CORRESPONDENCE.

THE WEISSHORN FROM THE SHALLIJOCH.

To the Editor of the ALPINE JOURNAL.

SIR,—Our attention has been called to a paper under this heading in the last number of the 'Alpine Journal,' and it has been suggested to us that it is advisable, in the interests of Alpine history, to correct some very inaccurate and, so far as we are concerned, entirely unauthorised statements which the author has therein made with regard to our own route up that mountain by the south-east face and south-west (Schallijoch) arête in 1877.

As will be seen on reference to the note at p. 340 of vol. viii. of the 'Alpine Journal,' and to Mr. Hartley's paper in the same volume, we ascended direct up the south-east face of the peak to a point which we estimated at the time to be about 1,500 ft. below the summit. We struck the arête at 11.20 A.M., and reached the summit at 1.35 P.M., so that the arête was followed for 2 hrs. 15 min., or about half the total (actual walking) time employed in climbing the mountain from our breakfast place beneath the bergschrund.

Our route is correctly indicated in the tracing which appeared in the 'Alpine Journal' for November 1895, and which was supplied at the special request of the then editor (Sir Martin Conway) by one of our number. We confess we are somewhat surprised in these circumstances that Mr. Broome's statements should have been allowed to appear in the 'Alpine Journal' without any sort of editorial comment or explanation.

We are, Sir, your obedient servants,

J. WALKER HARTLEY,
W. E. DAVIDSON,
H. SEYMOUR HOARE.

October 9, 1896.

To the Editor of the ALPINE JOURNAL.

DEAR SIR,—I thank you for sending me copy of above letter. I of course accept the corrections therein contained, though I tried to state the facts as they appeared to me, and could not (nor can I now) quite reconcile the 1877 track, as shown in the 'Alpine Journal' for November 1895, with the original note and Mr. Hartley's paper.

I am, yours truly,

EDWARD A. BROOME.

THE DOM.

To the Editor of the ALPINE JOURNAL.

Edinburgh: Sept. 10, 1896.

DEAR SIR,—In Mr. Broome's delightful paper on the Weisshorn, in the last number of the 'Alpine Journal' (p. 147), there are some

Digitized by Google

statements on which I hope you will allow me to make a few remarks, as his words convey an imputation—which I think undeserved—on the character of that respectable mountain the Dom. He complains of its eastern face as constantly raked with stones, and the ascent of it as a sort of 'Balaclava affair.' I cannot help thinking that the Dom must have been in an exceptionally bad humour the day he went up, for my experience was quite different. I went up from Saas-Fée, towards the end of August 1888, with Clemenz Zurbriggen and another Saas man. We passed the night on some rocks well above the Fée Glacier, at a point almost immediately below the Dom-Joch. We had a horrid night of it, for there was a heavy thunder storm and a good deal of snow fell. It took some time to clear, and we did not get off till past 5 next morning. We traversed nearly straight across the face of the mountain, which was, no doubt, seamed with shallow couloirs, down which something—snow or ice apparently—was in the habit of sliding; but I can safely say that we did not see a single falling stone during this passage. We then struck a rocky rib, with snow at intervals, which led straight up to a projecting point three or four hundred yards to the right—*i.e.* to the N.E. of the summit—whence the route to the summit was easy. On this rib the climbing was sometimes rather awkward, from the fresh snow, but again we saw no falling stones. Possibly the new snow contributed to keep them quiet, but I cannot help thinking that if the traverse—which is quite simple—is made early in the morning, the danger will be reduced to a minimum. No doubt after a few hours' sun it would be a very different matter, but this seems easy to avoid; and, once on the rocks, I do not think there is any risk at all to be feared. I merely mention these facts and impressions because I should be sorry to think that so good a climb as the east face of the Dom undoubtedly is should be avoided because of annoyances which I cannot help thinking must have been due to an exceptional condition of the mountain or to some error in the route taken.

Yours faithfully,

G. W. Prothero.

Digitized by Google