

»The country of Tibet is situated between Khurlhiz and the empire of Cheen. Cheen lies between the sea and the land of Ghuz and Tibet; and Cheen itself constitutes this climate (or division); but the other parts of Tibet were annexed to it . . . Sind is the same as Mansurek; and the region of Lattian, as far as Cheen, extends along the coast of Hindoostan, to Tibet, and Cheen Macheen, beyond which no one passes. — Of the Mihran it is said that the source is the river Jihoun; it comes out at Moultan, and passes on to the borders of Besmeid, and by Mansourah, and falls into the sea on the east of Dambul. The waters of the river Mihran are pleasant and wholesome, and they say it is liable to tides, or flux and reflux, like the Nile, and that it is infested by crocodiles. The Sind Rud, at three merhileh from Moultan, is of pleasant water, and joins the river Mihran. — Musk is brought from Tibbet, and sent to all parts . . . The mountainous country, bordering upon Tibet, is very populous, well cultivated, abounding in fruits, and excellent cattle; and the climat is very pure and healthy.»

The passage about the Indus is so different in ELLIOT'S »*History*» that I am not sure whether it is the same as the above in OUSELEY'S translation. It runs: »The Mihrán is the chief river of those parts. Its source is in a mountain, from which also some of the feeders of the Jíhún flow. Many great rivers increase its volume, and it appears like the sea in the neighbourhood of Multán. It then flows by Basmad, Alrúz, and Mansúra, and falls into the sea, to the east of Debal. Its water is very sweet, and there are said to be crocodiles in it like those of Egypt. It equals the Nile in volume and strength of current. It inundates the land during the summer rains, and on its subsidence the seed is sown, as in Egypt.»¹

The latter version regarding the source of the Indus is rather good for a time when so little was known of the interior of this world of mountains. The usual comparison with the Nile returns, especially on account of the crocodiles. At a few places, except those quoted above, Tibet is only just mentioned. Elliot has also the passage: »From the sea to Tibet is four months' journey . . .» The musk is also an object which has attracted the attention of most of the Arabian writers. Geographically Tibet remains inaccessible and almost unknown.

Nor does ALBERUNI help us to fix the position of Tibet, and if he mentions our lake, Manasa, it is only because he has got it from the Puranas. He quotes a long list of Sanscrit books in his work on India, and his geography is to a great extent purely Sanscrit. And still he could not, being a barbarian, approach the centres of Indian learning, Benares and Kashmir.

When Alberuni says: »The people inhabiting the mountains stretching from the region of Panchir into the neighbourhood of Kashmir live under the rule that several brothers have one wife in common», one feels inclined to think of the Tibetans, but he means the tribes of Hindu-kush, Hazara, Svat, Chitral and Kafirstan.²

¹ The History of India, as told by its own Historians. Edited from the Posthumous Papers of the late Sir H. M. ELLIOT, by Prof. JOHN DAWSON. Vol. I, London 1867, p. 40.

² Alberuni's India, about A. D. 1030. By Dr. EDW. C. SACHAU. London 1910. Vol. I, p. 108.