

by coolies who have been in those places, so far as separate apartments, remains of musical instruments, arms, &c. having been found in them, but from the way in which those tombs are opened, generally by a narrow shaft from the top, and the hurried way in which they have been explored, the foul air preventing them from being searched far from the opening of the shaft, it is very difficult to gain any correct information regarding the interior. In my rough sketch I have assumed the space occupied by the elephant to be 10'x5', and for the horse 10'x3', with a partition wall of 2 feet, which would give a square apartment of 10'x10' inside, and allowing the outer rooms to have been all of one size, the partition walls 2 feet thick and the outer walls 3', the outside dimensions of the whole building would be a square of 88 feet, and the size of the mound said to contain the tomb of Rajah Gadhadarra Sing at the Chereesai or Seereai Diew, is sufficient to cover a building of much larger dimensions; this however I need scarcely say is at present little better than supposition.

Some system of embalming is said to have been practised for the royal family; but if so, it must have been a very imperfect one, as I have ascertained that nothing more than scraps of bones have ever been found in any of the tombs, although I have met with several men who have asserted that the remains of more than one human being have been found in them.

I trust that you will kindly excuse my having trespassed so very far on your patience with what I am aware must for the most part be already more correctly known to you; but I have been induced to do so in hope that some apparently trifling matter might serve as a clue or connecting link to more important information previously in your possession.

Verification of the Itinerary of HWAN THSANG through Ariana and India, with reference to Major Anderson's hypothesis of its modern compilation. By Capt. ALEX. CUNNINGHAM, Bengal Engineers.

The Itinerary of Hwán Thsáng* is the most valuable document that we possess for the history and geography of Ariana and India

* See Appendix to the FÖE-KUE-KI.

prior to the Mahomedan conquests. The minute accuracy of its details and the faithful transcription of the native names of men and places, give it a vast superiority over all the Mussalmán works that I have seen, excepting only that of Abu Rihán. And yet this invaluable account has been impugned by Major Anderson of the Bengal Artillery, who states his conviction that in its present form the nomenclature of Hwán Thsáng cannot claim an antiquity of one hundred years: and he afterwards remarks that "the distances and directions are utterly worthless, being the combined results of misreadings, misunderstandings and guess-work." This is a sweeping condemnation of one of the most accurate of all ancient works, but I am happy to say that I can prove beyond all doubt that Hwán Thsáng is nearly always right in his "distances and directions," and that the Major is generally wrong in his conclusions, they being the combined results of *his own* "misreadings, misunderstandings and guess work."

In the first place, Major Anderson has used the wrong key, and he has consequently failed in unlocking the treasure of Hwán Thsáng's Itinerary. Having fallen upon the word CHI-NA-LO-CHE-FE-LO, which Hwán Thsáng says was the name given to the peaches introduced into the Panjáb from China, the Major's Persian reading immediately suggested that it was derived from the Persian term *shaftálu* (a peach), with the name of China prefixed to designate the country from whence the fruit had been imported. But a *partial* similarity of sound cannot be admitted as a proof of identity, when we have the direct testimony of Hwán Thsáng himself that the name bore a very different meaning. *Chini-shaftálu* means simply "China peaches," whereas the meaning of the original name was "son of the king of China." These translations, added to the transcriptions, enable us to identify the names in Hwán Thsáng's Itinerary beyond all possibility of doubt. Thus CHI-NA-LO-CHE-FE-TA-LO, is only a transcript in Chinese syllables of *China-raja-putra*, "sons of the China Raja." The Chinese alphabet possesses no R, and consequently this letter, as in the present instance, is always replaced by L. I have stated that *Chini-shaftálu* bears only a *partial* similarity to Hwán Thsáng's name: for it will be remarked that the third syllable of the original is altogether omitted in the Major's proposed reading; whereas my rendering of the term gives an

equivalent for each syllable, and at the same time possesses the exact meaning attributed to the appellation by Hwán Thsáng.

