

EARLY EUROPEAN KNOWLEDGE OF TIBET.

By *SVEN HEDIN*.

As the manuscript of Dr. *Jarl Charpentier's* article on Vol. I of my work "Southern Tibet", has kindly been submitted to me for perusal before printing by the Editor of "Geografiska Annaler", I have got an opportunity to enter somewhat more deeply upon a few questions of absorbing interest. To begin with I wish to express my sincere thanks to Dr. Charpentier for his much too kind and favorable opinion of my audacious attempt to penetrate the ancient knowledge of Tibet. A perfect stranger as I am within the domains of Sanscrit literature — and all other literatures — I met the greatest difficulties when trying to extract from Indian works published in European languages the principal features of the real information of the ancient Indians regarding the inhospitable countries north of the Himalaya. Most heartily do I agree with Dr. Charpentier in his wish that this highly fascinating and nearly virgin field of science should at last be ploughed by scholars familiar both with the Hindu language and culture, and with the geography of the mighty mountains. In the first pages of his article Dr. Charpentier has with great perspicacity and clearness drawn up the ground-lines of such a work, and he has herewith, and by other erudite studies published by him, undoubtedly proved himself to be the very man for carrying through the scheme.

The size and the plan of my "Southern Tibet" made it impossible for me to be master of and to make use of anything except the most important works dealing with the connection between antiquity and India, together with its neighbouring countries. Volumes have been written on the relations of Greeks and Romans with Oriental peoples. And within my 300 pages I had to compress at least the most important parts of all that was known of the mountainous countries north of India — from the remotest antiquity to the end of the eighteenth century. Even if I had had access to the whole discussion regarding, for instance, such a problem as Aornes, I should not have allowed this detail, which only indirectly touched upon my own regions, to grow to disproportionate dimensions. I am glad to hear that in this particular question *Vincent A. Smith*

in important points corroborates the results long ago arrived at by my principal authority on this subject, *Vivien de Saint Martin*. I could never think of completeness as regards sources. For such travellers as *Pian de Carpine* and *Rubruck*, who would indeed require a volume each, I had very little space. They could only pass by amongst many other early pioneers, so much the more as they have had nothing to say of the geography of Tibet. Their religious and ethnological accounts may be ever so interesting; but in a work on Tibet, where they never set foot, and of which they only heard, they can hardly be more than mentioned. It has therefore been a matter of secondary importance for my purpose, which editions of their travels I have consulted, provided that the sources have been reliable.¹ It may be regarded as beyond doubt that *Bacon* has simply copied Rubruck, and he is far from being the only one who has done so.

Before entering at greater length upon the three principal topics to which Dr. Charpentier has devoted special attention, I may perhaps be allowed to say a few words regarding matters of chiefly bibliographical, orthographical and personal importance, which, as they appear in his article, may indeed be accepted as great improvements and very welcome additions to my Vol. I.

I have the impression that Vincent A. Smith's judgement of *Mandelslo* is a little too severe, and I cannot quite agree in Dr. Charpentier's opinion that the real value of his work is nearly nil. But *Hugh Murray* exaggerates in the opposite direction in saying: "One of the most active and intelligent travellers in India, was Mandelslo, a German who went to Persia in the train of an embassy sent by the Duke of Holstein."² *Olearius*, who as a rule is very critical regarding his sources, has perfect confidence in Mandelslo. Nor should we forget that Mandelslo, when he wrote his will, in December 1638, was only 22½ years old, and just 23 years, when he wrote his letter from Madagascar.³ It would be unjust to expect too much from a traveller of that age.

The first edition of Mandelslo's original account has the year 1645,⁴ and is attached to Olearius' great narrative with the printing year 1647. It has the title: *Folget Ein Schreiben, des Wol Edlen, Gestrengen vnd Vesten Johan Albrecht von Mandelslow, so Er auss der Insel Madagascar an M. Adamum Olearium gethan, in welchem Er seine Reise auss Persien nach Ost-Indien durch den Oceanum Summarischer Weise erzehlet. Gedruckt i Schleszwig, im Jahr 1645.* The letter from Madagascar, dated S. Augustin Bay July 12th, 1639, is 27 pages

¹ In another connection I have briefly dealt with the religious part of *Rubruck's* narrative. — *Transhimalaya*, Vol. III. London 1913, p. 119 and 313.

² "Historical Account of Discoveries and Travels in Asia", Vol II. Edinburgh, 1820, p. 172.

³ He was born May 15, 1616, and died May 15, 1644.

⁴ I have made the mistake of giving (p. 148) the printing year as Schleszwig 1658, which indicates a later edition of the whole work.

in length, and has a "Complement oder Ergänzung der Indianischen Reise, aus des von Mandelslow fleissig gehaltenen Journal vnd Reise-Buch kürztlich gezogen. The letter is only a very short general narrative of the journey sent to Olearius, but the title of the "Complement" indicates that he had written a more detailed Journal or Book of Travel.

In the copy of Olearius' *Vermehrte Neue Beschreibung der Muscowitischen vnd Persischen Reyse so durch gelegenheit einer Holsteinischen Gesandschaft an den Russischen Zaar vnd König in Persien geschehen* (Schleszwig MDCLVI) — there is no addition of Mandelslo's journey, which seems also to have been published as an independent book. This also appears from the following passage of Olearius, p. 380: In diesem Convivio machte der Hoch Edle Johan Albrecht von Mandelslo mit mir ein Verbündniss, dass, wer unter vns am ersten stürbe, vom andern zum Gedächtniss mit einer Lob-Schrifft geehret werden solte, welches ich auch nach meiner wenigkeit gethan, wie in dessen Morgenländischer Reyse beschreibung, so ich absonderlich heraus gebe, zu sehen.

Now, how much of the statements regarding the rivers of North India that are to be found in *Wicquefort's* edition of Mandelslo's journey, really comes from Mandelslo himself, or simply is added by Olearius and Wicquefort, I cannot tell; nor was it of great consequence for my purpose. In Mandelslo's letter from Madagascar there is not a word of the Indian rivers. If he has mentioned them in his "Journal", he has borrowed his wisdom from Sir *Thomas Roe*, from *Terry* and other authors, as I indicate p. 147, 148. For my object, which was to examine how much of the Himalayan regions was known by the Europeans of old times, the printing years and the bibliographical details were of comparatively small interest. The very able article ("The credit due to the book entitled 'The Voyages and Travels of J. Albert de Mandelslo into the East Indies'.") which Vincent A. Smith has published in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1915, p. 245 et seq., appeared more than a year after the printing of my Vol. I, and, therefore, could not be used. But even if "the greater portion of the work passing under the name of Mandelslo is merely a compilation made partly by Olearius and partly by de Wicquefort", the statements found in it were of importance for my historical geography. Regarding the particular geographical problem I was treating, namely the knowledge of the situation of the sources of the Indus and the Ganges, the information found in Mandelslo, whosoever may originally have picked it up (*De Laët*, *Olearius*, *Manrique*, or *Wicquefort*) was indeed extremely meagre. In this particular detail the book, as it appeared from Wicquefort's hand, was just as poor as all other books of the period, owing to the fact that Europeans did not yet know anything of the mountains north of "Mogor", nor of the sources of the famous rivers. And after all, what did *Roe*, *Terry*, *De Laët*, and the rest know of these problems, which

craved some 250 years more to get cleared up! Nor can I see why Mandelslo should be blamed. According to the preface of *John Davies*, who translated Wicquefort's first edition into English, in 1662 and a second edition in 1669, there must have existed other annotations, in Mandelslo's own hand, than the mere letter from Madagascar, and the supplementary log of the voyage to England. Davies says:¹ "Being at Surat, in December 1638, he made a kind of *Will*, concerning his papers, which he put before the beginning of his Relation, wherein he desir'd his Friend Olearius, not to suffer it to be publish'd, in regard he had not had the leisure to digest it into order, or if he did, that he would rather regard therein his reputation after his death, than the friendship they had mutually promis'd one another, and faithfully improv'd, during the four years of their joynt-Travels."

Mandelslo himself therefore does not seem to have been very keen about the publication of "his Papers". If anybody has to be blamed it is the other German, Olearius, and specially the Frenchman, Wicquefort, who did their best to improve the original text! In any case it is of very great bibliographical interest that the matter has been cleared up by Vincent A. Smith in such an able and erudite way.

Regarding *Manouchi* Dr. Charpentier remarks "that the real name of the author quoted on p. 72 n. was *Manucci*, and that his work 'Storia do Mogor' is available in a complete English translation . . ."

The title of the whole work runs, in *W. Irvine's* translation, thus: "Storia do Mogor or Mogul India 1653—1708 by *Niccolao Manucci*." The title of the translated text is: "Travels in India, and History of the Mogul Rulers, divided into three Parts, by Mr. *Nicolas Manouchi*." In *Latina et Italica D. Marci Bibliotheca Codicum manuscriptorum per titulos digesta*, (by *Ant. Mar. Zanetti*) Venice 1741, he is called *Niccolo Manuzzi*. — *François Catrou*: *Histoire générale de l'Empire du Mogol depuis sa fondation jusqu' à présent sur les mémoires portugais du M. Manouchi*, Venetien. Another French version has *Manouchy*. *J. Talboys Wheeler* in his *History of India* (for instance Vol. IV. p. 322 et passim) has adopted the French spelling *Manouchi*. — *Bernoulli* writes *Manuzzi*. He says in his "Vermischte Noten zu dem ersten Bande", referring to *Storia do Mogor*:²

"Der Titel ist eigentlich: *Histoire générale de l'Empire du Mogol depuis sa fondation; sur les Mémoires Portugais de M. Manouchi, Vénitien, à la Haye, 1708* . . . Den wirklichen Urheber dieses wichtigen Buches sollte man nicht wie sein Redactor, *Manouchi*, auch nicht wie der P. Tieffenthaler, *Manucci* nennen, sondern

¹ *Vincent A. Smith*, loc. cit. p. 251.

² Des Pater *Joseph Tieffenthaler's* etc. Beschreibung von Hindustan, Bd. II, p. 192.

nach dem Venetianischen Dialecte Manuzzi." The man himself wrote his name *Nicolas Manuci*. *Manucci*, however, is no doubt the best spelling.

The relation between Manucci and Catrou is explained in the preface to Irvine's edition of "Storia do Mogor". In connection with the history of early travels to the source of the Ganges, the most important thing for my purposes was to find the fullest version, from a geographical point of view. I therefore preferred Catrou. It is easy to see which of the two contains most geographical detail, if we compare Catrou (quoted in my Vol. I, p. 72) with the text of Manucci as it is given in W. Irvine's translation of "Storia do Mogor".¹ Of special interest in Catrou's account is the statement that the Indians since the days of *Akbar* had found that the Cow's Head was not the source of the Ganges, but that the river "rises much higher in the Country towards the middle of Great Tartary."²

As in the case of Manucci, the spelling of many other names may be a matter of taste or language; and it is not always sufficient to make it a rule to write in the same way as the owner of the name did. A great Swedish general in the army of Charles XII, who in our historical works is nearly always called *Rehnsköld*, wrote his name *Rehnschiöldt*. *Cesare de' Federici* is called *Caesar Frede-*

¹ Manucci tells us:

"Akbar had been anxious for a long time to satisfy two subjects of curiosity, which he kept in his heart... The second was to find the source of the famous river Ganges... For the second inquiry he selected persons of good judgment and provided them with everything necessary — servants, conveyances, and sufficient money. They were on their travel for several months, and at the end of the time they returned and repaired to the king. He asked them what they had seen and where they had been. After all, the only thing they could say was that they had climbed many mountains, keeping always to the course of the stream, which each day grew smaller. After much marching, they arrived at mountains covered with forest. Here they had hard work to get through. When they had traversed these woods, they encountered a very high and large mountain having at its foot a great cow's head sculptured out of the very rock. From the mouth in this head issued a stream of water with such force that no one could keep his feet in front of it. They exerted themselves to ascend the great mountain, to see whether there was any river on beyond. But it was not possible to reach the top. Therefore they turned back and reported what they had seen. I am unable to affirm whether this was verily the river Ganges or not. For it would require one to exhaust one's purse, and perhaps lose one's life, if another attempt were made." — Irvine's translation, Vol. I, p. 142, 143.

² Of *Catrou Robert Orme* says: "The Jesuit, known by other works, wrote the History of the Mogul Emperors, from the memoirs of Manouchi, who had been physician to Sultan Mauzum. We find Manouchi at Madrass in the year 1691; but Catrou says, that the memoirs which he received from him came down to the year 1700. Mr. Anquetil du Perron, in his *Legislation Orientale*, published in 1778, says, that he saw the manuscript of Manouchi in the year 1763, in the library of the Jesuits of the *Maison Professe*. We are informed that this manuscript was not inserted in the catalogue of the sale, when the effects of the Jesuits were confiscated in 1773; nor had it been reserved for the king's library. It is supposed to have been carried into Holland, and is well worth recovering." *Historical Fragments of the Mogul Empire, of the Morattoes, and of the English Concerns in Indostan*... London, MDCCCV, p. 168.

ricke, not only by the old English collectors of travels, but also by Sir *Henry Yule*. Though this form, therefore, may very well be used in a work in English, I quite agree with Dr. *Charpentier* that the Italian form should be preferred. The same may be said of *John Hay*, where I, unfortunately, have used the French form *Jean Hay*. *Wessels* has the Dutch form *Joannes Hay*. A deplorable mistake is my "*Linscouter*", where I have been misled by the Latin form *Linscotanus*. Of course the spelling *Linschoten* is the only correct one.¹

The name of the famous astronomer Father *Adam Schaal* appears in different forms in the works of different authors. Father *Grosier* writes *Adam Schale* and says:² Le P. Adam Schal, jésuite de Cologne en Allemagne, le même que Nieuhof appelle Adam Schale, en latin Scaliger.³ Je fais cette remarque pour qu'on ne se trompe pas avec l'abbé Prévôt, qui paroît les avoir pris pour deux personnes différentes. *De Mailla* writes the name correctly, viz. *Schaal*.⁴ *Du Halde* uses both forms, *Schall* and *Schaal*.⁵ *Athanasius Kircher*, as a rule, calls him *Schall*, occasionally also *Adamus Schale a Zell*.⁶ Under the portrait

¹ Such mistakes, as well as the anachronism *Ortelius-Andrade* and the date of *Athanasius Kircher's* birth, which I have from the last edition of Brockhaus' *Konv. Lex.*, will have to be entered amongst the Errata, in Vol. IV. I am greatly indebted to Dr. *Charpentier* for drawing my attention to them. But when Dr. *Charpentier* says: "On p. 158 the new edition of *Benedict Goës* in the Vol. IV. of *Yule's* *Cathay* and the way thither (revised by *Cordier*) issued by the Hakluyt Society in 1916 is not mentioned", he seems not to have been aware of the note on p. XII of my preface, from which it appears that my Vol. I had been printed one or two years before the *Cathay* volume was published. The latter will, however, be of great use to me for my Vol. VIII, dealing with the Karakorum and neighbouring mountains in Western Tibet.

² *De Mailla*: *Histoire générale de la Chine*, T. XI, p. 41.

³ *Het Gezantschap Der Néerlandtsche Oost-Indische Compagnie . . . etc.* Editions of 1665 and 1670. The edition accessible to me is the Latin edition: *Legatio Batavica ad Magnum Tartariæ Chamum Sungteium . . . per Joannem Nieuhovium* (Joan Nieuhoff), *Amstelodami Anno MDCLXXIII*. At an audience *Nieuhoff* says (op. cit. P. I, p. 144): *Cancellarius supremo loco complicatis pedibus more Tartarico, ad dextrum duo Tartarici Magnates; ad lævam Jesuita quidam, Adam Scaliger, Colonia Agrippina, ut ipse ferebat, oriundus, qui jam per quadraginta & sex annos in Pekingensi aula, adhuc stante familia Taiminga, honoribus floruerat, extrema jam senecta ac promissa in pectus incana barba venerabilis videbatur.* This was in 1656, for the Dutch embassy took place in 1655—1657. *Adam Schaal* was 65 years old at that time, for he was born in 1591. He died in 1669, in the eighth year of Kang-hi.

⁴ Op. cit. p. 362.

⁵ *Description de l'Empire de la Chine etc.* I, p. 530 and 537.

⁶ When Dr. *Charpentier* says: "The famous father mentioned by Dr. *Hedin* p. 262 as *Schaal* is *Joh. Adam Schall von Bell*", he is in accordance also with *Henri Cordier* in *Bibliotheca Sinica*, Vol. II, Fasc. I, col. 1094. *Abel-Rémusat* in his *biographie* in *Nou. Mél. Asiat.* does not know anything of *von Bell*, which certainly is only the name of his birthplace, in the same way as *Georgi* calls *Orasio della Penna* — *Pinnabilensis* or *Penna de Billi*. There is a place *Bell* some 75 km south of Cologne west of the Rhine, and there is a village *Zell* on the Mosel about 100 km south of Cologne. *Kircher* has an *Epigraphe Ecclesiæ Pekinensis*, *Soc. Jesu.* signed as follows: *Posuit dedicavitque, Anno M.D.C.L. Xun Chi VII. Pater Ioannes Adamus Schale a Zell Germanus . . . etc.* — *China monumentis*

of the venerable Father he has the legend: P. Adamus Schall Germanus I Ordinis Mandarinus.¹ The name is therefore written in several ways, and, in spite of *Platzweg* and *De Backer-Sommervogel*, to whom *Abel-Rémusat* and Henri Cordier and certainly many other authors may be added, I prefer to use the spelling adopted by two of the most famous students of matters Chinese, viz. *Richt-hofen*² and *A. Conrady*, who both write *Schaal*.³

The spelling *Schaal* or *Schall* must therefore be a matter of taste. The same can be said of *Tieffenthaler's* name. In the latter case I have followed the example of *Johann Bernoulli*: Des Pater Joseph Tieffenthaler's historisch-geographische Beschreibung von Hindustan. In the French edition of this work the spelling is the same. *Ritter* has *Tieffenthaler*⁴, and so has *Charles-Eudes Bonin*.⁵ In a note (Vol. I, p. 280) I say: He (the Father himself) wrote his name Tieffentaller, but I use the spelling of his commentators.

