

WICQUEFORT in a new edition of MANDELSLO's narrative. The map comes from the offices of PIERRE VAN DER AA, and is very much of the same type as Jansson's map of 1641, (Pl. XXVIII).¹ At any rate it is nearly a hundred years too old, and shows what the publishers allowed themselves, and what the public had to accept. To the same class belongs the map reproduced as Pl. XLVIII. It dates from about 1739.² The Chiamay Lac. has been captured by the Ganges river system, though the old Chiamay Lake, under the name of Cananor or Cunabete, still plays its part as being the source of the four Indo-Chinese rivers. On serious maps the lake does not exist any more, and d'Anville has the sources of the Indo-Chinese rivers in or on the borders of Tibet.

The name of the lake has undergone very insignificant changes in the course of time. Barros writes Chiamay and his spelling has been adopted by Mercator, Herbert, Jansson, Blaeu, Sanson d'Abbeville, Visscher, de Witt, Coronelli, and certainly by a great many others who have not been discussed in the preceding chapters. Gastaldi (1561) has Cayamay. Ortelius writes Cajamai, though his second copy is called Chyamai. Hondius and Hoeius have Chiamai. Martini writes Kia, instead of Kiamay. Cantelli has Chimai, Witsen Chimoi, and Delisle Chaamay; names which have only augmented the confusion are Coconor, Zim, Cunabete, Kananor, Cara Nor, and Möhill. Disregarding these later attempts, the prototype is Chiamay, and such the name has remained from 1550 to 1705, or perhaps somewhat longer, with some unimportant variations in spelling. This is very natural, for the lake had been created by a misunderstanding, and Barros has heard the name as Chiamay. As nobody ever heard of it after his time, the name given by him had to remain intact. Nobody had any new information to bring, nor any new correction to add.

How could Barros positively assert the existence of a lake in an unknown country, where, as has fully been proved by the exploration of a later time, no lake exists at all? This question is impossible to answer with any degree of certainty. Natives on the banks of Irrawaddi, Salwen, and Menam would not pretend that their rivers come from a great inland sea. The information is probably not first hand. It may have come from Hindus living on the banks of the Brahmaputra, who have been convinced that their river came from a lake, which gave rise to three other great rivers. As the Indus and the Ganges ever since Ptolemy's time were supposed to be known as *not* coming from a lake, and as the Satlej was almost unknown,

¹ The lake is mentioned in Wicquefort's edition, Vol. I, p. 54, where the province of Udessa is placed between the provinces of Kandwana, Patna, Jesual, and Mewat, and the lake Chiamay. P. 290 he says of the Kingdom of Bengal: »Le Gange la traverse presque tout, & il est encore arrosé par les rivières du Guenga, du Caor, & du Cosmin.» And of the river of Menan we learn, p. 305: »elle est si longue, que jusqu'ici on n'a pas encore pu monter jusqu'à sa source».

² This map which was kindly shown to me at the Royal Library of Berlin, has the title: *Asiae Recentissima Delineatio, qua Status et Imperia totius Orientis unacum Orientalibus Indiis exhibentur* Authore Jo. Bapt. Homanno Norimbergæ.