Having thus started with the erroneous idea that all the names in Hwán Thsáng's itinerary could be identified by rendering them into Persian and Arabic characters, the Major proceeds to an examination of those mentioned in Northern India and Afghanistan: and believing in the fancied identification of KELU-SI-MIN-KIAN with *Kilah-semangán*, of THSE-KIA, with *Shikárpur*, of PO-FA-TO, with *Bhawálpur*, of U-TO-KIA-HAN-CHA with *Attok*, and of TU-MAN with *Hazrat-Imam*, he comes to the conclusion that the work of Hwán Thsáng is of an age posterior to the Moslem invasion of Afghanistan. I will now examine these identifications in detail; merely premising that, by the same style of reasoning, we may bring down the date of the composition of one part of the Bible to the reign of Queen Elizabeth, because Satan is therein named *Abaddon*, which in the English tongue is an appropriate name for the Devil.*

1st. KELU-SI-MIN-KIAN.—Hwán Thsáng particularly specifies that this place was to the south of FO-KIA-LANG, or *Baghalán*. Now Semengán was the ancient name of Heibuk, which lies to the North of West from Baghalán, instead of to the South. Of course Major Anderson will say that this is one of Hwán Thsáng's *misdirections*, but I will hereafter show from numerous instances that it is the Major himself who is wrong in his directions; he having been led astray by the ignis-fatuus of Arabic and Persian. Now his identification of KE-LU-SI-MIN-KIAN, with *Semengán*, rests only on similarity of sound, for he had not proved that Semengán was ever called *Kilah* Semengán, which is a very necessary desideratum before we can admit the identity of the

* In like manner we might bring down the date of Pomponius Mela to the period of British supremacy in India, as amongst the ugly Scythian tribes, he mentions the Riphaces (*Wry-faces*), a name which could only have been derived from us Britishers. An amusing squib might be written in this style against all the ancient geographers; more especially if it was combined with Mr. Vigne's ingenious system of etymologies. According to him, Hem-babs, the Tibetan name of Drás, is derived from *Hima* (snow, in Sanskrit), and *Bab* (a pass, in Arabic.) In humble imitation of this style I would suggest the possible derivation of the name of London, or Londinium, from *Lon* (salt, in Sanskrit) and *Donna* (a lady, in Spanish.) From this natural combination, we find that London means "the place of the salt lady," in which we have perhaps an allusion to Lot's wife. Mr. Thornton in his Gazetteer innocently quotes several of Vigne's etymologies as if they were correct.

two places. So far from its being a fort, we know from Edrisi that it was only a good sized town with "mud walls" (*murs en terre*). It could not therefore have been called *Kilah Semengán*; and the consequent deduction that the Chinese syllables *Kelu* represent the Arabic word *Kilah* (fort) must be abandoned.

2nd. **THESE-KIA**. Major Anderson identifies this place with *Shikárpur*, but *Hwán Thsáng's* distances and directions give it a very different position. On the west was the river **SIN-TU**, the *Sindhu* or *Indus*; and on the east was the river *Pi-po-che*, the *Vipása* or *Byás*. As there is no river to the eastward of the *Indus* at *Shikárpur*, the Major has prudently passed over the **PI-PO-CHE** in silence. But *Hwán Thsáng* adds another important particular regarding the position of **THESE-KIA**; namely, that at 14 or 15 *li* (about $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles) to the South-West of it stood the ancient town of **CHE-KO-LO**, with a *stupa* or *tope* which had been built by *Asoka*. This is no doubt the *Sákala* of the *Mahabhárat*, and the *Sangala* of *Arrian* and *Q. Curtius*. Its position to the Westward of the *Byás* agrees precisely with that assigned to the others; and the fact that *Asoka* built a *Stupa* there, proves that it was a place of consequence within 50 years of *Alexander's* death. And now for the first proof of the accuracy of *Hwán Thsáng's* distances and directions. *Hwán Thsáng* states that to the Eastward of **THESE-KIA** at 500 *li* (about 83 miles) stood the monastery of **THA-MO-SU-FA-NA**, (*forét obscure*) and at 140, or 150 *li* (24 or 25 miles) to the North-Eastward from the monastery, was the town of **CHE-LAN-THA-LO**, or *Jálandhara*. The monastery must therefore have been near the present *Dakhani Serai*, on the *Káli-Véhi* river, and **THESE-KIA**, and **CHE-KO-LO** must have been in the neighborhood of *Lahore* and *Amritsar*. Now from *Dakhani Serai* and *Sultánpur*, the whole of the Western *Doab-i-Jálandhara-pita* is covered with a thick jungle, from which the monastery no doubt took its name of **THA-MO-SEE-FA-NA**, or "forét obscure," from तमस् *tamas*, darkness, and वन, *vana*, a *jangal*. The actual position of **CHE-KO-LO**, *Ságala* or *Sangala*, I cannot at present determine, but we have no less than three distinct authorities, all of whom agree in placing it to the westward of the *Byás*, and on or near the high road leading across the *Panjáb*.

