

**A FEW CHINESE OBSERVATIONS ABOUT CHITRAL,
HUNZA, &c.**

In giving the effect of what the official Manchu-Chinese Annals record upon the subject, I must not be supposed to advance any opinion upon either international policy or territorial rights, for I have no personal knowledge of the regions in question, and therefore of course do not possess the competence to criticize.

The voluminous Chinese records have plenty to say about the numerous Tartar and Turcoman tribes enclosed in the space between Siberia, Mesopotamia, India, and Tibet, and there is some reason to believe that from the very beginning, *i.e.* 2000 years ago, they discerned by contrast with these an Aryan variety of mankind, and even mentioned some Aryan tribes, such as the Puktao or Pukta, and Atcha, by names corresponding with those used to-day. But this enquiry covers hundreds of volumes, besides thousands of years, and accordingly it is only proposed in the present paper to group together the modern extracts referring to the affairs of the Gilgit region under the present Manchu dynasty.

It was the Eleuth war of 150 years ago, followed by the Khojo rebellion and conquest of Kashgaria in 1759, that first in recent times brought the Chitral-Hunza tract under Chinese notice. In 1760 we find 'Sha Hushamet' of Bolor receiving orders from the Emperor, who states the ruler in question to be 'a vassal, just as much as the Kara Kirghiz.' (It must here

be stated that the Chinese call the Kara Kirghiz by the Eleuth name of Burut). There can be no mistake about the whereabouts of Bolor, for in 1760 some Balti traders on the way to Yarkand were questioned by the Chinese authorities at Yularik. They made the following statement:—'To our west is Kashmir, and west of that again is Hindustan; south is Khapulun, east is Tibet, and north is Bolor. We ourselves belong to the Memesparl and Usuwan tribes, which are separated from each other by a river, and each of which numbers 8000.' The letters from their chiefs offered submission to China.

In 1761 the Yarkand authorities report that Heslow, Beg of Khemchut, had sent his son to bring tribute of gold, and that return presents had been given to him. The Beg sends word at the same time that the Beg Naker Kilti also desires to send tribute of local articles by the same opportunity. (The whole of the words in the last two paragraphs are given according to the sounds the Pekingese-speaking Manchu-Chinese evidently wished to produce, and it is for specialists to decide what places and names are really intended. In any case it is quite clear that Khandjut and Nagar are indicated, and possibly 'Begs of Nagar and Gilgit'). The Emperor replies that the chiefs of petty states must always come in person or send relatives, no matter however trifling the tribute they

bring. ‘Naker is on a par with Heslow, and the former in asking the latter to bring tribute for him runs a risk of becoming vassal to the latter. The offer must be declined, and no return presents ever given in parallel cases; indeed the tribute thus vicariously sent must not even be received.’

In 1762 Aikhamed Sha, the Khan of the Affghans, for the first time sends tribute, and the Emperor orders that his envoy Khodjo Mirha be impressed as much as possible with China’s power whilst on his way to Peking. Meanwhile Sha Hushamet of Bolor asks Chinese aid against Sultan Sha of Badakshan, who has been raiding Chitlar (Chitral). The result of this was that the Badakshan envoy Kabaniyar was turned back at Yarkand, and a message was sent to him by one Sari Beg, to the effect that he must cease molesting Bolor, and must obey the Chinese residents at Kashgar and Yarkand. Next year, however, a Badakshan envoy named Abdul Amtsa reached Peking, and pleaded to the Emperor that Sha Hushamet had murdered Sultan Sha’s younger brother. Meanwhile Sari Beg succeeds in persuading Sultan Sha to ‘withdraw his younger brother Chitlar, and return the cattle plundered.’ (Here there appears to be some confusion of names, which, however, the sequel clears up). But another Badakshan envoy named Mirza Atalib argues the question of Chitral, touching which the Emperor orders a cautious and conciliatory attitude, pending developments. It was pleaded by the ruler of Badakshan that Chitral formed part of the dominion bequeathed to him by his ancestors and that the Chinese resident at Yarkand (then a Turkestan native named Emin Khodjo) had behaved unfairly in listening to and acting upon the one-sided story of Sha Hushamet of Bolor, who was guilty of murdering Sultan Sha’s brother. Moreover Sultan Sha was already in danger of an attack from the Affghans, who were incensed at his having surrendered to China the body of a *behanbar*, or descendant of the

Prophet. To this the Emperor of China (who seems to have been kept well posted by Emin, Yusuf of Hamil, and the other friendly Mussulman Begs) replied that Chitral rightfully belonged to Bolor and that Sultan Sha’s maternal uncle Sha Mamud had, during the period of Eleuth suzerainty over those regions, forcibly taken possession of it, but that Sha Hushamet’s grandfather had since then reconquered it. Hence the claim of Badakshan could not be admitted. Subsequently Sultan Sha sent an envoy named Osman Beg to Yarkand to apologise for the misunderstanding: the claim to Chitral was disavowed, and put down to the mistaken zeal of a former envoy named Khojiklan.

