

Bārāmūla, the ancient western 'Gate' of the kingdom, has, for the two marches leading to the capital, on his 'left the mountains of Bolor and Shamīlān'. The latter local name can, it is true, no longer be traced. But there can be no doubt whatsoever that it was applied by Albērūnī's informants to the mountains south of Chilās and probably also Astōr; for in a preceding passage he speaks of the rivers Kusnārī and Mahwī as coming from the 'mountains of Shamīlān', and the identity of these rivers with the Kunhār and Kishangangā has been demonstrated by me.<sup>5</sup> As regards the much-discussed term *Bolor*, it is certain that it primarily included the whole mountain region drained by the river of Gilgit.<sup>6</sup> Its application, which is certainly vague wherever we meet it, may well have also extended as far east as Skardo or Baltistān. But in that sense, too, its use here by Albērūnī's informants was perfectly justified, since the chain of great mountains which attracts the eye of the traveller on his left as he moves up the Kashmīr valley towards Srinagar, its capital in Albērūnī's time just as now, prominently includes the big ice-girt massif of Mount Haramukh and other high snowy peaks that could be more accurately described as lying south of Skardo than of Gilgit.

Albērūnī's  
*Bhatta-  
varyān* and  
*Bhatta-  
Shāh*.

An interesting question is raised by the terms *Bhattavaryān* and *Bhatta-Shāh* which Albērūnī's information records as the names of the tribes inhabiting these mountains of Bolor and Shamīlān and of their ruler, respectively. When previously discussing these names I suggested that 'Albērūnī's *Bhatta* may possibly represent the term *Bhuṭṭa* or *Bhauṭṭa* (the modern Kś. Buṭ<sup>a</sup>) which is applied in the Sanskrit Chronicles [of Kashmīr] to the population of Tibetan descent generally, from Ladākh to Baltistān'.<sup>7</sup> This view may be supported by the fact that the Balti people inhabiting what is now known as Baltistān or Skardo are certainly Tibetan in stock as well as in language,<sup>8</sup> and that the application to them by Albērūnī's informants of the designation *Bhuṭṭa* or *Bhauṭṭa* would have been fully justified.<sup>9</sup> But it deserves to be pointed out that in Chilās an important section of the population, supposed to represent the original branch of Shiṇā, i. e. pure 'Dard', settlers, are known as 'Bots'.<sup>10</sup> Drew states that the people of Chilās 'are

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Rājat*. II. pp. 361 sq.

<sup>6</sup> Regarding 'Bolor', the references given in *Ancient Khotan*, i. p. 6, note 5, may be supplemented by Chavannes, *Voyage de Song Yun*, p. 28, note 7. In Raverty, *Notes on Afghānistān*, pp. 295 sqq., a useful synopsis will be found of the notices bearing upon the use of the term by Muhammadan authors.

As regards the early use of the term, I now believe with M. Chavannes that the *Po-lu-le* of Sung Yün, the *Po-lun* of the pilgrim Chih-mêng (A. D. 404; cf. Chavannes, *Voyage de Song Yun*, p. 53, note 5), as well as Hsüan-tsang's *Po-lu-lo* and the *P'o-lü* of the T'ang Annals, are all intended to render a name corresponding to 'Bolor'. The last two names extended also to Baltistān ('Great P'o-lü').

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *Rājat*. II. p. 363, note 64; for *Bhuṭṭa* or *Bhauṭṭa*, see my note *Rājat*. i. 312-16.

<sup>8</sup> See, regarding the Baltis and their character as Muhammadanized Tibetans, Drew, *Jummoo and Kashmir*, pp. 356 sqq.

<sup>9</sup> At the present time the term *Buṭ<sup>a</sup>* is still generally applied throughout Kashmīr to people coming from Tibetan-speaking parts, whatever their religion, though those better informed know also the name *Baltī* (pronounced *Balit* in Kashmīrī) and apply it, as distinct from the Ladākhīs, to the men of Skardo who annually pass in numbers through Kashmīr in search of work.

The use of the term *Buṭ<sup>a</sup>* for the people of Baltistān is proved to be old by the terms 'Little and Great *Bhuṭṭa*-land' found in Śrīvara's Chronicle. They correspond to the present *Lukh Buṭun* and *Bud Buṭun* by which Kashmīris mean Baltistān and Ladākh respectively; cf. *Rājat*. II. p. 435.

Some confusion has arisen between the terms *Buṭ<sup>a</sup>* and *Bōd*, which latter is applied by Kashmīris to Lāmās or Tibetan Buddhist monks and is derived from Skr. *Bauddha*, 'a Buddhist'. This confusion is easily accounted for among Dōgrās and other Indians who are employed in Kashmīr but are generally ignorant of its difficult language. It is reflected e. g. in the statement: 'The word *Bhot* means Buddhist or perhaps, more particularly, Buddhist Tibetan'; cf. Drew, *Jummoo and Kashmir*, p. 231. The term *Buṭ<sup>a</sup>* clearly represents the Tibetan name *Botpa*, *Bod-pa*, by which the Ladākhīs call themselves; cf. Cunningham, *Ladāk*, p. 290.

<sup>10</sup> I take this statement from an official report on the Gilgit Agency (1909), printed but not published, which I have been allowed to consult. Evidently to the same ethnic designation relates the tradition recorded by Biddulph, *Hindoo Koosh*, p. 16, about an old feud that once 'broke out in the community between two brothers, Bôt and Matchuk, which ended in the defeat and expulsion of all the partizans of the latter. The Bôte are now the most prosperous family in Chilas.'

In view of what has been stated in the preceding note