But the position of this place furnishes a second proof of the accura-

cy of Hwán Thsáng's distances and directions, and the consequent inaccuracy of the Major's identifications. The Chinese pilgrim states that to the South-Westward of KIA-SHE-MI-LO, or *Kashmir*, and across the mountains at 700 *li* (about 117 miles) was PAN-NU-CHA, which all the continental savans have identified with the Panjáb, in spite of the assigned distance and direction. Major Anderson does the same, and remarks that the mention made by Hwán Thsáng that PAN-NU-CHA, was a dependency of Kashmir would, if the time could be ascertained, give a clue to the period when the work was composed. But PAN-NU-CHA is certainly *Panuch* or *Punach*, the *Punch* of the maps, which was always a dependency of Kashmir during the Hindu rule. Hwán Thsáng's distance and direction are therefore again correct. Hwán Thsáng further states that to the South-Eastward of PAN-NU-CHA, at 400 *li* (about 66 miles) was KO-LO-CHE-PU-LO, and at 700 *li* (about 117 miles) more to the South-Eastward, was THSE-KIA; or in other words, that THSE-KIA was situated about 183 miles to the south-eastward of *Punach*. This brings us again to the neighborhood of Lahore and Amritsar, the very position already obtained by working Westward from Jálandhara. As *Amritsar* was originally called *Chek*, it seems probable that the holy city of the Sikhs, stands in the actual position of the *Sákala* of the Mahabharata, and the *Sangala* of Arrian.

These detailed distances and directions, from two such well ascertained places as Kashmir and Jálandhara, fully establish the accuracy of Hwán Thsáng's Itinerary in this part, and the incorrectness of Major Anderson's identification of THSE-KIA with *Shikárpur*; more particularly as *Shikárpur* is to the west of India, and not to the north, as THSE-KIA is stated to be by Hwán Thsáng.

3rd. PO-FA-TO. This is placed by Hwán Thsáng at 700 *li* (about 117 miles) to the North-Eastward of MEII-LO-SAN-PU-LO, or *Mallisthánpura*, the present Multán. Major Anderson identifies PO-FA-TO with *Baháwalpúr* to the South-Eastward of Multán, a direction contrary to that indicated by Hwán Thsáng. As the town possessed no less than 4 topes built by Asoka, its antiquity may be placed as high as the period of Alexander. Now the distance and direction bring us to the banks of the Ravee, and to the neighborhood of *Harapa*, an ancient city now in ruins, which both from tradition and position, must have been one of the large fortified towns taken by Alexander. The Major

has been particularly unfortunate in his selection of Baháwalpur as the representative of PO-FA-TO, as that place was founded by Baháwal Khan within the last century. *Chicha-watni* may perhaps be the actual position of PO-FA-TO, as the second and third syllables are identical.

