before i.e. Ye-to near the river So-i; Ye-t'o is called Ye-ho by Wu k'ung; Ye t'o is * ngiät t'a (in Mm. ye = ga) which may be: * Gar ta, sKardo; the river Soi = * sâ i.

Near the capital there was another big town called Kia-pu-lo, certainly Kapalu⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ of today. The king Mo-chin-mang, in the period K'ai-yuen (713-741), sent ambassadors to the court. As I said above, there seems to have occurred in little P'u-lü a change of dynasty with Mo-chin-mang. If so, the event happened after 720 and before the end of period K'ai yüen 741, because as Chavannes rightly suggests, the above-mentioned Su-

(107) * kia pu lâ.

In Kapalu crops were abundant on the alluvial soil: but it was later ravaged because the Shayok river changed its course (BIASUTTI-DAINELLI 1925).

The above-quoted authors remarked that Ka-

palu has all the requirements to become a great centre; farming is very extensive, and it is even now the chief populated centre of the whole region.

fu-shê-li-chih-li-ni was alive in 719, but died in 720; in this very year, his son Su-lin-t'o-i-chih was given the royal investiture (CHAVANNES addenda p. 44, note 1).

As regards Kia-pu-lo = Kapalu I suppose that we must correct « it is on top of the mountain to its west » (is west here a mistake for east?). On the confusion between East and West in this very context see CHAV. 1903, p. 150 n. 1, 2.

The distance of the place, 500 li from Wakhān and 500 li from Kashmir, indicates that it was the very middle of the route.

In the sixteenth century Kapalu was the chief town from which 'Ali Mīr Shīr K̄han started for his subjection of Baltistan after which he founded or better rebuilt Skardo (BARTHOLD *E.Isl.* s.v. Tibet p. 781).

I realize that the identification of *ngiät t'a, *ga ta with Skardo presents some phonetical difficulties, but we do not know which was the original spelling of the name of that town Tibetanised by the Tibetans as Skardo; nor can we state that the Chinese transcription refers to a Tibetan original; I suppose that it was based on a name which was no Tibetan but Balti or Dardic. Anyhow about the fact that an important source like the "*story of the Li kingdom*" refers often to Skardo as a capital there seems to be no doubt.

This book has been studied and translated by F. W. THOMAS TLT. 1935-1955. From it we know its most important events; we learn that a Vijayavarman was king of Skardo, after the defeat inflicted on the Tibetans by the Chinese; that expedition of the Chinese barred the approach of the Tibetans to the Pamirs (THOMAS, *Ibid.* I, p. 161); there was a direct communication between Skardo and Gilgit via Nagar, *ibid.* I, p. 154; besides the other marauders in the route Skardo-Chinese Turkestan, the robbers of Hunza were specially dangerous, *ibid.*, 155-156. The same text speaks of the realm and even of the realms of Skardo; *Ibid.* I, 191-192. Another story tells how Vimalaprabhā, in a former life, expressed the intense desire to be reborn as daughter of the king of Skardo. *Ibid.* 199. Buddhist books were sent to Skardo (¹⁰⁸). *Ibid.* I, 255. Thus it is ascertained by these and other facts also that Skardo was for some time the capital of Baltistan and a Buddhist centre of a relevant importance. The information of Hui-ch'ao is thus fully confirmed and implicitly also the importance of the roads directly connecting Baltistan or the Tibetans who had occupied it, with Central Asia. Thus the necessity of controlling also the Kunar route far away from their bases is much reduced for the Tibetans.

The identification of Kapalu and Katsura, Kasara, Katsara confirms that the localization of Skardo. Katsara (p. 79 note 110) is only half a day's march from Skardo. At Kapalu, Kapallu three paths join: one to Skardo, five marches; one to Shigar four marches; another one to Leh. We find peculiar names between Shigar and Kapalu: Kasurmik, Thalle, Kuru, Olmoik, Barangus.

While discussing the problem of Kipin (see on Kipin the study of PETECH, 1950, p. 63)

⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ In Skardo there are very good Buddhist remains: some isolated huge boulders with fine engraved images deserve special mention (BIASUTTI-DAINELLI 1925 Pl. XIV, XV); the 21 Bud-

dhas of the confession of sins (*ltuñ bšags* in Tibetan), a standing Buddha in *bodhyāṅgī mudrā* (Vairocana). Very interesting are the images of the donors.

Lévi et Chavannes *J.A.* 1895 p. 377 suppose that the upper part of the Kabul river ran in another country than Gandhāra and think that it was P'u-lü bordering West Uḍḍiyāna and they identify Kia-pu-lo with Kabul; but such a proposal seems hardly acceptable.

There were then a pro-Tibetan party in Dardistan and a pro-Chinese party in Gilgit. The leadership of the family of Gilgit (of Surendaicca) came soon to an end. This seems clear if we read the names of the new rulers of Gilgit: Mo-chin-mang, * muət - kṣən - mâng and Mo lai-hsi, * Ma-lâi-γiei: therefore quite different types of names.

A few of these names show a partial similarities with the ending syllabes of certain names found in the Mss. of Gilgit.

Su fu chi li chieh li ni
 *Suo p'uət sia lji ts'ie lje nji
 (¹⁰⁹) su put śa, sa li, ri ci ri ni
 Su but srī, ci ri ṇi (ni)
 or Su but śa ri ci ri ṇi (ni)

Suo shi li chih
 Suo śiēt li(ri) tsī
 Suo śi li(ri) ci (Mm.)
 Su śri (or śi ri, śi li) ci

One is reminded of Suṣkitikaṭī si ri, *Bhaiṣajyagurusūtra* (DUTT, p. 32), kṣiṇi(ena), *Ajitasenavyākāraṇa*, ibid. p. 136.

The conclusion, according to my mind, is that the Tibetan invasion divided the history of P'u-lü into two periods: the first one, when P'u-lü included not only Gilgit but a great part of Baltistan under a dynasty which had already sent ambassadors to China in 696 and within the period 731-741 and a second one which starts with the retreat of Su-lin-t'o-i-chih to Gilgit proper, and the advent of Mo-chin-mang who ruled in little P'u-lü remaining on good terms with the Chinese, while the eastern P'u-lü was lost to the Tibetans. Thus, it seems almost certain that just then the real division of Dardistan into two parts took place:

a) Gilgit = Little P'u-lü and b) Baltistan etc., i.e. the Great P'u-lü under the control of the Tibetans. Until that event, there had been only one P'u-lü. But Gilgit remained the pivot of the Chinese influence on the Central-Asia-India routes, and it was considered "the western gate" of the T'ang (CHAVANNES 1903, p. 150).

Coming back to our narrative, as soon as Mo-chin-mang took possession of Gilgit, the Tibetans tried to persuade him to enter into an alliance with them: he refused because in 722 we find the Tibetans attacking "little P'u-lü" (PELLIOT, 1961, p. 99).

King Mo-chin-mang was faithful to the Chinese, and greatly contributed to the defeat

(¹⁰⁹) Transcription according to Mm.

of the Tibetans when they attacked him and captured nine of his towns, which however he reconquered. For his military feats he was thanked by the Court, and was given the title of King of P'u-lü, and Mo-chin-mang rendered his thanks in 733, and exchanges of Ambassadors and gifts are recorded in the following years. After the death of Mo chin-mang, of his son and of his elder brother Mo-lai-hsi, their successor Su-shih-li-chih passed over to the Tibetans and married a Tibetan wife. But in 747 Kao Hsien-chih came to the rescue, and succeeded not only in exterminating the pro-Tibetan party but also in sending as prisoners to China Su-shih-li-chih and his wife (^{109a}).

The above-mentioned changes which occurred after the death of Su-lin-t'o-i-chih seem to be confirmed by the fact that Great P'u-lü is no longer mentioned or rarely as a political entity. Also Mo-chin-mang is spoken of as King of P'u-lü, no distinction being made between great and small P'u-lü. But the Tibetans took another initiative after the death of Kao Hsien-chih, and in the year 753 Fêng Ch'ang ch'ing who had succeeded Kao Hsien-chih attacked the Tibetans and near the town of Ho sa lao, defeated them (¹¹⁰).

Such a situation, briefly summarized, involved willy-nilly the Pamir states in the conflict between the two giants; they tried alternatively, according to the change of events, to be on friendly terms with the more successful party, but at the same time they did their best to avoid major troubles and to shelter the advantages of their position and of the trades taking place on the routes they controlled. However, they must have suffered the repercussions due to the unstable situation between China and Tibet.

It is obvious that, especially from 745 to 755, the Tibetans tried to find allies in the Pamirs in order to cut off the routes from Gilgit to India: the easiest of these was that which passed through Chitrāl (eventually branching from there to Kalam, Upper Swat - Swāt) and reached Gandhāra at Lampāka. The other one ran through Baltistan, reached the left side of the Indus crossing it at Bunji, then proceeded to Astor, and to Guráis. From Gurais the road approaches east of the Wular lake and then Srīnagar. There is no doubt that in the good season this route was followed for the transportation of salt and rice to Gilgit and the T'u-ho-lo (Tokharistān). This is clearly indicated by the request of the King of the T'u-ho-lo to the Emperor of China in the year 749, after the

(^{109a}) On this memorable feat of Kao Hsien-shih and the itinerary followed by him in his campaign see STEIN, 1922, p. 112.

(¹¹⁰) CHAVANNES 1903 add. p. 88.

Ho sa lao, ancient pr. g'â sât lāu, can be identified with a place now called Katzarāh, Katsura, Casara in the basin of the Indus on the way from Skardo to Burzil, on the right side of the river Indus.

There exists an old document TUCCI 1949 I, p. 252 note 36, ID. 1956, b p. 73 (which has been reproduced by later texts, modified according to the changed political situations) in which the Western territories under the control

of the Tibetans are recorded. It goes back to a time when a part, at least, of the « four garrisons » was under the Tibetan rule; in fact Li (Khotan) is mentioned; then Žaň-žuň follows. Žaň-žuň had been conquered in year 737, HOFFMANN 1969, p. 149 mŇa' ris skor gsum or Bod sTod. Upper Tibet is divided into three districts:

1st district (sKor): sPu raňs. Maryul, Žaňs dkar

2nd district: Li (Khotan), Gru ža (Bru ža, Gilgit, sBal te)

3rd district: Žaň žuň, K'ri te stod and smad (K'ri ta, K'rita = Hsüan-tsang: Ki-li-to).

victorious expedition of Kao Hsien-chih of 747. This request was caused by the alliance established between the Tibetans and a small Pamir state Ch'ieh shih, or Chieh Shuai; there Tibetans had built some defence towers. The ruler of that state represented therefore another threat to the route from Gilgit to India. His name was P'o-te-mu, *b'ʊət d'ak muət. He was defeated by Kao Hsien-chih and the investiture of king was given by the Imperial Court to his elder brother Su-chia *Suo ka, CHAVANNES 1963, p. 215, who received the investiture as king of Ch'ieh shih.

There is some discussion on the location of this small state. We must first of all say that it is certainly different from Chitrāl, which is known to the Chinese sources as Shê mi.

STEIN 1921 p. 31 chiefly for geographical reasons, does not agree with the identification of Shê-mi or Shang-mi with Chitrāl, on the basis that Shê-mi or Shang-mi, being a mountainous country, cannot be Chitrāl, but it should be the valleys of Kafiristan to the West and South of Chitrāl. He identifies Chitrāl with Ch'ieh-shih of the Chinese sources and proposes that Shê-mi indicates those fertile parts belonging to Kafiristan. But Pelliot 1963, p. 707 accepts the equivalence of Shê-mi or Shang-mi with Chitrāl, a fact supported by the name Syāmarāja (see above p. 63) given to it by Hui-ch'ao, and confirmed by the Legend of Śyāma (contained in the *Udrayanāvadāna*, see *ibid.*)⁽¹¹¹⁾. The suggestion of Stein was however accepted by Chavannes in his addenda, p. 83 note 1; the latter, referring to an article of Biddulph, G. J. 1893, p. 342, f. in which the importance of Chilas is emphasized because its people controlled the route from Kashmir to Gilgit adds: “à l'époque de T'ang les gens du Kafiristan descendaient sur Chilas pour tendre la main aux Tibétains et intercepter ainsi la route entre le Kashmir et le petit P'u-lü (Yasin)” (Cfr. PELLIOU, 1959, p. 203).

