

which flows into the Punjaub country; and two days journey west from the Maun Surwur is the large town of Tereé Ládak . . . Proceeding from Ládak, seven days journey to the southward, there is a mountain called Cailasa Cungri, which is exceedingly lofty; and on its summit there is a Bhowjputr tree, from the root of which sprouts or gushes a small stream, which the people say is the source of the Ganges, and that it comes from Vaicont'ha, or heaven, as is also related in the Puránas; . . . At four days' journey from Cailasa Cungri is a mountain called Bráhmada, or Brahma's staff, in which is the source of the Aliknundra Ganga . . .»

This description really betrays several defects of the memory of the holy Fakir. He has quite forgotten the situation of Kailas Gangri, and he has not been able to get the Ganges to rise from any of the two lakes. But he has heard the people say that the source of the Ganges is situated on the Kailas. He has nothing to say of any channel between the two lakes. When he says it is *one* lake, one feels inclined to think of a communication, but when he talks of a partition wall one thinks of two different lakes. He positively asserts that the Satlej comes out from Langak-tso and he makes the Brahmaputra begin from the Manasarovar. The fact that he makes one river flow to the east from the eastern lake, and the two other rivers to the west from the western lake seems to indicate that he regards the »partition wall» as a definite water-parting. Add to this that, although he went round the Manasarovar and visited the temples, he does not mention any channel. From all this one gets the impression that there was no water in the channel at the time of his journey which has obviously taken place several years before 1792, say 1770 or 1780.

It is not easy to draw any reliable conclusions from such a meagre and fantastic report as this and it would not be worth while to attempt the task, if it were not for using every possible hint in clearing up the periodical fluctuations in the hydrography of a country very little known. To a certain extent the Fakir's view is so like Tieffenthaler's map, that both seem to come from the same source. In both cases there is no talk of any channel; the Brahmaputra begins from the Manasarovar and the Sardjou or Surju begins from Rakas-tal. The names of the lakes are the same, although written in different ways, Manasaroar and Maun Surwur, Lanka Dhé and Lunkadh or Lunkdeh. The only difference is that on Tieffenthaler's map the Satlej goes out of the Manasarovar, whereas the Fakir makes it begin from Rakas-tal. The Fakir also makes the Ganges start from Kailas, but here he relies upon what people and Puránas say and does not tell where and how the river passes the lakes, unless he means that it goes to Rakas-tal and reappears in the Surju.

As he is wrong in everything he says about the Ganges, the Brahmaputra and the Surju, his statement of the Sutroodra, which happens to be correct, is not worth very much. But strengthened by the information given to Tieffenthaler, it points, although vaguely, to the fact that the Satlej really went out of the Rakas-tal in those days. And if this view be accepted, the channel between the lakes must, of physical necessity, also have been full of water, as the Satlej could not be fed from any other source.