We now come to the most interesting part of Dr. Charpentier's article, in which he has added so much valuable and important information to some chapters of my Vol. I, viz., 1) Who was the first European to visit Tibet? 2) Who amongst European authors was the first to mention the Manasarovar? And, 3) how did the conception of the Lago de Chiamay originate?

Regarding the question: Who was the first European to visit Tibet? — we may safely confide ourselves to Dr. *Berthold Laufer's* guidance. It is a pity that I could not consult his excellent article on this subject in the T'oung-pao for 1914, as it appeared when the greatest part of my Vol. I was already printed.⁶ I had therefore nothing else to do than to trust the high authority of Sir Henry Yule in "Cathay and the way thither", and Henri Cordier in his great monography on the life of *Odoric de Pordenone*. The latter says: "Odoric

... illustrata, Amstelodami, Anno MDCCCLXVII, p. 107. — I am not able to settle whether *Adam Schaal* was born at Bell or at Zell, but so much is certain, that the birthplace is quite superfluous at the end of his name.

¹ China... illustrata, p. 113.

² China, I, p. 657.

³ China, p. 563. Swedish edition of *J. von Pflugk-Harttung's* Världshistoria, edited by *Harald Hjörne*, Kina af Dr. *A. Conrady*, transl. by Dr. *J. Kolmodin*, p. 559.

⁴ Entwurf zu einer Karte vom ganzen Gebirgssysteme des Himälaya, Berlin 1832.

⁵ Les Royaumes des Neiges, Paris 1911.

⁶ In the note mentioned above I say: "Vol. I was being printed from July 1914 till February 1916 ..." The greatest part of this volume was printed during the summer and autumn of 1914 — the remaining chapters in the winter of 1915—16. Several works which indeed would have been very important for my task, appeared *after* the bulk of my Vol. I had been through the press. Amongst them was Reese's book on the Greeks' knowledge of India before Alexander.

revient en Europe par le Chan-si, le Chen-si, le Se-tchouan et le Tibet, et il est le premier Européen qui nous parle de Lhasa." And further, regarding the capital Gota: "Dans tous les cas, il est hors de doute qu'il s'agit ici de Lhasa et qu'Odoric est le premier Européen qui ait visité cette ville."¹

In geographical literature, in point of fact, Odoric has been generally accepted as the first European in Tibet. A few examples are sufficient. *C. Puini* has no doubt as to the journey itself, but he has met with the same difficulties regarding the route as all the rest: "Non è facile determinare di dove Odorico uscisse dal Tibet."² *J. Deniker* speaking of *Grueber*: "... qui, s'il a eu un prédécesseur dans Odoric de Pordenone, n'en est pas moins le premier Européen qui ait donné une description tant soit peu détaillée du Tibet."³ When *C. Wessels* says: "Alleen de Franciscaner monnik Odorico de Pordenone, moor deze van China uit, heeft vóór Andrade Tibet bereikt, echter niet het Sadlatschgebied," he shows that he has found no reason to doubt the veracity of the Italian Friar.⁴ *Richard Garbe*, speaking of the Christian mission to Tibet, says: "Im Jahre 1330 fand der erste dorthin gelangte Europäer Odoricus von Pordenone in der Hauptstadt von Tibet — that is to say in Lhasa — schon christliche Missionare und einige Konvertiten vor."⁵ This statement is, of course, absurd.

Waddell, on the other hand, who accompanied *Younghusband's* Mission to Lhasa, has expressed his doubts; and *Graham Sandberg* only spends eight lines upon the Friar, where the following passage is read: "This worthy did not make any pretence of having approached the confines of Tibet."⁶ In spite of the doubts of *Waddell* and *Laufer*, *Cordier* seems not to have changed his original opinion in the new edition of "Cathay and the Way thither", 1913. He sticks to the view that *Yule* held some fifty years earlier. But already 170 years ago *Astley* regarded Odoric as a rather suspicious fellow and called him "a lying Friar". He says: "It seems plain, from the Names of Places and other Circumstances, that he never was in those Countries, but imposed on the Public the few informations he had from others, mixed with the many Fictions of his own."⁷ This hard judgement was very unjust, and modern research has rehabilitated Odoric.

I feel perfectly convinced of the veracity of Odoric's short narrative of his journey to Tibet. He says: De hac provincia recedens veni ad unum magnum

¹ Les voyages en Asie; Odoric de Pordenone, Paris MDCCCXCI p. XXIX et 458. — *Cordier's* identification of Gota with Pota-la or Bod cannot be correct.

² Il Tibet, Roma, 1904, p. XXVI.

³ La Géographie, Tome XIII, 1906, p. 104.

⁴ Tijdschrift voor Godsdienst, Wetenschap en Letteren, Afl. No. 4. Jaarg. 44. Deel LXXVII, 1912 p. 24.

⁵ Indien und das Christentum, Tübingen, 1914, p. 184.

⁶ Exploration of Tibet, Calcutta, 1904, p. 22.

⁷ New General Collection of Voyages and Travels, Vol. IV. London MDCCXLVII, p. 620.

regnum nomine Tybot quod ipsi Indiæ est confine.¹ The only question is to ascertain what he means by Tibet. For it is obvious from the different texts that he has not only heard some more or less vague stories about Tibet: "De ceste province m'en alay jusques à une autre très grande qui a nom Riboth . . . etc." — "Passando questa provincia grande perveni a un altro gran regno che si chiama Tibet, . . . etc." It is only in the French text of his journey that we are told that the capital of the Kingdom Riboth (Tibet) is called Gota.

Dr. Laufer reminds us of the great scholars who have accepted the story of the Friar's visit to Lhasa, as *Richthofen*, *Markham*, *Yule* and *Rockhill*. He shows the identity between *Carpini*, *Rubruck* and *Odoric* regarding the custom of treating the dead by the Tibetans, and the two first mentioned were never in Tibet. He then comes to the question of "bread and wine" and to the Friar's expression: "The folk of that country dwell in tents made of black felt", which Laufer regards as decisive against Odoric, as the Tibetans dwell in tents of black cloth woven from yak-hair. *Laufer* says: "It is obvious beyond any doubt that Odoric's observation refers, not to Tibetan, but to Mongol tents, which he may have encountered in the Ordos country or while crossing Mongolia on his way back to Europe. It seems to me infinitely more probable that Odoric, coming out of the Ordos and Kan-su, returned by way of Mongolia, on a similar route as *Carpini* and *Rubruck*, than that he should have performed the long and fatiguing journey across Tibet." Dr. Laufer further points out the fact that "coming to a certain great kingdom called Tibet" does not "yet mean entering and crossing Tibet". Finally Dr. Laufer is perfectly right in saying: "It is incredible that he should have traversed Tibet, nor does he himself make any statement to this effect. He makes no pretence whatever to having been in Lhasa." But on the other hand "there is no reason whatever to question his veracity."²

The evidences brought forward by Dr. Laufer are perfectly convincing, and I agree with him in his final statement: "Odoric of Pordenone never traversed Tibet proper, was never at Lhasa . . ." But where is the proof that he returned back to Europe through the same regions as *Carpini* and *Rubruck*? He must certainly have had some reason for saying: "Quitting this province (Kansu), I came to a certain great kingdom called Tibet, which is on the confines of India Proper . . ." This is one of the most realistic phrases in the whole of his meagre narrative. And if his veracity has to count for anything, this phrase cannot be explained as equivalent to his coming "in contact with Tibetans somewhere in Kansu or on its borders." If we make the concession to him, that by his above

¹ Cathay. Vol. II, p. 327.

² *Berthold Laufer*: Was Odoric of Pordenone ever in Tibet? — T'oung pao, Vol. XV. Leide, 1914, p. 405 et seq.

quoted words he really means that he has been in Tibet, we must remember that it is a very long way to Tibet Proper even from the borders of Kan-su. Starting from Koko-nor and marching towards Lhasa no native will ever speak of Tibet before he has crossed the Tang-la mountains and reached the first natives. In a native itinerary published by Vivien de Saint-Martin, it is said that the distance from Koko-nor to Lhasa is travelled in 46 days. "La trente-quatrième halte (i. e. from Koko-nor) se fait près du lac Tsoulmara. C'est la frontière du Tibet... Le premier village se nomme Nantchjou (= Nak-chu, Nagchukha...)"¹ And *Huc* says: "Na-Ptchu est la première station thibétaine de quelque importance que l'on rencontre en allant à Lha-ssa."² And when *Huc* says of Tibet: "Il n'est guère que les vallées qu'on puisse ensemer avec quelque espérance d'avoir une moisson à recueillir,"³ it is obvious that he only speaks of the southern parts of what we generally call Tibet. The Tibet of the natives is situated south of Transhimalaya. The immense, uninhabited regions north of that mountain system is called by them Chang-tang, whilst early European travellers reckoned these northern regions as belonging to Tartary.

Remembering these facts, we can hardly content ourselves with the suggestion that *Odoric's* words, "I came to a certain great kingdom called Tibet", mean that he came to Kan-su or Mongolia, so much the less as he adds: "which is on the confines of India Proper."

Under such conditions, and as nothing is known regarding his way back to Europe, we have to admit that he really came to a country which indeed was called Tibet, and such a country is to be found in Ladak, or Baltistan, or in the whole country between Ladak and Kashmir. To this very day Baltistan is called little Tibet, an appellation which (except "Little") is also attributed to Ladak. A few examples will prove this fact. Nearly 200 years before the journey of *Odoric*, *Edrisi* called Ladak Tebbet.⁴ *Ney Elias* says of *Mirsa Haidar*, who some 400 years ago visited and described these regions: "Mirza Haidar, like all natives of Central Asia, used the name Tibet to signify Ladak..."⁵ And again: "It may be noted here, that the only name for the province of Ladak ever used by Mirza Haidar is Tibet. In this he is at one with all the Turki-speaking inhabitants of Central Asia, down to the present day... The province of Baltistan, which is situated to the north of Kashmir and west of Ladak, is known as Little Tibet in all the neighbouring regions, and to most Oriental writers; while Ladak is sometimes termed Great Tibet by way of distinction."⁶ Cp. also the follow-

¹ Itinéraire du nord de la Mongolie au Tibet. L'année géographique, 1873, p. 134.

² Souvenirs d'un voyage dans la Tartarie, le Thibet et la Chine, etc. Tome II, Paris 1853, p. 238.

³ Nouvelles Annales des voyages. 1849. Tome I, p. 144.

⁴ Southern Tibet, Vol. I, p. 59, et passim.

⁵ *Ney Elias* and *E. Denison Ross*: A history of the Moghuls of Central Asia, London, 1898, p. 13, note.

⁶ Op. cit. p. 135, note.

ing note by Ney Elias: "Mirza Haidar, when speaking of Ladak as a country, always applies to it the name of 'Tibet', as is the custom at the present day among all natives of Eastern Turkistan, Badakhshán, etc. It is only on the south of the Karakorum and Hindu Kush that the name of 'Ladak' is heard."¹

In 1812 *Mir Iszet Ullah*, the Pioneer of *Moorcroft*, wrote as follows: "The people of the place (Leh) call the country Ladágh. In Kashmir they called the country Butan, and the people Bot; and in Persian and Turkish the country is called Tibet."²

Klaproth has some remarks on an itinerary (Von Jarkend nach Tübet gegen Süd), where the following passage is to be read: "Warscheinlich ist diese Stadt (Tübet) Ladak; aber dieser Name ist den Asiaten unserer Stadt (Semipalatinsk) unbekannt. Die letzte Bemerkung ist ohne Zweifel von dem Russischen Ordner dieser Reiserouten hinzugefügt. Hier ist allerdings von der Stadt Leï (Leh), der Hauptstadt des Landes, die Rede. Diese Stadt heisst im Tübetischen Lata-yul; es ist dieselbe, welche unsere Karten unter dem Mongolischen Namen Latac oder Ladac zeigen; sie ist den Hindu und Persern unter dem Namen Tübet oder Gross Tübet bekannt. Der erste Theil oder Klein Tübet ist das Land Balti oder Baltistan; der zweite oder Gross Tübet ist Ladak, und das dritte Tübet ist das dem Dalai Lama unterworfenen Gebiet, zwischen dem Indus und der Chinesischen Gränze."³

Cunningham says of Dr. *Henderson*: "He was probably the first European who had ever visited Skardo, or Little Tibet."⁴ Colonel *Holdich* says: "Beyond the Zoji La the road drops into the Indus basin, and is within the limits of Ladak (or Little Tibet), which geographically and climatically belongs rather to Tibet than to Kashmir."⁵ *Hermann von Schlagintweit* writes: "Skárdo, die Hauptstadt, Höhe 7,255 Fuss, war einst der Sitz des Königreiches von Bálti oder Klein-Tibet."⁶ On his map of 1705 and later editions *Delisle* has Petit Tibet north and NE of Cachemire. Grand Tibet is situated further east. Everybody who has travelled between Eastern Turkestan and Ladak knows that the latter country is always called Tebbet by the Mohammedans.

In the case of Odoric it is true that the step from China to Baltistan or Ladak is very great, but there is no continuity in the narrative of the Friar. At the time of Odoric's journey *Lha-chen gyalbu rinchen* (about 1325—1350) was prince

¹ Op. cit. p. 410

² Journal Roy. Asiat. Soc. of Great Britain & Ireland, No. XIV, London, 1843, p. 288.

³ *A. v. Humboldt*: Fragmente einer Geologie und Klimatologie Asiens. Aus dem Franz. von *J. Loewenberg*, Berlin, 1832, p. 117.

⁴ Ladák, London 1854, p. 12. — In later years Dr. *Henderson* himself always called the Ladakis —Tibetans. Cp. Lahore to Yárkand, London 1873, p. 38 et seq.

⁵ Tibet the mysterious. London 1904, p. 16.

⁶ Reisen in Indien und Hochasien, Dritter Band, p. 260.

(gyalbu) of Ladak, and later on he also became king of Kashmir. In the latter country the king *Simha Deva* had been attacked by the Tartars, who themselves perished in the snow during their retreat. *Simha Deva's* general, *Ram Chand*, was on his march to restore order in Kashmir, accompanied by *Rinchen Shah*, the same man who in Ladak and in the Tibetan chronicles is called *Rinchen* or *Lha-chen-gyalbu-rinchen*. On account of disputes with his father, the king of Tibet, this man had come as an adventurer to Kashmir. After some time Rinchen also began to quarrel with Ram Chand and arranged that he was assassinated. Rinchen afterwards became a Mohammedan, and the Lamas who have written the Tibetan chronicles therefore keep silent regarding him.¹ Of the place where Ram Chand was murdered *M. A. Stein* says: "Jonarāja mentions as the place of this event Lahara Kotta, i. e. the fort of Lahara = Lār. As the attacking force is described as Bhauttas = Ladākhis, the locality seems correctly indicated."²

Of Lār or Lār Stein says: "The district now known as Lār comprises the whole of the valleys drained by the Sind." He also speaks of its former importance, and adds: "It is probable that the great trade-route to Ladākh and Central Asia which passes through the district, added already in old times to its wealth and importance."³

The fort of Lār, or Lahara Kotta, was thus situated near the frontier of India, or as Odorico says, according to Yule: "... Tibet, which is on the confines of India," or, according to the Latin text: "... Tybot quod ipsi Indiæ est confine." It therefore seems likely that Odoric has been able to convince himself that the country to which he had arrived, and which he calls Tibet, bordered upon India. Such a conviction he could hardly have gained in Lhasa, which is situated on the southern foot of Transhimalaya, and separated from India by the world of mountains known as Himalaya, and of the breadth of which he could not have the faintest idea.

If I thus agree with Dr. Laufer in his conclusion: "Odoric of Pordenone never traversed Tibet proper, was never at Lhasa", it is for other reasons than those alleged by Laufer. His argument of the bread and wine may prove that Odoric was never in Tibet, but it does not prove that the Friar with his Tibet or Ri-both meant Mongolia. His speaking of tents made of black felt does not prove very much. Greater mistakes are made nowadays. Dr. Laufer's identification of Odoric's *abassi* with the Tibetan appellation a P'ags-pa for a priest, does not make any difference, for already in the days of Rinchen's predecessor and father,

¹ *Waller R. Lawrence*: The Valley of Kashmir. London 1895, p. 189.

² *Ibidem*. Cp. also Rev. *A. H. Francke*: A History of Western Tibet, One of the Unknown Empires. London 1907, p. 68 et seq. *Jonarāja* was the author of the chronicles of Kashmir after 1150 A. D.

³ Memoir on maps illustrating the Ancient Geography of Kāsmīr. Calcutta 1899, p. 209.

Lha-chen-ngorub (c. 1300—1325), Lamaism had definitely been introduced in Ladak, and it does not matter much whether p'ags-pa is a name or a title.¹

Nor does Odoric's description seem to indicate a Mongolian town, when he says: "But the chief and royal city is all built with walls of black and white, and all its streets are very well paved."² Such cities were, on the other hand, certainly to be found in the empire of Rinchen. Lahara Kotta was one of them. Kotta or Kot means simply a fort or a castle, or a fortified town, and was therefore an appellation which was attributed also to other places than Lār. It is therefore impossible to tell which particular city Odoric meant when, according to the French version, he wrote: "Leur maistre cité est moult belle, toute de blanche pierre, et les rues bien pavées. Elle est appelée Gota." The term Kotta (= "Gota") was probably used in the same way as the Tibetans speak of the "Dsong". It is not necessary that Odoric's Gota was situated in Ladak. It may as well have been situated in one of the neighbouring countries in the Sind Valley; it may have been in Baltistan, Gilgit or Chitral. To the Chinese the roads to these far countries of the West, the Si-yü, and the Ts'ung-ling, or Karakorum and Pamir mountains, have been well known since very old times. We only need to remember the famous campaign of the Chinese general *Kao-sien-che*, who in 747 A. D. brought his victorious army through the Pamirs, and across the passes of Baroghil and Darkot to Gilgit, — not to mention the journeys accomplished in these regions by the great Buddhist pilgrims from China.

