

mountains of Kara-korum. Burnes reduces to reasonable dimensions the fantastic Indus of Dras. The following passage contains a good deal of truth:

»That the river of Ladak has its source near the lake of Mansurour has been satisfactorily established by Moorcroft. The course of this branch of the Indus is, therefore, of great length; but the volume of water has been described to me as very small, though it receives several tributaries. The Shyook, on the other hand, is said to be a vast river, formed of many small ones, and discharges the water and melted snows of the Kara-korum mountains . . . This is considered by the natives as the great trunk of the Indus, and its source, to the NE of Ladak, is, consequently, that of the Indus.»

I have never heard the natives pretend that the Shayok should be regarded as the source of the Indus, but if one only considers the volume of water, it no doubt ought to be so. But as even the natives regard the N.E. branch in Tibet as the source, and also point out the very source itself, Singi-kabab, we have no cause whatever to create another source of the Indus.

It is interesting to compare Burnes' opinion with Baron VON HÜGEL's view of the source of the Indus. In his *Glossarium* he says that beyond the Himalaya range the course of this river is not yet ascertained with any certainty and its origin is unknown. He also finds it probable that the highest range of the Himalaya, is pierced by the Indus, the Jhelum and the Satlej, but so little is known of the country beyond the Himalaya, that the highest range may easily be situated beyond the sources of these rivers.¹ Regarding the main source of the Satlej, he says that it has, so far, never been followed to its origin, although it seems to come out from the lake Rawan-hrad.

Hügel regards the Kailas as a considerable mountain range which, approximately, stretches in the 31st latitude, and, beyond the Himalaya, is parallel to the Satlej, so that the sources of one of its sides belong to the Satlej, and those of the other to Tibet. It is curious how almost everybody who has paid any attention to the Kailas has his own conception of it, differing from that of everybody else. As a rule it is regarded as a great mountain range, while, in reality it is only a peak on the southern side of a mountain system. Hügel's route lies west of our regions as he did not even proceed so far as Ladak. His work is adorned with a map by JOHN ARROWSMITH, drawn in 1847, from Hügel's own manuscript maps.²

Finally, from 1843 there is an article by Lieut. J. D. CUNNINGHAM, that is nothing else than a compilation from Moorcroft and Gerard, but also interesting on account of the information Cunningham himself has got.³ He tries to introduce some order in the nomenclature of the four rivers. The Indus is called Sinh Khabab,

¹ Carl von Hügel: *Kaschmir und das Reich der Siek*. Stuttgart 1840, Vol. IV, p. 102. (Vol. IV published in 1848.)

² Already on his map of 1836 Hügel calls the Indus, above and below Leh, the Singhey Chu. *Journal Royal Geogr. Society* 1836.

³ Notes on Moorcroft's Travels in Ladakh, and on Gerard's Account of Kunáwar, including a general description of the latter district. Communicated by the Gov:t of India. *Journ. Asiat. Society of Bengal*, Vol. XIII, I, 1844, p. 172 et seq.