In the Khotanese Saka itinerary Chilas is called Śilathasa, Sīḍathasi (Alberuni: Śīltās) the journey from that place to the bridge on the Indus took eight days. Cf. also MORGENSTIERNE *N.T.S.* XI, 1942, p. 269.

Prof. Forte has kindly brought to my attention a passage of Hu San-hsing who has commented upon the *Tzu-chih T'ung-chien* (Hongkong ed. 1971, p. 6897). He writes on this country Ch'ieh-shih: “Ch'ieh-shih also called Ch'ieh-shuai”. “They belong to the Hu group and are close to the Tu-ho-lo. The great P'u-lü [some one says P'u-lü⁽¹¹²⁾] is straight to the west of Tibet. North of it there is little P'u-lü”. This corresponds to the location of Chilas, having to the north little P'u-lü, Gilgit, but being to the west of Bal-tistan, subject to the Tibetans.

On this problem I have consulted my colleague and friend Prof. Enoki who has been kind enough to reply in detail to my questions and to express his important conclusions

⁽¹¹¹⁾ There are many cases of countries being named by the name of their king or Lord. See e.g. above p. 33.

⁽¹¹²⁾ This implies the identification of P'u-lü and Great P'u-lü.



The petroglyphs of Gōgdara I, with the big cart at the left.



The cart with horses (?) and two wheels and the driver.



Standard (?) from Gōgdara I



Dogs from Gōgdara I, in different styles.



Dogs from Gōgdara I, in different styles.



Dogs from Gōgdara I, in different styles.

on the different aspects of the subject in question; when I asked him to be so kind as to allow me to reproduce as an appendix to my article his remarks, he kindly agreed: I am very grateful to him also for this.

But I think that the main trade went through the second route, the eastern one; Gilgit, Chilās, Astor, where the Kunar people could not or only with great risk interfere.

Of course, as it has been observed by many travellers, topogeographically Chitrāl is not a unity: already Grierson wrote that the Chitrāl *valley* was formerly inhabited by Kalashas; but as Morgenstierne puts it the original homogeneous Dardic population of Kafiristan, Chitrāl and Gilgit “was subsequently split into two by a wedge of Kho invasion, representing members of a different, but related tribes coming from the north of the Hindu-kush”.

According to MORGENSTIERNE (Some names of places and peoples of Hindu-Kush, BSOS vol. V, 1930-32, pag. 441, n. 3) *Sām* probably was the name of Upper Chitrāl (and he quotes Prasun Kafir *šim gol*, Simāi = Chitrāl). Thus again there is no reason to deny the equivalence Shê-mi = Syāma[rājā] = Chitrāl; of that some parts, west and south of Chitrāl, are particularly fertile. There is no valid reason to contest that these rich valleys might have been plundered by the Kafirs. But what has this to do with the big trade with Central Asia in which Tibet was interested? Thus I conclude that the route which the Pamir tribes might have threatened is not that of Kunar, but the eastern one, i.e. the Kashmir-Astor-Gilgit route which was completely under their control.

40. *The eastern routes*

The conclusions of Chavannes are not clear to me; does he mean that Ch'ieh-shih corresponds to Chilas and does he admit that the Kafirs used to help the Tibetans in plundering the caravans to and from Kashmir? Chilas of which Biddulph speaks is located not in Kunar (though there is a tribe of Chilasi in Kunar) ^(112a), but in Baltistan on the Indus. In this case it is highly improbable that the Ch'ieh-shih might have represented an impending threat to the Kunar route; the distance from Kunar to Chilas is considerable and the tracks are not easy. The Chilas to which Biddulph refers is on the route Srinagar-Gilgit described by the Saka itinerary. The description here summarized that Biddulph gives of the Chilas is not encouraging.

The route from Kashmir to Gilgit through Gurais follows the Astor waters to the Indus then the ferry at Bunji (eighteen marches from Srinagar); “on the western boundary Chilas is open to Yaghistan”: where it borders on the Indus the elevations is of 3400 feet. The situation “has given the people a spirit of independence and a distinctive character. They have been determined raiders from all time. During the Sikh occupation an expedition sent against Chilas met with a disastrous defeat”. (BIDDHULPH 1893, p. 342).

^(112a) W. of Kunar river, East of Shumashti, MORGENSTIERNE Notes on Shumashti NTS, XIII

1945 map to face p. 241 and p. 267

The route through Chilas was the shortest and the safest for the Tibetans, because it was in the territories which they controlled: Chitrāl or Kafiristan were far away from their bases and to reach them through Darel, Swāt, Kohistan was not an easy and short enterprise.

Moreover the Chinese Ch'ieh-shih (* γat, kat-si, sai) can hardly correspond to Chilas and their location near the Tu-ho-los (p. 80), as Hu San-hsin writes, excludes the identification with Chilas. Nor has Ch'ieh-shih any relation with the name of Chilas in the Saka itinerary, Śīdathasa, Śīdathasi (Šiltās, Alberuni). The only thing certain is that Chilas was on the shortest route from Gilgit to Kashmir, and that on the contrary Chitrāl remains far away from the Tibetan bases. This leads me to the same conclusions reached by Pelliot and to see in the Ch'ieh-shih an original Khaṣa, Kasi, Khasi, Khasia. The Khasas are a warring tribe which appears to have been one of the most mobile mountain tribes, *parvatāśrayinaḥ*.

The Khasas are listed with the Cīnas among the peoples of the Pamirs (LÉVI 1918, p. 118). They are the same as the Kakkha of Kashmir. Some tribes of them about the 10th-11th centuries migrated eastwards, and conquered a great part of Western Tibet and Western Nepal, as I think to have shown in TUCCI 1956b. About them, and the correspondence between Khasa and Kashmiri Kakha see STEIN 1961, Vol. I, 47 note to I, 317.

For further information on the Khasas, see S. LÉVI 1905b, p. 259. ŚĀRADĀTANAYA 1930, p. 310 verse 10 Kaṣa.

The problem of the original habitat of the Khasas is still unsolved and it deserves a thorough investigation.

From the inscriptions it appears that their real name was Khasa: "Aśokacalla king of the Khasa" (TUCCI 1956b, p. 66). In the inscription of Dullu (Ibid.) some of their kings have peculiar names: Cāpa, Cāpilla, Kraśicalla, Krādhicalla, Krācalla; in such names Kraśi, Krādhī, Krā correspond to Tib.: bKra šis, Grags btsan, Grags pa; the ending: calla corresponds to the epithet of the old Tibetan kings: *lde*. (Nāgadeva = Nāga lde).

We find some of these names in Garhwal, Kumaon, Kashmir; Cāvillā (kara) in Chambā Aśokacalla is also mentioned in some inscriptions of Kumaon. They are certainly descended from the region of the Pamirs and the Hindukush (ATKINSON 1888, p. 379 from Central Asia), and spread all over a great part of the Sub-Himalayan regions, but the original center of diffusion is still uncertain. On the inscription of Asokacalla found in Kumaon cf. NAU-TIYAL, 1969, pp. 70 ff.

For the time being I can only propose: Ch'ieh-shih = Khaṣa; extraction: Hu (HU SAN-HSIN); situation: near the Tu-ho-lo. (Various transcriptions of Khāsyalipi in different translations of *Lalitavistara* and other works in SHIRATORI 1957, p. 29).

Original contacts of the Kafirs with the Khāsas who invaded Western Nepal and Western Tibet founding a kingdom in those parts, may be suggested — certainly tentatively, at least at present — by the wooden images of the ancestors of the dead which are found in some secluded parts of Nepal (TUCCI 1956b, plates 17, 34).

The suzerainty of the Tibetans over Baltistan which began in 727 implied that the

northern route connecting Kashmir with Central Asia (see Wu k'ung, in CHAVANNES, LÉVI 1895, p. 356) who writes that three routes connected Kashmir with other parts of Asia (E: Tibet; N: P'u-lü; W: Gandhāra) passed through their domains. The Chinese or their allies in Gilgit were a potential threat to the Tibetan routes of communication with Central Asia, because the Tibetans who menaced Gilgit, had a complete control of the routes India-Central Asia, which run through Baltistan. This implies that the Chinese wanted to cut not so much the routes in Yasin and Gilgit as the Tibetan routes leading to those places. In fact the Tibetans say to Mo-chin-mang that they do not covet his kingdom, but only wish to use its routes in order to attack the four garrisons. Therefore Kao Hsien-chih informs Su-shê-li-chih that he wants free passages in little P'u-lü *for entering great P'u-lü* (CHAVANNES, p. 151); in the year 749 (CHAVANNES 214, n. 2) the Tu-ho-los write to the Chinese Court that, since the small state of Ch'ieh-shih *threatens the route to Gilgit*, they request the Chinese that the following year they should help them to *subdue the Great P'u-lü*, with the purpose that the connection with Yarkand, Khotan Kashgar or other places might be open. Which was done, because Kao Hsien-shih in 750 defeats Po-t'o-mo, the ruler of Ch'ieh-shih, and invests of the royal power his elder brother (CHAVANNES 1903, p. 214, note 2 and p. 296). Therefore I think that the only aim of the Tibetans was to maintain undisturbed the use of the routes in their territories and specially of that of Chilas which is also followed by the pilgrims using the Saka itinerary.

The route of Skardo or Chilas had been used from old times as documented by the inscription of Wima Kadphises found in Kalatze. Therefore the Chinese, in order to be sure in Gilgit tried their very best to assure the control of the routes of Baltistan and to find supporters in the local princes, instigating them against the Tibetans and also organizing military expeditions in the very core of Great P'u-lü: but the results did not last for a long time. In the campaign of 747 Kao Hsien-chih *entered* into P'u-lü^(112b) (not little P'u-lü) *up to about 60 li from the capital* (CHAVANNES Ibid. p. 153, note 1); the bridge which the T'ang-shu mentions on this occasion, had been built by the Tibetans, who did not rely on the local people: this may mean that the Tibetans were not yet completely sure of their Balti subjects in Great P'u-lü, but had established on them a kind of suzerainty. I think that the bridge here referred to corresponds to that which nowadays is the bridge of Bunji^(112c).

In conclusion I accept what Hui-ch'ao writes: that the kings of little P'u-lü, before Surendrāditya resided in great P'u-lü; their capital was Ye t'o which to my mind is Skardo which, also today, is an important meeting point of routes and tracks; this location seems to be confirmed by the fact that when Fêng Ch'ang-ch'ing invaded P'u-lü he went as far as a town whose Chinese name may well suggest Katsura^(112d).

^(112b) P'u-lü = Great Pu-lü in many cases.

^(112c) One of the main aims of Kao Hsien-shih had been that of cutting the bridge.

^(112d) All this does not exclude that the Kunar route was occasionally "protected" by local chiefs who in exchange of some financial advantages and of the building of some defence towers were

considered by the Tibetans as allies, helpful because eventually they could cause some disturbances to little caravans passing that way. But the results might have been pernicious to them as it was to Swāt (p. 75).

It is still unsolved for me the identification of the So yī, *sâ i. It is believed

The Eastern Route through Chilas was used in summer and it was short: it was followed up to 1931 by the Yarkandis coming from Turkestan. Immense caravans passed also through the longest and hard tracks to Nubra and Leh, where they used to stop before leaving again for Kashmir and Mecca. Others descended through Skardo, the largest part through the Astor Route. The meeting point and the market for selling or exchanging goods was in Srinagar; all that came to a stop after the political events which happened in Central Asia after the advent of Bolshevism.

To conclude: we can set down three main events in this part of the world:

A) 747 little P'ô-lü is reduced to subjection by Kao Hsien-chih. B) Second campaign by the same in 749-750. C) 753 after the death of Kao Hsien-chih, general Fêng Ch'ang-ch'ing undertakes another campaign against great P'ô-lü and captures their capital Ho-sa-lao (CHAVANNES 1903 addenda p. 83 n. 2). Ho-sa-lao ("*gâ' sât lâu, now probably Katsura").