The term "kot" or "kotta" is very widely spread in the regions of the Himalaya, not only to the west, but also to the east of Kashmir and Ladak. It is to be found in Nepal, though that country, of course, cannot be considered in this connection. In 1730 *Orazio della Penna* mentions the town Kuti, a name reminding us of Gota. "Verso ponente l'ultimo luogo della provincia di Tzang, in lingua industana si chiama Kuti . . ." Klaproth adds: "C'est une ville considérable dans laquelle on trouve toutes les nécessités de la vie en abondance." The same

¹ Laufer says: "This term is neither a common title nor a title at all, but merely a personal name." According to *Köppen*, speaking of the abbot of the Ssa ssKja monastery, who served under emperor *Kubilai*, "Phagss pa (Pagspa, Paspas u. s. w.)" signifies "*der Hochwürdigste*, eine Bezeichnung, die fälschlich für seinen Eigen- oder Familiennamen gehalten worden ist." (Die Lamaische Hierarchie und Kirche, Berlin 1859, p. 98.)

² Abbé Huc makes an attempt to explain the Friar's black and white houses: Il faut observer que les murailles des constructions de la capitale sont entièrement de couleur blanche et noire. Ce fait est assez singulier. Lorsque nous avons visité, en 1845, la capitale du Thibet, nous avons remarqué une bizarrerie qui serait peut-être de nature à expliquer les paroles du missionnaire franciscain. In a certain part of Lhasa the houses were built of the horns of oxen and rams, the former white, the latter black. He adds: Il ne serait pas impossible qu'au quatorzième siècle la capitale du Thibet fût entièrement construite comme le quartier que nous avons essayé de décrire. — Le christianisme en Chine, en Tartarie et Thibet, Tome premier, Paris, 1857, p. 408, and Voyage au Thibet, T. II, p. 250.

author reminds us of "le mont et le passage fortifié de Nagar cut (Nagar kote), appelé à présent Sâmdang."¹

In his chapter on the petty independent chiefs to the west of Nepal, *Francis Hamilton* uses it as a name for a fort. *Sangsar*, the chief of Kangra, had, with the help of *Ranjit Singha*, beaten the Gorkhas. "For this assistance, however, he paid dearly, as he ceded to *Ranjit* the fort and city of Kangra, and the fort of Kotta..." — "Kotta, although inferior to Kangra, is considered as a stronghold of importance."² Sir *Richard Temple* tells us that the Military Council Chamber at Kathmandu is also called *Kót*, which obviously is the same word.³ *Cunningham* says that the word *kot* = fort belongs to the Dardu dialect called *Shiná*.⁴

Odoric's narrative, therefore, does not present any obstacle in the way of identifying his Tibet or Ryboth with Ladak or any other country in the Western Himalaya, and his *Gotā* is the same as "kotta". It is true that he regards this country as "subject to the Great Khan", but it would be a more serious slip of the memory to pretend that Mongolia borders on India. We do not know which way he travelled, but before his start from China, he could get any necessary information. It would take us too far to test this statement from the Chinese literature available in translation. Communication between India and Eastern Turkestan goes back into the remotest antiquity. In the Buddhist time of Khotan, according to *Abel-Rémusat*: "des rapports religieux et commerciaux étaient entretenus avec l'Inde, au travers du Kaschemire et des montagnes de neige."⁵ About the progress of Buddhism *Rhys Davids* says: "In the second century of our era Buddhism had penetrated to China, along the fixed route from India to that country, round the north-west corner of the Himalayas and across Eastern Turkestan." In the second year B. C. an embassy took Buddhist books to the emperor of China.⁶ From the manuscripts and other material which I brought home from Lou-lan Professor *A. Conrady* makes a most interesting description not only of the lonely frontier place with its barbarian-Chinese-international mixed culture, but also of the roads as they were in 260—270 A. D. He says; "Das machen die *Strassen*, an denen Lou-lan als Sperrfort liegt. Denn hier kreuzen sich, von den Wasserstrassen über den See⁷ und flussaufwärts⁸ ganz abgesehen, die Wege nach Kao-ch'ang (Turfan) und wohl auch I-ho, d. h. Hami, die in das Herz Nordasiens führen, mit der grossen und uralten *Weltstrasse*, die quer

¹ *Nouveau Journal Asiatique*, Tome XIV, Paris, MDCCCXXXIV, p. 184.

² An account of the Kingdom of Nepal. Edinburgh 1819, p. 311, 312.

³ Journal kept in Hyderabad, Kashmir, Sikkim and Nepal. London 1887, Vol. II.

⁴ *Ladák*, London 1854, p. 398.

⁵ *Histoire de la ville de Khotan*, Paris 1820, p. V.

⁶ *Buddhism*, London 1903, p. 241.

⁷ *Lop-nor*.

⁸ On the Tarim River.

durch Wüste und Steppe gen Westen nach Khotan und weiter dann nach Persien, Indien, Europa und östlich über Tun-Huang und Tsiu-ts'üan (Suh-chou) ins eigentliche China zieht, und sie sind im wahrsten Sinne des Wortes die Lebensadern für unsern Bezirk, ohne die er körperlich und geistig zugrunde gehen, ohne die er verdumpfen, verbauern, verhungern müsste."¹ It is therefore pretty certain that this road was more frequented in old times than now. Therefore it is not surprising if Odoric has been able to travel through Central Asia, on the same road that, 300 years later, was used in the opposite direction by Benedict Goës. Regarding his further journey, from "Tibet" and homewards *Cordier* says: "le reste de son voyage n'est nullement indiqué, mais nous pouvons supposer, avec de grandes chances d'exacitude, qu'il passa par le Badakchan, le Khoraçan, Tauris, et enfin l'Arménie." Sir Henry Yule expresses the following opinion: "It is not unlikely that Odoric crossed Hindu Kush on his journey from Tibet, of which we have no particulars. It was through Badakshan that the Persian merchants used to go into Tibet, and Badakshan would probably be entered and left by one of the passes of the Hindu Kush."²

Finally it should be remembered that his names Tibet and Gota, and his expression "which is on the confines of India Proper", determines approximately the most interesting portion of his journey.

On account of this result Dr. Charpentier claims: "we have consequently to look for a traveller of a later date than Friar Odoric to confer upon him the priority of a European visitor to the Land of the Lamas."

Dr. Charpentier, therefore, is looking out for a traveller, who visited Tibet after Odoric, but before Goës and *Andrade*, and he has found a European, who "must have been there before the time Goës started on his journey." The narrative of his wanderings is to be found in a very rare work, written by the Augustin monk *Dom Antonio de Gouvea*, and published in Coimbra 1606.³

The traveller in question, *Diego d'Almeida*, had told the Fathers at Goa that he had resided two years in Tibet. According to the information he got from Copenhagen Dr. Charpentier gives us a most interesting and important extract from *Diego d'Almeida's* narrative in the form it has received in *Gouvea's* work.

Without any doubt we may accept this traveller with the greatest confidence; and I find it quite superfluous to call his account "to a certain degree fanciful but not wholly untrue." The only thing in *d'Almeida's* short narrative that can be called fanciful is his statement that churches and Christian images were to be found in the country, but such mistakes, intentional or not, were common then,

¹ *A. Conrady*: Chinesische Handschriften-Funde *Sven Hedin's* in Lou-lan. — This work will soon be published in Stockholm.

² *Cathay*, Vol. II, 1913, p. 263.

³ In a note Dr. Charpentier mentions *Gouvea's* visit to the great *Shah Abbas*. I have slightly touched upon *Gouvea's* journey to Persia in *Svenska Akademiens Handlingar*, 29:de delen, 1917, p. 257.

and at a later period. The Capuchin Fathers at Lhasa during the first decades of the 18th century used to send reports to Rome about Christian communities in Tibet — as soon as they were in need of money for the propaganda. Otherwise d'Almeida's account is one of the very best we possess from old times; and in authenticity and reliableness regarding geographical information, it even supercedes Andrade's narrative. Only in one point do I differ in opinion from Dr. Charpentier, viz. in the following passage of his: "That he had really been in Tibet . . . there is no reason to doubt, and so this Portuguese seems to have been the first European of whose stay in Tibet we possess any reliable knowledge — perhaps the first one who ever actually visited it."

If we still may be in some doubt regarding Odoric, we may, so far as d'Almeida is concerned, feel absolutely convinced that *he was never in Tibet*. He has given us an excellent, though very concentrated, description of *Ladak*, and everything he has to say of that country — except on religious matters — is true.

D'Almeida's statement that Tibet "could only be reached at a certain time of the year, the roads at other times being extremely intrafficable on account of the vast masses of snow in the mountain-passes", is likewise true, for even nowadays, with modern technical resources, the road across the Zoji-la is often closed by snow.¹

Further d'Almeida says, according to the above quotation: "The principal fortress and residence of the king is called Babgo." Here we get a perfectly certain argument for Diego d'Almeida's speaking of Ladak and not of Great Tibet, "il gran Regno del Tibet, la di cui Capitale è Lassa", as *Orazio della Penna* says. Already in the beginning of the 15th century Basgo — situated a short day's march below Leh and on the right bank of the Indus — was a place of no mean importance. *A. H. Francke* tells us of the place:

¹ Cp. "Asien, tusen mil på okända vägar," II, p. 636, and the English edition of the same: "Central Asia and Tibet", London 1903, Vol. II, p. 599: "I had been told before leaving Leh that the pass of Zoji-la is nearly always closed in winter, and that I might there be turned back; but this winter the snowfall happened to be a good deal less than usual . . ." — In my *Scientific Results of a Journey in Central Asia, 1899—1902*, Stockholm 1907, Vol. IV, p. 374 et seq., I have a more detailed description of the Zoji-la. There I say: ". . . it is the mountainous character of the country on the south side of the pass that makes the Sodschi-la (Zoji-la) so dreaded, and generally keeps it closed for a certain part of the winter, or at any rate makes it extremely perilous to set foot upon it." — Of the gorge at the side of the pass I say: "The dangerous portion is fairly short, though quite long enough for travellers to get buried under the avalanches. The important thing is to choose a quiet time in the early morning, whilst the snowy masses are still relatively adherent in consequence of the cold during the night. In the day time, and especially when the sun is shining or the wind is blowing strong, it is extremely perilous to venture into the defile. The path on the face of the precipice on the right side of the gorge is absolutely impassable in winter, for it is overhung by threatening masses of snow, which may at any and every moment start gliding downwards."

"His (King *Dragspa's*) principal seats were the villages of Basgo and Teya Tingmogang..." — "It was probably also Dragspa who improved the ancient fortifications at Basgo, to make them a stronghold of the first rank."¹

Sengge Namgyal reigned 1590—1620. He invited to his country the Grand Lama *Stag Tsang Ras Chen*, the same who has built the famous "mani"-walls at Basgo, and the four still celebrated monasteries, Hemis, Chimre, Tashigang and Hanle. Hemis was the most important one of all. *Sengge Namgyal* constructed a wooden bridge across the Indus at Alchi, which still exists, though, of course, many times restored.² His residence was Basgo. D'Almeida's Babgo is simply a slip of the pen or a misprint.

I have only passed this place (summer 1906) and say of it: "Basgho gomba has a fine situation in a side valley of the Indus. The monastery is built on the left side of the valley, the white walls of three storeys, with balconies, effective cornices and pendants, standing on a long cliff. A number of chhortens and manis surround Basgho."³

"The country has plenty of gold and jewels", says d'Almeida. In Chapter II, Vol I, of "Southern Tibet" I have mentioned Herodotus' and Megasthenes' knowledge of the gold-digging ants, and the excellent way in which Dr. Berthold Laufer has explained this old legend.⁴ Rev. A. H. Francke writes on this subject: "Here⁵ I received a letter from a European student of folklore,⁶ asking me to send him tales of gold-digging ants, if such should be current in the place. After a few days I was able to send him two long tales of gold-digging ants, discovered at Kalatse. But not only that: I was even shown the kind of ant which, according to the belief of the Kalatse people, was the gold-digger.. It was a very tiny creature, and far from the size of a dog or fox; but we must allow the story to have grown a little on its way from India to Greece. — Putting aside this fable, the fact remains that the existence of the Upper Indus valley as a gold-producing country has been known to the world since the times of Herodotus. Other classical authors speak of the gold-production of this district. Ctesias states that 'the gold was not obtained by washing, as in the river Pactolus'; and Pliny's sentence, 'Fertilissimi sunt auri Dardæ, Setæ vero argenti', has become quite famous... Even in one part of the country it is of particular interest to go along the banks of the Indus and to observe the traces which the gold-diggers have left there from days of old. I have travelled along the Indus

¹ A history of Western Tibet, p. 80.

² On p. 44 of my Transhimalaya, Vol. I, there is a sketch of the bridge as it is now.

³ Transhimalaya (Engl. edit.) Vol. I, p. 44.

⁴ T'oung pao, Série II, Vol. IX, Leide 1908, p. 429 et seq.

⁵ At Kalatse, where he lived several years.

⁶ Dr. B. Laufer.

from Saspola to Dartcig, a distance of over fifty miles, and have seen but few parts of the ground which have remained untouched. It looks as if the ground had been worked with huge ploughs . . . There has been a break in the digging for several years, owing to political causes; but the eyes of Europeans are once more directed towards these ancient gold-fields, and the old river may yet witness once more the feverish activity of human gold-hunters.”¹

In the country south of Pamir *Hsüan-tchuang* (643 A.D.) mentions gold: “Après avoir franchi une montagne, au sud de la vallée de Po-mi-lo (Pamir), on rencontre le royaume de Po-lo-lo (Bolor), d’où l’on tire beaucoup d’or et d’argent; l’or est rouge comme le feu.”²

Many other statements of the same kind could be quoted, though it may be sufficient to mention only Cunningham in his “Ladak” and the first European who gave a description of Leh, viz. William Moorcroft: “Gold is frequently found in the rivers of Chan-than, and it was also discovered in the sands of the Shayuk.”³ Recent travellers have made the same observation. Dr. *H. Pfannl* says of Dras and the surrounding region: “Auffallend ist an den Frauen der reiche Goldschmuck, den sie auch bei der Arbeit tragen. Derselbe dürfte aus von den Eingeborenen gewonnenen Flussgold erzeugt sein; wenigstens fanden wir massenhaft Goldgruben im Flussande, und ein Eingeborner zeigte uns auch ein kleines Ledersäckchen voll selbst gewaschenen Flussgoldes.”⁴

Precious stones, more specially turquoises, are extremely common in Ladak, and there is hardly to be found a woman in the whole country who is so poor that she cannot afford to wear a few turquoises in her plaits, her rings or on her head. Turquoise is also one of the most important commodities yearly brought by the so-called Lopchak mission from Leh to Lhasa.

“The inhabitants are of a rather fair complexion”, says Diego d’Almeida. Probably he has got this impression by comparing the Ladakis with the dark Hindus. Otherwise the Ladakis are, as a rule, dark-coloured, though some of them have fair complexion. Amongst the Arghons, the mixed race between Turki men from Eastern Turkestan, and Tibetan women from Ladak, fair types seem to be more common than amongst the pure Ladakis.

D’Almeida’s “Achbishop” who was called “Lamhao”, is the above-mentioned Grand Lama *Stag Tsang Ras Chen*, the “Tiger-Lama”, who was summoned to Ladak by King *Sengge Namgyal*. According to d’Almeida, the „Archbishop” “lives at a distance (i. e. at Hemi-gompa) from the town (i. e. Basgo), separated from it

¹ A history of Western Tibet, p. 14 and 15.

² *Stanislas Julien: Voyages des Pélerius buddhistes. Tome III, p. 208.*

³ Travels in the Himalayan Provinces of Hindustan . . . in Ladakh and Kashmir etc. from 1819 to 1825. Vol. I, London, MDCCCXLI, p. 314.

⁴ *Zeitsch. d. Deutch. u. Österreich. Alpenvereins. 1904, Band XXXV, p. 92.*

(i. e. from Basgo) by a stream (i. e. Indus), and when he wishes to cross it he throws his cloak or a skin on the water, sits down on it and reaches the other shore in perfect safety." Beyond doubt the "Tiger-Lama" usually lived in Hemis monastery on the left bank of the Indus, 40 km from Basgo, which is situated on the right bank. Where the distance between the bridges is great, the natives still cross the river during the summer on goatskins.¹

Finally the following passage in Gouvea's work and in Father Glen's translation will definitely prove that my conclusion is correct: *Et diray encore cecy, que pardela ce royaume de Tibete, dont nous parlons au présent, il y en a encore un autre, appellé le petit Tibete, laquelle est sous la puissance & domination des Mores de la Ceita de Xaa Roy de Perses, & pourra être par aduventure ceste Thibete, dont parle Paulus Venetus en son livre, sans faire mention, que la y soit aucune chretiené. This Little Tibet or Baltistan is indeed situated on the other side, or N. W., of Ladak.*

Diego d'Almeida's narrative therefore concerns Ladak and not Tibet, a country which, so far as is known, he never visited. Probably he is the first European who, more than one hundred years before *Ippolito Desideri*, has visited Ladak and the city which in his time was the capital of the country. If we thus have been forced to deprive *Odoric de Pordenone* of the honor of being the first European in Tibet and in Lhasa, it is not d'Almeida who gets the priority. The first European in Tibet was, so far as we know, *Antonio de Andrade*, and, so far as Lhasa is concerned we may willingly agree in Dr. Laufers' conclusion: „The honor of being the first Europeans to have reached Lhasa is justly due to the two Jesuit Fathers Grueber and Dorville, who spent two months there in 1661.”