4th. U-TO-KIA-HAN-CHA. The position of this place can be determined very nearly by Hwán Thsáng's distances and directions. From SHANG-MU-KIA-PHU-SA, which appears to have been a holy spot in or near the city of PU-SE-KO-LO-FA-TI (*Pushkaldvati* or *Peukelaotis*, the modern *Hashtnagar*) to the South-East was the town of PA-LU-SHA; to the north-east of which at 50 *li* (upwards of 8 miles) stood the temple of PI-MA, the wife of Iswara (*Bhimá*, one of the many names of Durga)▲ To the south-east of this temple at 150 *li* (25 miles) was the town of U-TO-KIA-HAN-CHA. From these data I have ascertained by measurements on Walker's and Mirza Mogal Beg's maps that the temple of *Bhimá* must have stood close to the present town of Noshahra, and that U-TO-KIA-HAN-CHA must have been at or near the modern Niláb. Major Anderson identifies the latter with Attok, and points to the identification of PHO-LO-TU-LO with the ruins of *Pertór*, as a simple proof of his correctness. But the ruins of Bithor lie to the South of Attok, while PHO-LO-THU-LO was 20 *li* (or 6½ miles) to the North-West of U-TO-KIA-HAN-CHA, which I identify with Niláb, between which place and Attok the hills are covered with the ruins of Bithor and Messa Kot. Major Anderson is wrong in disputing Hwán Thsáng's measurement of the Indus at this place. For the accurate pilgrim does not say that the river was *one mile* wide; but that it was from 3 to 4 *li* (as nearly as possible half a mile) in width; which it actually is in many places in this neighbourhood. The Major may therefore keep his note of admiration for the breadths of rivers recorded by Arrian. The very fact that the *li* of Hwán Thsáng differs so much from the *li* of the present day proves the antiquity of the composition of his work: for there are about 6 of his *li* to the British mile, whilst of the modern *li* there are only 3 to the British mile. This is not a mere assertion, but a point which I have ascertained by Hwán Thsáng's recorded distances between Kashmir and Jálandhar, before alluded to; and by the recorded distances in the Kabul valley, which I will now mention.

Beyond FAN-YAN-NA, or BAMIAN to the Eastward, and across the snowy mountains, or *Koh-i-Baba*, lies the town of KIA-PI-SHE, which is undoubtedly the *Kapisa* of Ptolemy and the *Capissa* of Pliny. Major Anderson identifies KIA-PI-SHE with Kabul; and thinks that "SI-PI-TO-FA-LA-SSE may be *Estalif*." But *Estalif* lies to the North of Kabul, whereas SI-PI-TO-FA-LA-SSE was to the South of KIA-PI-SHE. The Major is therefore as unfortunate in his conjectures as in his more elaborate deductions. SI-PI-TO-FA-LA-SSE is an exact transcript syllable for syllable, of the Sanskrit *Sweta-Versha*. Now Ptolemy mentions both *Kapisa* and *Kabura*, and places the former to the Northward of the latter, and in the neighbourhood of *Barborana* or *Parwan*, of *Parsiana* or *Panjshir*, and of *Niphanda* (read *Ophiana*) or *Hupia*. It is highly probable therefore that we may identify it with the present *Kushán*, more particularly as Solinus calls the place *Caphusa*; for the name of Kushan, كوشان, is often written كفشان, *Kafshan*, in the same way that we have both *Afghan* and *Aoghan*.