In 1785 an isolated report is forwarded to Peking to the effect that the two Khunchi Begs are having a squabble with Sha Wangti Beg of Shignan, and that the former, by name Sha Mansur, and Sha Hergos, wish to pasture in the Serikol. In granting this request for one year only, the Emperor warns the Begs of Khunchi not to squabble with the Kara Kirghiz settled there. Nothing more is said of these places until 1827, when we find the Beg of Shignan instructed to coöperate with China in defeating the rebellion of Jehangir (grandson of the man whose body had been given up Badakshan). At the same time Singh Tsinbal of Kanchut (Khandjut) sends a letter and tribute of gold, from which we may assume that his assistance was also offered. In 1828 the Emperor directed that the *Akim*-begs and *Ashkan*-begs of the Serikol region under Yarkand must in future be natives of the place, as they are far from the Chinese outposts and lie between Shignan and Badakshan. Reports from Kashgaria, giving particulars of where all these posts are, state positively that Langar, leading to Badakshan, and Kugiar, leading to Kashmir, are the only two outposts to pass when one travels to foreign states. A claim was made by Kokand to tax the trade coming from Kashmir and

Badakshan, and this claim was enforced by a temporary occupation of Serikol, and specifically the town of T'a-ha-érh-ma (Tagarma). When at last in 1837 the Kokandian tax-gatherers were got rid of, Serikol was exempted during three years from having to send tribute of cloth. In 1848-9 the Kara Kirghiz murdered the Kokand tax-gatherer who had appeared once more and had attempted to interfere with what the Chinese call 'beyond our outpost trade.' The Chinese published Annals end with 1860, and up to that date I can find nothing which bears upon the Chitral or Hunza region; but I may mention that on two occasions during the past fifteen years I have seen memorials from the Kashgar authorities stating that the 'Serikol tribe of southern Mussulmans' had sent their $1\frac{1}{2}$ oz. of tribute gold. The 'head-eye' or *tou-mu* (a slightly contemptuous word, not a title, having much the same shade of meaning as 'boss') is in one place called Mir Rajah, and in the other Khamchüt. Here, clearly, we have a third form of Khandjut, and also the origin of the mysterious 'Chinese title of *thun*'.

The following sentence from Mr Curzon's book (1894) explains all the other Chinese words 'We were met by the Thum, or Mir, or Rajah, Mohammed Nazim Khan.'

The most recent Chinese maps, one of which Lord Dunmore has published, place the Khandjut frontier at Mi-sz-ké (evidently the Miskar of the Russian maps), which they say is two stages from Taghdumbash. As they place the fort of Serikol between Tagarma and Taghdumbash, and the Ming-t'ieh Pass (Minteké) between Khandjut and Taghdumbash, which last place they say is 'eight stages from Khamchüt or Kanchud,' it is evident that by 'Serikol' they mean Tashkurgan (or 'Stone Fort'), and that by 'Taghdumbash' they mean Udjadbai (in the Taghdumbash district).

The above slender contribution represents all that I can find in the Chinese Annals bearing upon the subject. There is nothing recorded on either the Yarkand stone or the Somatash stone about Chitral, Hunza-Nagar, or any other place in that neighbourhood.

E. H. PARKER.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

NOTES.

CONFUCIAN CRITICISMS.—Su-tung-po attacked the Buddhists and blamed any of the literati who conformed to Buddhist worship or the worship of the Tauists. He also criticised the Sung emperors, for, being not content with the seven imperial temples of ancestors, they added Buddhist and Tauist temples to the ornamental buildings of their palaces. This is, he said, simply supplying ladders to the enemy to enter our fortress. Yang-shen of the Ming dynasty who mentions this adds that while Su-tung-po spoke in this way, at the same time he himself studied Buddhist literature with great eager-

ness. As Chwang-tsi said as long as we live we must be thinking and the subjects of thought are without end. This explains the inconsistency of Su-tung-po.

J. EDKINS.

CURRENCY AND GRAIN PRICES.—In the Soochow Fooche of 1881 it is stated that in A.D. 1524 the rice of the prefecture due to the emperor was 1,428,752 piculs. The silver equivalent was Taels 447.998. By dividing we have 3,189 piculs to a tael. The note says that a tael of silver was received for four piculs of rice and the same amount of wheat. Nineteen thousand pieces