This fact does not in the least degree interfere with the high merit of d'Almeida, whose journey is in any case an early record, and who has proved to be a good observer and a trustworthy pioneer. Dr. Charpentier has done both d'Almeida and students of exploration in Tibet a service in dragging him out of his obscurity and giving him the place of honor due to him.

* * *

Regarding the great and important work of Fathers *Alois* and *Auguste De Backer* and *Carlos Sommervogel*, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, which contains any amount of bibliographical details, and which has occasionally been used by C. Wessels for his studies on early exploration in Tibet, very little was to be found there for purely geographical investigations. Under the heading

¹ The memory of d'Almeida's "Archbishop" still lives in Ladak. At my visit in Hemi-gompa 1902 the abbot told me that the monastery had been built 300 years ago by a Grand Lama called *Dogg Tsang Ras Pa*, which is the same name as *Stag Tsang Ras Chen*. — *Central-Asia and Tibet*, Vol. II. p. 626.

“Tibet” the Index, however, contains a good many works, and I have undertaken to examine the book-titles to make sure whether any important exploration has been omitted in my review of early travellers. The *Lettere annue del Tibet 1626 e della Cina 1624—1628* seem all to be different versions and variants of Andrade’s original letters, which have been available to me in the following two editions “Novo descobrimento do Gran Cathayo, ov reinos de Tibet, pello Padre Antonio de Andrade da Companhia de Iesv, Portuguez, no Anno de 1624. Com todas as licenças necessarias. Em Lisboa, por Mattheus Pinheiro. Anno de 1626’ — and: *Histoire de ce qui s’est passé av Royavme dv Tibet. Tirée des Lettres escriptes en l’année 1626. Addressée av R. P. Mvtio Vitelleschi General de la Compagnie de Iesus. Traduite d’Italien en François par vn Pere de la mesme Compagnie, A Paris, Chez Sebastien Cramoisy MDC. XXIX. 104 pp.*

The following information in Backer-Sommervogel (Tome I, col. 331) seems to be promising: *Lettre du P. Antoine Andrade de son voyage au Tibet ou Catay. — Extraits d’autres lettres plus amples du même P. Andrade, touchant le reste de son voyage, arrivée et succès au grand Catay ou royaume de Tibet; — à la p. 200 et suiv. de: Extrait des lettres adressées av R.P. general de la Compagnie de Jesvs, contenant ce qui s’est passé de plus memorable depuis 1621, iusques à 1626, ès Indes au grand Mogor, et principalement en Ethiopie, au Royaume de Tibet et en la Chine. Av Pont-a-Movsson. Par François Gavnault, M.DC.XXVIII, 8°, pp. 242, etc.* Ce recueil contient des lettres du P. Louis d’Azevedo. Fr. Machado, Emman. Lameira, Michel Rodriguez, Louis Mariano, Fr. Godin. — However, we should not forget that in all these titles “Grand Cathay” and „Kingdom of Tibet” is the same country. As to the above quoted names, they have probably nothing to do with Tibet. It is true that Ritter made a mistake in saying: *Aber dem Pater Andrada folgte durch das neu geöffnete Thor nach Tübet, noch sobald kein anderer Bekehrer der Heiden.*¹ For C. Wessels has found that at least eighteen missionaries followed Andrade’s footsteps before 1650. He says: *Voor zoover hunne namen te achterhalen zijn, waren het Manuel Marques (van af 1624; in 1642 nog in Tsaparang), Gonzales de Sousa, Steph. Cacella († 1630 in Sjigatze), João Cabral, João de Oliveira, Alano dos Anjos (Alain de la Bauchère, † 1636 in Tibet), Manuel Diaz († 1629 in Morong), Francisco de Azevedo, Dom. Capece, Francisco Morando, Nuño Coresma, Stan. Malpichi Ambrosio Correa, Bonaste Godinho, Emmanuel Moteiro.*²

Amongst the above quoted names in *François Gaunault’s* *Extraits des lettres* we recognize not a single one of those enumerated by Wessels.

The next work in Backer-Sommervogel’s Index is: *Théodore Rhay: Descriptio regni Thibet. Paderbornae, typis Henrici Pontani, 1658, 4°.* — Tiré en grande

¹ *Erdkunde von Asien*, Bd. II, p. 451.

² *Wessels*: Antonio de Andrade S. J. De Studiën, Jaargang 44. Deel LXXVII. p. 435.

partie de la relation du P. Ant. Andrade. Thus again we return to the original information of Andrade, and the Description of the Kingdom of Tibet is always Tsaparang and the surrounding regions.

Then follows in the Index *Frédéric Szembek* from Krakow: Tybet, wielkie Panstwo w Azyey, etc., or, in Latin: Tybet, regnum magnum in Asia, ad quod PP. Jesuitae non pridem pervenerunt et Fidem S. Christianam erroribus magnis ethnicis falcificatam ad sinceritatem reduxerunt, hoc est: Brevis descriptio morum devotionis et Fidei Nationum Tybeti, a quodam Sacerdote Ejusdem Ordinis e scriptis ad A. R. P. Suum Generalem hac de re inde missis et Romæ typis orbi universo promulgatis anno præsentis 1628, permittentibus Superioribus Ordinis et officio ecclesiastico. The year of publication and the title of this little Polish work (52 pp.) is enough to give us an idea of its contents. There is certainly nothing more than what Andrade gave in his letters.¹

Jean Cabral's Relação copiosa dos trabalhos grandes, que padeceo na Missaõ do Tibeth, 1630, belongs probably to the same category of works. *J. Darde*; Histoire de ce qui c'est passé au Tibet, 1629, is the same little work of 104 pp. which I have used, and which is quoted above.

The next Jesuit on Tibet in Backer-Sommervogel is *François Godin*, who, after all may be the same man as *Bonaste Godinho*, mentioned by Wessels. As we have seen above, he is to be found in Extrait des lettres . . . 628: Extrait des lettres du P. François Godin écrites de Chaparangué, ville du royaume de Tibet, en date du 16 août 1626, touchant le deuxième voyage des PP. de la Compagnie au dit pays. Now it is curious that the letter of Andrade, the French edition of which was published in 1629 and which I have used, is dated: De Caparangué le 15 Aoust 1626, only a day before that of Godin. The latter thus accompanied Andrade, and the same courier brought the letters of both missionaries. Though I have had no opportunity of examining the matter it does not seem likely that Godin should have been able to communicate much more than what Andrade had written himself the day before.²

In his *Imagem da virtude Em o Noviciado da Companhia de Jesus* etc. Father *Antonio Franco* has given a resumé of Andrade's journeys, obviously — according to Wessels' notes — without adding anything new.

One gets the impression that Andrade has not left any writings of geographical value except the two letters I have used. It is true, however, that a closer

¹ In Cordier's *Bibliotheca Sinica*, col. 2901 the edition of *Szembek* is entered amongst the works of Andrade. It is obviously only a translation.

² In the beginning of 1627 Andrade had three other missionaries with him at Tsaparang. Wessels says: "Hoevele jaren Andrade in het Sadlatsch-dal verbleef, is niet meer met zekerheid vaststellen. Behalve een brief van 2 Februari 1627 eveneens uit Tsaparang, waaruit blijkt, dat hij daar sinds het begin van dit jaar met drie missionarissen, woonde, bestaan er nog twee brieven van 29 Augustus en

examination of libraries and collections in Southern Europe may lead to the discovery of many hitherto unknown manuscripts of the Jesuit and other missionaries in Tibet.

As to *Desideri's* letters, by far the most important is the one dated at Lhasa April 10th 1716 and printed in *Lettres Édifiantes*, which I have used. At present, however, the few lettres from Desideri's hand are superfluous, since his brilliant description of Tibet was discovered in manuscript and edited by the Società Geografica Italiana under the title: *Il Tibet (Geografia, Storia, Religione, Costumi) secondo la relazione del viaggio del P. Ippolito Desideri (1715—1721)*, by *Carlo Puini*, Roma 1904.

* * *

The question: When did the name Manasarovar first become known to Europe, is of great historical interest, though of no special geographical importance. From a geographical point of view Father *Antonio de Monserrate* does not occupy the same place of honor as those missionaries whose names we have just mentioned, for he only got second-hand information of Tibet and the Sacred lake, and belongs to the same category as Father *Joseph Tieffenthaler*. *D'Almeida, Andrade, Grueber, Dorville, Desideri, Beligatti, della Penna* and others wandered to the unknown countries beyond the Himalayas, and became pioneers for European exploration of the new time.

When, with the assistance of the best of our scientifically trained Librarians of Sweden, I searched for Monserrate's geographical observations, and — of course, as is now proved by the discovery of the Calcutta MS, — could not find any information about them, I thought that *Wilford* might have made a mistake. This seemed the more probable as he said: "The lake of Man-saraur is mentioned by Pliny, and it is probably the same that is mentioned by Ctesias, who says it was eight hundred stadia in circumference. M. Polo describes it as to the West of Tibet, but does not mention its name." I do not need to add that none of these authors, neither the ancient, nor the mediaeval, had the slightest idea of the lake. Nor did the criticism Klaproth made on Wilford's article "The Sacred Isles in the West"¹ inspire confidence in all his statements. What he said of Monserrate, therefore seemed not to be sufficiently well founded. Still I said (Vol. I, p. 154): "The statement about Monserrate, on the other hand, is so positive, and so detailed that it cannot simply be dismissed as constructed out of Wilford's

2 September van ditzelfde jaar, warin geen voor ons belangrijke bijzonderheden voorkomen. Hoogstwaarschijnlijk heeft hij een of twee jaar later Tibet verlaten, want zeker weten wij, dat hij in 1630 de geheele missie van Voor-Indië als overste bestuurde en als zoodanig in Goa woonde." (Op. cit. p. 438.

¹ Asiatic Researches, VIII, 1808, pp. 245 et seq.

imagination."¹ I found it probable that Wilford had "confounded Monserrate and Tieffenthaler, who, nearly 200 years later, calls the lake, Mansaroar, which is almost the same spelling as Monserrate's supposed Mánсарuor."

Tieffenthaler arrived at Goa in 1743. In 1759 he began his correspondence with the learned Anquetil du Perron, and in 1766 he travelled to Gogra and got native information regarding the Sacred lake. I cannot see that it would have been a most extraordinary mistake if Wilford had confounded the two Jesuits, though the latter was nearly a contemporary of his. The chief point is, of course, not the two *men*, Monserrate and Tieffenthaler, but the information gained about the lake Manasarovar. It is a pity that I was not able to use the extremely valuable material which has been at Dr. Charpentier's disposition, viz.: Rev. H. Hosten's copy (first published in 1914) of Monserrate's "first and until now only discovered book": "Mongolicae legationis commentarius", and Vincent A. Smith's important work: "Akbar the Great Mogul", Oxford 1917. For when Hosten's work appeared most of my Vol. I was already printed.

Rev. H. Hosten writes: "The texts from Monserrate's writings quoted by Col. F. Wilford will prove that the manuscript in his possession was different from the one here edited".² It is interesting to find that Rev. Hosten also, in this connection, has come to think of Father Joseph Tieffenthaler, just as I did. He writes as follows³: "How did Wilford obtain *his* manuscript? He does not tell us. One of the suggestions that might be made is that Bk. II,⁴ and perhaps also the Calcutta manuscript,⁵ had found its way from Goa to the Jesuit College of Agra, and that Wilford obtained his volume from Father J. Tieffenthaler, S. J. In the eighteenth century the Jesuits in North-India played a conspicuous part as scholars and scientists. We have all too soon forgotten the honourable position they occupied at the Court of the Moghul Emperors, what they did at the Court of Jay Singh II of Jaypur, as astronomers, or again, what valuable services were rendered by them to Indian Geography, in particular by Fr. J. Tieffenthaler, If Monserrate's manuscripts on India were not already at Agra, where they would have been more useful generally than at Goa, Tieffenthaler might have procured them from Goa. He would naturally have been looked up to by his confrères as the man best fitted to utilize those materials. Then came the suppression

¹ As I have quoted (Vol. I, p. 155) Ritter referred to Monserrate's authority. In 1819 *Malte-Brun* discussing the question of the source branch of the Indus, said: "Dans ce conflit, ne serait-il pas permis de renouveler une ancienne opinion, celle du père Montserrat, qui, en 1581, accompagna l'empereur Acbar dans son expédition contre Caboul? Ce missionnaire affirma que le véritable Indus sort du lac Manasarovar." *Nouvelles Annales des voyages*, Tome II, Paris, 1819, p. 314.

² *Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*. Vol. III. No. 9. Calcutta 1914, p. 693.

³ *Op. cit.* p. 527.

⁴ Not yet discovered.

⁵ The one published by Rev. H. Hosten.

of the Society in the Portuguese dominions in 1759. Fathers J. Tieffentaller and Francis Xavier Wendel were soon the only quondam Jesuits left in North India. Neither of them could now obtain from their brethren in Europe the assistance they would formerly have received for the publication of their valuable writings. Both addressed themselves to strangers and freely bestowed on them the fruits of their labours and those of their predecessors. Tieffentaller sent his learned geographical and historical disquisitions to Anquetil du Perron and Dr. Krutzenstein of Copenhagen . . . If they were so liberal towards strangers with their own manuscripts, they may be supposed to have been not less generous with those of others." Further he says of Wilford: "He saw Fr. Tieffentaller at Lucknow in 1784, one year before 'the good old man's death'. It is very tempting to suggest that somehow or other Wilford obtained Monserrate's manuscript — Bk. II — from the old man at Lucknow. Tieffentaller having died without natural heirs, Wilford might have considered himself justified in keeping what no one would be able to turn to better use than himself. On the other hand, what tells strongly against this assumption is that no allusion to Monserrate's manuscripts is to be found in Tieffentaller's *Beschreibung von Hindustan*; and yet both Bk. I and Bk. II would have been most useful for his geographical disquisitions . . . Whatever explanation be true, there remains a mystery to clear up in connection with the Calcutta manuscript."

From all these reasons, Mr. Hosten's suggestion seems very likely to be correct. It also proves that my assumption, as explained in Vol. I, regarding a certain connection between Monserrate and Tieffenthaler, and made shortly before the Calcutta manuscript had been discovered, was founded on not quite unreasonable grounds. Now that the manuscript has been discovered, the situation is, of course, completely changed. But still Mr. Hosten returns to Tieffenthaler and the important part he *may* have played in the question Monserrate—Manasarovar. The fact that Tieffenthaler does not mention Monserrate's manuscripts in his *Beschreibung von Hindustan* is not surprising, for he is silent about most of his sources. Therefore Bernoulli in his "Vorerinnerungen des Herausgebers" complains: Der gegründeteste Vorwurf, den man unserm Verfasser dürfte zu machen haben, ist dieser, dass er seine Quellen nicht umständlich und sorgfältig genug angezeigt, und an manchen Orten Dunkelheiten gelassen hat, die ihm vielleicht keine zu seyn schienen, ohne zu bedenken, dass wir in Europa mit Indien nicht so bekannt sind, um mit halben Worten zu verstehen."¹

¹ Regarding Krutzenstein Bernoulli says in the preface, that Tieffenthaler's "Geography" in 1773 through a certain Dr. Flor of the Danish colony in India came into the hands of Professor Krutzenstein. The great maps and the parts belonging to them were, in 1776, sent to Anquetil du Perron. Bernoulli found the geographical work in Krutzenstein's home in Copenhagen. After many difficulties he succeeded in publishing it: "nun erscheint es aber so vollständig als ich es selbst erhalten habe." So far as I can see, the geographical works of Tieffenthaler which came to Professor Krutzenstein are the same as those published by Bernoulli in Tieffenthaler's "Beschreibung von Hindustan".

The principal thing is that the injustice I, *volens volens*, have done both to Monserrate and Wilford, has now been expiated.¹

* * *

From the sacred Manasarovar we now come to the fabulous lake Chiamay, a curious problem, to the solution of which Dr. Charpentier has contributed some very interesting and valuable considerations. As this question is a very extraordinary one, and as the hydrographical system in the form it has received on old maps does not represent anything existing in reality at the place where Lago di Chiamay has been located, the field is open to conjecture and one theory may be considered as well justified as another. Amongst geographers who have dealt with the history of cartography and who have published old maps, not a single one has paid any great attention to this problem. In his learned work on ancient Siam *Lucien Fournereau*, has, for instance, devoted a whole chapter to the cartography (*Notice sur quelques cartes relatives au royaume de Siam*), which he has illustrated with fifteen old maps (from 1517 to 1781), but he has not even mentioned the name of Chiamay.² It is true that the lake is visible only on two of these maps, and that it was regarded as situated north of the frontiers of Siam. But of the rivers Fournereau has much to say in his text, and it would not have been out of the way to say a few words about the lake, from which these rivers were, for two hundred years, believed to take their origin. In this respect Fournereau has followed the example of Ritter, who, though he quotes all the authorities on the question, such as Fernand Mendez Pinto, Barros, De la Loubère, Vincent Le Blanc and others, has not taken any notice of the lake itself. Only lately an English author has touched upon the question. In his explications to the "Translations from the Chinese World Map of Father Ricci", *Lionel Giles* makes the following interesting remarks³: "The 'story wilderness' is evidently the Taklamakan desert, for which there is very little space on the map owing to the undue length attributed to the Yellow River. The Hsi-fan (of north-eastern Tibet) and K'un-lun Mountains are placed on its eastern bank. It is made to rise in a comparatively large lake (about three times the size of Koko-nor, which is much too small) called the Sea of Constellations. — A little to the north-west is a still larger lake, the Chia-Hu. This is the source of four almost parallel rivers: the An-i-Ho (Ganges), which 'receives thirty streams

Speaking of the Father's source, Ain-i-Akbari, and the rest, Bernoulli adds: "Ausser diesem hat der Pater Tieffenthaler viel andere der bewärtesten Geographen und Geschichtsschreiber von Indien benutzt." Monserrate may easily have been reckoned amongst the Geographers and Historians of India!

