

right to expect that it shall at all events make some distinction between data that are certain and data that are doubtful. But on Roborovskij's map of the Upper Kum-köl basin the Upper lake is delineated in the same way as the Lower lake, although the latter was the only one that the draughtsman saw. The same thing is true of the mountain-ranges, even of those that do not exist at all. Any one attempting to reconcile Roborovskij's map with Carey's would have a very difficult task before him; for while the delineation of the former must be taken as certain, the delineation of the latter ought to be taken as almost certain, for the outline of the lake is not dotted. Dr. B. Hassenstein, in sheet IV of my maps in *Peterm. Mitteil.*, Ergänzhft. 131, has followed both travellers by entering not only Carey's little »lake» of 1887 but also Roborovskij's Tschong-kum-köl of 1892. But considering that a length of 60 versts and a breadth of 14 versts were improbable in the case of the latter lake, he has reduced its dimensions to 33 km. and 7 km. respectively, and moreover has dotted the entire circuit of the lake, to show that he considers the data uncertain. On the other hand he has entered Carey's lake unchanged, and made a couple of the deltaic arms of the Bulak-baschi enter the lake and the others enter the Kum-köl-darja, which seems to me to be extremely probable, because of the great quantity of mud on the southern shore at the western end of the lake. If the Tschong-kum-köl be taken away from Hassenstein's map altogether, it is then correct, for we return to Carey's standpoint. How far Carey's estimate of 11 km. is correct for the length I am, as I have said, not in a position to determine, but his 3 km. for the breadth is as near as possible right, for at the point where I paddled across it, the lake measured 3200 m., and this, so far as I could see, was the broadest place in it. Carey's omission to enter any streams as entering the lake or the Kum-köl-darja from the south is easily explicable, because he travelled along the northern shore, from which it is difficult to see any of the brooks on the south shore. As for the Lower lake, Carey, while cautiously pricking in its outline on the east, has not ventured to indicate even in any way its westward prolongation: he could not know that Prschevskij discovered the lake 1½ years before. On the whole Carey was in a position to secure trustworthy information, because his companion, Dalgleish, spoke the Jarkent dialect of the Turkish language. But with regard to the nomenclature of the mountain-ranges, he is equally as unfortunate as the Russian travellers. To the Astin-tagh he gives no name at all, but the Akato-tagh he calls the Altun Range. The words »Chimen Tagh Range» are printed across the Kalta-alaghan. The Tschimen valley he names quite correctly the »Chiman Plain», and the little lake which I have simply called »köl» (p. 29 above) Carey calls the Chiman Bashkul, i. e. Tschimen-basch-köl, or the First Lake in Tschimen, which is very probable, even though I did not hear of it. Contrary to Prschevskij, Bonvalot has correctly indicated that the Astin-tagh is a double range, for which he employs the incorrect Altyn Tagh, a name introduced however by Prschevskij. The words Astin (or Astun)-tagh mean the Lower Mountains in contrast to Üstün-tagh, the Upper Mountains, though this name is not applied to any special mountain-range. Bonvalot crossed the Upper Astin-tagh range by the pass of Tasch-davan, the altitude of which he gives at 5200 m., whereas its real altitude is only 3960 m.! What are we to think of the remaining altitudes he gives when one that we are able to check is