Thus, we may conclude that Swât had already come in contact with China, since the 6th century; this explains how at the times of Sung Yün there was in Uḍḍiyāna a Chinese interpreter; there must have been at that time not only an increasing number of pilgrims, but also a more consistent bulk of trade between Swât, Gilgit and Central Asia. The fact itself that Uḍḍiyāna had sent missions to China from the beginning of the 7th century shows that the pilgrims coming and going to and from China gave the first news of the great empire and of its power: its conquests had brought China near to its frontiers; when the Tibetans advanced, and the Chinese lost to them some parts of Central Asia, Swât could not help sharing the apprehensions resulting from the fact that the Pamir had become a meeting-point of the three rival powers: Swât opposed itself to the Arabs and was rewarded by the Chinese.

A coin of Sam B. Ziyād, 64 H = 683, GÖBL 1976, p. 37 was found in Butkara (of course it may also be a stray coin, a single surviving testimonial of trade); there is little discrepancy between the date of the coin and that of the investiture given by China to the king of Swât. But if, at a later date the ruler of Kapiśa received from the Chinese an in-

to correspond to the Gilgit river, but this should be better ascertained. In the Saka itinerary the track from Gilgit proceeds along the "Golden river", which is the Indus; but 6 + a not better specified number of days before reaching Gilgit, the sources of the "golden water" are mentioned. "Golden water" may be the same as the Golden river; the sources of the Indus have been always uncertain for ancient geographers; the Greek placed them near Aornos in Kohistān (above p. 53) and some Indian grammarians vaguely among the Dards; Ptolemaeus indicates the Himaios. It is not excluded that the Gilgit river was taken as a branch of the golden river So yi, *sâ i Ysar-

nījiṭṭāji; two towns, Skardo and Katsura (Katsara) are on the Indus; Kapalu, Khapalu, is on the Shayok.

In India there are two traditions concerning the sources of the great rivers of the Jambudvīpa. In Mahāyāna the four rivers Gangā, Sindhu, Vakṣu, Sitā issuing from the Anavatapta which for the Chinese is placed in the K'un lun: LAMOTTE 1944-49, pp. 385-386 note.

In the Chinese maps published by HERMANN 1922 the sources of the Indus are vaguely indicated in the K'un lun; its course is very imprecisely designed and its connection with other rivers chiefly the Gilgit river is not indicated.

vestiture also as king of Swāt, this may imply that Swāt, impressed by the power of the Tibetans reaching Baltistan, had changed its policy.

In the light of these facts it would seem that the journey of Padmasambhava to Tibet from Swāt can be better explained. Perhaps he was not even officially invited, so to say, as the tradition narrates; he might have gone there of his own will, after having heard from some Swātis or Gilgit monks who had preceded him or from some of the Tibetans themselves who certainly passed through Swāt, of the new possibilities open to Buddhist preachers, in attempting the evangelization of the Land of Snows. His departure must have taken place two or three years before the foundation of bSam yas 775 c. in Tibet; being perhaps the best appreciated thaumaturge, among the various siddhas and magicians, he enjoyed a great renown, and as all siddhas, he was a wandering man. Now that we have seen how Swāt was in the very middle of the Chinese-Tibetan quarrels for the control of the main routes connecting Central Asia with Kashmir and Northern India, in a general way, it is clear that we have to look to Swāt with other eyes. A region, by its very geographical situation open to all sorts of trade and cultural influences; a fact which explains its wealth documented by the immense number of religious settlements and its high culture testified by the archaeological discoveries; these documents will certainly greatly increase when the orthogonal town laying underneath the fields near the present play-ground of Mingora will be excavated.

As a general conclusion, we may state that while the Pamir, the Hindukush, the Karakorum and Ladok so far have mainly attracted the attention of the Alpinists, now they must be considered as regions of great interest for protohistorians and historians of Buddhism.

Romae, pridie nonas februarias A.D. 1977 conclusum

APPENDIX I

SOME REMARKS ON CHIEH-SHI 竭師

by KAZUO ENOKI

(1) The location of Chieh-shi:

The basic Chinese source concerning the location of Chieh-shi/shuai or shuo 羯/竭一師/帥 is the petition produced to the Emperor Hsüan-tsung by the Yabghu of T'u-ho-lo 吐火羅 in the 8th year of T'ien-pao (749). The petition, which reached the court of T'ang on December 22, 749 (the 5th day of the 11th month of the 8th year of T'ien-pao) according to the Tzu-chih t'ung-chien 資治通鑑, Bk. 216 (ed. Hong Kong, p. 6897), is recorded in the Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei 冊府元龜, Bk. 999, which is also reproduced in the Ch'üan-t'ang-wên 全唐文, Bk. 999, and is translated into French with commentaries by Ed. Chavannes (Documents sur les Toukieu occidentaux, pp. 214-215).

In this petition, the Yabghu asked the Emperor to send an army of the protectorate An-hsi 安西 or An-hsi tu-hu-fu 安西都護府, situated at Kuei-tzu 龜茲 or Kucha, to the Little and Big P'o-lü 勃律 to get rid of the armies of both Chieh-shih and Tibetans, who were occupying these places, interfering the free transport between Tokharestan and India (Kashmir). According to the petition, the Chieh-shih were barbarians living in the mountainous region in the neighbourhood of Tokharestan which they were threatening to invade. The petition was accepted and the general Kao Hsien-chih, 高仙芝, who led the army, returned from the victorious campaign to Chang-an together with the king of the Chieh-shi whom he captured. The dispatch of Kao Hsien-chih and his triumphal return to the capital, which was some time before April 26, 750 (kêng-tzu 庚子 or the 12th of the 3rd month of

the 9th year of T'ien-pao), is recorded in the Collation of Tzu-chih t'ung-chien under the 2nd month of the 9th year of T'ien-pao (ed. Hong Kong, p. 6898). As is well-known, Kao Hsien-shi conquered the Little P'o-lü in 747 for the reason that the Little P'o-lü were put under the control of the Tibetans and not obedient to the T'ang. So, the campaign of 749/750 was the second one.

The petition as reproduced in the Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei (and the Ch'üan-t'ang-wên) is not complete and should be supplemented by quotations of the same petition in such books as the T'ai-p'ing huan-yü-chi 太平寰宇記, Bk. 186, the Hsin T'ang-shu 新唐書, Bk. 221 b, under T'u-ho-lo 吐火羅 and the T'ang-hui-yao 唐會要, Bk. 99. But, still, some part of the petition is yet to be clarified.

For instance, the Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei does not say that Tokharestan was being invaded by the Chieh-shi, while the T'ai-p'ing huan-yü-chi, the Hsin T'ang-shu, Bk. 221 b, and the T'ang-hui-yao clearly state to the effect that the Chieh-shi were invading T'u-ho-lo. So, Chavannes is apparently wrong when he took that the Chieh-shi were invading P'o-lü (Documents, p. 215). The Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei says that Kao Hsien-chih conquered P'o-lü (in 747) where he increased the number of garrison by 3,000 and P'o-lü relied upon these soldiers, while the king of Chieh-shi and the Tibetans, making use of this vacancy and instability, tried to invade To-ho-lo. But, it is not clear why the increase of 3,000 (Chinese) soldiers in P'o-lü made the king of the Chieh-shi and the Tibetans venture to invade T'u-ho-lo. Actually, Chavannes just translates as: "Depuis que Kao Sien-tche a ouvert le Pou-lu, il y a eu là trois mille soldats de plus et le Pou-lu en a été acca-

blé (Documents, pp. 214-215). But, it seems that this does not make sense.

Anyway, the petition makes it clear that a tribe named Chieh-shi were situated between T'u-ho-lo and the Little and Big P'o-lü in the 11th month of the 9th year of T'ien-pao (Dec. 7, 750-Jan. 5, 751). At that time T'u-ho-lo meant two kinds of territories. The one is the whole territory under the control of the yabghu of T'u-ho-lo. According to a petition of P'u-lü 僕羅, who was a younger brother of the yabghu of T'u-ho-lo, of the date of the 17th day, 11th month, 6th year of Kai-yüan (December 17, 718), the yabghu of T'u-ho-lo controlled 12 countries which included Hsieh-yüeh 謝颺 (Zabûlistân), Chi-pin 罽賓 (Kapisa), Ku-t'u 骨咄 (Khot-tâi), Shih-han-na 石汗那 (Shagâniyân), Chieh-su 解蘇 (Shûmân), Shih-ni 石匿 (Shighnân), I-ta 怛達 (Hephthal), Hu-mi 護密 (Wakhân), Hu-shih-chien 護時健 (Juzjân), Fan-yen 范延 (Bâmiyân), Chiu-yüeh-tê-chien (for yen) 久越德健 (for 延) (Kabâdiyân) and P'o-t'ê-shan 勃特山 (Badakhshân). (Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei, Bk. 999: Ch'üan-t'ang-wen, Bk. 999, Cf. Chavannes, Documents, pp.200-202). The other is the dominion of the yabghu of T'u-ho-lo himself, of which the capital was situated at A-huan 阿緩 or Ho-huan 過換 (Walwâlîj; in the neighbourhood of what is now Kunduz) (cf. Chavannes, Documents, p.68 note: J. Markwart, Wehrot und Arang, Leiden, 1938, p. 44).

T'u-ho-lo which had been threatened by Chieh-shih with invasion must have been in Wakhan or in Badakhshan or in the Kapisa region. Seeing that the Badakhshân-Yasin and Gilgit (The Little P'o-lü)-Skardu (The Big P'o-lü) road has been the shortest and the most frequented cut to connect the Afghan Turkestan with the North India via Peshawar, it may have been

Badakhshan that was being invaded by the Chieh-shi tribe at the end of 749. This means that the Chieh-shi occupied the upper-waters of Kunar.

Hu San-shêng 胡三省 gives a comment to the effect that the Chieh-shi are in the neighbourhood of T'u-ho-lo: Ta P'o-lü 大勃律 = Baltistán_x, which is also called Pu-lu 布露, is situated directly to the west of T'u-fan 吐蕃 or Tibet and to the north of it_x = Ta P'o-lü_x exists Hsian P'o lü 小勃律_x = Yasin and Gilgit region_x under the day of I-wei 乙未, the 11th month, the 8th year of T'ien-pao of the Tzu-chih t'ung-chien, Bk. 216 (ed. Hong Kong, p. 6897). However, these comments, which are the extracts of relating passages of T'ang-shu (New History of the T'ang), Bk. 221 b and T'u-ho-lo and Ta P'o-lü, have nothing new or of particular notice for the location of Chieh-shi.

2) The name of Chieh-shi:

There are three variants of the name Chieh-shi:

- | | |
|------------------------|---|
| (a) 羯師 Chieh-shi | <u>Hsin T'ang-shu</u> , Bk. 221b under T'u-ho-lo; <u>T'ang-hui-yao</u> , Bk. 99 |
| (b) 羯帥 Chieh-shuai/shu | <u>Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei</u> , Bk. 965, 999 |
| (c) 羯師 Chieh-shi | <u>Tzu-chih-t'ung-chieh</u> , Bk. 216; <u>Ch'üan-t'ang-wên</u> , Bk. 999; <u>T'ai-p'ing huan-yü-chi</u> , Bk. 186 |

In this connection, Chavannes' Documents, p. 159, note 3 may be compared.

Among these three, (b) 羯帥 and (c) 羯師 must be the same because these are used alternatively in the same petitions recorded in the books noted here. 羯師 is a variant of the same pronunciation. Seeing that (a) and (c)

are making use of the same character 師, 帥 of (b), which is seen in only Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei, can be looked upon as a corruption of 師

According to Karlgren, Analytic Dictionary, Nos. 73 and 893 Chieh-shi have been pronounced as â/kât -- s1/sa1 or siuet under the T'ang and, if we take into our consideration of its location, Chieh-shi (kat-s1) may represent Kâsh of Kâshkâr as A. Stein has already pointed out (Ancient Khotan, 1, Oxford, 1907, p. 14). The Kâshkâr is the name given to the river Kunar, especially to its downstream to the south of Chitral. Chitral and its neighbourhood had also been known as Kâshkâr (T. H. Holdich, The Indian Borderland, London, 1901, p. 244; Encyclopaedia of Islam, 1st and 2nd editions under Citrāl Chitral).

