

which, however, is further east, south of Tarok-tso. Should Dzolmié thang be identical with Nganglaring-tso and the wide plain (tang) surrounding it? Takra long indeed corresponds to d'Anville's M. Mouron. But I become lost in guesswork and do not find a single fixed starting point. The conclusion drawn by de Rhins seems, generally speaking, to be fairly correct, in case the two really existing ranges of Ding-la and Surnge-la are meant. For, further east the orography becomes more complicated. De Rhins personally expresses the following view: »La plus éloignée des deux fleuves est la chaîne des Gang ri située dans le prolongement des Tsong ling ou monts Karakorum; à la plus rapprochée, dont fait partie le Gang dis ri, on peut avec quelque raison appliquer le nom du sommet principal.» This is not quite clear. The one of the two ranges situated at the greater distance from the rivers should be the Gang ri and to the one situated nearest the rivers he suggests the name of Gang dis ri. But so far as I understand, the name Gangri has been proposed earlier for the range to which Kailas belongs. Whether the Tsong-ling is identical with the Kara-korum mountains and whether the range Gang ri is the continuation of the Kara-korum, these are questions which had already been opened by Klaproth and to which we shall have to return later on.

The following passage is interesting:¹ »Les Chinois prétendent qu'il y a une douzaine de chaînes parallèles à celles-ci au nord-est de l'Indus et du Tsan po; mais leurs textes et cartes ne donnant pas d'autres renseignements que ceux que nous reproduisons, il est impossible d'en trouver plus de quatre dans les limites du Thibet: les deux que nous venons d'indiquer et deux autres dans la région nord-occidentale que nous étudierons plus tard.»

The two ranges mentioned before are thus the Gangri and Gang dis ri, of which the latter was known to Moorcroft and both crossed by the Pundits of 1867. But what did the Chinese mean in pretending that a dozen other chains should be situated N.E. of the Indus and Tsangpo, all parallel with the Gangri and Gang dis ri? De Rhins could find only two, and two others in the N.W. From the Chinese text he could not find out a single range N.E. of the upper Indus and Tsangpo except the two mentioned. It may be that the Chinese author means, amongst others, some of the ranges which it was my good fortune to discover north and N.E. of the upper Tsangpo, the existence of which was unknown even to such western scholars as had made a special study of the Chinese texts. And de Rhins also points out that neither the Chinese texts nor their maps have anything to say about this dozen of chains.

Du Halde says that the Chinese called the whole chain to the *west* of Kentaise Kan te chan, or at least the Lama surveyors were told so in the temple where they stayed to gather information about the further course of the Ganges.²

¹ Ibidem, p. 521.

² Description de l'Empire de la Chine etc. Tome IV, p. 465.