

T. G. Montgomerie.¹ The outlines of the lakes are not bad, although the Manasarovar is much better than its western neighbour. The two lakes are called Lake Lang Cho or Rakastal, and Lake Chomapang or Manasarowar. Of the affluents Some Cho is by far the best and very correctly drawn, for Nain Sing's route went along this river, where Thokchan is entered at its right place. Only a little bit of the Tage-tsangpo is to be seen, but nothing of its upper valley which is so important as containing the real and single watershed between the Satlej and the Brahmaputra. South and S. E. of the Manasarovar Gur La is drawn, not as a peak, but as a range, which does not at all correspond to the real configuration of the orography. The range north of the two lakes is much better, but it is a mistake to place Kailas Parbat *on* this range, instead of south of it.² I believe Nain Sing is one of the few travellers who have given the real and correct Tibetan name of this peak, calling it Garingboche, although the spelling is wrong, for it should be Kang-rinpoche. He has also the name Gang-rhi, which, under the form of Gangri, has been the most commonly used in Europe.

Between the two lakes there is no sign of a channel, which, however, does not prove anything, for Nain Sing never went down so far. The Satlej is called Longjon Khamba and drawn with a dotted line. Only the uppermost part of the river, where it leaves the N. W. corner of Rakas-tal, is drawn in full. And this is just the part where Nain Sing's route crossed the river. From this one gets the false impression that there must have been a small effluence.³

Already after his first paper Montgomerie had expressed the following wish: »I am trying to extend the explorations northward into the great blank between the Himalayas, Russia, and China Proper; and some day I hope to get a route carried down

¹ Map Showing the Route Survey from Nepal to Lhasa and thence through the Upper Valley of the Brahmaputra made by Pundit — from the Map compiled by Capt. T. G. Montgomerie, R. E. Published for the Journal of the Royal Geographical Society by J. Murray. London 1868.

² In this respect such maps as Berghaus' 1850, Pl. X, and H. Strachey's, 1853, Pl. XI, are more like reality.

³ On the basis of Montgomerie's Report, Dr. A. Petermann worked out an article, to which he added a map (vide Vol. III) on half as big a scale as Montgomerie's original, but containing all its details and some additions, taken from d'Anville, »bei dem im allgemeinen Übereinstimmung mit den neuen Aufnahmen ersichtlich ist und welchem die gestrickelten Theile und Nebenflüsse des Brahmaputra entnommen sind». *Reisen und Aufnahmen zweier Punditen in Tibet, 1865—66. Petermann's Mitteilungen 1868, p. 233 et seq.* For his map he has further used *Carte de la route de Tchhing Tou Fou à H'Lassa, 1830*, and the map of the Reports on the political Missions to Bootan, etc. The result is admirable, as all the maps compiled by Petermann, and it contains practically everything that was known about southern Tibet in 1868. So far as d'Anville has been used the same mistakes as he makes, return, of course, on Petermann's map. Petermann regards the journey of the Pundit as one of the most wonderful undertakings that has ever ranged in the history of discovery in the interior of Asia. The journeys of Andrade, Desideri, Grueber, Dorville, Huc and Gabet are admirable, but cannot be compared with the achievements of the young Pundit. He means from the point of view of mathematical geography. For, as a describer of humanity and religion, no Pundit has ever approached Huc, and as a describer of the journey itself none of them can ever be compared with Desideri.

On his map Petermann has been careful enough to draw the whole Langchen-kamba with a dotted line, from the very point where it leaves the lake.