The meaning and origin of the name is not known. According to the Shih-shih Hsi-yü-chi 釋氏西域記 which is attributed to Tao-an 道安 (314-385) (quoted in the Shui-ching-chu 水經注 Bk. 1), the present Kashgar in Chinese Turkestan was called Chia-shê-lo-shih 迦舍羅逝, that is to say, Kâsha Râja. The Catalogue of Yaksa in the Mahâmâyûrî records Khasesu which is transcribed as either Chia-shê 迦舍 or Su-lê 疏勒 in Chinese translations (S. Lévi, Le catalogue des Yakṣa dans la Mahâmâyûrî, JA, 1915, p. 52). These Chia-shê 迦舍 and Khasesu must have a meaning common to that of Kâsh of Kâshkâr. Phonetically chieh 羯 or 竭 may represent kar, as seen from 拓羯 chih/t'o-chieh which is to be identified with châkar, shâkar or thakur "warrior". (Sinjō Mizutani 水谷真成 Daitō-saikiiki 大唐西域記, Tokyo, 1971, pp. 27-28). But this does not prevent us from looking Chieh-shi as representing Kâsh.

By the way, A. Stein has never tried to identify Chieh-shi with Kafir phonetically but only from geographical point of view. He looks upon

the upper waters of Kunar as a part of Kafīristān.

In connection with Chieh-shī, a mention must be made to the country of 劫 Chieh described by the T'ang-shu, Bk. 221b, Chavannes, who translated the passage (Documents, p. 159 and note 3), takes it as an abbreviation of Chieh-shī 竭師 and its variants. But, 劫 Chieh, which is situated to the north and east of Shē-mī 賒彌 or what is now Chitral (compare G. Morgenstierne, The name Munjān and some other names of places and peoples in the Hindu Kush, BSOS, IV, 1930-31, p. 440), should not be confused with Chieh-shī which is to be located at, or to the south of, Chitrāl. The character 劫 chieh was pronounced as kiāp (Karlgren, Analytic Dictionary, should be considered as representing Kaf of Kafīr. A detailed description of 劫 is given in the T'ai-p'ing huan-yü-chi, Bk. 186, which tells us the country is quite different from Chieh-shī in several points.

(3) Three Chieh-shī names:

- 1) Chieh-shī: The name of the tribe or of the locality occupied by the tribe. See (2) The name of Chieh-shī.
- 2) P'o-t'ê-mu/mei or mo 勃特没: The name of the king who was capture by Kao Hsien-chih. (Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei, Bk. 965; Tzu-chih-t'ung-chien, Bk. 216).
- 3) Su-chia 素迦: The name of the king who succeeded P'o-t'ê-mu and who was entitled the king of the Chieh-shī by the T'ang (April 26, 750). (Ibid.)

(4) The situation of Udyāna:

As is already shown by Chavannes' translation (Documents, p. 132 and note 4), the king of Kapisa was entitled as the king of Udyāna in 745, that is to say, Kapisa and Udyāna were united under the same ruler. This is the translation of the statement of T'ang-shu, Bk. 221a, and the imperial order of the investiture dated October 25, 745 (the 22nd day of the 9th month of the 4th year of T'ien-pao) is recorded in the Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei, Bk. 965.

APPENDIX II

On the Petroglyphs of Gōgdara I in Swāt

by B. BRENTJES

The petroglyphs brought up to now to light in the excavations of Gōgdara I belong to the very few of this kind the datations of which, drawn by analogies, is supported by stratigraphic observations.

Prof. C. Silvi Antonini in statement sent to Prof. Tucci, writes: "In the site of Gōgdara during the excavation campaign of 1958 some petroglyphs have been found out in the area to the south of Udegram, on a rocky layer 5 meters high. The trench was meant to find out the lowest level, but it did not give satisfying results as regards potsherds.

On the basis of analogies with protohistorical Iranian and Centrosiatic ware we are inclined to think that the petroglyphs are to be placed within a period of time going from the 2nd millennium B.C. to the beginning of the 1st millennium B.C. Some stylistic details, such as the representation of cars drawn by animals, suggest the hypothesis that, at least for a certain period of time, the authors of the petroglyphs belonged to a social group stably installed in this area. In such a prospective it might be possible to assume a connection with the population who left the graveyards of Butkara, Kātelai, Loebanr, and the site of Aligrāma (2nd millennium B.C.)".

We can also get to this datation through analogies with similar images, since we are dealing with the repeatedly documented reproduction of two-wheeled battle-carts or race-carts with a driver, in the same way as they are represented in the late Bronze Age in a large area going from China up to Sweden, and to Northern Africa.

In the case here considered the draught animals are so stylised that, as they are, they could simply be defined "quadrupeds". But regarding a two-wheeled cart of this period, they can only be horses, to which also recall the long tails of the animals represented in the figures.

The representation of the cart is far from our present way of thinking, but is in conformity with a descriptive reproduction, since the existence of all the essential elements goes beyond our visual image.

The wheels look like two glass lenses connected by a stirrup-like axle to both sides of the cart, while the driver, at least in the big clearer figure, is standing up on the ending back part of the axle. We know similar images in the Val Camonica, in Ain Kudeirat (Sinai), Megiddo, and in Tassili of Ajers in Algeria (see J. SPRUYTTE, *Les chars et les chevaux de Tamadjert*, *Bull. Soc. Roy. Belge Anthropol. Préhist.*, 76: 73-78, 1966, fig. 3, etc.). The large diffusion of those images prevents us from advancing any deduction since this way of drawing answers to a very spread, world-wide "*forma mentis*".

Things are different for what concerns the rock images of Central Asia since their authors can be historically connected to the old population of Swāt. As far as in the Ferghana valley, near to Sajmali-Taš, we can find images of this kind of carts of the old Iranian era

(about 1000 B.C.) (see among others A.N. BERNŠTAM, Naskal'nje izobraženija Šajmali Taš. in *Sovetskaja Etnografija*, 1952, 2, Karatau (Kazakhstan) that are represented like those of the old Iranian era (M.K. KADYRBAEV and A.N. MAR'JAŠEV: Karatauskie Kolesnizy, in: *Archeologičeskie Issledovanija v Kazachstane*, Alma Ata 1973; pp. 128-145). Here camels and oxen also appear as draught beasts besides horses. Also in the Indian rock images (of a more recent period) we can see "open wheeled" carts with non-parallel wheels, like in Mandori (see D.H. GORDON, *The prehistoric background of Indian culture* 2nd edition, Bombay 1960, pl. XXIII etc.). From the photographs we cannot understand if the less clear and smaller images of the wall are older or only represented in a second level. From the historical background, the general view of the images coming from Gōgdara I must be placed in the period of the "war carts" that lasted up to the beginning of the 1st millennium B.C., and in this way the datation resulting from the tombs would be confirmed.

The 2nd group belongs, according to the findings of the tombs, to the higher strata of Gōgdara I, and the animals represented seem to be of the family of dogs, notwithstanding the peculiar interior drawing, that nevertheless appears as a drawing form also in ceramics of different periods. The height of the paws and the shape of the tail, as also the length, allow us to think that these animals are dogs. The finding of dogs as main animals of rock images indicates the presence of Indo-Iranian authors, since we know the great importance of dogs in the old Iranian religions and also in other Indo-European and Northern Asiatic conceptions. Dogs can be found on rock images much more often than carts, so that the evidence is superfluous. It is enough for us to indicate the representation of dogs in scenes of worship in Sajmali-Taš (see BERNŠTAM, *op. cit.*, fig. 15).

The difference in the interior drawing could let us think at different plays of colours, but we cannot be sure of this.

To this group belong both the animals with a bee's nest ornamental framework drawing, and the animals whose body is formed by two triangles settled like a double axe (cf. 157/4 and 153/8). Probably we are in front of two groups of figures of different periods, anyway this cannot be told only by looking at the photos at my disposal.

The zebu (?), the head of which has probably been partly destroyed by the pashtu inscription, does not look thoroughly in good state. Fascinating is the standard (?) (165/8/9) reminding the square pins of Luristan (cf. for instance H. FRANKFORT, *Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient*, Harmondsworth, 1954, pl. 176 A) without having their decorative figures. It might be a symbol of cult or battle. Unfortunately, also in this case, there are no connecting links with other rocky figures.

It would be interesting to find out some connections with the scenes of the waggons. There is a certain similarity with the schematic figures of the houses of the Val Camonica, but here the well-defined vertical axis is on the contrary probably a pole, lacking in the Val Camonica, to which is hung up a symbol like a shield.

The closest similarity to the standard of the rock images can be found on the coins of the Fratadara of Fars. The standard of Fars is characterized by straight lines intersecting one another in the centre as in the standard graved on the rocks.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (*)

- ABAEVA 1975: T.G. ABAEVA, *Granicy drevnego Bolora*. in: Strany i narody Vostoka, vyp. XVI, Moskva 1975.
- AGRAWALA 1953: V.S. AGRAWALA, *India as known to Pāṇini*. Lucknow, 1953.
- ALLAN 1936: J. ALLAN, *Catalogue of the Coins of Ancient India*. London, 1936.
- ALTHEIM 1947-1948: F. ALTHEIM, *Weltgeschichte Asiens im Griechischer Zeitalter*. 2 Vols. Halle, 1947-1948.
- ALTHEIM und STIEHL 1970: F. ALTHEIM und R. STIEHL, *Geschichte Mittelasiens im Altertum*. Berlin, 1970.
- AMARASIMHA 1914: AMARASIMHA, *Nāmaṅgānuśāsana*, with the Commentary Ṭikāsarvasva of Vandyaghatiya Sarvananda. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series n. XXXIII. Trivandrum, 1914.
- ĀPASTAMBAŚRAUTASŪTRA with DHŪRTASVĀMIBHĀṢYA 1955-1963. Ed. by A. Chinnaswāmī Śāstri. Vols. I-II, Baroda, 1955-1963.
- ATHARVAVEDASAMHITĀ 1895-1898: *Ātharvavedasambhitā*. With the Commentary of Sāyanāchārya. Ed. by Shankar Pandurang Pandit. 4 Vols. Bombay, 1895-1898.
- ATKINSON 1888: E.T. ATKINSON, *The Himalayan Districts of North-Western Provinces of India*. Allahabad, 1888.
- BAGCHI 1927-1938: P.Ch. BAGCHI, *Le Canon Bouddhique en Chine*. Paris, 1927-1938, 2 Tomes.
- BAILEY 1936: H.W. BAILEY, An Itinerary in Khotanese Saka. *Acta Orientalia*, Copenhagen, vol. XIV, 1936.
- BAILEY 1943: H.W. BAILEY, *Zoroastrian Problems in the Ninth-Century Books*. Oxford, 1943.
- BAILEY 1946: H.W. BAILEY, Gāndhārī. *BSOAS*, XI, 1946.
- BAILEY 1952: H.W. BAILEY, Kusanica. *BSOAS*, vol. XIV, 1952.
- BAILEY 1956: H.W. BAILEY, *Khotanese Buddhist Texts*. Cambridge, 1956. 2 volumes.
- BAILEY 1958: H.W. BAILEY, Languages of the Saka. *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, Erste Abt., Band IV, 1 Abs., 1958.
- BAILEY 1961: H.W. BAILEY, *Indo-Scythian Studies Being Khotanese Texts*. Vol. IV. Cambridge, 1961.
- BAILEY 1971: H.W. BAILEY, Ancient Kambodja. in: *Iran and Islam*. Edinburgh, 1971.
- BANERJEE 1931: M. BANERJEE, *The Deśināmamālā of Hemacandra*. Calcutta, 1931.
- BAREAU 1955: A. BAREAU, *Les Sectes Bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule*. Saigon, 1955.
- BARTHOLOMAE 1904: C. BARTHOLOMAE, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Strassburg, 1904.
- BASHAM 1975: A.L. BASHAM, *Cultural Heritage of India*. Oxford, 1975.
- BEAL 1884: S. BEAL, *Si-yu-ki. Buddhist Records of the Western World*. London, 1884.
- BERGMAN 1939: F. BERGMAN, *Archaeological Research in Sinkiang. Especially the Lop-Nor Region*. Stockholm, 1939.
- BIASUTTI e DAINELLI 1925: R. BIASUTTI e G. DAINELLI, *I tipi umani. Spedizione Italiana De Filippi nell'Himalaia, Caracorum e Turchestan Cinese (1913-1914)*. Serie II, vol. IX, Bologna, 1925.
- BIDDULPH 1893: M.A.S. BIDDULPH, Chilas. *Geographical Journal*, 1893.
- BIVAR 1971: A.D. BIVAR, Petroglyphs and Buddhist Remains of Jāghūrī District, Afghanistan. in: *Iran and Islam*. Edinburgh, 1971.
- BLOCH 1950: J. BLOCH, *Les Inscriptions d'Aśoka*. Paris, 1950.
- BÖHTLINGK 1887: O. BÖHTLINGK, *Pāṇini's Grammatik*. Leipzig, 1887.
- BONGARD-LEVIN and GRANTOVSKIJ 1974: G.M. BONGARD-LEVIN and E.A. GRANTOVSKIJ, *Ot Skifii do Indii*. Moskva, 1974.
- BRĤATSAMHITĀ see VARĀHAMIHIRA.
- BROUGH 1962: J. BROUGH, *The Gāndbārī Dharma-pada*. London, 1962.
- BROUGH 1971: J. BROUGH, Soma and Amanita muscaria. *BSOAS*, Vol. XXXIV/2, 1971.
- BUDDRUS 1960: G. BUDDRUS, Zur Mythologie der Prasun-Kafiren. *Paideuma*, Band VII, Heft 4/6, 1960.
- BUDDRUS 1964: G. BUDDRUS, *Aus dardischer Volksdichtung. Mélanges présentés à G. Morgenstierne à l'occasion de son 70^e anniversaire*. Wiesbaden, 1964.
- BÜHLER 1886: G. BÜHLER, *The Laws of Manu*. Oxford, 1886.