¹ To Monserrate's excellent map I shall have occasion to return in Vol. VIII of *Southern Tibet*.

² *Le Siam ancien, archéologie — épigraphie — géographie, Première Partie, Paris 1895. (Annales du Musée Guimet, Tome Vingt-septième.)*

³ *Geogr. Journ. Vol. LII. No. 6, Dec. 1918, p. 384.*

and carries golden sand'; another flowing through Eastern Bengal, a third called the River of Golden Sand (a name still applied to the Upper Yangtse), which passes through Burma and unites with the fourth before reaching the sea." On this Dr. Giles has the following note: "The lake no doubt represents the fabulous Lake Chiamay of Barros, Camoëns, Mendez Pinto, and the map-makers of the time, which was supposed to give rise to the four principal rivers of Indo-China. The name is probably that of the principality of Chieng-mai or Zimmé, on an upper branch of the Menam". All this is perfectly correct, and the derivation of the name had already been given by Sir Henry Yule.¹ But as usual amongst all ancient and recent commentators, no attempt has been made to explain the genesis of the extraordinary phenomenon known as Lago de Chiamay.²

In his perspicacious analysis Dr. Charpentier says "that the idea of the lake is by itself quite natural", as the great Indo-Chinese rivers could easily be supposed to derive their origin from one common source somewhere in the absolutely unknown land on the boundaries between Tibet and China". He is further of the opinion that a mere theoretical discussion might have arrived at a conclusion of that kind. He adds: "but the introduction of the Lago de Chiamay into European geography seems to be connected with one single author, viz. Barros". The next question therefore is whether Barros' Lago de Chiamay is merely a theoretical creation constructed on the basis of conclusions which he has drawn from his own experiences, or whether its origin is due to information which Barros may have got from travellers?

I have not access to the different editions of Ramusio and Barros, and I cannot, therefore, tell in what relation the former stood to the latter as a source. In this matter too Dr. Charpentier has given a good deal of important information. Still I wonder whether it would have been quite impossible for *Ramusio* to make use of, already in 1550, some portion of the material published by *Barros* in 1552 in his first Decada — disregarding if such material really is to be found or not in Ramusio's first edition. The learned Reviewer reminds us of the Préface of Ramusio to the edition of *Marco Polo* in Vol. II of the *Navigazioni et Viaggi*, dated July 7th 1553, and adds that one from this gets the impression "as if Ramusio had really had access to the geography of Barros; but this is scarcely possible." In a note Charpentier says that Sir Henry Yule evidently was of this opinion, whereas Charpentier himself believes that Ramusio is in fact referring

¹ Though he was not the first to identify it. See below!

² In the November Number of the *Geographical Journal* for 1918, p. 303, *E. Heawood* has an article: "A seventeenth-century Japanese map of the world", where he shows the European sources used by the Japanese map maker. Thus he says: "The drawing of the lakes in the interior of China after the pattern set by Ludovicus Georgius in his map engraved by Ortelius in 1584, and also of the fabulous Lake Chiamay in northern Indo-China, giving birth to four great rivers, which had so great a vogue for over a century." He might equally well have said: for over two centuries.

to a certain place in the *Decadas*. From the explanation given by Sir Henry Yule it appears to me to be quite obvious that Ramusio had access to Barros' geographical manuscript, which, although the preface is dated July 1553, may easily have taken place a few years earlier. In his preface Ramusio speaks of the journeys of the Portuguese to the north-east beyond the Golden Chersonese, and says that they "have brought to knowledge many cities and provinces of India, and many islands likewise, with those very names which our Author (Marco Polo) applies to them; and again, on reaching the Land of China, they have ascertained from the people of that region (as we are told by Sign. John de Barros, a Portuguese gentleman, in his *Geography*) that Canton, one of the chief cities of that Kingdom, is in $30^{\frac{2}{3}}^{\circ}$ of latitude . . . etc." To this Sir Henry Yule adds in a note: "The *Geography* of De Barros, from which this is quoted, has never been printed. I can find nothing corresponding to this passage in the *Decadas*."¹

From this it seems evident that Ramusio really had access to the geography of Barros. On the other hand, it is impossible to tell at what date Barros had got his information about Lago de Chiamay. I am so far of the same opinion as Dr. Charpentier, that I cannot believe that Barros at his writing-table simply constructed the lake, which would have been an absurd idea, but that he had really got some information from one of his countrymen who had actually visited Pegu, Siam and adjacent realms.

With our present knowledge it seems to be impossible to tell whether Barros got his information regarding the lake from Fernão Mendez Pinto, or Pinto his information from Barros. For the lake, as it has been represented on the maps is a fabulous creation, and it would have been a singular coincidence if two geographers, independent of each other had got such an extraordinary idea as locating a non-existing lake at the same place and giving it the same name. Only so much is perfectly certain, that those geographical names which Pinto has and which are missing in the *Decadas*, originate exclusively from notices collected by Pinto himself. When the latter, for instance, places the boundary of the province of Surobosoy in the vicinity of Lago de Chiamay he has probably drawn this conclusion from his own combinations.

Dr. *E. W. Dahlgren* reminds us of the fact that "Pinto's dates, as has often been pointed out, are confused, incomplete, and partly contradictory."² In connection

¹ The Book of Ser Marco Polo, Third Edition, revised by Henri Cordier, I, p. 3.

² It is a well known fact that Fernão Mendez Pinto could not be reckoned amongst the most reliable of travellers. In his *Description du Royaume de Siam* etc., Amsterdam MDCC, De la Loubère says of him . . . „Si malgré les bevûës continuelles de cet Auteur, qui paroît s'être trop fié à sa mémoire, on peut croire ce qu'il dit, . . . » etc. — Major Michael Symes: "Even the accounts of Mendez de Pinto, the prince of fiction, although an intelligent traveller, will enable his readers to form an estimate of the importance and civilization of nations which, at a later period have, by many, been erroneously

with his journey to Japan he only gives two fixed dates, one of which is the ninth of January 1545, when, after returning to Malacca, he sailed from there to Bengal.¹

In the *Encycl. Brit.* we are told that *Pinto* arrived at Goa in 1554 and returned home in 1558. In their article Chiamay, to which Dr. Charpentier directs my attention, Yule-Burnell (*Hobson-Jobson* p. 145) claim that the first statement about the lake dates from F. Mendez Pinto in c. 1544. If this be true the "discovery" of the extraordinary lake was made by Pinto, who misunderstood the information given by some traveller or native. From Pinto the news may have been told in the east, and finally, before 1552, reached Barros, who, as Dr. Charpentier says, "almost daily had occasion to meet and discuss with people that had gone out to India, for he never sailed to India himself". That Pinto could not have used Barros as a source is obvious, as he stayed in the East from 1537 to 1558, and Barros' two *Decadas* appeared during that period.

My quotation of Barros' information regarding Lago de Chiamay is taken from Ramusio's *Navigazioni et Viaggi* of 1554, the only one available to me. It may be misleading to make oneself too much dependent on the year of publication — if the difference is only two or three years — when one has to determine the priority of different authors.² It is very probable that the maps of *Gastald*

considered in a condition bordering on wild barbarity." An account of an Embassy to the Kingdom of Ava... 1795. London 1800, p. 2. — Doudart de Lagrée et Francis Garnier: "Toute cette relation (de Pinto), où les royaumes de Xieng Mai, d'Ava, de Pégou, de Siam, jouent un grand rôle, est malheureusement très-confuse et l'auteur s'est laissé trop souvent égarer par son imagination. Il est possible cependant de tirer de son récit de précieux renseignements." *Voyage d'exploration en Indo-Chine 1866—1868*, Tome I, Paris 1873, p. 7. — Richthofen: "Der vielgelesene Bericht von Fernand Mendes Pinto, ein Meer von Lügen, in dem man einige Inseln von Wahrheit erspäht, gibt den besten Begriff von dem moralischen Standpunkt eines gewiss nicht unbedeutenden Theiles derjenigen, welche damals nach China gingen. China, Bd I, Berlin 1877, p. 647. — Sir Henry Yule had no high opinion of his veracity. He says: "The celebrated Ferdinand Mendez Pinto was in these countries as a military adventurer in 1545, and professes to have been present at the sieges of Martaban and Prome. His relations are full of extravagant statements, and a great deal of his geography is probably absolute invention. Still it is evident that he was in the country." Hugh Murray in his *Historical account of Discoveries and Travels in Asia*, etc. Vol. I, Edinburgh 1820, p. 235, quotes an expression about Pinto, which he attributes to Shakespeare. As a matter of fact this expression is, however, according to *Encycl. Brit.*, due to the English dramatist Congreve, who wrote in "Love for Love": "Mendez Pinto was but a type of thee, thou liar of the first magnitude." There we are also told that some witty countrymen of his own parodied his name into: Fernao, mentes! Minto! (Fernao, do you lie? I do!). — Still there seems to be no doubt about the great value of much of the information brought home by this extraordinary, courageous and enterprising pioneer in the East.

¹ A Contribution to the History of the Discovery of Japan. By E. W. Dahlgren. The Transactions of the Japan Society of London, Vol. XI, p. 256.

² According to *Jac.-Ch. Brunet* many accounts which are to be found in Ramusio's later editions of his first volume, are missing in the first edition, Venezia, Giunti 1550 in-fol. — Manuel du libraire

were ready some years before their publication in Ramusio's work. Thus, for instance, *A. E. Nordenskiöld* enumerates in a list of different maps of Gastaldi amongst others the following from the years before 1550 — which, however, deal with other parts of the world than those occupying us here: "some maps of Gastaldi, which were first inserted in the third volume of Ramusio's wellknown collection of narratives, which was printed in 1556. The maps are regarded as completed before 1550." In a note Nordenskiöld says: "That the first volume of Ramusio's work was laid under the press in 1550, appears from an annotation at the end of *Nomi de gli Autori* in this volume."¹

Dr. E. W. Dahlgren counts the question of Lago de Chiamay among the "unsolvable problems" and says: "This lake appears for the first time on a map of the Farther Indian Peninsula by Giacomo Gastaldi (1550)."² Beyond doubt Gastaldi got the information of the lake's existence from Barros, probably at the same time as Ramusio got the short text of it, which I have quoted from the edition of 1554. As the lake thus was "mapped" already in 1550, it might very well have been mentioned in Ramusio of 1550. But *this* question is here of no consequence. To us the geographical side of the problem has by far the greatest interest.

Like Dr. Charpentier, Dr. Dahlgren is of opinion, that Lago de Chiamay cannot be Manasarovar. The latter maintains "that the lake Chiamay itself may simply be explained as the result of some misunderstood account which does not need to be led so far away as to the Manasarovar, or, perhaps, as the result of a presumption by the discoverer of the rivers, that a fluvial system exhibiting extraordinary common features, must also have a common source; and as a consequence of the observed great volume of water in these rivers, this source has been represented as a lake of considerable dimensions. This explanation may be counted for what it is worth; at any rate the question of Lago de Chiamay is of interest as being a striking example of the old cartographers' practice, which, by lack of criticism and by carelessness, lead to the most monstrous combinations."³

With this view we have to compare Dr. Charpentier's theory:

"That Barros had apparently drawn from oral or written sources his knowledge of the existence of a lake from which sprang the main rivers of the Peninsula, and that such notices must have at least some real foundation if even they were afterwards seriously misunderstood."

et de l'amateur de livres, Tome IV. Paris 1863, article Ramusio. — I am not in the position to tell whether the story of Lago de Chiamay is one of those things which were not included in the edition of 1550.

¹ Facsimile-Atlas, Stockholm MDCCCLXXXIX, p. 114 and 115.

² *Ymer*, Stockholm 1918, p. 116.

³ *Ymer*, loc. cit., p. 117.

All the perspicacity and erudition displayed in the articles of Dr. Dahlgren and Dr. Charpentier do not, however, reach the very nucleus of the problem. They afford — as also I have tried to do in my chapter on Lago de Chiamay — the apparatus which is necessary for the getting-up, the *mise-en-scène* of the problem. But all these lifeless dates which already in their original sources were built up on a fragile basis of mistakes and misunderstandings, only touch the periphery of the question — they are secondary matters, certainly themselves of great historical value, but still of a character not to give us the key of the solution of the problem, and not to permit us to penetrate the very soul of this extraordinary phenomenon. Later on in this article I will try to approach the essence of the fabulous lake somewhat closer than I was able to do in my Vol. I. Before doing so I will quote a few contributions to the history of the lake which I have come across since this volume was printed.

Yule-Burnell (Hobson-Jobson) have just been mentioned. They have only four dates regarding our lake. The first is, as was said before, Pinto c. 1544.¹ The second is *Barros'* statement from 1552.² The third is *Camões'* verses from 1572, also quoted by Dr. Charpentier in a note.³ And the fourth is to be found in *P. Heylin's* *Cosmography*, II, 238, from 1652, which, for completeness' sake may be quoted here: "The Country of these Brames . . . extendeth Northwards from the nearest Peguan Kingdomes . . . watered with many great and remarkable Rivers, issuing from the Lake Chiamay, which though 600 miles from the Sea, and emptying itself continually into so many Channels, contains 400 miles in compass, and is nevertheless full of waters for the one or the other."

To these dates the following may be added. *P. Bertius*, in 1606, only mentions the lake: Siam regio amplissima est, Continens regna multa . . . Lacus in eo Chiamay è quo emanant fluuij Aua, Menam, Menon, & alij.⁴

In 1680 *A. Montanus* tells the same story as so many other geographers before and after his time: Doch (om weder te komen tot het voorgaende) behalven de menigte der rievieren, die Indien ververschen, bevochtigen ook geen weinige meiren dese gezengde landstreeken. Het grootste van dusdaenige binnelandse

¹ "So proceeding onward, he arrived at the Lake of Singipamor, which ordinarily is called Chiamay . . .", or as in *Historia Oriental de las peregrinaciones de Fernan Mendez Pinto*, Madrid 1627, p. 384: Assi llegò al lago de Singuapamor, que comunmente llaman en aquella tierra, el lago de Chiámay.

² Quoted in my Vol. I, p. 230, 231.

³ In Burton's translation it runs thus (Hobson-Jobson): "See Pam, Patane and in length obscure, *Siam* that ruleth all with lordly sway; behold Menam, who rolls his lordly tide from source Chiámái called, lake long and wide." — Yule-Burnell are not the first to quote *Camões'* verses on the grande lago, que Chiamay se chama, for this had already been done by Sir John Bowring in 1857, in Vol. I, p. 7 of his: *The Kingdom and People of Siam with a Narrative of the Mission to that Country in 1855.*

⁴ *P. Bertii tabularvm Geographicarvm contractarvm Libri Quinque . . . Editio tertia. Amstelodami 1606, p. 597.*

Zeen word huden ten dage Chiamay genaemt, als welke in sijn omtrek vier honderd mijlen beslaet.¹

De la Loubère's opinion, quoted by Dr. *Charpentier*, is of great interest. The city of Kiang-mai or Zimme is situated at the right bank of the river Me-ping, which is a right tributary to the Me-nam. On De la Loubère's map the city of Chiamái is placed on the left bank of the western one of his two Menam Rivers, which, however, is identical with the Me-ping. It therefore seems possible that the derivation of the name Chiamai from Kiang-mai may be correct. Of the western Me-nam De la Loubère writes: "A la ville de Laconcevan le Menam reçoit une autre riviere considerable qui vient aussi du Nord, & qui aussi s'appelle Menam, nom general à toutes les grandes rivieres. Nos Geographes la font venir du Lac de Chiamái: mais on assure qu'elle a sa source dans les montagnes, qui ne sont pas si au Nord que cette ville."² It is obvious that De la Loubère did not in the least believe in the existence of the "famous lake".

The opinion of De la Loubère is valuable as he was a very intelligent and critical observer. Hugh Murray is quite right in saying of him: "Tachard had along with him La Loubere, who produced afterwards a general description of Siam, so accurate and intelligent, as to be perhaps the most valuable fruit of the expedition."³

Father *Guy Tachard*, mentioned by Murray, wrote two books on his experiences during the missions to Siam. It seems that he measured very carefully, the breadth of the Menam and made some geographical observations regarding the river, but he does not say anything of its source, and does not mention Lago de Chiamay, perhaps influenced by the doubts of De la Loubère. On the other hand he knew "un grand lac entre Siam & Camboje", which is easy to recognise.⁴

In 1707 *Frantz Caspar Schillinger* has the following communication to give: "Oberhalb Bengalam gegen Orient zu liegt das Königreich Maug, so biss an das Chinesische Gebirge sich erstrecket; In diesem Königreich ist nahmhafft die eingeschlossene See Chiamay, aus welchem etliche grosse Flüsse hervor kommen, so gegen Mittag in den Oceanum sich ergiessen . . . In der Gegend des Chiamayischen Land-See befinden sich die stärckste Nass-Hornen, oder Hornnässige Thier, die von der Natur gleichfalls geharnischt seynd, und obhalb der Nasen ein gesteyfftes Horn tragen . . ."⁵

¹ Oud en Nieuw Oost-Indien door Arnoldus Montanus. Amsterdam, (Dedication dated 1680), p. 12.

² Description du Royaume de Siam etc. Amsterdam MDCC, Tome Premier, p. 9.

³ Historical account of Discoveries and Travels, Vol. III, Edinburgh, 1820, p. 237.

⁴ Second voyage du Pere Tachard et des Jesuites envoyés par le Roy, au Royaume de Siam, etc. Amsterdam, MDCLXXXIX, pp. 236, 237, 247 et seq.

⁵ Persianische und Ost-Indianische Reis welche Frantz Caspar Schillinger (S. J. 1699—1702) . . . vollendet. Nürnberg 1707, p. 349 and 370.

