

great mountain systems of the interior of the Continent. However, Lóczy principally deals with the Kwen-lun System, as the expedition chiefly came in contact with it. He examines, so far as it was possible nearly 30 years ago, the connection between the Western, Central and Eastern Kwen-lun, and also enters upon the mountain systems interesting us in this volume.¹

Lóczy shows how RICHTHOFEN corrected the mistakes of HUMBOLDT regarding the continental extension of the Kwen-lun, and its presumed connection with the Hindu-kush, and how the same scholar, from the discoveries of STOLICZKA and the British geologists explained the tectonic relations between the Kwen-lun and the Himalaya. Later on the researches of BOGDANOVITCH modified RICHTHOFEN'S views considerably.

Lóczy points out that RICHTHOFEN, when he sketched the great lines of Asiatic orography, hardly had more exact materials at his disposition than HUMBOLDT and RITTER. His results agree very well with the experiences of the expedition of Count SZÉCHENYI, with PRSHEVALSKIY'S second and third journeys and with the wanderings of the PUNDIT A—K—.

As some of the great Chinese rivers came from a line stretching S. W.—N. E. in Eastern Tibet, Richthofen believed in the existence of a mighty protuberance in these regions, the probability of which was strengthened by HUC'S description of the mighty Tang-la.

While Richthofen regarded the Bolor Mountains of Humboldt or the Kizil-yart, as a N. W. and northern continuation of the Himalayan system,² SUESS proves that this view was wrong and that the Western Kwen-lun turns to the N. W. and N. N. W. the Kizil-yart being its continuation. He also explains how the Western Himalaya to the S. W. goes over into the Hindu-kush.

Lóczy had no dates regarding the parts of Tibet situated east of Ling-si-tang and Aksai-chin. A space of some 10° of Long., *i. e.* the interior of Tibet and the continuation of the Kwen-lun remained unknown.

The journey of BONVALOT and Prince HENRY OF ORLÉANS generally indicated a W.—E. stretching of the ranges. »In dem Reisewerke sind leider keine Angaben über Breitenbestimmungen und ebenso auch keine Routenaufnahmen enthalten, infolgedessen wir nicht in der Lage sind, über den Grad der Genauigkeit der Bonvalot-schen Karte zu urteilen. . . . Das mächtige Duplex-Gebirge scheint die W. N. W.-liche

¹ Ludwig Lóczy in *Die wissenschaftlichen Ergebnisse der Reise des Grafen Béla Széchenyi in Ost-Asien 1877—80*. Erster Band: *Die Beobachtungen während der Reise*. Dritter Abschnitt: *Geologie*. Wien 1893, p. 619 *et seq.*

² Dutreuil de Rhins is right in saying: En se servant de la carte de Klaproth pour relever les directions des principaux sommets et établir sa théorie, d'après laquelle les chaînes de l'Asie centrale seraient orientées dans le sens des parallèles et des méridiens, A. de Humboldt ne pouvait donc obtenir qu'un résultat assez incertain dont la régularité géométrique et la simplicité ne s'observent guère dans la nature. — *L'Asie Centrale*, p. 582.