This point being established I will now proceed to examine Hwán Thsang's "distances and directions." From *Kiapishe* to the eastward at 600 *li* was LAN-PHO, or *Lamghán* (*Lambatos* of Ptolemy.) Thence to the South-East at 100 *li* and across a large river was NA-KO-LO-HO, or *Nangrihár*. Major Anderson calls this district *Nang-nehar*, which is only another erroneous fruit of his Persian predilections, that name being the Persian corruption of *Nangrihar*, as the word is spelt in Pushtu works, and which is faithfully preserved in the Chinese transcript. Professor Lassen has identified it with the *Nagara* or *Dionysopolis* of Ptolemy, which was no doubt the same as the *Begrám* near *Jalalabad*, around which several topes still exist as witnesses of Hwán Thsang's accuracy. Ptolemy's name of *Dionysopolis* was still in use so late as A. D. 1000, for *Dinus* or *Dinus*, is mentioned by Abu Rihan as lying nearly midway between *Kabul* and *Peshawur*. Now, from KIA-PI-SHE to NA-KO-LO-HO being 700 *li* or 233 miles by Major Anderson's estimate of the *li*, it follows that if he is correct in his identification of the former with *Kabul*, the latter must be situated to the eastward of *Peshawur*; but as he identifies NA-KO-LO-HO with *Nangrihar*, it is clear that his estimate of the *li* must be wrong. According to my estimate of 6 *li* to the British mile the distance will be 117 miles; which is only a few miles more than the distance measured upon Walk-

er's large map. Again, from NA-KO-LO-HO to KIAN-TO-LO, or *Gandhara*, and its capital, PU-LU-SHA-FU-LO, the distance is said to be 500 *li*, which according to Major Anderson's estimate, would place the latter somewhere to the eastward of the Jehlam. By my estimate the distance is upwards of 83 miles, which is somewhat short of the distance measured by the perambulator. But the total distance by my estimate is exactly 200 British miles, which agrees nearly with the measured distance of Alexander's surveyors between *Alexandria Opiana* (Hupian) and *Peukelaotis* (Hashtnagar) which was 227 Roman miles, or 207½ British miles. From these statements it is clear that it is not Hwán Thsáng's distances that are wrong, but Major Anderson's estimate of those distances.

5th. IU-MAN. This Major Anderson identifies with *Hazrat Imam*;—but Hwán Thsáng's statements point to a different place :—for *Hazrat Imám* lies to the south of the Oxus, whilst all the places to the East and West of JUMAN lie to the north of the Oxus. Besides which the itinerary of the Southern bank from AN-THA-LO-FO or *Anderáb* to SHE-KHI-NI, or *Shakhnan*, is detailed in another place. According to Hwán Thsáng IU-MAN was situated between TAN-MI, or *Termed*, to the North of the Oxus, and KO-TU-LO, or *Khatlán*, a district likewise to the North of the river. Now in this very position we have the *Shumán* and *Nomán* of Ibn Haukal, the *Sumán* of Edrisi and the *Shumán* of Abulfeda. But the itinerary of Edrisi agrees exactly with that of Hwán Thsáng. To the eastward of TAN-NI, or *Termed*, was CHI-AO-YAN-NA or *Chaganian*; to the east of which again was HU-LU-MO, the *Hamúrán* of Idrisi, situated at 30 miles from Chaganian. Then to the east of HU-LU-MO was IU-MAN, the *Sumán* of Edrisi, 39 miles from Hamurán. Beyond IU-MAN was KIU-HO-YAN-NA, the *Andián* of Edrisi, and the *Alubán* of Ibn Haukal. Then to the eastward was HU-SHA, the *Waksh* or *Washgerd* of the two Musalmán geographers; beyond which again was KO-TU-LO, or *Khutlán*, a district on the northern bank of the Oxus. This well known place the Major identifies with *Kator* to the south of the Hindu Kush. From these distinct details it is certain that IU-MAN cannot be identified with *Hazrat Imám*.

I have now examined one by one the chief positions on which Major Anderson relied for the proofs of the correctness of his system of iden-

tification. As not one of them has stood the test of a rigid examination I consider it clear that the Major's system must be wrong: in further proof of which I will examine a few more of his geographical identifications before proceeding to the historical part of the enquiry.

