

of this wonderful geography. Be it sufficient to say that Veniukoff regards as the highest mountain in these tracts the one which is »forming the knot or connecting link of the Bolor System with the Kuen Lun, Hindu-kush, and even Himalayas».

Sir HENRY RAWLINSON at once answered to this and criticized Veniukoff's papers in a most annihilating way. He says:<sup>1</sup>

English geographers had been much surprised to learn from Russian sources that a detailed description already existed of a great part of this region, and so authentic appeared the announcement that it became the duty of the Geographical Society to inquire into the nature of these new materials, with a view to placing the information which might be obtained from them at the disposal of the public.

Sir Henry found it extraordinary that a country at which the British had been nibbling from the frontiers for the last fifty years, should all the time have been, as it were, at their disposal throughout its whole extent. The conclusion to which he arrived was that the »Travels were nothing more than an elaborate hoax». No German employé had been in the service of the Government of India and no horses purchased from those quarters at the time stated.

The next document in the matter is found in the letters from the famous and learned M. DE KHANIKOFF »on the Subject of Sir H. Rawlinson's Criticisms of the MS. Travels» etc.<sup>2</sup> He maintains emphatically that the German Traveller had really undertaken his journey within the last 20 years of the 18th century. The defence of Khanikoff is very strong and very well done indeed, at any rate, much stronger than Sir Henry's criticism.

To this Lord STRANGFORD made a reply,<sup>3</sup> not very convincing, but culminating in the sentence, that no substantial reason in favour of the traveller had been adduced; nor had any reason been taken up in M. Khanikoff's vindication of the earlier part of the *Travels* which seemed to be tenable for one moment.

In a new article: *Additional Remarks on the Bolor Highland*,<sup>4</sup> Veniukoff defends Georg Ludwig von —, refers to Khanikoff and fights Rawlinson. He now tells us that the much debated journey had actually been performed in 1769 or 1770, but the account written after 1800. Therefore, many things might have become confused in the traveller's memory, many jottings made in his diary might have become illegible, and, therefore, not utilised. »In this way I reconcile some small discrepancies which exist between his statements and more recent discoveries.» There is a good deal of truth in his words: »The dispute would prove a barren one, as neither I nor Sir H. Rawlinson have been in the part of Asia which forms the subject of this paper. Sir Henry has great knowledge of Iran, Mesopotamia,

<sup>1</sup> *Proceedings Royal Geographical Society.* Vol. X. 1865—66, p. 134 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibidem* p. 301 *et seq.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibidem* p. 315.

<sup>4</sup> *Proceedings Royal Geographical Society.* Vol. XIII. 1868—69, p. 342 *et seq.*