

Page 110	line 6	from the top	<i>Kelyang</i>	stands for	<i>Kebyang</i>
» 110	» 2	» »	bottom 5,151	» »	5,094
» 120	» 5	» »	» 4,169	» »	4,069
» 122	» 3	» »	top <i>Totlung</i>	» »	<i>Totling</i>
» 122	» 2	» »	bottom <i>Sarper</i>	» »	<i>Sasser</i>

E. THE MAP IN 1:200,000.

In 1918 Professor KARL D. P. ROSÉN published a scientific critical examination of the reliability and accuracy of my Tibetan panoramas, reproduced in a reduced scale in the Atlas of Panoramas.¹ He compared my sketches with the photographic panoramas made from the same points as some of them, and arrived at the conclusion that the exactitude was so great that it would be a pity not to make all possible use of the sketches. Only to a very small extent was this done by Lieutenant KJELLSTRÖM when he constructed the map, in 1:300,000.

Professor Rosén therefore advised me to have a new and chiefly hypsometrical map drawn where all the material of the map in 1:300,000 should be worked out more in detail from the morphological data contained in my panoramas, and the mountains should be sketched with approximate isohypses or »Gefühlsisohypsen» as the German term runs.

The new map which forms a separate atlas to this work, was to be drawn by Colonel H. BYSTRÖM. To keep the expenses within reasonable bounds we decided to make the map only in black, brown, blue and red. The range of sight of every panorama was to be marked in the map. To make it possible for students directly to compare this map with the map of my journey in 1899—1902 published in the atlas of my *Scientific Results*, we found it appropriate to have the new map reproduced in the same scale as the first one, or in 1:200,000. The larger scale also had the advantage of affording more space for morphological details. In cases where discrepancies existed between the absolute altitudes as given in the text and on the map in 1:300,000, all necessary corrections should be made, and the altitudes regarded as definitive.

Finally it was decided not to force my route into the net of co-ordinates, but to construct the map entirely upon the basis of my original field-maps. Also in this respect it would be quite equal to my map of 1899—1902, and with regard to accuracy both maps could be directly compared with one another.

I have said above, p. 203, that the length of my route from *Tankse* through Tibet and back to *Tankse* was, in my fieldbooks, found to be 4,270 km. in length. If the field survey had been correct, the polygon would have been closed at *Tankse*.

¹ *Vide Ymer*, 1918, p. 125 *et seq.*