

RENNELL's of 1782, more than hundred years later. On Kircher's map the sources of the Indus are more correct than those of the Ganges.

At some distance south of this big lake, the Manasarovar, there is another from which two rivers take their origin. The eastern one is obviously meant to be the Jumna, as Agra is situated on it and »Delli» not far from it. It does not join the Ganges but goes its own way to the sea. There can hardly be a doubt that the western river is meant to be the Satlej. Both the Satlej and the Jumna have two head branches on the map. The lake from which the two rivers issue has no name, but on Andrade's route west of it is Caparangue, as the cartographer did not know that this town was situated on the very river. The name of the river is Kauc flu., i. e. the river of Kauc or Guge (?). That the river is the Satlej is obvious from its running S.W. and its joining the Indus far below Attock. The hydrography of Panjab is of course far more absurd than on any contemporary map. The river comes from a lake which is situated south of the Manasarovar instead of west, just as in the case of the two lakes at the origin of the Hwang-ho on the same map.¹ This second lake is the Rakas-tal. It is no wonder if the cartographer was a little bewildered by the information in the narratives of Andrade and by those brought home by Henri Roth and Joseph. Andrade's route is marked on the map, though it does not harmonize very well with the physical geography of the same map. But the map shows that, in Kircher's opinion, Andrade passed through »Sgrinegar» in Garhwal and Caparangue, that he crossed the Satlej and went close west of the Rakas-tal and the Manasarovar and of Kailas, that he crossed the Transhimalayan mountains to Radoc (Rudok), by which the cartographer has made the mistake to let the road turn east instead of west. From Rudok he has returned to India the same way. This is what Kircher believed! But in reality Andrade never went beyond Tsaparang.

Comparing Kircher's text with his map, and comparing both with Andrade's narrative, the whole situation becomes perfectly clear. On the map as in the text the two lakes dominate the hydrographical system, just as in the mythical poetry and the belief of the Hindus. Andrade cannot be made responsible for the hydrography of the map. For he only saw *one* pool, from which the Ganges went to the south and another river, irrigating Tibet, to the north. And this does not at all agree with Kircher's map. This is the first time a European has made the Ganges take its origin from the Manasarovar. The informant, whosoever he may have been, probably a native who explained matters to Joseph or Roth, has certainly seen a river leaving the Manasarovar and believed it was the Ganges, and not simply the channel to Rakas-tal. He, or some other informant, has seen the Satlej leaving the Rakas-tal, just as the map represents it. He was, so far as we know,

¹ On Kircher's map China is taken from Martini 1655, except the Kia Lacus, which has disappeared.