

at Chitrāl. According to this statement the successive traditional periods comprised: the 'Kāfir-daur' or 'time of the Kāfirs'; the dynasty of the Ra'īs with which Chinese influence seems somehow associated in popular notion; the reign of Abdullah Khān, the Turk; of Khairullah Khān, from Gilgit; and finally the rule of the present family of Mehtars known as Katūr. Now the Khairullah Khān of this series is evidently identical with the Shāh Khairullah, Bādshāh, whom Mughul Bēg, the author of the surveys translated and explained in Raverty's *Notes on Afghānistān*, knew as the supreme ruler of the Kāshkār State, including Mastūj, about 1789-90,³⁹ and who is shown also in the genealogical table of the Khushwakt branch of the Chitrāl family in a chronological position approximately corresponding.⁴⁰ Hence Abdullah Khān, too, must probably be placed somewhere in the eighteenth century.

Whatever may be the explanation of the earlier traditional mention of Chinese invasion, it is certain that Chinese power made itself felt again in Chitrāl after the Tārīm Basin had been reconquered for the Empire under the Emperor Ch'ien-lung about the middle of the eighteenth century. As this reassertion of Chinese authority after the lapse of just a thousand years is curiously illustrative of the earlier records, the few references to it I have been able to trace may receive here brief mention. The most reliable among them is the definite statement made by the author of Raverty's Surveys that at the time he visited Chitrāl, about the year 1789, its ruler acknowledged Chinese sovereignty, and that under its protection inroads from the Badakhshān side had ceased.⁴¹ The oral traditions recorded by Major Biddulph give a lengthy account, tinged with legendary details, of an invasion which a Chinese force in concert with the ruler of Badakhshān, Mīr Sultān Shāh, effected in Chitrāl at a time when Khush-āmad, a nephew of the founder of the Khushwakt branch and the elder brother of Khairullah, was ruling in Mastūj. After a lengthy siege of Mastūj, terms were agreed to, and the invaders retired up the Yārkhūn Valley, i.e. towards the Barōghil.⁴²

There is a reference to the same invasion also in an extract from a Chinese geographical work published in 1790, which Klaproth appears to have first translated.⁴³ This deals with the territory of 'Bolor', which is described as situated to the south-west of Yarkand and to the east of Badakhshān, and which in view of the incidents mentioned can only be meant for Kāshkār-Bālā including Mastūj, and eventually also Yasīn.⁴⁴ In 1749 its prince, whose name, reproduced in Klaproth's French as *Chakhou Chamed*, is manifestly to be read as *Shāh Khush-āmad*, is said to have made his submission to the Chinese, and his territory was incorporated. In the following year his envoy 'Chah bek', i. e. Shāh Bēg, came to the Imperial Court. Another embassy is referred to in 1763. 'In the next year the country was invaded by Sultān Shāh of Badakhshān, whereupon the prince of Bolor asked support from the Chinese general residing at Yārkan. The latter called upon Sultān Shāh to evacuate Bolor and to stop hostilities. The king of Badakhshān conformed, and Shāh Khush-āmad wrote a letter of thanks. The two adversaries sent embassies to the Emperor with tribute, consisting of daggers which are of excellent quality in their territory.' In 1769

Chinese
influence in
18th cent.

Record of
Chinese in-
tervention.

³⁹ See Raverty, *Notes on Afghānistān*, pp. 154, 158, 162; also *ibid.*, p. 306, note, where an attempt is made to utilize the date supplied by the surveys for clearing up the tangled chronology of the Khushwakt family.

⁴⁰ See Biddulph, *Hindoo Koosh*, p. 153, table.

⁴¹ See Raverty, *Notes on Afghānistān*, pp. 154, 188.

⁴² Cf. Biddulph, *Hindoo Koosh*, pp. 151 sq.

⁴³ See *Magasin asiatique*, i. p. 96. I take the reference from Biddulph, *Hindoo Koosh*, p. 152.

⁴⁴ Raverty, *Notes on Afghānistān*, pp. 305 sqq., has

discussed Klaproth's notice of 'Bolor'. He has given reason to suppose that the term, which he prefers to spell *Bilaur*, was used, in the Muhammadan sources, both in a wider and a more restricted sense. In the latter it included mainly Kāshkār-Bālā with Mastūj and Yasīn, while in the former it was vaguely extended to the whole mountain region from the borders of Baltistān in the east to Kāfiristān in the west (see *loc. cit.*, pp. 307 sq.; cf. also the references given in *Ancient Khotan*, i. p. 6, note 5).