(*) *Supplementary Abbreviations*: ID. = Irano-Dardica (MORGENSTIERNE 1973), IIFL = Indo-Iranian Frontier Languages (MORGENSTIERNE), Mm. = *Mahāmāyūrī* S. Lévi 1915, NTS = Norske Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap.

- BÜHLER 1892: G. BÜHLER, *Aphorisms on the Sacred Law of the Hindus by Apastamba*. Bombay, 1892.
- BURLINGAME 1921: E.W. BURLINGAME, *The Buddhist Legends*, Harvard Oriental Series, vol. XXVIII. Cambridge 1921.
- BURROW 1973: T. BURROW, The Proto Indo-Aryans, *JRAS*, 1973.
- CALAND 1921: W. CALAND, *Das Śrautasūtra des Apastamba* aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt von ... Göttingen, 1921.
- CALAND 1922: W. CALAND, *The Jaiminigrhyasūtra*. Lahore, 1922.
- CAROE 1958: O. CAROE, *The Pathans 550 B.C.-A.D. 1957*. London, 1958.
- CENTRAL'NAJA 1974: *Central'naja Azija v Kušanskuju épobu*. Tom I. Moskva, 1974.
- CHAKRAVARTI 1953-1954: N.P. CHAKRAVARTI, Hatun rock inscription of Patoladeva *EI*, vol. XXX, 1953-1954.
- CHAVANNES 1895: E. CHAVANNES, Les Pays d'Occident d'après le Wei lio. *TP.*, vol. VI, 1895.
- CHAVANNES 1897: E. CHAVANNES, Le Pays d'Occident d'après le Heou-Han-Chou. *TP.*, vol. VIII, 1897.
- CHAVANNES 1903: E. CHAVANNES, *Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) Occidentaux* (suivi de notes additionnelles). Paris, 1903.
- CHAVANNES 1903: E. CHAVANNES, Voyage de Song Yun dans l'Udyāna et le Gandhāra (518-522 p.C.). *BEFEO*, Tome III, 1903.
- COUSENS 1916: H. COUSENS, *Bijapur and its Architectural Remains*. Bombay, 1916.
- COUSENS 1929: H. COUSENS, *The Antiquities of Sind*. Calcutta, 1929.
- COUSENS 1931: H. COUSENS, *Somanātha and other Mediaeval Temples in Kāthiāwād*. Calcutta, 1931.
- GRÜNWEDEL 1915: A. GRÜNWEDEL, *Der Weg nach Sambhala*. (Abhand. d. K. Bayerischen Akad. der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse, XXIX 3), München, 1915.
- CUNNINGHAM 1924: A. CUNNINGHAM, *Ancient Geography of India*. Ed. by S.N. Majumdar Sastri. Calcutta, 1924.
- CURTIUS RUFUS 1862: CURTIUS RUFUS, *De gestis Alexandri Magni Regis Macedonum libri qui supersunt octo*. Recognovit H.E. Foss. Leipzig, 1862.
- DAFFINÀ 1967: P. DAFFINÀ, *L'immigrazione dei Sakā nella Drangiana*. Roma, 1967.
- DAINELLI 1924: G. DAINELLI, *Le condizioni delle genti. Spedizione italiana De Filippi nell'Himàlaia, Caracorum e Turchestàn Cinese (1913-1914)*. Vol. VIII. Bologna, 1924.
- DAHLQUIST 1962: A. DAHLQUIST, *Megasthenes and Indian Religion. A Study in Motives and Types*. Stockholm, 1962.
- DANI 1967: A.H. DANI, Timargarha and Gandhara Grave Culture. *Ancient Pakistan*, vol. III, 1967.
- DANI 1969: A.H. DANI, *Peshawar Historic City of the Frontier*. Peshawar, 1969.
- DANI, HUMBACH, GÖBL 1964: A.H. DANI with H. HUMBACH and R. GÖBL, Tochi Valley Inscriptions in the Peshawar Museum. *Ancient Pakistan*, vol. I, 1964.
- DAS 1908: S.C. DAS, *dPag bsam ljon bzai*. Calcutta, 1908.
- DASGUPTA 1974: K.K. DASGUPTA, *A Tribal History of Ancient India, A Numismatic Approach*. Calcutta, 1974.
- DEANE 1896: H.A. DEANE, Note on Udyāna and Gandhāra. *JRAS*, October 1896.
- DE LA VALLÉE POUSSIN 1897: L. DE LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Bouddhisme. Études et Matériaux*. s.l. 1897.
- DEMIÉVILLE 1954: P. DEMIÉVILLE, La Yogācārabhūmi de Saṅgharakṣa. *BEFEO*, Tome XLIV, fasc. 2, 1954.
- DESSAU 1960: G. DESSAU, « Rock Engravings (graffiti) from Iranian Baluchistan. *EW*, vol. XI, No. 3-4, 1960.
- DILTHEY 1971: H. DILTHEY, *Versammlungsplätze im Dardo-Kafirischen Raum*. Wiesbaden, 1971.
- DUCHESNE GUILLEMIN 1960: J. DUCHESNE GUILLEMIN, Miettes Iraniennes, Hommage à Georges Dumézil, *Collection Latomus*, Vol. XLV, Bruxelles, 1960.
- DUTT 1939-1943: N. DUTT, *Gilgit Manuscripts*. Srinagar, 1939-1943.
- EDELBERG 1959: L. EDELBERG with A. SCHAFER and W. LENTZ, Imfra, Creator-God of the Kafirs and His Main Temple in the Parun Valley (Nuristan, South Hindukush), *Akten des 24. Internationalen Orientalisten-Kongresses, München 1957*. Wiesbaden 1959.
- EGGELING 1882: J. EGGELING (transl.), *Śatapatha-Brahmaṇa*. S.B. of the East. Oxford, 1882.
- EGGERMONT 1966: P.H.L. EGGERMONT, The Murundas and the Ancient Trade-Route from Taxila to Ujjain. *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, vol. IX, 1966.
- EGGERMONT 1970: P.H.L. EGGERMONT, Alexander's Campaign in Gandhāra and Ptolemy's List of Indo-Scythian Towns. *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica*, vol. I, 1970.
- EGGERMONT 1975: P.H.L. EGGERMONT, *Alexander's Campaign in Sind and Baluchistan and the Siege of the Brahmin Town of Harmatelia*. Leuven, 1975.

- EILERS - MAYRHOFER 1960: W. EILERS - M. MAYRHOFER: *Namenkundlich Zeugnisse der Indischen Wanderung? Eine Nachprüfung. Die Sprache* 1960.
- ELIADE 1970: M. ELIADE, *De Zalmoxis à Gengis-Khan*. Paris, 1970.
- EMENAU 1966: M.B. EMENAU, *Dialect of Old Indo-Aryan. Ancient Indo-European Dialects*, Berkeley, 1966.
- FACCENNA 1964: D. FACCENNA, *A Guide to the Excavations in Swāt (Pakistan) 1956-62*. Roma, 1964.
- FAIRSERSVIS 1959: W.A. FAIRSERSVIS, *Archaeological Survey in the Zhob and Loralai Districts, West Pakistan*. New York, 1959.
- FOUCHER 1901: A. FOUCHER, Notes sur la Géographie ancienne du Gandhāra. *BEFEO*, Tome I, No. 4, 1901.
- FOUCHER 1942: A. FOUCHER, *La Vieille Route de l'Inde de Bactres à Taxila*. Paris, 1942.
- FRANCKE 1907: A.M. FRANCKE, *A History of Western Tibet*. London, 1907.
- FRAUWALLNER 1952: E. FRAUWALLNER, Die Buddhistischen Konzile. *ZDMG*, 1952.
- FRAUWALLNER 1956: E. FRAUWALLNER, *The Earliest Vinaya and the beginnings of the Buddhist Literature*. Rome, 1956.
- FUCHS 1938: W. FUCHS, *Huei ch'ao's Pilgerreise durch Nordwestindien und Zentral-Asien um 726*. (Sonderausgabe aus den *Sitzungsberichten der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*), Phil.-hist. Klasse, XXX. Berlin, 1938.
- FUSSMAN 1972: G. FUSSMAN, *Atlas Linguistique des parlers dardes et kafirs*. 2 vols. Paris, 1972.
- FUSSMAN 1977: G. FUSSMAN, Pour une problématique nouvelle des religions Indiennes anciennes. *JA*, Tome CCLXV, no. 1-2, 1977.
- GHAFOOR 1966: M.A. GHAFOOR, Two lost inscriptions relating to the Arab Conquest of Kabul and the North West region of West Pakistan. *Ancient Pakistan*, II, 1965-66.
- GAN'ZOVSKIJ 1971: Ju.V. GAN'ZOVSKIJ, *The Peoples of Pakistan*. Moscow, 1971.
- GERSHEVITCH 1959: I. GERSHEVITCH, *The Avestan Hymn to Mithra*. Cambridge, 1959.
- GERSHEVITCH 1974: I. GERSHEVITCH, An Iranianist's view of the Soma controversy, in *Memoirial Jean de Menasce*. Louvain, 1974.
- GHIRSHMAN 1946: R. GHIRSHMAN, *Bégram, Recherches Archéologiques et Historiques sur les Kouchans*. Le Caire, 1946.
- GHIRSHMAN 1948: R. GHIRSHMAN, *Les Chionites-Hephtalites*. Le Caire, 1948.
- GHIRSHMAN 1977: R. GHIRSHMAN, *L'Iran et la migration des Indo-Aryens et des Iraniens*. Leiden, 1977.
- GÖBL 1976: R. GÖBL, *A Catalogue of Coins of Butkara I (Swāt, Pakistan)*. Rome, 1956.
- GOETZ 1969: H. GOETZ, *Studies in the History & Art of Kashmir*. Wiesbaden, 1969.
- GONDA 1976: J. GONDA, *The Triads in the Vedas*. Amsterdam, 1976.
- GOODLEY 1960-62: A.D. GOODLEY (ed. and transl. by), *Herodotus*. Cambridge, 1960-1962.
- GORDON 1953: D.H. GORDON, *The Pre-historic Background of Indian Culture*. Bombay, 1953.
- GRAZIOSI 1964: P. GRAZIOSI, *Prehistoric Research in Northwestern Punjab, Anthropological Research in Chitral*. Leiden, 1964.
- GUPTA 1974: S.P. GUPTA, *Disposal of the dead and physical types in Ancient India*, N. Delhi, 1974.
- HANEDA 1957: T. HANEDA, *Recueil des Oeuvres Posthumes de ...* Vol. I - *Etudes Historiques*. Kyôto, 1957.
- HARGREAVES 1929: H. HARGREAVES, Excavations in Baluchistan 1925, Sampur Mound, Mastung and Sohr Damb, Nāl. With an Appendix by Lt. Col. R.B. Seymour Sewell, and Dr. B.S. Guha. *Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India*, No. 35. Calcutta, 1929.
- HARMATTA 1966: J. HARMATTA, New Evidences for the History of Early Medieval Northwestern India. *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, vol. XIV, fasc. 3-4, 1966.
- HARMATTA 1969: J. HARMATTA, Late Bactrian Inscriptions. *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, vol. XVII, fasc. 3-4, 1969.
- HARVA 1938: U. HARVA, *Die Religiösen Vorstellungen der Altaischen Völker*. Helsinki, 1938.
- HAZANOV 1975: A.M. HAZANOV, *Social'naja istorija Skifov*. Moskva, 1975.
- HAZANOV 1975: A.M. HAZANOV, *Zoloto Skifov*. Moskva, 1975.
- HEDIN 1916-1922: S. HEDIN, *Southern Tibet*. 12 vols. Stockholm, 1916-1922.
- HERMANN 1939: A. HERMANN, *Das Land der Seide und Tibet im Lichte der Antike*. Leipzig, 1939.
- HERMANN 1966: A. HERMANN, *An Historical Atlas of China*. Edinburgh, 1966.
- HOFFMANN 1958: K. HOFFMANN, « Altiranisch ». *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, 1 Abt., Band IV, 1 Abs., 1958.
- HOFFMANN 1961: H. HOFFMANN, *The Religions of Tibet*. London 1961.

