

This view is of course quite impossible nowadays, as we have a rather good knowledge of a great number of extremely sharply-marked ranges.

At the end of his article Severtsoff returns to the significance of the name though he again comes into contradiction with what he has said regarding the *Bolor*:

The name of »Bolor» in the sense of an entire mountain system, which I have denominated the *Southern Tsun-lin*, should, in my opinion, properly be excluded from the geography of Asia, because it is really *not the name of a mountain system*, and in this sense is therefore an error. Bolor is the name of a river and of a town situated upon it (!); and is besides, according to Central Asiatic usage, the term for the one mountain from which the Bolor issues. They perpetuate an error by giving this name to a mountain region which has for several ages born another appellation, instead of one that is general, and at the same time most appropriate, *viz.*, »Tsun-lin». And this name will be preserved in geography, although the Tsun-lin, as we have seen, does not constitute a complete and independent mountain system, being formed by the western converging extremities of the Thian-Shan and the Himalayas. Both of these ranges, however, at their junction assume one common character as to their orography, somewhat distinct from that of their more distant elevations, as is illustrated by the dispersal of their peaks, and by the numerous short ranges that detach themselves, and intersect each other.¹

We have seen above that SIR HENRY YULE accepted Severtsoff's proposal to call this somewhat vague mountainous region the *Ts'ung-ling*, a proposal that, however, never has had any success. It cannot be otherwise, for a mountain region formed by the western converging extremities of the *Tien-shan* and the *Himalayas* is in reality a monstrosity that does not exist. The single fact that explains Severtsoff's view is that he includes both the *Kwenlun* and the *Kara-korum* in his *Himalayas*.

Severtsoff has at any rate made a serious attempt to approach an exhaustive definition of the system.

6. YULE.

In his brilliant article »Notes regarding Bolor, and some other names in the apocryphal Geography of the Upper Oxus»,² SIR HENRY YULE gives an historical review of the name Bolor, and as *Bolor* is a part of the Chinese *Ts'ung-ling*, he sometimes comes in contact with this system.

Yule shows the vitality of the name *Bolor* for a mountain, a town, a state near the sources of the *Oxus*. CUNNINGHAM had told us that *Bolor* was a Dard name for *Balti* or *Little Tibet*. VIVIEN DE ST. MARTIN recurred to the old Bolor Geographorum, west of Pamir, as a probable explanation of the *Puliho* of HSÜAN-CHUANG to a small state of *Tokharistan*. On ARROWSMITH'S map of 1834 it was to be found, as well as on the more recent maps of KIEPERT (1864), BERGHAUS and KEITH JOHNSTON. Yule then follows the name from Hsüan-chuang, the Annals of the T'ang dynasty in the eighth century, from ALBERUNI in the eleventh, who speaks of the king *Balur Sháh* and the mountains of *Balur*, — the Balúr of NASRUDDIN of Túz (c. 1260), the Bolor of MARCO POLO, who travelled nearly the same way as the MIRZA viâ Little Pamir and Chicheklik-davan, so that this Bolor falls within the boundaries of *Sarikol*, the *Balúr* of the TARIKHI-I RASHIDI, probably including the whole of the Dard

¹ Loc. cit., p. 398.

² Journal Roy. Geogr. Society. Vol. XLII, 1872, p. 473 et seq.