It is surprising that such a learned man as *François Valentyn* could accept, so late as 1726, without hesitation the lake as an existing reality, though he had read and several times mentions De la Loubère, and therefore must have known of his doubts. In the part of his great work which has the title: *Beschryving van Siam, en onsen Handel aldaar*, he gives the boundaries of Siam in the following words: *In't N. grenst het aan China, Tsjamay, (of Chiamay by anderen genaamd) en 15 dagen verre benoorden de grensen van Siam gelegen, en Lantsjang . . .* He tells his readers that the river Menam comes from an Inland sea situated some 15 or 16 days' march north of the frontier of Siam: *Ik zal my ook niet ophouden met de verdere plaatsen, hooger op om de Noord leggende, te beschryven, alsoo de Leser die klaar genoeg hier uitgedrukt siet, met dese en gene gebergten, of wel vlekken en dorpen met hare Siamse naamen, en te gelyk ook aangewesen, hoe de Rivier Me-nam al hooger om de N. uit het Binnen-Meir van Tsjamay, in't N. na Tartaryen zyn oorsprong, zoo zommige willen wel 15 a 16 dag reisen boven de grensen van Siam, neemt, en dus met een swaren stroom van 't N. na 't Z. langs de stad Judia, en zoo verder na de Zee toe loopt, en met een groot geweld daar in stort, na dat boven drie groote stroomen sig met den anderen vereenigd hebben.*¹

In his "Breve notizia" Orazio della Penna has a good deal to say of Kokonor, and he is pretty sure that no river issues from that lake. "Da questo lago non esce fiume alcuno". In connection with this assertion he enters, in a most curious and interesting way, upon the question of Lago de Chiamay. He says that the five rivers which on old geographical maps are generally represented as issuing from a lake, be it the Iandrò (=Yamdok-tso), three days' march west of Lhasa, or Koko-nor "which are the single lakes of Tibet", — do not exist, and are absolutely imaginary, as no rivers issue from the said lakes. But della Penna makes a very ingenious attempt to explain the hydrographical problem saying: "But there are other great rivers, as I have said before, viz. not far from Lhasa the Tzangc'ù belonging to the province of Tzang, a second called Nakt'ù, and further the Bic'ù, which belong to the state of Ciang, and two others the names of which I have forgotten. These informations have been got from rather experienced persons, and they affirm positively that the source of the Ganges is situated in the part of Ngari which confines upon Tartary."²

¹ Omstandig Verhaal van de geschiedenissen en zaaken het kerkelyke ofte den godsdienst betreffende, zoo in Amboina . . . etc; Mitsgaders van de Koningryken Tonkin, Cambodia, en Siam, etc. Derde deels tweede stuk. Dordrecht—Amsterdam, MDCCXXVI, pp. 56 and 62.

² Li cinque fiumi che comunemente fanno uscire le carte geografiche antiche da un lago, o sia il sopracitato Iandrò, o Iantzò che sta lontano tre giornate da Lhasà a ponente, o sia il suddetto lago di Kokonor circa una giornata da Scilin, o Scilingh, a confini del Thibet, che sono li due soli laghi del medemo, sono insussistenti, ed assolutamente ideali, perchè verun fiume esce da'medesimi laghi; ma sono altri fiumi grossi, come si disse di sopra, cioè vicino a Lhasà Tzangc'ù nella provincia di

Della Penna's Tzangc'ù is the Tsangpo or upper Brahmaputra. His Nakt'ù is the Tibetan Nak-chu or Black river, the Salwen, and his Bic'ù is the Bri-chu or river of the Yak-cow, by the Mongols called Murui-ussu, and by the Chinese lower down Kin-sha-kiang and Yang-tze-kiang. From his own experience della Penna had not the slightest idea of the two last-mentioned rivers. He probably knew both the Salwen and the Yang-tse-kiang, but he could not know that Nak-chu and Bri-chu were the upper courses of these rivers. He has not heard of any other lakes in Tibet except Yamdok-tso and Koko-nor. The latter he had never seen himself, but he had heard of it, as well as of the rivers Nak-chu and Bri-chu, from the Dutch traveller Samuel van der Put, who passed through Lhasa and along Koko-nor on his journey to Peking in 1731. The meaning of Orazio della Penna is not quite clear. He does not in the least believe in the existence of the five rivers of the maps, for, as far as he knows, neither Yamdok-tso nor Koko-nor has any effluents, and he has no notion of other lakes in Tibet. But there exist five other rivers, viz. Tsangpo, Nak-chu, Bri-chu and two the names of which have been lost to his memory. It is curious to remark that della Penna then immediately comes to speak of the source of the Ganges as if this river had something to do with the hydrographical problem of the non-existing lake and its five non-existing rivers. Though della Penna himself does not say anything in his *Breve notizia* regarding the lake in Ngari, i. e. the Manasarovar, which was believed to give rise to four rivers, we know, however, that he was well acquainted with this story as are also nearly all the natives of southern Tibet and northern India, though he was less critical than Father Ippolito Desideri, who had his own opinion of the hydrography of the Manasarovar, which he visited on his memorable journey of 1715—1716. We are indebted to Father *Georgi* for the following statement: "P. Horatius Pinnabillensis (della Penna de Billi) lacum describit in provincia Tibetana Ngari ad confinia Caskar, ex quo testantur Indigenæ flumina quatuor exoriri, Indum nimirum, Gangem & Tzhang-pò, sive Tzhang-ciù, aut etiam Tsangia dictum."¹ The fourth river, the Satlej, he seems not to have known.

Della Penna did not dare to examine the problem thoroughly, though he, in a quite exceptional way, had all the necessary material in his hands. In his *Breve notizia* he simply denies the existence of a lake giving rise to five rivers, as shown on all the maps ever since Gastaldi's days. And he denies the existence of the

Tzang, l'altro detto Nakt'ù, così ancora Bic'ù, che sono nello stato di Ciang, ed altri due che ne ho perduta la memoria. Queste notizie si sono avute da persone ben pratiche, quali assolutamente affermano essere la sorgente del Gange dalla parte di Ngari verso la Tartaria." --- *Breve notizia del regno del Thibet. del frà Francesco Orazio della Penna de Billi, 1730. Nouv. Journal Asiatique, Tome XIV, Paris, MDCCCXXXIV, p. 201.*

¹ *Alphabetum Tibetanum, Romæ MDCCLXII, p. 343.*

rivers themselves. But he knows, as Father *Georgi* tells us, another lake, giving rise to four rivers, of which he only mentions three, the Indus, the Ganges and the Brahmaputra. It would therefore have been very natural for him to explain the mistake of the old maps, saying: "The lake giving rise to the several rivers is neither Yamdok-tso nor Koko-nor, but the lake of Ngari, called Lago di Retoà (Rudok) by Desideri, and Manasarovar by the Hindus."

According to *Georgi*, della Penna continues thus (loc. supra cit.): Istud (i. e. Tzhang-pò) Lhassam rapidissimo cursu præterfluit: conjungitur cum Cihasum ad Arcem Ciuciu: mergitur post longa viarum intervalla in lacum Lopà; inde rursus emergit, seseque tandem in Gangem exonerat. De quarto id unum memorat, quòd cursum vergat in Tartarorum terras. Hujusmodi fluviorum origines ansam dedisse puto veteribus, ut Paradisum terrestrem in India collocarent."

On some old maps both the Ganges and the Brahmaputra are shown as coming from Lago the Chiamay. The latter, the Tibetan Tsang-po, joins Cihasum (Ki-chu) at Ciuciu (Chushul), and, after a long course, obviously eastwards, flows through the lake Lopà, a statement, which again looks like an attempt to save Lago de Chiamay. Della Penna is, from a general point of view, quite right. He indicates that the Brahmaputra is the continuation of the Tsangpo. But he makes the river pass through a lake. This hydrography, and the words "inde rursus emergit", has a great resemblance to the old Chinese view, that the Tarim was the upper course of the Hwang-ho. In this case also the intermediate lake is called Lop(-nor). One feels tempted to suppose that della Penna had heard something of the old Chinese misunderstanding regarding the Tarim-Hwang-ho.¹ This becomes the more likely as Chinese geographers really have confounded the Hwang-ho with the Tsang-po, and the K'un-lun with the Himalaya.²

"Description du Royaume de Laos et des pays voisins" is the title of a geographical note which, in 1687, was presented by the ambassadors of the king of Laos to the king of Siam. This note, together with an accompanying memoir, was sent to Europe by Father *Claude de Visdélou*.³ It begins with a description of the capital of Laos, called Leeng, and of which it is said: "Elle est arrosée par le fleuve Laï, qui vient de la montagne Pan-yen, située au nord de

¹ Cp. Albert Herrmann: Die alten Seidenstrassen zwischen China und Syrien. Quellen und Forschungen zur alten Geschichte und Geographie. Herausgeg. von W. Sieglin, Heft 21, Berlin 1910, p. 61 et seq.

² K. Himly: Einiges über das Si Yü Shui Tao Ki. Zeitschr. d. Ges. f. Erdk. z. Berlin. Bd XV. Berlin 1880, p. 182 et seq.

³ Claude de Visdélou was born Aug. 12. 1656 in Bienassis in Pléneuf, Côte du Nord; Bishop of Claudiopolis Febr. 12. 1708; died Nov. 11. 1737 at Pondichéry. — Henry Cordier: Bibliotheca Sinica Vol. II. Fasc. I. Paris 1905, p. 1100. ... Abel-Rémusat has written his biography in Nouveaux mélanges Asiatiques, Tome second. Paris, 1829, p. 244 et seq.

la ville, près d'un endroit appelé Bankiop, et se jette dans le fleuve Koum (ou de Camboge). Le Koum est un de ces quatre bras d'un même fleuve, lesquels se séparent dans le Chaï ou Vinam (Yunnan). Ce premier bras traverse les villes de Lee, Kian-sen, Kian-koum et Lan-kan; de cette ville-ci il passe au milieu du Camboge, où il entre dans la mer. Son embouchure est appelée Ba-sak. Le second bras se rend dans l'An-va (Ava), et y est appelé communément Me-nam-kiu. Le troisième roule ses eaux jusqu'à Canton, où il se décharge dans la mer. Le quatrième, enfin, traverse les villes de Kiang-koung et Lan-chan. Le Menam, ou le fleuve de Siam, prend sa source dans la montagne de Ki-an-dau, et près du royaume de Laos, le Kiam-haï ou Kiamai reçoit ses eaux. Au delà des frontières de Siam, du côté du nord, on rencontre d'abord Kiam-haï, ville et province du même nom. De cette ville à Kie-ma-rath, ville et province, il y a sept jours de chemin, et de Kie-ma-rath à Lán, il y en a huit. Les routes sont bien mal entretenues, et à peine peut-on y aller dans de très-petites voitures."¹

Father Visdélou has further added the following observation to an "Extrait d'une relation de quatre chinois transalpins", dating from 1687: "Il est hors de doute que le fleuve de Siam, ou le Me-nam, a sa source au delà des frontières de Siam, mais non pas à une grande distance; car j'ai appris d'une personne digne de foi, que c'étoit dans la province de Kiam-haï, près les frontières de Siam: J'ai des raisons de croire à cette assertion; car lors de mon séjour dans le Siam, je suis arrivé plusieurs fois dans une barque, dans l'été, en moins de soixante et dix heures, à Leu, par l'embouchure du Menam, ou du fleuve de Siam. Dans cet endroit, son lit a plus de cent pieds de latitude; mais il étoit absolument sec, à l'exception de dix pieds environ, où l'eau couloit doucement, n'ayant que deux ou trois pouces de profondeur, ce qui prouve que sa source n'est pas beaucoup éloignée. Les ambassadeurs de Laos assurent qu'il coule de la montagne appelée Kian-dau, sans déterminer cependant la position de cette dernière. J'ai lieu de croire qu'elle se trouve dans le Kiam-haï; au moins elle ne peut être loin de cette région. — Or, presque tous nos géographes se sont entièrement trompés en dérivant ces quatre fleuves (c'est-à-dire ceux du Siam, du Pégu et les autres deux qui se déchargent dans le golfe de Bengale, entre le Gange et le fleuve du Pégu) d'un lac d'une grandeur extraordinaire, appelé Ki-mo-y ou Quia-mai, qu'ils placent sous le trente-quatrième ou cinquième degré de latitude, dans le Thibet. Le Kiam-haï, comme nous avons dit ci-dessus, confine avec le Siam, il est très-petit, et ne peut pas avoir un aussi grand lac, à moins qu'il ne forme un lac lui-même. Ils entassent ainsi des erreurs très-considérables sur d'autres encore plus embarrassantes; ils confondent ce lac, qu'ils ont créé, avec un autre lac appelé Thsing haï par les Chinois, Khoukhou-noor par les Tartares de l'ouest, et communément mer Bleue par les deux nations, et qui est situé à peu près par la même

¹ Lettres édifiantes, etc. Tome IV, Paris MDCCXLIII, p. 662.

hauteur du pôle. Le Khoukhou-noor est tout près de la Chine; il n'est pas même à sept postes entières de Si-ning, place célèbre dans l'occident de cet empire. Nos géographes avoient peut-être entendu dire quelque chose d'aussi vague que la relation des ambassadeurs de Laos, relativement aux quatre bras des fleuves qui coulent de la province de Yunnan; cependant ils diffèrent d'eux, en ce que les ambassadeurs nous assurent que le premier et le quatrième bras, divisés à leur source, se réunissent de nouveau près de la ville de Lan-chan, au lieu que les géographes européens pensent que le fleuve du Siam soit un bras du fleuve du Pégu, qui s'est dirigé bien loin de sa source. Ils se sont également trompés en les plaçant dans le Thibet ou dans le Yun-nan.”¹

In the description of Laos, quoted by Father Visdélou, there is a mention of one river which divides into four branches. One of them goes to Cambodia, another to Ava is called Me-nam-kiu, though the river of Ava is Irrawaddi. A third flows to Canton and a fourth to Kiang-kung and Lan-shan. In this view, which perhaps was generally accepted in the country, we may find one of the causes of the misunderstanding. The four rivers are supposed to come from a common source. In a note to Visdélou's Memoir, which has also been published in *Journal Asiatique*, Klaproth says: “Il s'agit ici de quatre fleuves séparés, et non pas de quatre bras d'un même courant d'eau.” The Kiam-haï or Kiamai is said to receive its waters in the vicinity of Laos. Here thus we have another derivation of the name Chiamay which seems to be more probable than Xieng-mai. But it is not said whether Kiam-haï, in this connection, is a lake or a river. The same name, however, also belongs to a city and a province north of Siam, a location which is in accordance with the supposed situation of Lago de Chiamay.

Visdélou has further some very sound remarks on an account of four “trans-alpine” Chinese. According to this account, the source of the Me-nam is situated in the province of Kiam-haï, a statement which again contributes to the explanation of the misunderstanding. Visdélou himself does not doubt that Me-nam has its source in the region of Kiam-haï. He sharply criticizes the geographers who have made the capital mistake of deriving the four rivers from a lake of extraordinary dimensions. The province of Kiam-haï, he says, is so small, that there is not room enough for such a great lake, unless the whole of Kiam-haï were a lake itself. The geographers heap mistakes upon mistakes. First they imagine a lake, and then they confound this fabulous creation with — the Koko-nor. He presumes that the geographers have heard something about the account of the ambassadors from Laos regarding the four rivers coming from Yunnan. In spite of his very good criticism, however, the learned Father has not sufficient information himself to enable him to solve the problem. His view is in any case of great interest as being a step in the right direction.

¹ Op. cit. p. 666.

At Visdélou's time and earlier several European draftsmen indeed confounded Lago de Chiamay with Koko-nor. Thus, for instance, *de Witt* has on his map: "Coconor at Chiamay Lacus."¹ It is surprising that in the middle of the nineteenth century the following words could still be accepted for printing in a geographical journal, the author being the wellknown Dr. *Gutzlaff*: "We have now arrived at the banks of the Loo-keang (Lu-kiang), which is even here a very considerable stream. If the accounts of Chinese geographers be correct, it takes its rise in Kokonor, the land of springs and fountains, in the 32nd degree of N. lat., and receives many other rivers before it reaches the Birman frontier. It is there known under the name of Thauleuen, and having traversed that country through its whole length, it falls, known as the river Salwen, below the town of Martaban into the sea."² Thus in the middle of last century Salwen was supposed by some geographers to derive its source from the Koko-nor! What could then be expected from 300 years earlier, or about 1550! Though it is hard to understand what Gutzlaff means by his Kokonor in 32° N. lat. Already in 1733 d'Anville knew that Koko-nor was situated in 37° N. lat., and he also knew that the upper Hwang-ho came in between the Koko-nor and the drainage area of the Salwen.

A German traveller, *Johann Gottlieb Worms*, more than a hundred years before Gutzlaff, thought it safer to place the source of one of the famous rivers, the Me-nam, in Tartary, to which the whole northern and eastern Tibet was reckoned: "Der ansehnlichste Fluss ist der Menam auf Siamisch, so viel, als eine Mutter der Gewässer, ist ein gut Theil breiter als die Elbe, sehr tief, und entspringt, wie man meynet, in der Tartarey."³

In 1795 Major *Michal Symes* was sent on an embassy to the king of Ava. His narrative shows that Yule-Burnell (Hobson-Jobson) were not the first to identify the name Chiamay with Yango-may or Zengomay, the Burmese Zimmé and the Chinese Chiang-mai. He says: "The kingdom of Siam, or Shaan, comprehended as far south as Junkseylon, east to Cambodia and Laos, and north to Dzemeé (probably the Chiamee of Loubère), and Yunan in China."⁴

The nice little map adorning Major Symes' book was compiled from the materials collected by two members of the mission, Dr. *Buchanan* and Mr. *Wood*. Of their work *Dalrymple*, who constructed the map, says: "This part of Indian geography has hitherto remained in inexplicable obscurity, and although much

¹ Cp. my Vol. I. Pl. XXXV.

² Frontiers of China towards Birmah. Journal R. G. S. Vol. XIX, 1849, p. 43.

³ Johann Gottlieb Worms, Ost-Indian- und Persische Reisen, etc. . . . Dresden und Leipzig, 1737, p. 751.