- HOFFMANN 1975: H. HOFFMANN, *Tibet, a Handbook*. Bloomington, 1975.
- HÖFINGER 1946: M. HÖFINGER, *Étude sur le Concile de Vaiśālī*. Louvain, 1946.
- HONIGMANN et MARICQ 1953: E. HONIGMANN et A. MARICQ, *Recherches sur les Res gestae divi Saporis*. Bruxelles, 1953.
- HUBER 1906: E.D. HUBER, *Études de Littérature Bouddhique. Les Sources du Divyāvadāna. La Destruction de Roruka. BEFEO, VI, 1906.*
- ḤUDŪD AL-ALAM 1937: ḤUDŪD AL-ALAM, *The Regions of the World. A Persian Geography 372 a.H.-982 A.D.* (tr. by J. Minorsky). London, 1937.
- I TSING 1896: I TSING, *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago (A.D. 671-695)* (tr. by J. Takakusu). Oxford, 1896.
- INDRAJI 1883-1885: P.B. INDRAJI, An Inscription of king Aśokavalla. *JRAS, Bombay Branch*, vol. XVI, 1883-1885.
- IRWIN 1973: J. IRWIN, "Aśokan" Pillars: a reassessment of the evidence. *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. CXV, Nov. 1973.
- IYER 1909: A.K. IYER, *The Cochin Tribes and Castes*. Madras, 1909.
- JETTMAR 1967: K. JETTMAR, The Middle Asiatic Heritage of Dardistan (Islamic Collective Tombs in Punal and Their Background). *EW*, vol. XVIII, 1-2, 1967.
- JETTMAR 1975: K. JETTMAR, *Die Religionen des Hindu Kush*. Stuttgart, 1975.
- JUNGE 1939: J. JUNGE, Saka-Studien der Ferne Nordosten im Weltbild der Antike. *Klio*, Beiheft XLI, Neue Folge, Heft 28, 1938.
- JUNGE 1941: P.J. JUNGE, Satrapie und natio. Reichsverwaltung und Reichspolitik im Staate Dareios' I. *Klio*, N.F. XVI, No. 1/2 1941.
- KANE 1930-1962: P.V. KANE, *History of Dharmaśāstra*. Poona, 1930-1962.
- KARLGREN 1923: B. KARLGREN, *Analytic Dictionary of Chinese and Sino-Japanese*. Paris, 1923.
- KARLGREN 1940: B. KARLGREN, *Grammata Serica, Script and Phonetics in Chinese and Sino-Japanese*. Stockholm, 1940.
- KAUṬALYA 1924-1925: KAUṬALYA, *Arthaśāstra*. Trivandrum, 1924-1925.
- KAUṬILYA 1919: KAUṬILYA, *Arthaśāstra*. Ed. by SHAMA SASTRI. Mysore, 1919.
- KEITH 1925: A.B. KEITH, *The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads*. Cambridge, 1925.
- KENT 1953: R.G. KENT, *Old Persian Grammar-Texts-Lexicon*. New Haven, 1953.
- KIRFEL 1920: W. KIRFEL, *Die Kosmographie der Inder, nach den Quellen dargestellt von...* Bonn, 1920.
- KIRFEL 1954: W. KIRFEL, *Das Purāṇa vom Weltgebäude (Bhuvanavinyāsa). Die Kosmographischen Traktate der Purāṇa's - Versuch einer Textgeschichte*. Bonn, 1954.
- KONOW 1929: S. KONOW, Kharoshthī Inscriptions with the Exception of those of Aśoka. *CII*, vol. II, part. I. Calcutta, 1929.
- KOPPERS 1936: W. VON KOPPERS, *Pferdeopfer und Pferdekult der Indogermanen, Eine Ethnologisch-religionswissenschaftliche Studie, Die Indogermanen - und Germanenfrage*. Leipzig, 1936.
- KRAMRISCH 1946: S. KRAMRISCH, *The Hindu Temple*. 2 vols. Calcutta, 1946.
- KULLAR 1972: D.K. KULLAR, Kailāsa. *Himalayan Journal*, 1972-1973.
- KUZ'MINA 1972: E.E. KUZ'MINA, K Voprosu o formirovanii kul'tury severnoj Baktrii. *Vestnik drevnej istorii*, 1972.
- KUZ'MINA 1976: E.E. KUZ'MINA, The "Bactrian Mirage" and the Archaeological Reality. On the Problem of the Formation of North Bactrian Culture. *EW*, vol. XXVI, No. 1-2, 1976.
- LAMOTTE 1944-1976: E. LAMOTTE, *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse de Nāgārjuna*. Louvain, 1944-1976.
- LAMOTTE 1947-1950: E. LAMOTTE, Alexandre et le Bouddhisme. 3-Mahāsammata et Alexandre. *BEFEO XLIV*, 1947-1950.
- LAMOTTE 1958: E. LAMOTTE, *Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien. Des origines à l'ère Saka*. Louvain, 1958.
- LANCIOTTI 1970: L. LANCIOTTI, The Na-khi Religious Tradition and Ezra Pound. *EW*, vol. XX, 3, 1970.
- LASSEN 1858-1874: C. LASSEN, *Indischen Alterthumskunde*. 4 vols. Leipzig, 1858-1874.
- LAUFER 1898: B. LAUFER, Die Sage von den Goldgrabenden Ameisen. *TP*, vol. IX, 1898.
- LAW 1943: B.Ch. LAW, *Tribes of Ancient India*, Poona, 1943.
- LEFMANN 1902: S. LEFMANN (Ed. by), *Lalita - Vistara*. Berlin, 1902.
- LEGGE 1965: J. LEGGE, *A Record of Buddhist Kingdoms*. New York, 1965.
- LÉVI 1897: S. LÉVI, Les Eléments de formation du Divyāvadāna. *TP*, vol. VIII, 1897.

- LÉVI 1905a: S. LÉVI, *Le Népal. Étude historique d'un royaume hindou*. Paris, 1905.
- LÉVI 1905b: S. LÉVI, Notes Chinoises sur l'Inde. Quelques documents sur le Bouddhisme Indien dans l'Asie Centrale. *BEFEO*, Tome V, 1905.
- LÉVI 1915: S. LÉVI, Le Catalogue géographique des Yakṣa dans la Mahāmāyūri. *JA*, Janvier-Février, 1915.
- LÉVI 1918: S. LÉVI, Pour l'histoire du Rāmāyaṇa. *JA*, Janvier-Février 1918.
- LÉVI 1932: S. LÉVI, Manuscripts provenant de Bamiyan et de Gilgit. *JA*, Tome CCXX, 1932.
- LÉVI 1937: S. LÉVI, Deux peuples méconnus. in: *Mémorial Sylvain Lévi*. Paris, 1937.
- LÉVI et CHAVANNES 1895: S. LÉVI et E. CHAVANNES, L'itinéraire d'Ou-k'ong (751-790). *JA*, Septembre-Octobre 1895.
- LIN 1949: LIN LI-KOUAN, *L'Aide-mémoire de la Vraie Loi*. Paris, 1949.
- LITVINSKIJ 1964: B.A. LITVINSKIJ, Tadžikistan i Indija. *India v drevnosti*, Moskau, 1964.
- LITVINSKIJ 1967: B.A. LITVINSKIJ, Archeologičeskie otkrytija v Tadžikistane za gody Sovetskoi vlasti i nekotorye problemy drevnej Istorii Srednej Azii. *Vestnik drevnej istorii*, No. 4, 1967.
- LITVINSKIJ 1970: B.A. LITVINSKIJ, India and Soviet Central Asia. *India's Contribution to World Thought and Culture*. Madras, 1970.
- LITVINSKIJ 1972: B.A. LITVINSKIJ, *Drevnie Kočevniki "Kryši Mira"*. Moskva, 1972.
- LÜDERS 1940: H. LÜDERS, *Philologica Indica*. Göttingen, 1940.
- LÜDERS 1961: H. LÜDERS, *Mathurā Inscriptions* (*Abh. der Akad. der Wiss. in Göttingen. Phil.-Hist. Klasse*, 3. Folge, 47). Göttingen, 1961.
- MACDONELL and KEITH 1958: A.A. MACDONELL and A.B. KEITH, *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*. 2 vols. Delhi, 1958. (reprint).
- MACDOWALL 1968: D.W. MACDOWALL, The Shahis of Kabul and Gandhāra. *Numismatic Chronicle*, Seventh Series, vol. VIII. London, 1968.
- MAJUMDAR 1949: R.C. MAJUMDAR, Achaemenian rule in India. *Indian Historical Quarterly*, XXV, 1949.
- MAJUMDAR 1953: R.C. MAJUMDAR (gen. ed.), *The Age of Imperial Unity*. Bombay, 1953.
- MAJUMDAR 1960: R.C. MAJUMDAR, *The Classical Accounts of India*. Calcutta, 1960.
- MALALASEKERA 1937: G.P. MALALASEKERA, *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*. 2 vols. London, 1937.
- MARQUART 1896-1905: J. MARQUART, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran*. Heft I, Göttingen, 1896. Heft II, Leipzig, 1905.
- MARQUART 1901: J. MARQUART, *Ēranšahr*. Berlin, 1901.
- MAYRHOFER 1973: M. MAYRHOFER, *Onomastica Persepolitana, das Iranische Namengut der Persepolis Tafelchen*. Wien, 1973.
- MÉLANGES 1966: *Mélanges de Sinologie offerts à Monsieur Paul Démieville*. Tomes I-II. Paris, 1966-1974.
- MINORSKY 1937, see: HUDŪD-AL-ĀLAM 1937.
- MORECHAND 1975: G. MORECHAND, Contribution à l'étude des rites funéraires Indiens. *BEFEO*, Tome LXII, 1975.
- MORGENSTIERNE 1926: G. MORGENSTIERNE, *Report on a Linguistic Mission to Afghanistan*. Oslo, 1926. Inst. Sml. Kult. Ser. C 1:2.
- MORGENSTIERNE 1929-1934: G. MORGENSTIERNE, The Language of the Ashkun Kafirs. *NTS* 2: 192-289. Additional Notes on Ashkun *NTS* 7: 56-120.
- MORGENSTIERNE 1931: G. MORGENSTIERNE, The Name Munjān and Some Other Names of Places and Peoples in the Hindu Kush. *BSOAS*, Vol. VI, part. II, 1931, p. 439-444.
- MORGENSTIERNE 1932: MORGENSTIERNE, *Report on a Linguistic Mission to North Western India*. Inst. Sml. Kult., Ser. C, 3:1. Oslo, 1932.
- MORGENSTIERNE 1933: G. MORGENSTIERNE, *A Kāfir on Kāfir Laws and Customs*. Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift, 39, 3. Göteborg, 1933 and *Irano-Dardica*. Wiesbaden, 1973.
- MORGENSTIERNE 1936: G. MORGENSTIERNE, Iranian Elements in Khowar. *BSOAS*, vol. VIII, part 1-2, 1936 and *Irano-Dardica*. Wiesbaden 1973.
- MORGENSTIERNE 1942: G. MORGENSTIERNE, The Śaka Itinerary. *N.T.S.* XII. Oslo, 1942.
- MORGENSTIERNE 1942a: G. MORGENSTIERNE, Archaisms and Innovations in Pashto Morphology. *NTS* vol. XII, 1942.
- MORGENSTIERNE 1942b: G. MORGENSTIERNE, Notes on Dameli, a Kāfir Language of Chitral. *NTS*, Vol. XIII, 1942.
- MORGENSTIERNE 1944: G. MORGENSTIERNE, *IIFL* vol. III: 2, *The Pashai Language. Texts and Translations*. Oslo, 1944.
- MORGENSTIERNE 1945: G. MORGENSTIERNE, *Notes on the Shumashti*, A Dardic dialect of the Gawar-Bati type. *NTS*, vol. XIII. Oslo, 1945.
- MORGENSTIERNE 1945: G. MORGENSTIERNE, Indo-European *k'* in Kāfir. *NTS*, vol. XIII, 1945.
- MORGENSTIERNE 1947: G. MORGENSTIERNE, The Spring Festival of the Kalash Kāfirs. *India Antiqua*, a Volume of Oriental Studies Presented to J. Philippe Vogel C.I.E. Leyden, 1947 and *Irano-Dardica*. Wiesbaden, 1973.

