

Kara-korum water-parting performed a distinct function, separating the basin of the Indus from that of the Tarim. He asked what such a water-parting should be called and why it should not be regarded as a range, when its summits reached an elevation of 28,000 feet?

This discussion took place only some fifteen years after the SCHLAGINTWEIT'S journeys! And JOHNSON'S map had been published in the *Journal*!

SHAW'S article *Central Asia in 1872* was translated by PETERMANN.¹ He points out that recent English and Russian exploration had brought forward a quite new theory of the arrangement of the mountains of these regions. The Bolor-tagh was regarded as a north-western continuation of the Himalaya, the Kara-korum and Kwen-lun were joined with the Himalayas into one great mountain system. And instead of our imaginations of sharply defined water-parting ranges, we get great mountain masses and high plateaux on the top of which the peaks and series of crests were built up. In spite of SAUNDERS' criticism, PETERMANN agrees with SHAW, MONTGOMERIE, SEVERTSOFF and others who reckon Bolor-tagh, Kwen-lun and Kara-korum in the Himalayan System. He thinks Shaw was right in giving a greater and more natural importance to the enormous upheavals of the plateau-masses than to the more artificial representation hitherto given by the maps.

The geographers of those days did not know the many other systems in the interior of Tibet and which, notwithstanding the plateaux, are very distinct, and can not be called peaks built up on a plateau-land. It should not be forgotten that the original, primary orography may, on account of innumerable periods of climatic changes and the always acting denudation, be hidden by the secondary phenomena, to which belong the filling up of basins and the transformation of valleys into plateaux.

The famous Bolor falls outside of our region, and we have no space here to enter upon Sir HENRY YULE'S very valuable and learned discussion of the name, to which he was led by Shaw's information that the Kirgiz used to give the name Bolor to Chitral. Yule follows the history of this name which has played such an important part in maps and geographical works and up to 1870 has been so misleading, not least on account of HUMBOLDT'S unrivalled authority. It is sufficient for us to quote Yule's final result:²

Bolor, it may be hoped, is now finally disposed of. We not only know that there is no such place where it was located, but we can also now account for the error. The name Bolor is, I see, still used by recent geographers for the Pamir Mountains. But the name has been so tainted, both by accidental error and by forgery, that it would surely now be well to dismiss it from our maps and books altogether.

¹ *Petermanns Mitteilungen*. Band 19, p. 1 *et seq.*

² *Journal Royal Geographical Society*. Vol. XLII. 1872, p. 473 *et seq.*