

direct north of Kashmir.¹ The list of different opinions could easily be multiplied, but the task would be useless.² On his most interesting and instructive map: »Zentralasien zur Zeit der alten Handelsbeziehungen zwischen China und den Iranisch-Turanischen Ländern» Dr. A. HERRMANN identifies the Sera metropolis with Liang-chow and the Casii Montes with the northern border ranges of the Kwen-lun. Comparing the Casii Montes with the Oecharde, and accepting this river, beyond doubt, as the Tarim, the Casii Montes must of course be the Kwen-lun. Richthofen also identifies the Casii Montes with the Kwen-lun, though only the western part. In fact the Casii Montes are the same as the Chinese Tsung-ling or »the Onion mountains». Therefore the space which, on Ptolemy's map, is situated between the Casii Montes and Emodus and its eastern continuation, should belong to the Tibetan highlands. And as there is only one river, the Bautisus, flowing from west to east, only the Tsangpo could be meant. And still I believe that the Bautisus is meant to be the Tarim, or, in other words, that this river has been represented twice on Ptolemy's map. Ptolemy has got his information from merchants, who, themselves, had been informed by natives and travellers. It would not be surprising if Ptolemy had misunderstood his different direct or indirect informants and believed that what he heard about the Tarim, from two different informants, in fact referred to two different rivers.³

Therefore, where Richthofen finds a striking correspondence between the Auxakian, Kasian and Emodus mountains with the Tian-shan, Kwen-lun and Himalaya, this correspondence is chimerical. The northern slopes of the Casii Montes are the same as the northern slopes of the Emodus; therefore the Tarim river appears twice. In reality there is no sign of Tibet on Ptolemy's map, much less of any Tibetan river. The Kwen-lun and the Himalaya, inclusive, of course, of all the rest of Tibet with Arka-tag, Kara-korum and Transhimalaya, or in one word the

¹ Deuxième Mémoire, p. 375.

² DEGUIGNES is not quite clear in his identification. He speaks of Khotan-darya which loses itself in the desert, and of two other rivers, obviously the Yarkand-darya and Aksu-darya. Of the latter two he says: Les deux autres vont plus loin, et après s'être réunies, elles se jettent dans un grand lac, appelé Lop, qui est situé dans la partie la plus basse de tout ce grand terrain. Les anciens Chinois pensoient que les deux fleuves dont je viens de parler étoient le même que le Hoam-ho . . . Cette dernière idée mise à part, Ptolémée paroît avoir aussi confondu le Hoam-ho avec ces deux fleuves sous le nom d'Oecharde. — Further on he says that Bautisus takes its origin in the Montes Cassii or the Tsung-ling of the Chinese, situated S.W. of Kashgar. Dans les mêmes montagnes Tsung-ling vers Yerken il sort un grand fleuve qui va se rendre dans celui qui part d'Aksou, l'un & l'autre se jettent dans le lac de Lop. Les Chinois appellent le plus méridional Cheou-pa-ho, il doit être le Bautisus. — Histoire générale des Huns, Tome I, seconde partie, p. V and XXXIX. Paris 1756. — In this second case he identifies Bautisus with Yarkand-darya.

³ I wrote to Dr. A. HERRMANN to hear his opinion in the matter and he answered, amongst other things: »Der Bautisus kann nicht der Tsang-po sein. Auf der Karte des Marinus ist, wie ich bei der Rekonstruktion desselben fand, jener Name noch nicht enthalten; erst PTOLEMÄUS hat ihn eingeführt, ohne dass er sich auf bestimmte Nachrichten stützen konnte; er hat in dem Bautisus nur die marinische Darstellung des Oecharde (= Tarim und seine Fortsetzung der Hwang-ho) schematisch nachgeahmt. Es wäre daher falsch, in dem Bautisus einen tibetanischen Fluss suchen zu wollen; er existierte nur auf der so fehlerhaften Karte des PTOLEMÄUS.»