⁴ An account of an Embassy to the Kingdom of Ava, sent by the Governor General of India, in the year 1795, 4to, Nichol, 1800, p. 3. At other places in his book Symes writes Zemee.

light has been thrown on the subject in consequence of the Embassy, . . . not only from the astronomical observations by Ensign Thomas Wood, which do him the greatest credit, but from the great mass of native geography, which the assiduous pains of Dr. Buchanan . . . have accumulated from various persons. — These maps obtained by Dr. Buchanan from the natives, although they elucidate the geography, cannot be considered as positive documents for the construction of an accurate map of these countries, etc. . . ."¹

Here, therefore, we have a European traveller, who sees the great rivers and collects information from the natives. There is not a word of anyone of the great rivers coming from a lake in the north, unless it be the Irrawaddi, the presumed upper course of which, or the Tsangpo, was supposed to come from the Manasarovar. If Dalrymple had not known more of the general physical geography of these regions than Barros, he might easily have fallen into the same mistake as the Portuguese historian.

Some people so late as 1800, still believed in the existence of Lago de Chiamay. In the *Asiatic Annual Register* for the year 1800, London, 1801, we find a "Description of the Kingdom of Assam, taken from the *Alemgeernameh* of Mohammed Cazim, and translated by Henry Vansittart." A more recent translation of the same description had been published in the 11th number of the *Indian Telegraph*. In the latter, which is not at my disposal, a note dealt with the Chiamay Lake. This note, quoted in the *Asiatic Annual Register*, runs as follows: "Mons. De Lisle, in his History of India beyond the Ganges, calls this country Achem or Acham, and tells us, that it was formerly a part of the empire of Ava, under the king of Pegue, who had no less than twenty kingdoms in his dominions, among which was Assam . . . It should seem that Assam was first discovered by the Moguls, in Aureng Zeeb's time, by sailing up the large river Laquia, which (says a contemporary of De Lisle's, Mons. Martinia,) rises from the lake Chiamay, and, after a course from east to west, bends southwards, and falls with divers mouths into the eastern branch of the Ganges. Our present author, in his account of Assam, makes no mention whatever, either of the river Laquia, or of Lake Chiamay; both, certainly, worthy of note, the one for its navigation — the other, its astonishing size, which according to Luyts, is 180 leagues in compass."²

Even in geographical manuals we may find the name of the lake mentioned: Thus for instance: "In the interior of the peninsula beyond the Ganges, we discover a feature, which continues long to figure in European maps, the lake of Cayamoy, forming the source of the Brahmapoutra, the Ava, the Menam, and all the rivers by which this part of Asia is watered."³ Later on, in the days of *Sanson*:

¹ Symes, *op. cit.*, Preface, p. X.

² *Asiatic Annual Register*, London 1801, Miscellaneous Tracts, p. 42.

³ Hugh Murray: *Historical Account of Discoveries and Travels*, Vol. I, Edinburgh 1820, p. 508.

“The lake of Cayamoy continues to give rise to all the rivers of Siam and Ava”.¹ And from the time of the Jesuits in China: “The lake of Cayamoy was now banished, and the sources of the great rivers which water the peninsula beyond the Ganges, as well as of those of China, were discovered in mountainous regions which lie much deeper in the interior. Upon the whole, these materials, arranged by the superior geographical skill of D’Anville and Rennell, afforded to Europe a tolerable idea of the component parts of the Asiatic continent, and of their bearings upon each other.”²

In a quite recent Manual, that of *Hugh Clifford*, the following references are made to the Lago de Chiamay: “The Portuguese also learned of the existence ‘in the midst of the continent’ of a great lake called ‘Cunebetea’ by its nearest neighbours, and Chiamay by others in which the river (Mekong) took its source. This belief in a great central lake in which all the large rivers of the Indo-Chinese peninsula took their rise was very persistent, and in writing of Burma, it will be recalled, Pinto declares that he had himself seen it — which is manifestly untrue. The great lake of Kambodia may have been the origin of this tradition, a lake at the head of the main branch of the Mekong being inferred by analogy with the more accessible branch which joins the parent stream near Pnom Penh, but it is obvious that the coast natives did not know that the river ran through a portion of China, and that it was never regarded by them as a possible highway for communication with the Celestial Empire.”³

The place referred to in the above passage runs as follows: “He (Mendez Pinto) repeats the myth which had long been current of a great inland lake whence flowed all the rivers of the Indo—Chinese peninsula — a tradition which may possibly have had its origin in the Lake of Tonle Sap — and he adds, characteristically enough, that he had himself seen it!”⁴ The supposition that such rivers as Irrawaddi and Menam ever could have been supposed to rise from the Tonle Sap, which is situated near the coast on the boundary between Siam and Cambodia, is, of course, quite absurd.

The Menam, the Mother of the Waters or Madre dell’ acque, to which the imagination and misunderstanding of the old Portuguese had given such a glorious origin, is, like the Indus, a quite insignificant rivulet at its birthplace. Thus *F. Bernard* says:

“Nous eûmes, en découvrant les sources de la Mé-Nam, le même plaisir que d’autres ont trouvé à voir les sources du Nil ou du Congo et mes collègues

¹ Ibidem, p. 509.

² Ibidem, p. 515.

³ Further India being the Story of Exploration from the earliest time in Burma, etc. London, 1905, p. 94.

⁴ Op. cit. p. 83.

siamois prirent une joie un peu enfantine à sauter à pieds joints ce ruisseau qui, quelques centaines de kilomètres plus loin, devenait le fleuve majestueux de Bangkok, la Mé-Nam, Mère des Eaux.”¹

All attempts to identify the Lago de Chiamay with some really existing lake in the Indo-Chinese peninsula or in the regions north of it, have proved to be failures. Such was the fate of Koko-nor some 250 years ago, such the fate of Tonle Sap in our own days. The sacred lake of Brahmakund has also been mentioned, — not as the prototype of Lago de Chiamay, but still as the fountain from which the Brahmaputra and several other rivers took their origin, and in this quality it has been compared with the Manasarovar.

In a lecture before the Geographical Society of Paris M. *de Larénaudière* made the following interesting remarks founded upon different reports from English geographical papers: “Un fait remarquable, c’est l’indication d’une ouverture dans la chaîne inférieure orientale jusqu’au Brahma-Khound ou source du Bourampoutre, fixée à 27°44’ latitude, et 96° longitude E. de Greenwich . . . Le Brahma-Khound est à peu près la même chose que le Manasarowar et l’Ewan-Hrad du Tibet. C’est le réservoir où viennent se réunir les fontes de neige de toutes les chaînes supérieures, et le bassin d’où s’écoulent non seulement le Bomampoutre, mais plusieurs autres courans.”²

We do not need to enter upon a discussion of this speculation, the mistakes of which are obvious in the light of our present knowledge. But still it is curious to notice how Larénaudière, without quite understanding the deep meaning of his own words, made a comparison between the Brahmakund and the Manasarovar. Of Brahmakund he says that not only the Brahmaputra but also several other rivers take their origin from that lake, just as the natives of Southern Asia pretend that the Manasarovar gives rise to four rivers, one of them Brahmaputra. In the same way Lago de Chiamay is a mysterious manifestation of Lake Manasarovar, and the Brahmakund is a kind of intermediate station between Lago de Chiamay and the Sacred Lake in the west of Tibet.

In the region where the Indo-Chinese rivers stream along in very deep valleys very near to one another and only separated from each other by considerable

¹ L’exploration de l’Indo-Chine et la délimitation de la frontière franco-siamoise. La Géographie. Tome XIX. 1909, p. 177.

² *Nouvelles Annales des voyages*, Tome XXX, Paris 1826, p. 400. In another French description of Assam some 80 years ago it is said: Toutefois le vrai Brahmakound, tel qu’il est décrit dans les chastrâs des Hindous, est à la source du fleuve; mais jusqu’à présent il reste encore à décider la question de savoir si le bassin dont il s’agit est à la source de la branche du fleuve dont nous nous occupons en ce moment, ou à celle d’une autre branche qui, d’après ce que l’on croit, prend son origine dans les mêmes montagnes, mais suit une direction différente, et forme au moins une partie du Dihong, qui venant du nord se réunit au Brahmapoutre, à une vingtaine de milles au-dessous de Sadiya. — *Nouvelles Annales des voyages*, Tome troisième, 1836, p. 158.

and narrow mountain ranges, there is no room left for the formation of lake basins. But in Yunnan, where the mountainous country is less accentuated, and where there is more room left in the valleys between the ranges, a few lakes are to be found. One of these, the one farthest west, Ta-li or Er'hai, situated in 26° N. lat. 95 km east of the Me-kong and less than half that distance SW of the Kin-sha-kiang (Yang-tse), might possibly have been suspected as being a Madre dell' acque. A very famous trade route passes from Ch'eng-tu-fu to Ta-li-fu on this lake, and continues from there to the great city of Bhamo, where the road divides to the Salwen, Irrawaddi and Brahmaputra valleys. The Irrawaddi road, at least, is old enough for our purposes. It has been seen by Marco Polo passing by and it has been seen, already in 124 B. C. the transport of silk to India.¹

A great many Europeans have visited it. Amongst others Captain *William Gill* Sept. 27. 1877,² and Prince *Henry of Orléans* at the end of May 1895. The latter says of it: "Le lac s'allonge dans le Nord: à première vue, il a l'air moins grand que celui de Yünnan-sen, sans doute parce qu'il est moins large. Par ces temps pluvieux, il produit une impression médiocre: peut-être faut-il que les sommets des montagnes se découvrent et qu'un rayon de soleil vienne éclairer ses eaux pour que leur aspect change, et pour qu'on retrouve devant soi ce lac légendaire si beau, qui surgit comme une merveille dans l'esprit de certaines peuplades sauvages. C'est en vain qu'on fait effort pour se représenter ici l'Oiseau d'or des contes thibétains planant sur le lac sacré."³

One might therefore suppose that some of the innumerable caravans and travellers coming from Ta-li-fu would have told Europeans near the coast that they had seen a lake in the north situated in the region where the Kin-sha-kiang, the Me-kong and the Salwen are still very near each other, and that such a report might have been misunderstood. For, of course, there is no connection between the lake and the neighbouring rivers. This *may* be the case, though we have not heard positively that the lake of Ta-li has been suspected as being a source of the great rivers.

I have quoted Father Visdelou's derivation of the name Chiamay, and Major Symes' identification of Chiamay as Zimmé or Kiang-mai. And Dr. Charpentier reminds us of Yule's⁴ acceptance of this explanation, which *may* be correct.⁵

¹ China von A. Conrady, p. 471. Swedish edition of J. von Pfugk-Hartung's *Världshistoria*, published by Harald Hjärne, Stockholm 1914, Vol. III. p. 468.

² The River of Golden Sand, Vol. II. London 1880, p. 295.

³ Du Tonkin aux Indes, Paris, 1898. p. 116.

⁴ In 1834 and 1835 Dr. Richardson reached Zimmé, "the Jangomai of the old writers, unvisited by any European traveller, for two centuries". — Henry Yule: "On the Geography of Burma and its Tributary states..." *Journal Roy. Geogr. Soc.* Vol. XXVII, 1857, p. 54 et seq.

⁵ Ritter writes Chiangmai. J. M. Kennedy, Assistant-Surveyor 1890—91, has the spelling Chieng-mai. Aymonier and the mission Pavie, Indo-Chine 1879—1895, Paris 1901 have Xieng Mai.

On the other hand it seems rather unlikely that a region situated 3° south of the southernmost headlands of the Brahmaputra-delta should be suspected as hiding a gigantic lake. Even in Gastaldi's days, in 1550, so much was known that the Brahmaputra could not be drawn as flowing from south to north, which would be the case if Lago de Chiamay were situated where the town of Kiang-mai was found. Kiang-mai is situated on one of Me-nam's tributaries, only 2° north of the delta of the Salwen, and both the Me-nam and the Salwen were supposed to come from the lake. Were Lago de Chiamay on the boundary between Siam and Burma, the Brahmaputra must needs cross both the Salwen and Irrawaddi in order to be able to reach its delta. And we may be pretty sure that Kiang-mai in old days was well known as situated on a great road. Therefore Dr. Charpentier is no doubt right in saying: "it might even be possible, that this name Jangomai (=Kiang-mai) . . . might have been transferred to a locality further to the north." If we examine the old maps reproduced in my Vol. I. this seems indeed to be the case. Gastaldi, 1550, or 1554, has the lake very far south. In the course of time the lake then proceeds to the north, taking the name, whether it be Kiang-mai or something else, with it. This is obviously the case with Witsen, 1687 (Pl. XXXIV), who has the following legend: "Coconor vel Chimoi Lacus sive Zim", where Zim must be the same as Zimme.

On p. 243 of Vol. I, I am discussing Delisle's representation of the lake on his map of 1705. I say: Delisle retains the lake and calls it Lac de Chaamay, but removes it so far eastwards as possible, obviously with the calculation that it should not interfere too much with the comparatively settled physical geography of Hindustan and Tibet. The lake is situated straight south of Lhasa, which is also too far to the east. Delisle has dropped three of the four rivers, Irrawaddi, Salwen and Menam, which on Gastaldi's map issued from the lake, though the great French cartographer has not yet dared to leave the Irrawaddi quite without contact with Chiamay: a tributary to the river of Ava, Caipoumo, still takes its origin from the lake. Otherwise he has only one river that gets every drop of its water from Lac de Chaamay, namely Rivière de Laquia, the river from the *terra incognita* of Lakhimpur . . . But Delisle got time to change his opinion thoroughly. On his map of 1723 the Chiamay has disappeared without leaving any sign behind. Here, only ten years before d'Anville's map was pub-

In his History of Tennasserim Captain James Low has a chapter: Che-ung Mai, or North Laos. It is a very good description of the country and the city, its history, government, population, trade, scenery, climate, etc. He has also some information to give regarding the rivers Mekong and Menam, as well as the roads. He says: "There are some reasons for the supposition that Che-ung Mai lies on or near what was once the famous Bamian route from India to China and Camboja, and which was pursued by traders before navigation was opened." In old times the city of Che-ung Mai may thus have been comparatively better known, or more in use than ever nowadays. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Gr. Brit. & Irel. No. X. London 1839, p. 245 et seq.

lished, we have a map without the slightest trace of the Manasarovar. For there is no Chiamay, no Beruan, no Siba, and no nameless lake. Only the Coconor is left.

Nevertheless a rudiment of Lago de Chiamay appears again in 1751, on *Gilles Robert de Vaugondy's* "Carte du Royaume de Siam."¹ This Robert was grandson of Nicolas Sanson and "Geographe ordinaire du Roi", born at Paris in 1688, died in 1766. Although Delisle in 1723 had exterminated the lake, it reappeared thirty years later and filled its age of 200 years on European maps of Asia. But Robert has given the lake quite diminutive dimensions. From the western shore issues, just as in Delisle's map of 1705, Laquia Fl., and from the southern shore Caipoumo Fl., a tributary to the river of Ava or Irrawaddi. Robert seems to have searched for some equivalent in the actual facts in order to be able to reintroduce the lake, which he, like Gastaldi 200 years before, calls L. Chiamay. Such an equivalent he has found in the little lake Logtak in Manipur, Upper Burma, from which an outflow runs to the right tributary of Irrawaddi, at which the town Manipur is situated, and which is probably identical to the Caipoumo Fl. of the old maps.

Robert's map was published the same year (1751) as d'Anville's, on which the Irrawaddi is represented as the lower course of the Tibetan Tsangpo, a river that, according to Indian belief, originated from Manasarovar. Father *Gaubil* agrees with *d'Anville*², and so does *Klaproth*.³ Much ink and paper have been wasted on this problem, which we have only to remember in order to get an impression of the hopeless confusion that must have reigned some 370 years ago, when practically everything was unknown, both Tibet and the systems of the Indo-Chinese rivers. As a symbol of the uncertainty, Lago de Chiamay still in 1751 belonged to the river systems of both the Indian peninsulas, both to the Brahmaputra and the Irrawaddi.⁴

¹ *Annales du Musée Guimet. Tome vingt-septième. Le Siam ancien par Lucien Fournereau, Première partie, Paris 1895, p. 39.*

² *No. uv Journal asiatique, X, Paris 1832, p. 401.*

³ *Mémoires relatifs à l'Asie, Tome III, Paris 1828, p. 386.*

⁴ The mistake of the old Portuguese travellers and geographers has nothing surprising in itself. In much less remote times than those in question rivers of India have been mixed up and confused with rivers of Indo-China in a most extraordinary way. In my Vol. II, p. 277 et seq., I have given a very short *resumé* of the Tsangpo-Brahmaputra problem. Regarding this hydrographical problem Sir Henry Yule writes the following words, which, indeed, might equally well have been used regarding the Manasarovar-Chiamay problem: "Very eminent geographers have, however, not been content to accept the view of the identity of the Tsanpu and the Brahmaputra, and several have contended that the Irawadi of Burma was the true continuation of the great Tibetan River. . . Chinese writers find leisure to speculate on geographical questions as well as Europeans. And some of them, finding, on the one hand, the Tsanpu flowing through Tibet, and disappearing they knew not whither, and finding, on the other, the Irawadi coming down into Burma from the north, issuing they knew not whence, adopted a

One of the arguments Dr. Dahlgren as well as Dr. Charpentier allege against my theory that Lago de Chiamay must be a manifestation of the Manasarovar, is the great distance between the latter and its ghost. But old mapmakers have taken greater liberties than that. Nineteen years after Lago de Chiamay's first appearance, or in 1569, *Mercator* removed the whole Ganges system all the way eastwards to southern China and confounded that river with the Hsi-chiang. Within a few hours he destroyed with his pencil a fact which had been known some 1,500 years. He confused Ceylon with Sumatra and changed the whole hydrographical system of the southern part of the continent in accordance with this singular mistake. In this case the question was about two islands known for centuries. In the case of Chiamay it was a question of two lakes, of which one did not exist and the other was absolutely unknown to Europeans. In comparison with Mercator, Barros made a rather innocent mistake, for, without knowing it, he moved a lake 1,800 km eastwards, while Mercator removed an island, easily attainable by sailing ships, and a whole river system, known already by Ptolemy, some 2,500 km eastwards. And still in the seventeenth century *de Witt* confounded Chiamay lacus with Koko-nor, some 1,200 km farther north.