P. 1189, "KIU-MI-THO."—"Kunduz I suspect." Hwán Thsáng has just before been detailing the itinerary of the northern bank of the Oxus from Termed eastwards: and beyond KO-TU-LO or *Khutlán*, (mentioned above) he placed the mountains of TSUNG-LING and KIU-MI-THO, which must therefore be to the eastward of *Khutlán* near the source of the Oxus; in which position we find the *Komedæ Montes* of Ptolemy answering to the TSUNG-LING, and the *Vallis Komedorum* answering to the district of KIU-MI-THO, Hwán Thsáng is therefore right again.

P. 1189.—"CHI-KHI-NI, Cherkes-Circassia," *Circassia!* To justify this seven-leagued saltation the Major states that he has no doubt "a leaf has here taken its wrong place." I feel bold enough to express my opinion that the leaf is certainly in its right place, and that CHI-KHI-NI is as certainly in the very position indicated by Hwán Thsáng. The origin of many of the Major's most erroneous conclusions may be noticed in his attempted identifications of this word, in which he evidently reads the French *ch* as an English hard *ch*, instead of as the English *sh*. After correcting this curious "misreading" we have, according to Hwán Thsáng, the river FA-TSU or Oxus to the southwest of KIU-MI-THO, and the mountains of *Tsung Ling*; and to the south of the Oxus, we have SHI-KHI-NI or *Shakhán*, the *Lakinah* of Ibn Haukal, and the *Sakiná* of Edrisi: the district on the Shakh-Dara, one of the head waters of the Oxus.

To the south of SHI-KHI-NI, on crossing the Oxus, we come to THA-MO-SI-THIEI-TI, or HU-MI, of which the inhabitants had green eyes. This district Major Anderson identifies with *Daghestan* on the *Caspian*: but from the position assigned to it by Hwán Thsáng there can be no doubt that it is the present *Wákhán*. The dimensions given to it agree very well with those of the narrow valley of the upper Oxus. HU-MI was from 1500 to 1600 *li* (250 to 266 miles) from east to west; and only 4 or 5 *li* (rather more than half a mile) in width, from north to south. Now from the Sir-i-kol lake to the junction of the *Shakh-dara*, the Oxus is 170 miles in length, measured direct by a pair

of compasses on Wood's map, to which must be added one half more for the windings of the stream, making a total length of 255 miles. From Ish-kashn to Kundut the valley of Wakhan, according to Wood, is from "a few hundred yards to a mile in width."—The average width is therefore somewhat more than half a mile, as accurately stated by Hwáng Thsang. This is one more proof that the distances and directions of the Chinese pilgrim are correct.

But there is another interesting point mentioned by Hwán Thsang connected with this identification of HU-MI with *Wakhán* that in my opinion adds the last link to the chain of evidence in favor of the correctness of my identification. Hwáng Thsang says that HU-MI was one of the ancient districts of the TU-HO-LO, or *Tochari*. Now one of the five tribes of the Tochari was named HIEU-MI, and their chief town was called HO-MI. From them I believe that the Oxus received its name of *Amú*. This was no insignificant *clan*, but a mighty *tribe*, whose king, *Kadphises Hoëmo* (OOHMO), judging from the numbers of his coins still existing, must have ruled over Kabul, and the Panjab for a long time.

The mention of green eyes points to a mountainous country, and not to the low banks of the Caspian. For it is a well known fact that in lofty mountain-valleys the inhabitants generally have blue or grey eyes, often inclining to green, as is likewise the case with the same colored eyes in Europe.

P. 1197.—"OU-LA-CHI may be *Uch*." This is another instance of the French *ch* being misread as the hard English *ch*. U-LA-SMI is no doubt the *Urasa* district of the Kashmirian history, the *Urasa regio* of Ptolemy, and the *Rash* of the present day, for the district of *Rash* lies just to the westward of Mozafarabad, and to the north-east of Kashmir; agreeing with the direction indicated by Hwán Thsang.

