presiding over and leading this band of enthusiastic mountaineers, among whom are to be found names that are known in all European climbing circles. The systematic list of expeditions makes great reading. The stupendous Lalidererwand was climbed (second ascent) by O. Herzog and G. Sixt, jun. Naturally the Kaisergebirge claimed great attention, the Predigtstuhl being twice descended by its S. arête, while Hans Dülfer, who, with W. Schaarschmidt, appears to be the most daring of the present young climbers, with the very brilliant guide Hans Fiechtl and a lady made the direct ascent of the W. face of the N. summit. As to the Totenkirchl, 120 members record ascents and another new route was made up the notorious W. face. New routes were also made up the Fleischbank and the Lärcheck, the latter extremely hard. Six members are noted as having ascended the St. Bartolomä face of the Watzmann; the N. arête of the Ödstein was again overcome—probably the third ascent; the S. arête of the Thurnerkamp was twice done; the Guglia received four visits; in the Geisler group several new routes were made; in the Rosengarten the Delago, Stabeler and Winkler Thürme were each traversed by fifteen members; a new route was made direct up the W. face of the Rosengarten, and the hard climb up the E. face was done by nine members; in the Primiero, Sexten, and Cortina districts several new routes were invented, and in fact hardly a single district in the Eastern Alps has escaped the fearless tread of these redoubtable Müncheners. Then we come to the Western Alps, and here again the ascents recorded, though less numerous, are eminently respectable. Four members ascended the somewhat tiresome Lauteraarhorn, and two the little-visited Ochs. An old friend, the Bieshorn, has somehow got transported across the Rhone Valley into the Oberland, but appears to have been duly found and overcome. Herr Pfann made the first guideless traverse of part of the long Breithorn arête and the Col du Lion is mentioned as having been visited, but can scarcely have been crossed. The Section suffered no loss through accident, notwithstanding this tremendous activity. It may indeed be proud of the brilliant energies of its sons. J. P. F.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE TWIN SUMMITS OF ELBRUZ.

To the Editor of the ALPINE JOURNAL.

April 10, 1914.

SIR,—Mr. Raeburn informs me that in addition to the expeditions recorded in the last number of the JOURNAL his party climbed the eastern summit of Elbruz. This was (as far as I know) the second ascent, none having been made (or at any rate recorded in any western European publication) since that by my party (François

Dévouassoud, A. W. Moore, C. Comyns Tucker and myself) on July 31, 1868.

Last year, as Mr. Raeburn's photographs show, there was a great deal more snow on the mountain, and the rocks of the summit ridge—including doubtless our stoneman and bottle—were mostly buried. The main point of interest, however, in the recent ascent is that, as far as the party could ascertain without instruments, there was no perceptible difference in height between the western and eastern summits. As a rule in my experience a top of equal, or nearly equal height, seen from a neighbouring eminence looks to the observer loftier. And the Russian Survey gives the western summit an advantage of 123 feet, enough one would have expected to be very appreciable to the naked eye. In the Appendix to my 'Exploration of the Caucasus' I hinted doubts of this alleged difference, not from my own experience, for owing to a local mist we never saw the other top, but on the strength of the report of several of my friends who had stood on the western summit.

Mr. Raeburn's notes have led me to examine afresh the Government maps of Elbruz, of which I have a collection, with the following result. The triangle indicating the culminating point of the eastern peak is, as a rule, placed not on the highest portion of the horseshoe-shaped top, but on its extreme N.E. end. This may possibly be accidental, but in the first edition of the special physical map of Elbruz (1 verst scale), for which its author, M. Golovievsky, received a distinction from his Government, this mark is omitted altogether, while the height is given. Does this indicate any uncertainty in the mind of the cartographer as to the accuracy of the omitted indication? Is it possible that the Russian surveyors have measured a point on the summit-ridge of the eastern peak which is not its highest? Mr. Raeburn's party, having with them the latest map, had intended to make for this rocky N.E. heel of the horseshoe. Finding however the opposite, and at the time snowy, W. end seemed higher they went to it and found themselves looking down on its rival. They estimated their superiority at 100 to 150 feet.

I write now to express my hope that the next climbers of either summit of Elbruz will by means of a spirit-level do their best to settle this matter. I would further suggest that a similar step should be taken with regard to Tetnuld and Gestola. It is very difficult to me to believe that Gestola is the higher summit, and S. Sella's panorama from Elbruz confirms my scepticism. It may appear bold to question surveyors' determinations, but in the case of peaks measured from bases on opposite sides of a chain discrepancies often arise, as has been shown over and over again in the Alps in the Italian, French, and Swiss surveys.

I am, Yours faithfully,

DOUGLAS W. FRESHFIELD.