

As to the Chema-yundung it is not mentioned in Ogawa's version either.

The following tributaries from the north seem very doubtful, at any rate their derivations. A-la-chu-ho is d'Anville's Artchou R., but the Sha-la-mu-kang cannot be identified. The Na-yu-ko-tsang-pu is d'Anville's Naouc Tsanpou R. and is probably identical with Ryder's Nakchak and Nain Sing's Chu Nago. It is said to come from the lake Sang-li, d'Anville's Sanc-li, which, perhaps, may be Senit-tso, a lake situated on the southern side of the Transhimalayan water-parting as the Tibetans told me. But the river Na-yu-ku-tsang-pu cannot be S.W. of Cho-shu-tê, if this is the district of Toshut or Hor-toshut as I believe, for then it is N.W. of that district.

The mountains from which the tributaries come are as yet impossible to identify, unless Ya-la-ling is Yor-la, one of the chief passes of the Transhimalaya.

In the description of the many tributaries of Sa-chu-tsang-pu or Tsachu we easily recognise the reality. Most of the water of this river seems to come from Lunpo-gangri and flow to the S.W. The Man-chu-tsang-pu is my Men-chu.

The general description of the course of Sa-ko-tsang-pu is admirable. It is the same river which Nain Sing more than a hundred years later called Charta Sangpo and which I call Chaktak-tsangpo. The Chinese author simply gives it the same name as the province in which it is situated, Sa-ko, the Sarka-jong of Nain Sing, Saka-dzong of Ryder and myself. It is said to come from the lake La-pu on the N.E., and indeed, as I found in 1908, it comes from a lake Lap-chung-tso situated N.N-E. of its junction with the Tsangpo. It is also perfectly right to say that the river first flows south-westwards and, after receiving several tributaries, turns south-eastwards to join the Tsangpo. But when he comes to the explanatory details within brackets, he is difficult to follow. The La-pu-kang-chung-shan is all right, for the whole country round the lake is called Lap-chung, and there may easily be a Lap-chung-gangri. Kang-lung-shan may be my Kan-chung-gangri. The length he gives to the river, 1,000 li, is very much exaggerated, if the distance between the Kailas and the Tamchok-kabab shall be used for comparison and which is given as 300 li. For the distance from the Lap-chung-tso to the mouth of the Chaktak-tsangpo is not even so much as 300 li. But the general description of the river is incomparably better and more correct than the fantastical representation given on d'Anville's map, where the river in a straight line goes to the S.W. the whole way. The Lio L. of d'Anville is meant to be the La-pu lake of Chi Chao Nan. About half way between the lake and the mouth of the river d'Anville has a range of mountains he calls Lop M., an echo from the Lap-chung mountains. He calls the river the Sanki Tsanpou.

We have seen that some of the Chinese writers make the Chema the principal branch, coming from Tamchok-kabab, others say that Chema is only a tributary joining the Kubi. In all instances, both western and eastern, the Kubi-tsangpo has, however, been almost ignored. The Chinese authorities do not mention its name, although at least in one case, it is called the Yere-tsangpo. Only Kawaguchi seems