

most the same as to deny the existence of a Tibetan continuation to the system, where Humboldt at least has his Khor or Hor range.

With our present knowledge the Tengri-nor is not more characteristic for the high plateaux between the Kwen-lun and Himalaya, than any other of the innumerable lakes, unless the fact that it is larger than the rest should be sufficient. And still Humboldt had at his disposal the Chinese maps and d'Anville. But he did not believe in them. He says that d'Anville's conjectures belonged to a time, in which the most confused and erroneous ideas prevailed regarding the mountain ranges of the plateau of High Tartary, the ranges running in all directions without the least order. So far as the Transhimalaya is concerned we have seen that this view happens to be correct. And still d'Anville's map is here more correct, generally, than Humboldt's. Both originate from the same initial sources, which have been far better understood by d'Anville than by Humboldt. D'Anville's map lets us suspect the existence of several different ranges as is indeed the case. Humboldt's map makes us believe in the existence of only *one* single range, the Dzang, north of the Tsangpo and south of Tengri-nor.

I have referred here to Humboldt's map of 1831 (Pl. VIII.) The one published in *Central-Asien*, 1844, is somewhat different. There we see a range: »Nubra oder Karakorum», and S.E. of it another called »Geb. Ghiang-ri», which is identical with the Gangri or Kailas. The lakes he calls Rawana-hrada and Mana-sarowar; the latter had been called Manasa on the earlier map. He has no channel between the lakes, but the Satlej issuing from Rakas-tal, where Moorcroft has been his authority. As Humboldt died in 1859 he lived sufficiently long to see the results of H. and R. Strachey's exploration.

The brilliant perspicacity of Humboldt could not be satisfied with the dogmas of the past, which with such obstinacy kept the new time in their spell and proved to be a hindrance to independent observation. But Humboldt to a certain extent exaggerated the value of his own orographical system, for he says:¹ »Ich verweile hier bei einer Erörterung, welche, wie ich mir schmeichle, den Schleier über einige für die historische Geographie interessante Verhältnisse in einem an grossen Erinnerungen so reichen Theil der Erde gelüftet hat.» Humboldt will always be given the honour of having brought order into the orographical systems of the interior of Asia. He drew the boundaries, Kwen-lun and Himalaya, for the Tibetan highlands, from which the knowledge of Kara-korum and Transhimalaya had to develop at a much later time. In the points in which he criticised d'Anville and Strahlenberg² he was wrong. If he had accepted them as he accepted Klaproth, his map would have been improved. His Dzang or Ghiang-ri range, is not a discovery of his own, nor the result of orographical or morphological conclusions, but simply a statement, which he, as did Ritter, borrowed from Klaproth.

¹ Op. cit. p. 119.

² Vide Vol. I, p. 251.