P. 1199.—"CHE-TO-THOU-LO,—*Khoozdar*." This is a third instance of the misreading of the French *ch*, and distances and directions are again mistaken. According to Hwán Thsang to the north-east of CHE-LAN-TSA-LO, or *Jalandhara*, and across precipitous mountains at 700 *li* (about 117 miles) was KEIU-LU-TO, the boundary of India on the north. Both distance and direction point to the district of *Kulu*, which as Hwán Thsang correctly states, is "surrounded by mountains, and close to the snowy mountains." Major Anderson iden-

tifies KHIU-LU-TO with *Kelât-i-Ghilzi*. Now from KHIU-LU-TO to the south, at 800 *li* (about 133 miles) across high mountains and a large river, was SHE-TO-THU-LO, bounded to the west by a great river. This name, SHE-TO-THU-LO is an exact transcript of the Sanskrit *Satadru*, the *Zadadrus* of Ptolemy, and the *Hesudrus* of Pliny, now called *Satrudr* or *Satlaj*. The other large river crossed on the road from *Kulu* is of course the *Vipâsa* or *Byds*.

These two identifications of KHIU-LU-TO and SHE-TO-THU-LO with *Kulu* and *Satadru*, are I think, conclusive of Hwán Thsáng's accuracy both in distances and directions, and of the erroneousness of the Major's system of identification founded upon Persian readings and etymologies. My identifications prove that Hwán Thsáng derived his names from Sanskrit originals; witness the rivers PI-PO-CHE, or *Vipâsa*, SHE-TO-THU-LO, or *Satadru*, SU-PHO-FA-SU-TO, or *Subhavastu*, with the towns PU-SE-KO-LA-FA-TI, or *Pushkalâvati*, SATHANI-SHE-FA-LO, or *Sthaneswâra*, and numerous others, all of which show that Hwán Thsáng could not have copied his names from the misspelt spoken names of Mahomedan authors. As Major Anderson has stated his conviction that Hwán Thsáng has derived his information from "Arabic and Persian geographical publications," it behoves him to point out the Musalmán geographer from whom the Chinese author has copied. If such a work really exists it will be invaluable. I will now proceed to an examination of some historical points mentioned by Hwáng Thsáng for the establishment of the perfect correctness of the date (600 to 650 A. D.) claimed for him by Chinese authors.

1st. In his mention of the kingdom of SIN-TU or Sindh, Hwán Thsáng states that the king was of the race of CHOU-TO-LO (or in English characters, SHU-TO-LO) an exact transcript of the Sanskrit *Sudra*, one of the four well known castes of Hindus. Major Anderson, using the same mispronunciation of the French *ch* for a fourth time, identifies the CHOU-TO-LO with "*Chator*, a celebrated tribe of Rajputs." *Chitor* or *Chitrâwara*, is the name of a celebrated fortress, as its meaning implies, and not that of a tribe. The Rajputs of Chitor are now called *Sisodia*, but in Hwán Thsáng's time they were known under the names of *Grâhilôt*.

Now the period at which *Sudras* reigned over Sindh must be the date of Hwán Thsáng's visit. In the *Chach-Nâmeh*, or Persian history of

Sind, we find that Mohammed bin Kásim conquered that country from Raja Dáhir in the year A. D. 711. As Dáhir reigned 33 years, and his father Chach reigned 40 years, we obtain A. D. 638 as the date of Chach's accession. Now as Chach and Dáhir were Brahmans, and their successors were Mahomedans it is clear that the Sudras must have reigned prior to A. D. 638; which agrees precisely with the period assigned to Hwán Thsáng's travels from A. D. 629 to 646. I cannot positively assert that Chach's predecessor was a *Sudra*; but it is certain that he was not a *Brahman*, for the Rana of Chitor addressing Chach says "you are a *Brahman*; the affairs of Government cannot be carried on by you;" thereby intimating that his predecessor was not a Brahman.

