

the plains of Northern India, while a slope of corresponding character descending to the north is known as the Kuen-lun».

Dealing with Dr. Thomson he says that this distinguished traveller acknowledged the unity of the Himálaya-Tibetan region. Referring to A. Cunningham he points out his parallel chains beyond the Himalaya, »comprising at least three distinct ranges of mountains, which Cunningham proposes to call the Trans-Himalayan, or that which divides the head waters of the Satlej from those of the Indus and extends to the western limits of Rongdo and Astor; second, the Kailás or Gangri range which runs through the midst of Western Tibet along the right bank of the Indus to its confluence with the Shyok; and third, the Trans-Tibetan range, also called Bolor and Kárákoram». Atkinson finds these distinctions purely local and geographical but also so far convenient as to be accepted.

The next contributor, Henry Strachey, shows us that the Indian watershed is not the great Himálaya as seen from India, but is situated in a succession of valley heads, and Sir Henry Rawlinson recognises the unity of the entire mass, and writes that the »whole country between India and Tartary may be considered as a broad mountain range, the Himálaya forming the southern crest, and the Kuen-lun the northern».

After having referred to the views of Saunders, Markham and the Calcutta Reviewer, Atkinson comes to the latest contribution to the physical geography of the Himalaya, namely H. Blanford, who, in his *Manual of the Geology of India*, »considers the Himálaya to form a curved belt of mountains with their convexity to the southward which mark the southern scarp of the Tibetan plateau as the Kuen-lun define the northern . . .»

Atkinson's final conclusions are important as giving us an idea of the store of knowledge of his time. He says: »Though year by year fresh materials are added to our stock of knowledge regarding the Himálaya, they are yet too imperfect for us to offer little more than a suggestion as to the views that should be adopted regarding its structure. A glance at Mr. Saunders' map will show us the vastness of the subject, and that the Himálaya of Kumaon and Garhwál, with which we are more immediately concerned, is but a very small portion of the great girdle of snowy peaks that uphold between them the elevated plateau of Tibet.» Having reviewed the different theories he says: »To our mind the recognition of the unity of the entire Himálaya-Tibetan system is the most important of them all, and that alone which will lead to practical results. The division of the Himálaya into ranges may be allowed as a matter of convenience, but should not be permitted to cloud the great fact that all are but variations in the southern slope of the great table-land due to the influence of the elements on the materials of which they are composed, and to the disturbing action of subterranean forces. We can lay down the line of water-parting and the line of greatest elevation with some precision . . .» the rest and the final word, he correctly says, must be given by the geologist.