

time during the night and early morning our tents were in danger from the violence of the blast, and we passed a very disturbed night. On the morning of the 9th it cleared by 8 o'clock and the sun came out, and shone brilliantly on three inches of fresh snow. Our tent ropes were coated with ice and the canvas covered by a layer of frozen snow. The peak was quite clear, and in spite of the late hour the outlook was decidedly promising. Crossing the S.E. arête we were compelled to descend 300 ft. to a snowfield covering the E. glacier. The steep slope with loose rocks, and fresh snow, resting in places on ice, caused some delay here, but by 10.30 we had crossed the snowfield and reached the foot of a broad couloir stretching 600 ft. up to the N.E. arête. We started off on snow, but above we had to scramble up a very steep shale slope. At the top was a cornice of snow with the 5-ft. edge toward us. On the opposite (northern) side a very sharp snow incline stretched straight away down for two or three thousand feet to a glacier. From the point where we stood a broken and steep jagged rocky arête stretched up for more than 2,000 ft. towards the summit, which could not be seen. Following up the arête for a short distance we worked across its N. face amongst loose rocks and fresh snow, traversing some couloirs full of snow, continuous with the steep slope below. We rejoined the main arête about 200 ft. higher, and a steady steep climb up the edge brought us at last to a point at which it became knife-like. By working down a ledge on its southern side we reached a couloir, which steadily followed up eventually again brought us to the main arête, only a few hundred feet below the top. The gradient then became less severe, although the drop on both sides was very great. The porters caused some trouble and delay, owing to their being unused to the rope.

We reached the summit (15,524 ft.) at 2 p.m. It was very sharp being formed by two blocks of trap rock standing on end, immediately below which was a vein of pure white quartz. We believe this to be the first time that the summit of Tatticooti has been reached.

MOUNT EVEREST, OR JOMOKANGKAR.

THE note from Dr. Ruge, a well-known historical geographer, translated below, appeared in the last December number of 'Petermann's Mitteilungen.' Mr. Douglas Freshfield has addressed to the editor of that periodical the subjoined correction of the series of errors into which the German writer has been betrayed by his imperfect acquaintance with English literature.

'MONT EVEREST.'

'In your second number for the current year Dr. Emil Schlagintweit has introduced a dissertation on the name of the highest mountain in the world, in which he discusses the question whether Everest and Gaurisankar are identical. I leave this question untouched, and desire only to remark with regard to the English name that the peak was correctly baptized Mont Everest, not Mount E., as is perfectly clear from the communications of General J. F. (*sic*) Walker, formerly Surveyor-General of India ("Proc. Roy. Geogr. Soc.," London, 1886, p. 88 ff.).

'Colonel Waugh in 1856 conferred this name, and in this form; and although Douglas W. Freshfield describes this form as a "curious hybrid" (*l.c.* p. 176) yet Mont Everest must be maintained as the accredited form. Ought not the highest mountain of the world to be allowed an unusual form of name—in the first place, to make it remarkable? And it is not so entirely without analogous forms, when one remembers the names Montgommery (*sic*) and Montrose.

'At any rate it is not permissible in quotations ("Pet. Mitt.," 1901, p. 40, note 3) to alter Mont into Mount. General Walker wrote Notes on Mont Everest, not on Mount Everest. Freshfield answered with Further Notes on "Mont Everest," and Walker produced a last note on Mont Everest. The mountain has, as a matter of fact, borne the name Mont Everest, and it would be petty pedantry to degrade it into an ordinary Mount.—S. RUGE.'

Mount Everest, or Jomo-kang-kar.

1 Savile Row, Burlington Gardens, London, W.:

January 8, 1902.

SIR,—Your contributor Dr. Ruge is quite mistaken in supposing that 'Mont Everest' rather than Mount Everest is, or ever has been, the accepted official English name for the highest measured peak in the world. It is true that a letter signed by Colonel Sir A. Waugh, in which the hybrid form 'Mont Everest' is several times repeated, was printed in the 'Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society' for 1856 (vol. i. p. 345). But the letter was headed in the 'Proceedings' 'Mount Everest,' and that form was used by the well-known Indian geographer Mr. Brian Hodgson in commenting on it. In the next volume of the 'Proceedings' (p. 102) Dr. Ruge will find a series of official letters from various members of the Indian Survey, including one from Sir A. Waugh himself, in all of which the mountain is called Mount Everest. Sir R. Murchison, then the President of the Royal Geographical Society, used the same form in 1857 ('Journal R.G.S.' vol. xxvii. p. 109). If Dr. Ruge requires still further evidence of English usage I may refer him to the article 'Himalaya,' by Sir R. Strachey, in the 'Encyclopædia Britannica,' to Sir Wm. Hunter's 'Imperial Gazetteer of India,' and to the articles 'Waugh' and 'Everest' in the new 'Dictionary of National Biography.'

The use of *Mont* in Sir A. Waugh's original letter was very probably the slip of a copying clerk. Whatever its origin may have been the slip has never been repeated, or treated seriously by any person of authority, except the late General J. T. Walker. Where ('P.R.G.S.' vol. viii. p. 89) he quotes Sir A. Waugh as using the form '*Mont*' on a subsequent occasion he misquotes him ('P.R.G.S.' vol. ii. p. 105). General Walker was influenced—I speak from personal knowledge—partly by an illogical respect for a document issuing from his former department, which he failed to realise had been promptly and consistently ignored by his predecessors more immediately concerned, Sir A. Waugh and Sir G. Everest; and partly by an erroneous idea that some latent distinction exists between the French *Mont* and the English *Mount*, a delusion which Dr. Ruge appears to share.

I must add, in correction of Dr. Ruge, that I have never used the phrase '*Mont Everest*' except ironically and within inverted commas. I would as soon write of '*Mount Blanc*' or '*Mount Rosa*' (see 'P.R.G.S.' vol. viii. p. 184).

With regard to the supposed analogous instances, cited by Dr. Ruge, of the use of *Mont* in the British place-names Montrose and Montgomery, I would beg the learned writer to recall to his memory the following facts:—

Montrose is said (Blackie on 'Place Names,' p. 168) to be a corruption of '*Monros*, the promontory on the marshy land—*moin*.' *Montgomery* is derived from a Norman-French personal name. To cite such a name as an argument for using a French word in a British Survey in Asia surely implies a curious lapse in historical perception! *Montgomery* records an event of considerable importance—the Norman Conquest of England—while the '*Mont*' before Everest is absolutely unmeaning.

You will, I trust, allow me to use the present opportunity to point out that Major Waddell, a Tibetan scholar and a high authority on this region, has in his recently published work, '*Among the Himalayas*,' confirmed, apparently on satisfactory evidence, the statement made in 1885 by the Pundit Surveyor Chandra Das that the Tibetan name for the peak in question is '*Jomo-kang-kar*,' the Lord, or Lady, of the Snows; their translations differ as to the sex.

In my opinion, as I have frequently stated, any authentic native name is preferable to that of an individual, however eminent, for so great a natural object. But if foreign geographers as a body decide, as they may, that the English name has been too long and too generally adopted to be conveniently altered, we are entitled to ask them not to misspell it.

I am, Sir, yours obediently,

DOUGLAS W. FRESHFIELD.

To the Editor of '*Petermann's Mitteilungen*.'