- MORGENSTIERNE 1951: G. MORGENSTIERNE, Some Kati Myths and Hymns. *A.O.*, vol. XXI, part 3, 1951.
- MORGENSTIERNE 1956: G. MORGENSTIERNE, *IIFL*, vol. III: 3 - *The Pasbai Languages. Vocabulary*. Oslo, 1956. Inst. Sml. Kult. Ser. 8, 40.
- MORGENSTIERNE 1958: G. MORGENSTIERNE, Neuiranische Sprachen. *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, Abt. 1, B. IV, 1. Leiden, 1958.
- MORGENSTIERNE 1973: G. MORGENSTIERNE, *IIFL*, vol. II (2nd ed.), *Iranian Pamir Languages*, Oslo, 1973.
- MORGENSTIERNE 1973: G. MORGENSTIERNE, *IIFL*, vol. IV, *The Kalasha Language*, 1973.
- MORGENSTIERNE 1973: G. MORGENSTIERNE, *Irano-dardica*. Wiesbaden, 1973.
- MORGENSTIERNE 1973: G. MORGENSTIERNE, Die Stellung der Kafirsprachen. *Ibid.*
- MORGENSTIERNE 1973: G. MORGENSTIERNE, Sanskrit Words in Kowar. *Ibid.*
- MORGENSTIERNE 1973: G. MORGENSTIERNE, The Phonology of Kashmiri. *Ibid.*
- MORGENSTIERNE 1973: G. MORGENSTIERNE, Genealogical Traditions among the Kafirs. *Ibid.*
- MORGENSTIERNE 1973: G. MORGENSTIERNE, A Vedic Word in some modern Hindukush Languages? *Ibid.*
- MORGENSTIERNE 1973: G. MORGENSTIERNE, Svāsā and Bhaginī in Modern Indo-Aryan. *Ibid.*
- MORGENSTIERNE 1973: G. MORGENSTIERNE, Metathesis of liquids in Dardic. *Ibid.*
- MORGENSTIERNE 1974: G. MORGENSTIERNE, Languages of Nuristan and Surrounding Regions. in: *Cultures of the Hindukush*. Wiesbaden, 1974.
- MOTWANI 1958: K. MOTWANI, *Manu Dharma Śāstra*. Madras, 1958.
- MUKHERJEE 1973: B.N. MUKHERJEE, *Central and South Asian Documents on the Old Śaka Era*. Varanasi, Bharati, 1973.
- MUKHERJEE 1975: B.N. MUKHERJEE, *The old Śaka Era*. Varanasi, 1975.
- MÜLLER-STELLRECHT 1973: I. MÜLLER-STELLRECHT, *Feste in Dardistan-Darstellung und Kulturgeschichtliche Analyse*. Wiesbaden, 1973.
- MÜLLERUS 1855-1861: C. MÜLLERUS, *Geographi Graeci Minores*. Paris, 1855-1861.
- NAUTIYAL 1969: K.P. NAUTIYAL, *The Archaeology of Kumaon*. Varanasi, 1969.
- NEVE 1923: E.F. NEVE, *The Tourist's Guide to Kashmir, Ladakh, Skardo*. Lahore, 1923.
- NOBEL 1955: J. NOBEL, *Udrāyana König von Roruka*. Wiesbaden, 1955.
- PAL 1969: P. PAL, *The Art of Tibet*, with an Essay by Eleanor Olson. Asia Society, 1969.
- PAL 1975: P. PAL, *Bronzes of Kashmir*. Graz, 1975.
- PELLIOT 1961: P. PELLIOT, *Histoire ancienne du Tibet*. Paris, 1961.
- PELLIOT 1959-1973: P. PELLIOT, *Notes on Marco Polo*. 3 vols. Paris, 1959-1973.
- PETECH 1950: L. PETECH, *Northern India According to the Shui-ching-chu*. Roma, 1950.
- PETECH 1966: L. PETECH, A Kharoṣṭhī Inscription from Butkara I (Swat) *EW* XVI/1-2, 1966.
- PETECH 1977: L. PETECH, *The Kingdom of Ladakh. C. 950-1842 A.D.* Roma, 1977.
- PIEMONTESE 1970: A. PIEMONTESE, Parētakēnoi e Paraitakēnē. *RSO*, vol. XLIV/2, 1970.
- PIGGOTT 1947: S. PIGGOTT, Notes on Certain Metal Pins and a Mace-Head in the Harappā Culture. *AI*, 4, 1947-48.
- PISCHEL 1877: R. PISCHEL, *Hemacandra's Grammatik der Prākritisprachen*. Halle, 1877.
- PIPERNO 1975: M. PIPERNO and M. TOSI, The Graveyard of Shahr-i Sokhta, Iran. *Archaeology*, vol. XXVIII, n. 3, 1975.
- PISCHEL 1900: R. PISCHEL, *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*. Strassburg, 1900.
- P'JANKOV 1977: I.V. P'JANKOV, Massagety, sosedi indijcev, in *Srednjaja Azija v drevnosti i srednevekov'e (Istoria i Kul'tura)*, Akademija Nauk SSSR, Institut Vostokovedenija. Moskva, 1977.
- PRZYLUKI 1914: J. PRZYLUKI, Le Nord-Ouest de l'Inde dans le Vinaya des Mūla-Sarvāstivādīn et les textes apparentés. *JA*, 1914.
- PRZYLUKI 1923: J. PRZYLUKI, *La légende de l'Empereur Açoka*. Paris, 1923.
- PRZYLUKI 1936: J. PRZYLUKI, Les Ugrya dans l'Inde. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny*, XI, 1936.
- PUGLIESE CARRATELLI 1964: G. PUGLIESE CARRATELLI, G. GARBINI, U. SCERRATO, *A Bilingual Greco-Aramaic edict by Aśoka*. Roma, 1964.
- PUGLIESE CARRATELLI 1966: G. PUGLIESE CARRATELLI, Greek Inscriptions of the Middle East. *EW*, vol. XVI/1-2, 1966.
- PULLEYBLANK 1951: E.G. PULLEYBLANK, A Sogdian Colony in Inner Mongolia. *TP*, XLI, 1951.
- QUARITCH WALES 1953: G.H. QUARITCH WALES, *The Mountain of God*. London, 1953.
- RADHAKRISHNAN 1963: S. RADHAKRISHNAN, *The principal Upaniṣads*. London, 1963.
- RAHMAN 1968: INAYAT-UR RAHMAN, *Folk Tales of Swāt* collected and translated, Rome 1968.

- RĀJAŚEKHARA 1934: RĀJAŚEKHARA, *Kāvyaṁimāṁsā*. Ed. by C.D. Delal and R.A. Sastry. Baroda, 1934.
- RANADE 1926: R.D. RANADE, *A Constructive Survey of Upanishadic Philosophy, being a Systematic Introduction to Indian Metaphysics*. Poona, 1926.
- RAY 1931: H.C. RAY, *The Dynastic History of Northern India*. Calcutta, 1931.
- RENOU 1925: L. RENO, *La géographie de Ptolémée. L'Inde (VII, 1-4). Texte établi par L. Renou*. Paris, 1925.
- RENOU 1939: L. RENO, *La Maison Védique*. JA, vol. CCXXXI, 1939.
- RENOU et FILLIOZAT 1953: L. RENO et J. FILLIOZAT, *L'Inde Classique*. Vol. II. Paris, 1953.
- RHYS DAVIDS 1910: T.W. and C.A.F. RHYS DAVIDS (tr. by), *Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta. Dialogues of the Buddha*. S.B. of the Buddhists. Vol. III, part III, London, 1910.
- ROBERTSON 1896: G.S. ROBERTSON, *The Kāfir of the Hindu-Kush*. New York-London, 1896, Reprint 1970.
- ROCK 1948: J.F. ROCK, *The Mūan bpo ceremony or the Sacrifice to Heaven as practiced by the Na-khi*. *Monumenta Serica*, vol. XIII, 1948.
- ROOS 1967: A.G. ROOS (ed. and transl.), *Flavii Arriani Quae Exstant Omnia*. Vol. I, *Alexandri Anabasis*. Vol. II, *Scripta Minora*. Leipzig, 1967.
- ROY 1957: D. ROY, *Sino-Indian Studies, Liebenthal Festschrift*. Santiniketan, 1957.
- ROY 1963: D. ROY, *The Megalithic Culture of the Khasis*. *Anthropos*, vol. 58, 1963.
- SALVATORI 1975: S. SALVATORI, *Analysis of the Association of types in the Protohistoric Graveyards of the Swāt Valley (Loebanr I, Kātelai I, Butkara II)*. *EW*, vol. XXV/3-4, 1975.
- ŚĀNTIDEVA 1960: ŚĀNTIDEVA, *Bodhicaryāvatāra*, ed. by V. Bhattachārya. Calcutta, 1960.
- ŚĀRADĀTĀNAYA 1930: ŚĀRADĀTĀNAYA, *Bhāvaprakāśana*. Baroda, 1930.
- SCARCIA 1965: G.R. SCARCIA, *Şifat-nāma-yi Darviş Muḥammad Ḥān-i Gāzī*. Cronaca di una crociata musulmana contro i Kafiri di Lagmān nell'anno 1582. Roma, 1965.
- SCERRATO 1966: U. SCERRATO, *Excavations at Dahan-i Ghulaman (Seistan-Iran) First Preliminary Report*. *EW*, vol. XVI, no. 1-2, 1966.
- SCHEFTELOWITZ 1933: I. SCHEFTELOWITZ, *Die Mithra-Religion der Indoskythen und ihre Beziehung zum Saura- und Mithras-Kult*. *Acta OH*, vol. XI, 1923.
- SCHIPPMMANN 1971: K. SCHIPPMMANN, *Die Iranische Feuerheiligtümer*. Berlin, 1971.
- SCHOMBERG 1935: R.C.F. SCHOMBERG, *Between the Oxus and the Indus*. London, 1935.
- SCHOMBERG 1936: R.C.F. SCHOMBERG, *Unknown Karakoram*. London, 1936.
- SCHOMBERG 1938: R.C.F. SCHOMBERG, *Kafirs und Glaciers, Travels in Chitral*. London, 1938.
- SENART 1894: H. SENART, *Notes d'épigraphie indienne*. JA, Septembre Octobre, 1894.
- SHAMA SASTRI 1919: SHAMA SASTRI, *Arthasastra of Kautilya*. Mysore, 1919.
- SHAMA SASTRY 1924: SHAMA SASTRY, *Index Verborum to the Published Texts of the Kautiliya Arthasastra*. 3 vols. Mysore, 1924.
- SHARP: R.N. SHARP, *The Inscriptions in Old Persian Cuneiform of the Achaemenian Emperors*, n.p., n.d.
- SHIRATORI 1957: K. SHIRATORI, *On the Ts'ungling Traffic Route described by C. Ptolemaeus*. *MRDTB*, 1957.
- SILVI ANTONINI 1972: C. SILVI ANTONINI and G. STACUL, *The Proto-historic Graveyards of Swāt (Pakistan)*. Roma, 1972.
- SIRCAR 1960: D.C. SIRCAR, *Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Medieval India*. Delhi, 1960.
- SMITH 1916-1918: H. SMITH, *Sutta-Nipāta Commentary, being Paramatthajotikā*. 3 vols. London, 1916-1918.
- SMITH 1914: V.A. SMITH, *The Early History of India, from 600 B.C. to the Muhammadan Conquest Including the Invasion of Alexander the Great*. Oxford, 1914.
- SMITH 1972: V.A. SMITH, *Catalogue of the Coins of the Indian Museum, Calcutta*. Varanasi, 1972.
- SMITH 1973: B. MORTON SMITH, *Dates and Dynasties of Earliest India*, Delhi, 1973.
- SNOY 1962: P. SNOY, *Die Kafiren. Formen der Wirtschaft und geistigen Kultur*. Dissertation. Frankfurt am Main, 1962.
- SNOY 1965: P. SNOY, *Nuristan und Munḡan, Tribus 14*, 1965.
- SORENSEN 1963: S. SORENSEN, *An Index to the Names in the Mahābhārata*. Delhi, 1963.
- SRINIVASACHAR 1931: D. SRINIVASACHAR, *The Apastamba-Sulbasūtra*. Mysore, 1931.
- STACUL 1974: G. STACUL, *New Archaeological Evidence on North-West Indo-Pakistan (3rd-1st millennia BC)*. *EW*, XXIV, 3-4, 1974.
- STACUL 1975: G. STACUL, *The Fractional Burial Custom in the Swāt Valley and Some Connected Problems*. *EW*, XXV, 3-4, 1975.
- STACUL and TUSA 1975: G. STACUL and S. TUSA, *Report on the Excavations at Aligrāma (Swāt, Pakistan), 1966, 1972*. *EW*, vol. XXV/3-4, 1975.
- STEIN 1899: A. STEIN, *Detailed report of an Ar-*

