

follow Andrade's text, which he has, of course, misunderstood, though his map, when nothing else was known from these regions, seems really to be in full accordance with Andrade's words: »onde nasce o Rio Ganga de hum grande tanque, & do mesmo nasce tambem outra, que rega as terras do Tibet», exactly as the legend on the map. From Andrade's pool issue the Ganges and the river watering Tibet; the same is the case with Delisle's lake. But by Tibet Andrade only meant Chaparangué. Delisle believes he meant the whole Royaume du Grand Tibet which is written north of and along the river; north of it is the Kingdom of Ladac or Laduca,<sup>1</sup> and south of it Rudoc or Redoc. Both Andrade and Delisle leave the river watering Tibet without a name. To Andrade it was only a small tributary to the Satlej; to Delisle it was a great river. He makes it flow through the Kingdom of Cogué, the present Guge, which in reality makes the river identical with the upper course of the Satlej, of which, however, Delisle could have no information. I have shown above that Kircher's lakes, Pl. XI, are the Manasarovar and Rakas-tal. Delisle, on the other hand, who missed the direct information Father Kircher had obtained, had no reason to confuse Andrade's pool with the Manasarovar. Therefore his map has no direct indication of this lake, except that his lake is too great for a pool.

To recapitulate, Delisle's hydrography is the following: the Indus and the Ganges rise close to each other in the mountains of Cachemire, for the river which enters the nameless lake from the N.W. is the uppermost Ganges, as shown on Delisle's map, *Carte de Tartarie* 1706 (Pl. XLI). Two rivers issue from the lake, one running eastwards through Tibet, the other being the Ganges. The Satlej has no connection with the lake. The topography is not bad, though the hydrographical combination of the different waters is wrong. The nameless river should be flowing west instead of east, and join the Satlej at Siba instead of the lake, and the Ganges should be cut off from the lake, and the map would be right. As it is the lake cuts the Satlej in two pieces, of which the upper half belongs to Cogue, the lower starts from Siba.

Only a very scanty knowledge of Tibet had been gained in Europe about 1705, and still it was sufficient to confuse even the most clever draughtsmen. To place the different kingdoms, rivers and mountains approximately correctly in relation to each other was, of course, impossible. Delisle gives us a very fine proof of the maximum of correctness to which such attempts could reach. He separates Tibet from India with a double range called M. de Purbet ou de Naugracut, of which the first name *eo ipso* means mountain.

North of these mountains Delisle has seven kingdoms, or six if Grand Tibet be considered as including the whole lot. Leaving eastern Tibet, with Lassa alone, we have so far five kingdoms: Ladac, Cogué, Rudoc, Utsang, and Moriul. Here again Andrade is his source. For when the Portuguese missionary, accompanied by

<sup>1</sup> In his *Histoire . . . du Tibet*, p. 39, Andrade uses the form Lodacca.