

the case of the Brahmaputra I would say that the source is to be found in one great glacier and that the brooks from smaller glaciers contribute to the volume of the brook from the principal glacier.

One year later, or August 15th, 1895, I crossed the Wakhjir Pass, though I did not pay any special attention to the source; but as far as my observations went I agree completely with Curzon's opinion.¹

Curzon's examination of the different rivers which have been claimed as the source is extremely able and does not omit a single case. He says the little river joining at Bozai Gumbaz, which CAPUS regarded as one of the parent streams has not a single argument in its favour. The next claimant is the Pamir-river from Sor-kul or Victoria Lake, discovered by WOOD in 1838. Wood regarded it as the true parent stream of the Oxus, and Curzon shows that it has taken fifty years to rectify the mistake. Neither in length, volume, nor any of the requisite characteristics can it claim to be the parent stream.

The Bartang, Murghab or Aksu, which comes from the Chakmak Lake has been defended as the parent stream by VENIUKOFF, RAWLINSON and others, an opinion which has found favour with some who were unacquainted with the full geographical details. In favour of the Aksu it has been said that it is longer and has a greater volume than the Panja. The Russians give it a length of 252 miles from the Chakmak Lake to Kala Wamar, whereas the Panja from its source to the same point was roughly estimated at 240 miles. Curzon does not regard the length as a proof of a river being a parent river. And in this case he finds the length of Panja to be 270 miles.

Regarding the volume, Curzon's opinion should be compared with the method I have been following when examining whether the Maryum-chu or the Kubi-tsangpo should be regarded as the source of the Brahmaputra. Curzon says:² »it is obvious that the sole method of applying this test is . . . by measurement of the volume of the two streams at the point of junction. Not one of the advocates of the Aksu-Murghab theory, however, has ever visited Kala Wamar». NEY ELIAS had found, in November 1885, that the Panja was much more voluminous than the Aksu. Curzon also shows that the source of the Panja is situated at a higher elevation. Finally he points out that the historical proofs are not without weight. His words run: »The final argument is that of historical authority and popular acceptance. In the first place, it is noteworthy that, from as far back as records extend, the identity of the river below Kala Wamar with the Panja (and not with the Murghab) above has been assumed by the inhabitants of the district, indicating that, in their opinion, this was the parent stream. Like the Greek Oxus, so the Persian name Panja is applied to the river both below and above Kala Wamar . . .» Already in 1815 Lieut. MACARTNEY

¹ My observations on this journey have never been worked out or published. There is only a short account in popular form in *Through Asia*, Vol. II, p. 685. London 1898.

² Loc. cit. p. 36.