- archaeological tour with the Buner Field Force. *JA*, 1899.
- STEIN 1900: A. STEIN, *Kalhana's Rājataranginī. A Chronicle of the Kings of Kaśmir*. 2 vols. Westminster, 1900. Reprint 1961.
- STEIN 1907: A. STEIN, *Ancient Khotan, Detailed Report of Archaeological Explorations in Chinese Turkestan*. Vol. I. Oxford, 1907.
- STEIN 1921: A. STEIN, *Serindia. Detailed Report of Explorations in Central Asia and Westernmost China*. Oxford, 1921.
- STEIN 1922: A. STEIN, A Chinese expedition across the Pamirs and Hindukush A.D. 747. *Geographical Journal*, 1922.
- STEIN 1927: A. STEIN, Alexander's Campaign in the Indian North-West Frontier. *Geographical Journal*, vol. LXX, no. 5-6, 1927.
- STEIN 1928: A. STEIN, *Innermost Asia, Detailed Report of Explorations in Central Asia, Kan-su and Eastern Iran. I: Text*. Oxford, 1928.
- STEIN 1929: A. STEIN, *On Alexander's Track to the Indus*. London, 1929.
- STEIN 1930: A. STEIN, *An Archaeological tour in Upper Swat and Adjacent Hill Tracts*. In: *Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India*, No. 42. Calcutta, 1930.
- STEIN 1931: A. STEIN, On the Ephedra the Hūm Plant and the Soma. A volume of Indian Studies presented by his Friends and Pupils to E.J. Rapson. *BSOS*, VI, 1931.
- STEIN 1962: R. STEIN, *La Civilisation Tibétaine*. Paris, 1962.
- STEIN 1973: A. STEIN, A Contribution to the History of the Śāhis of Kābul. *EW*, vol. XXIII, no. 1-2, 1973.
- STIETENCROON 1966: H. STIETENCROON (von), *Indische Sonnenpriester Sāmba und die Śākadvi-piya-Brāhmaṇa*. Wiesbaden, 1966.
- STRABO 1969: STRABO, *The Geography of Strabo* (transl. H.L. Jones), vols. 8, London, 1969.
- SWĀMĪ GAMBHĪRĀNANDA 1957-1958: SWĀMĪ GAMBHĪRĀNANDA (tr. by), *Eight Upaniṣads*. two vols. Calcutta, 1957-1958.
- TADDEI 1966: M. TADDEI, An Interesting Relief from the Swāt Valley. *EW*, vol. XVI/1-2, 1966.
- TARN 1951: W.V. TARN, *The Greeks in Bactria and India*. Cambridge, 1951.
- TAWNEY 1928: C.H. TAWNEY (transl. by), *Soma-deva's Kathā-sarīt-sāgara. The Ocean of Stories*, 10 Vols. London, 1928.
- THAPAR 1961: R. THAPAR, *Aśoka and the Decline of the Mauryas*. Oxford, 1961.
- THOMAS 1918: F.W. THOMAS, Udyana and Urđi. *JRAS*, 1918.
- THOMAS 1935-1963: F.W. THOMAS (sel. and transl.), *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents Concerning Chinese Turkestan*. 4 vols. London, 1935; 1951; 1955; 1963.
- THOMAS 1954: F.W. THOMAS, Brahmi Script in Central-Asian Sanskrit Manuscripts. *Asiatica*. Leipzig, 1954.
- TOUSSAINT 1933: G.Ch. TOUSSAINT, *Le Dict de Padma*. Paris, 1933.
- TROUSDALE 1965: W. TROUSDALE, Rock-Engraving from the Tang-i Tizao in Central Afghanistan. *EW*, vol. XV, no. 3-4, 1965.
- TUCCI 1932-1941: G. TUCCI, *Indo-Tibetica*. Vols. 1-7, Roma, 1932-1941.
- TUCCI 1949: G. TUCCI, *Tibetan Painted Scrolls*. 3 vols. Roma, 1949.
- TUCCI 1956a-1971: G. TUCCI, *Minor Buddhist Texts*, 3 vols., Roma, 1956-1971.
- TUCCI 1956b: G. TUCCI, *Preliminary Report on two Scientific Expeditions in Nepal*. Roma, 1956.
- TUCCI 1958: G. TUCCI, Preliminary Report on an Archaeological Survey in Swāt (Pakistan). *EW*, vol. IX, no. 4, 1958.
- TUCCI 1963: G. TUCCI, The Tombs of the Asvakāyana-Assakenoi. *EW*, XIV, no. 1-2, 1963.
- TUCCI 1970: G. TUCCI, *Die Religionen Tibets*, Stuttgart, 1970.
- TUCCI 1971a: G. TUCCI, Himalayan Cina. *Études Tibétaines, dédiées à la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou*. Paris, 1971.
- TUCCI 1971b: G. TUCCI, *Opera Minora*. Roma, 1971.
- TUCCI 1973: G. TUCCI, *Tibet*, in: *Archaeologia Mundi*, Gèneve, 1973.
- VAN GOOR 1895: E. LULIUS VAN GOOR, De buddhische Non. 1915, pp. 236-40 quoted by NOBEL, 1955.
- VARĀHAMIHĪRA 1895-1897: VARĀHAMIHĪRA, *The Brhatsambhitā*. Vizianagaram Sanskrit Series, vol. X, parts 1-2. Benares 1895-1897.
- WALSER 1966: G. WALSER, *Die Volkerschaften auf den Reliefs von Persepolis*. Berlin, 1966.
- WASSON 1968: R. GORDON WASSON, *Soma, Divine Mushroom of Immortality*, New York, 1968.
- WATTERS 1904-1905: T. WATTERS, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India 629-645 A.D.* London, 1904-1905.
- WHITNEY 1905: W.D. WHITNEY, *Atharva-veda Sambhitā*. Harvard Oriental Series, vols. VII-VIII. Cambridge, 1905.
- WIKANDER 1938: S. WIKANDER, *Der Arische Männerbund*. Lund, 1938.
- YOUNGHUSBAND 1895: F.E. YOUNGHUSBAND, Chitral, Hunza and the Hindu Kush. *Geographical Journal*, 1895.
- YULE 1915-1916: H. YULE, *Cathay and the Way Thither*. London, 1915-1916.
- ZIMMER 1879: H. ZIMMER, *Altindisches Leben. Die Cultur der Vedischen Arier. Nach den Samhitā dargestellt*. Berlin, 1879.

ADDENDA

p. 12, note 6

Prof. Gherardo Gnoli writes to me that he has changed some of his views expounded in the paper published in *Atti del Convegno sul tema: La Persia e il Mondo Greco-Romano*, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Roma 1966, pp. 471-476, and he is now inclined to consider Dahanī Ghūlāman as an expression of a local religiosity, as he will show in a paper of imminent publication.

p. 17, l. 1 ff.

Perhaps we may find a confirmation of the geographical location of the Haumavarga near the Pamirs in the fact that the first part of their name has been connected with *haoma* (KENT p. 211 « Haoma drinking », WIKANDER « Die Leute die sich durch den Haoma Rausch in (wer)-Wölfe verwandeln » and chiefly DUCHESNE GUILLEMIN 1960 p. 96). Their name may be derived from the fact that they were great drinkers of *haoma* growing in abundance in their habitat. The article by LITVINSKIJ, Sakā Haumavargā v svete sovetских arheologičeskijh issledovanij, *Festschrift Altheim*, pp. 115 ff. (kind communication of Prof. Gherardo Gnoli) is unfortunately not accessible, at present, to me.

p. 54, l. 8

Later writers know, in Tibet, also the form Ilora, GRÜNWEDEL, 1915, p. 26.

p. 69, l. 11

The stories about the witches of Udyāna (= Uḍḍiyāna) abound in later Tibetan literature which refers to their magic performances and also to their cannibalism. They were supposed to be predominant as far as Ghazni and were considered to represent a peculiar class of dangerous creatures; therefore they stand alone; they have no relation at all with Buddhist, heterodox schools (Hindu), much less with the Mlecchas, Mussulmans (GRÜNWEDEL, 1915, p. 28).

p. 71, l. 16

Another *gajapati*, Śaṅkarasena, is mentioned as a donor of a beautiful image of Buddha, PAL, 1975, 30, a, b.

Pratāpāditya Pal's book is very interesting and useful; the only thing to which I dare to object is its title: *Bronzes of Kashmir*. There is no doubt that the largest part of his images come from Kashmir and its adjacent countries; many of them are clearly Hindu Śāhi. But others are the work of local artisans: Baltistan had Buddhist centres in old time, since Buddhism was widely spread all over Transhimalaya from Gilgit up to Ladakh (see Hui ch'ao); one of the still unknown centres was certainly Skardo, where there are huge rock reliefs; the extension of suzerainty of Tibet upon Baltistan may have facilitated the diffusion of Buddhist art, and given impulse to local artistic schools; in fact looking at the photos of those images one perceives the difference which many of them reveal in style; many bronzes may have been carried into Ladak, Baltistan, Gilgit by travelling monks. Some of them show evident influences from Central-Asia (see: *li lugs* in Samada, TUCCI *Indo-Tibetica* vol. IV, 1, p. 30). Some have certainly been cast in various places of all the Transhimalayan and Subhimalayan regions Chambā, Kulu, Lahul etc. (TUCCI, *Ibid.*). Now that Pratapaditya Pal has furnished us with such a large material it is necessary to investigate the details and classify the appurtenance of each different group of images to a peculiar locality. The task is difficult but not impossible. The existence of separate artistic centres is testified in some places of W. Tibet: e.g. the now very small village of Luk was once famous for its paintings, as I could verify studying the old samples existing in the nearby *lha k'añ* and private chapels. The tradition was still alive in the place. Local people testified that Luk was once also famous for his wooden and metal images.

p. 72, l. 18

An image of Buddha published by PAL 1975, p. 31 was commissioned by Mahārājā-dhirāja-parameśvara-nandivikramāditya: Pal is right in attributing this image to Gilgit area.

p. 93 at the end

The article of Prof. Brentjes had already been printed, when I received from him a second letter containing the following statement on the "standard": « Ritzbild einer Standarte, deren Binnenzeichnung wie die geweihtartigen Aufsätze schwer zu interpretieren sind. Sie erinnert an quadratische "Nadel"-Köpfe der Luristan-bronzen. Sie dürfte zu den Streitwagenbildern gehören und eventuell ein Feldzeichen darstellen ».