

He supposes that the great mountainous mass of the Tibetan table-land and Himalaya is continued till it ends abruptly about 40° North. lat. in Bulut Tag in the very centre of Turkestan.¹ He gives a very good *résumé* of what we know from the journeys of MOORCROFT and HEARSAY, himself and his brother and WINTERBOTTOM. This is not much, »but we have obtained a distinct though distant view of the mountains in this quarter as far as E. long. 82° ; and native information regarding the remaining corner to the S. E. has been tolerably precise». After VIGNE he mentions the explorations of Lieut. R. YOUNG, J. E. WINTERBOTTOM and P. VANS AGNEW in 1847, extending to $35^{\circ} 50'$ north, in the valley of Haramosh and in other valleys farther west. Henry Strachey himself reached the eastern head of the Chang-chenmo »without attaining any knowledge of a Turkish watershed».

Regarding the names of peaks and ranges, Henry Strachey writes the wise words:

The Tibetans have proper names for a few remarkable peaks and for all of the passes, but no general name for whole ranges; and when such appear upon our maps they are the misapplication of purely local names by English surveyors and European geographers. Thus.... the Turkish Mus-Tag, *i. e.* Ice-Berg, and Kara-korum, *i. e.* Black Gravel, applied by the natives exclusively to the mere passes, and the Indian Kailash to a mere peak, have been raised to that wrong eminence upon the map of Asia.²

This observation is quite correct. But still such names are absolutely necessary by want of any better. There is, however, a great difference between the three names mentioned by H. Strachey as examples. For »Mus-tagh» are always the highest mountains, *viz.* such that give rise to glaciers, as, for instance, Mus-tagh-ata. Kara-korum is the name of one single pass; but as the most important road through Western Tibet crosses it, it has become more famous than any other pass in these regions, and is known by whole nations. Kailas, on the other hand, is an Indian name belonging only to one special peak. The appellation Kailas Range, as CUNNINGHAM has it, is quite superfluous.

Henry Strachey regarded the mountain system of Western Tibet as consisting of a series of parallel ranges running right across the breadth of the table-land in a direction so extremely oblique to the general extension of the whole as often to confound the one with the other, or to convert the transverse direction to a longitudinal one. The supposed primary arrangement would be converted into the existing varieties of valley and drainage by short transverse necks connecting the main ranges in some parts, fissures cutting through them, and projecting spurs of a secondary order. The connecting necks may be confounded with the main ranges. Secondary spurs also may be so high and so obliquely joined to the primary ranges as to make it difficult to distinguish between the two. Strachey believes that much of the

¹ *Ibidem*, p. 5.

² *Loc. cit.*, p. 26.