

important fixed point for the stretching of the Nien-chen-tang-la towards the west, and the general situation of the Nien-chen-tang-la between Khalamba-la and Sela-la may now, approximately, be entered on the maps. But until somebody has crossed the range, say at the head of Tanak-pu-chu, this section of the Nien-chen-tang-la will have to be regarded as completely unknown. So much can already now be said, that both the Chinese map and that of Klaproth are quite wrong in these parts. In some particulars, for instance, the reasonable length of the northern tributaries of the Tsangpo, the Chinese map is nearer the truth, in others, for instance, the relative situation of Dangra-yum-tso, Shuru-tso and Amchok-tso, Klaproth's map is the best. We only need to notice that Klaproth has the source of the Shang river very near the eastern shore of Dangra-yum-tso, whereas in reality it is situated not far S.W. of Tengri-nor, 180 miles further east, to realise the confusion in this part.

Further so much is known through three of my crossings, that the continuation of the Nien-chen-tang-la to the west goes between Shuru-tso and Amchok-tso. On Klaproth's map there is a water-parting between Shuru-tso and Amchok-tso, but he places the principal watershed of the Nien-chen-tang-la direct east of Dangra-yum-tso, which, as we have seen, makes the tributaries of the Tsangpo double as long as they ought to be. Only the part of the range which is situated east of the Shang valley is fairly correct on Klaproth's map, as far as we now are able to judge, and disregarding the general deformation of his map. His Tombala corresponds to the Pundit's Khalamba-la.

The best feature on his map is that L. Dangra youmdzo, L. Chourou youmdzo and L. Amtchouk have not only got their correct names, but have also been relatively so well placed. For he has all three lakes on one line, almost north and south, as they are in reality. If this has happened by some lucky intuition or from some source unknown to us is difficult to say. For as far as we know with the exception of natives, no traveller has ever passed this way, and here Klaproth's map is very unlike the Ta-ch'ing map. Klaproth has a river between Shuru-tso and Dangra-yum-tso which does not exist in reality. Amchok-tso has got three rivers, two entering and one issuing which end in a little lake without connection with the Raga-tsangpo. This river is much too short, but correctly called Dok-tchou.

We do not need to search for any more extracts of Klaproth's translations from Chinese geographical works. It will be sufficient to discuss his remarkable map of Central Asia, which was published in Paris 1836 in four sheets and on the scale of 1 : 2 600 000. This map, of which Pl. III shows the part of Tibet which interests us, may be regarded as the result of many years' hard work and as representing the whole store of knowledge possessed by Klaproth in 1836. For while Dutreuil du Rhins' map of Tibet is chiefly built upon the Ta-ch'ing map and the more recent European exploration, Klaproth has made use of all material existing at his time and tried to penetrate the meaning of the several Chinese geographical