2nd. At 1000 *li* (about 166 miles) to the north-east of U-CHE-YAN-NA or *Ujain* was the kingdom of CHI-CHI-TO of which the ruler was a Brahman. Now from Abu Rihán's description of *Jajáwati* (read *Chacháwati*) of which the capital city was named *Kajurádhah*, there can be no doubt that the place indicated was the principality afterwards held by the Chandél Rajputs, *Kajurádhah* still exists; and from the inscriptions yet extant, as well as from the genealogy preserved by the bard *Chand* in his *Chand Rás*, we know that the Chandel Rajputs held this district from about A. D. 700 down to the period of the Mahomedan conquests. The time at which a Brahman reigned there, and consequent by the date of Hwáng Thsáng's visit must therefore be anterior to the accession of the Chandel Rajputs, or prior to A. D. 700 which agrees with the time assigned to Hwán Thsáng's travels.

3rd. In his mention of MA-KIEI-THO or *Magadha*, Hwáng Thsáng gives the name of five kings who reigned there previous to his visit. Their names are,

SO-KIA-LO-A-YI-TO.	or <i>Sankaraditya.</i>
FO-THO-KIU-TO.	<i>Budhagupta.</i>
THA-KA-TA-KIU-TO.	<i>Takatagupta.</i>
PHO-LO-A-YE-TO.	<i>Baladitya.</i>
FA-CHE-LO.	<i>Vajra.</i>

Of the second, fourth, and fifth of those Princes there are coins still existing to testify to the truth of the pilgrims narration. But we have yet more explicit evidence of his accuracy in the date of *Budha-gupta's* inscription on the Eran Pillar. This date is 165 of the Gupta era

which as we learn from Abu Rihán commenced in A. D. 319. The date on the pillar is therefore equivalent to A. D. 484. Supposing that *Budha-gupta* reigned until A. D. 500, and that the three following princes occupied the throne during the 6th century we have the date of A. D. 600 as the earliest limit of the period of Hwán Thsáng's visit.

4th. The king of PHO-LI-YE-THA-LO was of the race of FEI-SHE or *Vaisya*. PHO-LI-YE-THA-LO is a literal transcript of the Sanskrit *Vrihadhara*, the "much-containing," a synonyme of Indra, and the recorded bearing and distance of 83 miles to the westward of MO-THU-LO or *Mathura* point to *Indra-prastha* or Delhi, as the place visited by Hwán Thsáng. Now we know from Abul Fazl's lists that prior to the conquest of Shaháb-ad-din in A. D. 1188, the throne had been occupied for 83 years by 7 *Chohan* kings, who reigned 83 years and before them by 20 *Tuar* kings who reigned 437 years. From these data, we have A. D. 1188—83—437—668 A. D. the latest date at which a *Vaisya* prince could have reigned at Delhi.

I have now shown from four independent historical statements made by Hwán Thsáng that the period of his visit from A. D. 600 to 668 corresponds precisely with the date assigned by the Chinese authorities, namely the first half of the 7th century. This date is moreover fully corroborated by other internal evidence of which the principal points are ; 1st, the total silence of the pilgrim regarding the Arabs and their conquests ; 2nd, the mention that the king of FOE-LI-SHI-SA-TANG-NA or *Paraskasthan*, (the present *Panjhir* or *Panjshir*) was of the race of *Thu-kiuei* or *Turk* ; therefore prior to A. D. 900, the period of the usurpation of the Brahman *Kallar*, whose descendants reigned over the Kabul valley until Mahmud Ghaznavi's conquests. This is distinctly proved by Abu Rihán. 3rd, That all the districts along the Oxus were in the possession of the TU-HO-LO or *Tochari* : therefore prior to the Arab conquests in the beginning of the 8th century.

In conclusion I would ask Major Anderson to state in what Mahomedan author Hwán Thsáng could have found the *Sanskrit* names of kings and countries already noticed. I will answer the question myself. "In none:" for, to quote the words of Ibn Haukal regarding *Hind*, (India) as the greater portion of the country belonged to Kafirs and Idolaters, "a minute description of it would be unnecessary and unprofitable."