

the most probable, both cases are correct, the deep saddle of Kore-la seems to give some support to the view, that the Ladak range is only a part of and belongs to the Himalaya. But even if we leave all sort of speculation alone, the fact that the Indus, Satlej and Brahmaputra break through both the Ladak range and the Himalaya ranges, gives to the Ladak range the same orographical position as the Great Himalaya and the lower Himalaya ranges. This of course would not interfere with the name which has been accepted by Burrard and Hayden.

The question of new names in formerly unknown countries is a difficult one. The discoverer has of course the right to baptise mountain peaks and lakes which nobody has visited before and which have no native names. Nobody has made use of this right on a greater scale than Prshevalskiy, although many of the names he has given, specially in the Kwen-luns, begin to disappear more and more from our maps. Bonvalot has also dropped a lot of names behind him on his famous crossing through Tibet. Only once, in 1896, have I given a European name to a geographical feature in Asia, namely a peak in northern uninhabited Tibet, to which I gave the name of King Oscar. Burrard and Hayden have proposed some names for ranges, which are necessary and useful, and rather general appellations or terms than names. They are always geographical, not personal, Asiatic not European, and almost every one of them has its own history and *raison d'être*.

As regards the nomenclature of the Transhimalayan ranges, the following quotations may serve as an illustration. In the summer of 1910 I wrote: <sup>1</sup> »Herr H. Habenicht, of Gotha, has suggested to me the name of 'Ryder range' for the range situated to the north of the upper Brahmaputra, and I am only too happy to accept it. I regard the Ryder range as stretching between the eastern end of the Kanchung-gangri in the west, and the Ki-chu of Lhasa in the east. The range bordering the very upper-most part of the upper Brahmaputra, say from Cha-chu to Kailas, I should like to call the Strachey range, and the range from the Kailas along the upper Indus the Montgomerie range. But all these are mere suggestions which have to be submitted to the Survey of India and the Royal Geographical Society, and unless they are approved I am not going to use the new names. As a rule I hate European names on Asiatic maps. Wherever native names are to be found, no other should ever be used. But in some cases, and for lack of native names, it may be useful and practical to introduce exotic ones. And as far as Tibet is concerned, no names have a greater right to appear on the map than those of Montgomerie, Strachey, and Ryder.» <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Geographical Journal, August 1910, Vol. XXXVI, p. 193.

<sup>2</sup> »Tafel 2» in Petermann's Mitteilungen 1910, II, is an excellent map under the title: »Das Hochland von Tibet zur Übersicht von Sven Hedin's Reisen 1894—1908, Entwurf und Terrain von H. Habenicht, Situation und Schrift von C. Barich. Even this map is, however, only to be regarded as a preliminary one, for my sketch-maps on a big scale were not yet worked out. For 1910 it was the best and most complete map ever published over the whole of Tibet. Here the two ranges along