

The idea here suggested, that the various names given in the different Chinese chronicles to the different terminal lakes of the Tarim are all successive names of one and the same lake, is certainly correct. At all events it is *a priori* in a high degree probable, precisely because the terminal lake of the Tarim has at all times had a position of but little permanence. It was because of its migratory character that, after my first journey to the Lop-nor, I called it »the travelling lake». It is very likely that a lake which time after time changes its position will also change its name. On the other hand Grenard makes a mistake in saying, that the East Turkestan tribes use the name Lop-nor more frequently than they do the names Kara-buran and Kara-koschun. Although I have traversed that country in every direction, I have never heard the Turkish tribes employ the classic designation; in fact, they generally fail to give any answer at all when you ask them where Lop-nor is situated. And it is easy to understand why they are unable to do so. They know of course the country of Lop, which extends alongside the river from Al-katik-tscheke to Tusun-tschapghan, and they call themselves Lopliks; they are acquainted, further, with the names Kara-buran and Kara-koschun, and the Kara-köl lakes, besides a number of marginal lakes; but they have never heard, and *never can* have heard, speak of a lake bearing the name of Lop-nor, for the simple reason that the lake in question had disappeared long before those tribes arrived in the country. On the other hand the Mongols frequently employ the name Lobo-nur or Lovo-nur, and so do the Chinese. Of the latter it is however only the educated who know that the old lake lay north of the existing one. The Chinaman, who according to Grenard, applies the name »Ta Lob nor» to the Kara-buran, commits a serious error.

To this Grenard appends an interesting note, containing an opinion which Himly also has suggested, so that I quote it here: »Ce nom (Lob nor) n'apparaît pas avant le XIII^e siècle, époque où les Mongols ont occupé la région pour la première fois. Mais, si *nor* est exclusivement mongol, Lob est sans doute le vieux nom local du pays appelé Leou-lan et Chan-chan dans les plus anciens textes chinois. Il n'est pas impossible que le *Na-po-po* de Hiouen Ts'ang et le *Napaei* de Plin ne soient des transcriptions de ce nom.»

The resemblance that Grenard thus suspects becomes all the greater if we write the name as Himly does, namely Lâu-lan. The first syllable would thus be transferred to the lake; and after the Mongol word »nor», meaning »lake» is added to it, it becomes Lâu-nor.

Grenard's intervention in the Lop-nor question, witnessing as it does to great acuteness and accuracy, is however impaired by the final passage, which I will now proceed to quote. It is quite excusable, that he should have adopted the views of Prschevskij and other Russian travellers who have visited those regions rather than the views of Richthofen, who has never been there. My first journey in the Lop country seems, as I have already mentioned, to have escaped his attention. He says:

»Nous croyons que M. de Richthofen n'était point dans le vrai en soutenant que l'ancien Lob nor était un autre lac que ceux vus par Prjévalsky sous prétexte que la latitude donnée par ce voyageur ne correspondait point à celle de la carte chinoise. Une erreur d'un degré sur une carte chinoise n'a rien d'extraordinaire, surtout pour un point situé hors des grandes routes. M. de Richthofen a démontré