De la Loubère's words, quoted by Dr. Charpentier, touches the heart of the problem, from a geographical point of view, very closely. He says: "Mais les Siamois . . . ne connoissent pas ce lac célèbre, d'où nos Géographes font sortir la rivière de Menam, et auquel selon eux cette ville donne son nom. Ce qui m'a fait penser ou qu'elle en est plus éloignée que nos Géographes n'out cru, ou que ce lac n'est point du tout . . ." His first alternative, viz. that it is farther away, is true of Manasarovar; the latter, that it does not at all exist, is true regarding Lago de Chiamay. In reality "ce lac célèbre" is Manasarovar, which he did not know. *De la Loubère* also tells us that the city of Chiamay was said to be fifteen days' march north of the frontier of Siam. This statement agrees with *Visdelou's* remarks, and makes it very unlikely that this city could be Kiang-mai.

We now proceed to another side of the problem. On *Gastaldi's* map of 1550,

practice well known to geographers (to Ptolemy, be it said, *pace tanti viri*, not least) long before Dickens humorously attributed it to one of the characters in *Pickwick*, — they "combined the information", and concluded that the Tsanpu and the Irawadi were one". — *Introductory Essay to the River of Golden Sand*, London 1879, p. [23]. — *Jacques Bacot* says: "La source de l'Irrawady a été, durant la dernière moitié du siècle dernier, l'objet de nombreuses discussions entre géographes.. L'Irrawady est, en Birmanie, un fleuve considérable, de la même importance que le Fleuve Bleu en Chine et le Mekong en Indo-Chine. On en concluait qu'il devait prendre sa source, comme ces deux fleuves, au loins dans l'intérieur du Tibet. Mais on ne savait quel fleuve connu du Tibet identifier avec l'Irrawady . . . La conclusion est que l'Irrawady prend sa source à l'est un peu au nord d'un affluent de la Salwen, ce qui semble paradoxal et montre à quel point ce pays est tourmenté. Cela démontre aussi que les discussions purement théoriques appliquées au Tibet sont illusoire." — *Le Tibet révolté*. Paris 1912, p. 336.

where Lago de Chiamay appears for the first time, only *four* rivers issue from its basin. This is in accordance with the four rivers which, as the Indian cosmogony has it, discharged the Manasarovar. That the number, in the case of Lake Chiamay, later on grew to six, was due to new "discoveries" made by the European cartographers at their drawing-boards.

Regarding Monserrate's account of Manasarovar Dr. Charpentier says: "I should feel much inclined to believe that he was even the very first one who got any information of that famous lake from native reports." He is no doubt perfectly right that it was *from native report* that Monserrate got his information of the lake, and that too so early as in 1581, or perhaps, even earlier. What was at that epoch known of Tibet? An answer to that question may be given by the series of old maps which I have reproduced in Vol. I. Mercator, in 1569, has only the name Thebet, too far to the east and north. It is worth noting that he has placed this name N. N. E., not west, of Chiamay lacus. We must proceed to Delisle, 1705, to find "Tibet" and "Lassa" comparatively well placed, though always too far east. Even hundred years after Mercator the cartographers knew nothing except the name Tibet. The *single* geographical detail that already in 1581 had reached European ears was Manasarovar, the sacred lake of which the peoples of southern Asia believed that it gave rise to four rivers. Or, as Abel-Rémusat says:

"Le lac Anoudata . . . d'où l'on suppose que sortent les quatre grands fleuves du Djambou dvîpa, a 800 li (environ 80 lieues) de circonférence. Ses rives sont ornées d'or, d'argent, de saphir, de cristal, de cuivre, de fer et d'autres matières précieuses." ¹ Wonderful myths and tales whispered round the shores of the lake which gave birth to the four great rivers of Jambudvîpa or India. Their age could be reckoned in thousands of years. The mystical tales round Lago de Chiamay were of Portuguese fabrication and quite new to men and gods. Of course, any other traveller might, just as well as Monserrate, have heard some rumours of the lake in the north with its four rivers! The single thing Joseph Tieffenthaler, 200 years after Monserrate, could get out of the natives regarding Tibet, was likewise the lake Manasarovar and its relation to the great Indian rivers, though he misunderstood what they told him.

In his "Essai sur la cosmographie et la cosmogonie des Bouddhistes, d'après les auteurs chinois", just quoted above and published in *Mélanges posthumes*, Abel-Rémusat mentions the four rivers, supposed to take their origin from the sacred lake. "Ces quatre fleuves sortent d'un lac carré, nommé A neou tha (Anoudata), dont les quatre faces sont remarquables par un animal et une matière qui leur sont particuliers." ² In a sūtra translated by *Burnouf* Anavatapta is said

¹ *Mélanges posthumes d'histoire et de littérature orientales*, Paris MDCCCXLIII, p. 78.

² *Op cit.*, p. 77.

to be the same lake as Râvana hrada, in Pâli Anavatatta, in Chinese A neu tha. Regarding this lake *Klaproth* says: "Le lac A neu tha ou Anawadata est le Râvanhrada des Hindous et le Mapam dalaï des cartes mandchou-chinoises faites sous Khang hi et Kiang loungh."¹ From the Great Imperial Geography *Klaproth* translates Ma-pin-mou-ta-lai or Mapam talaï thus: "Le mot mapham signifie, en tubetaïn, ce qui surpasse tout, dalaï, en mongol, est mer. Les Hindous appellent ce lac Manassarovar." On d'Anville's map of 1733 the lake is also called L. Mapama. We find therefore that A-neou-tha, Anavatapta, Anavatatta, Anawadata and Anoudata in different languages all signify Manasarovar.

Now, this name Anoudata, as Abel-Rémusat has it, is used in a most interesting connection by Captain F. Wilford in his article quoted above: "An Essay on the Sacred Isles in the West."² Wilford tells us the story of Monserrate's discovery of the sacred lake from native information. Then he continues: "He (Monserrate) calls it Mán-saruor, and, from the report of pilgrims, places it in thirty-two degrees of latitude North; an about three hundred and fifty miles to the North-East of Serhind. The first European who saw it, was P. Andrada, in the year 1624: and in the years 1715, and 1716, it was visited by the missionaries P. Desiderius and Emanuel Freyer."³ — The Burmahs call the lake Anaudát, and place four heads of animals to the four cardinal points, from which spring the four great rivers; and thus, in the opinion of the divines of Tibet and Ava, this lake is the real Mán-saraur. From this description one might be induced to suppose this lake to be the crater of a Volcano, but much larger than any now existing."

The lake Anaudát (i. e. Anoudata, Anavatapta=Manasarovar) was thus known to the natives of Burma; and the divines of Tibet and of Ava (i. e. the country on both sides of the Ava River or Irrawaddi=Burma) identified Anaudát with Manasarovar. They certainly had a fairly correct idea of its geographical situation. But, of course, they could not be responsible for the misunderstanding of a European traveller, to whom the hydrography of the interior of Asia was a perfect chaos.

The fame of the sacred lake Anavatapta has, from time immemorial, been great and wide-spread. It is no wonder that it was renowned in Burma, nor that rumours of its existence should reach the ears of European travellers. The ground-lines of Indian cosmography has already some 2,000 years ago extended so far as China. In a later time, still more than a thousand years ago, the great Chinese pilgrim *Hsüan-tchuan*g passed, in 643 A. D., on his return journey from India, where he had collected Buddhist religious works, through Pamir, and travelled

¹ Foë Koué Ki, Paris 1836, p. 37-

² Asiatic Researches, VIII, 1808, p. 245 et seq.

³ Or, more correctly: Freyre.

along the Dragon Lake, which obviously was either the Sirikol (Sor-kul), discovered by Wood in 1838, or the Chakmakden-kul.¹ In his memoir Hsüan-tchuang says: ² Au centre de la vallée de Po-mi-lo (Pamir), il y a un grand lac de dragons (Nâgahrada), qui a environ trois cents li de l'est à l'ouest, et cinq cents li du sud au nord. Il est situé dans l'intérieur des grands Tsong-ling, et au centre du Tchen-pou-tcheou (Djamboudvîpa)."³ But the biographer of *Hsüan-tchuang*, the Shaman *Hwui-li* more positively expresses himself regarding the Dragon Lake: "It lies in the centre of Jambudvîpa, at an immense height. . . This lake, moreover, is one with the Anavatapta lake, in its north and south direction."⁴

It would take us too far to enter upon this interesting question now. I will, instead of that, finally say a few words on what I have called the soul of the problem.

In a review of Lieutenant Colonel Michal Symes' book "An Account of an Embassy to the Kingdom of Ava, sent by the Governor General of India, in the year 1795", quoted above, I find the following passage: "Tirup-mieu, or Chinese Town, commemorates the defeat of another Chinese army who invaded the Burman dominions; five miles farther on, the Keenduem mingles its waters with those of the Iravati (Irrawaddi); this great river comes from the north-west, and divides the country of Cassay from that of Ava. 'The Burmans say it has its source in a lake three months journey to the northward; it is navigable as far as the Burman territories extend for vessels of burthen.' The most distant town in the possession of the Burmans on the Keenduem was named Nakioung, and the first Shaan town, says our author, was called Thangdat. Shaan, he informs us, is a term given to different nations; thus the Yudra Shan, is Siam, the Cassay-Shan, Cassay. . . We may venture to predict that when the geography of this *terra incognita* is somewhat better understood, the Keenduem will be found to be a branch of the Sanpo, or Brahmaputra; Thangdat the most southerly town of Asham: and the lake three months to the northward, the Man-saravara of Tibet, whence both the Ganges and Brahmaputra derive their source."⁵

The Burmans say, according to this statement, that the Irrawaddi, which European mapmakers indeed derived from Lago de Chiamay, has its source in a lake three months' journey to the north. They may equally well have told this story to a European traveller in Pinto's days. It should be noted that the re-

¹ Cp. *Through Asia*, Vol. II, p. 689, and *En färd genom Asien*, II, Stockholm 1898, p. 17.

² Stanislas Julien: *Mémoires sur les contrées occidentales. . . par Hiouen-thsang*. Tome II, Paris MDCCCLVIII, p. 207.

³ I. e. India.

⁴ Samuel Beal: *The Life of Hiuen-tsiang*, London 1911, p. 198. — In Stanislas Julien's translation: *Ce lac, dans la direction du sud au nord, correspond au lac A-neou (Anavatapta).*" — *Histoire de la vie d'Hiouen-thsang*, Paris 1851, p. 54.

⁵ *The Asiatic Annual Register. . . For the year 1801*. London, 1802, Account of Books, p. 27.

viewer does not mention Lake Chiamay, and therefore seems not to be prejudiced by it. He feels *a priori* persuaded that it will prove to be the Manasarovar as soon as the geography of the country is better known.

In a note to *Marignolli's* "Recollections of Eastern Travel", and more specially to his "Chapter concerning Paradise", where he talks of a lake called Euphirattes, from which a fountain issues forth and divides into four rivers — Sir Henry Yule has collected some examples showing that different nations have attributed a common source to several rivers as if there were something in the idea attractive to man's imagination. After speaking of the four rivers of Eden he says: "The most prominent instance of the tradition alluded to is that in both Brahmanical and Buddhist cosmogony, which derives four great rivers of India, the Indus, the Sutlej, the Ganges, and the Sardha from one Holy Lake at the foot of Kailas . . . The rivers of Cambodia, of Canton, of Ava, and a fourth (perhaps the Salwen) were regarded by the people of Laos as all branches of one river; a notion which was probably only a local adaptation of the Indian Buddhist tradition . . . The Hindu myths suggested to mapmakers a great Lake Chiamay in Tibet, from which dispersed all the great rivers of Eastern Asia; Ferdinand Mendez Pinto declared, perhaps believed, that he had visited it, and every atlas down to the beginning of the eighteenth century, if not later, repeated the fiction."¹

Sir Henry Yule, the greatest authority on Asiatic historical geography, in these words expresses the opinion that Indian Buddhist tradition had influenced the people of Laos, and that Lago de Chiamay derived its existence from the Hindu myths.

Regarding the solution of the problem itself, that is to say, the identification of the Lago de Chiamay, Sir Henry Yule expresses himself in a much clearer way in his description of the Mission to Ava in 1855. There he says: "Many of the old maps depict a certain 'Lake of Chimay', somewhere in the far interior of the Indo-Chinese countries, whence issue all the great rivers of Eastern India. But Ferdinand Mendez Pinto is probably the only traveller who declares he had *seen* it. He gives it, however, a different name."² To this statement Yule has the following note: "Such a notion seems to have been generally diffused, probably from India with the Buddhist legends. Doubtless it originated in the fact of the rise of the Indus, the Sutlej, the Ganges, and the Tsanpoo, within a space of little more than two square degrees, from that great world-water-shed on which lake Manasarovar lies."³

¹ *Cathay and the Way thither*, Vol. III, London, MDCCCCXIV, p. 221.

² Singapamor or Chiamay. — I believe it quite hopeless to try and locate the lake from the names given by Pinto. A supposed relation between Singapamor and Ginaphogaos will not help us any where, and of the Singphos Pinto could hardly have heard anything. One might equally well find a resemblance in Singapamor with Singi-pamir or the Indus-valley, which, of course, would be absurd.

³ A Narrative of the mission sent by the Governor-General of India to the Court of Ava in 1855,

When, in 1913, I wrote my Vol. I, I did not know Yule's work on the Mission to Ava, for otherwise I should, of course, have used it as an excellent support of my view. He fully corroborates my opinion which I expressed in my chapter on Lago de Chiamay.

A short time after his visit to Ava Yule gives a clear idea how little was really known of this complicated hydrography even in the time of Dr. Buchanan. He says: "The Sitang river, known in the upper part of its course as the Pounloug, is shown even in some of the latest maps as discharging from the lake of Nyoung-yuwé in the westernmost of the southern Shan states; from which also a radiation of other streams was represented as diverging to the Myitngé, near Ava; to the Irawadi, near Yéngyoung; and to the Salwen, with a great variety of junction lines between these ramifications." The learned author adds in a note the following words: "These features originated in the Burmese maps obtained by Dr. Buchanan. The divergence and intercommunication of all rivers appears to be a favourite feature in Burmese notions of geography, perhaps derived from the myth of the great northern lake, the supposed source of the great rivers of India. Buchanan himself seems to have been so far misled by these notions as to conjecture a partial communication of supply, by such an offshoot, from the Tsanpoo to the Irawadi, whilst admitting in the main Rennell's theory of the discharge of the latter river by the Brahmaputra."¹

To recapitulate the essential points of the last quotations, we find, that Indian Buddhist tradition regarding a lake feeding great rivers was, perhaps at a very early date, adopted in Laos. The notion of a lake in the north obviously came from India with the Buddhist legends. Sir Henry Yule positively says that it *doubtless* originated from the Manasarovar and its four rivers. Lake Anavatapta, or Manasarovar, was known to the natives of Burma and to the divines of Ava, though their conception of its geographical situation was, of course, even more diffuse than that of the Indians. The divergence and intercommunication of rivers is a feature, characteristic of the Burmese conception of hydrography, which Yule thinks to be derived from the myth of the great northern lake, the supposed source of all the great rivers of India, i. e. the Manasarovar. Though Buchanan was persuaded of the correctness of Rennell's theory that the Brahmaputra was the lower course of the Tsangpo, he was nevertheless so deeply influenced by Burmese ideas, that he, by way of bifurcation, had a portion of the Tsangpo water — from the Manasarovar, as it was supposed — joining the Irrawaddi. According to the Burmese, the Irrawaddi comes from the N. W., and has its

with notices of the country, government, and people. By Captain Henry Yule. London 1858, p. 209 and 305.

¹ *On the Geography of Burma and its Tributary States*, etc. Journal Roy. Geogr. Society, Vol. XXVII, 1857, p. 80.

source in a lake three months' journey to the northward. This lake *cannot* be any other than the Manasarovar. This conviction was already possessed by an unknown reviewer 120 years ago, a man who believed in the Manasarovar as being the source of the Ganges and the Brahmaputra, and who also believed that the Burmese lake three months' journey northwards one day would prove to be the Manasarovar. The Hindu myths and the Buddhist legends suggested, by ways that probably will never be quite cleared up, to European mapmakers a Lago de Chiamay as feeder of the great Indo-Chinese rivers.

A sacred lake in the north, the abode of Gods, the mother of great waters, ripening the harvests of Northern India, and blessing humanity, was already in remote antiquity a dogma as hard as crystal. Religious dogmas have made wider wanderings than from India to Burma, Siam and Laos. The misunderstanding of one or several Europeans some 375 years ago, seems only too natural.

The conclusion at which I arrived in my book, also received much support from the examination of the old European maps, where, in the course of time, and in the light of more solid knowledge, the fabulous lake is seen gradually wandering westwards, or in the direction of the region where the Manasarovar is situated. The result of my researches may indeed, at first sight, seem somewhat audacious. Mere geographical and historical speculation, however, is not enough. Any amount of erudition, together with a boundless knowledge of the literary sources, will not prove sufficient for the solution of a problem the essence of which has for countless ages been sung by royal rivers, and whispered by the winds of the Himalaya.

Anyone who like myself, has had the good luck to pass a longer time than any living or dead European on the shores of the sacred lake, and who has witnessed the pilgrims from India at sunrise worshipping the holy waters, has indeed received a very powerful impression of the magnificent part played by this lake in the world of religious ideas of the Indians, and may well feel persuaded that the solution I have given of the Chiamay problem not only *may* be, but also really *is* perfectly correct.
