

what we are to understand by « domestic brazil-wood » (the word *domesce* is left out by *RR*, 280); YULE's interpretation (*Y*, II, 276), « the brazil we make use of », which follows the reading of *FA*, cannot be retained; only MOULE's version, « cultivated brazil-wood », makes good sense. Yet I was in doubt about the correctness of *F* and *Z*, until I noticed that both « verzino dimestico » and « verzino salvatico » occur in Pegolotti (ed. EVANS, 295, 296). Although Polo does not use the word « domesce » in the chapter on « Lambri », he gives there (Vol. I, 376) a description of what certainly is the process of cultivating brazil-wood. In modern times, the brazil-wood of Malabar is both wild and cultivated (cf. *Y*, II, 380).

275. LOP

<i>job</i> VL	TA ¹ , TA ³ , V, VA,	<i>lope</i> VB
<i>lop</i> F, Fr, <i>t</i> , FB, L, LT, P,	Z; R	<i>loup</i> FA

For « Lop », the modern Charkhlik (Čarḥliq), on the southern side of the Lop-nōr, cf. STEIN, *Serindia*, index, 1546. The etymology is unknown, but the name, with an initial *n*-, goes back to pre-T'ang times. Hsüan-tsang's 納縛波 Na-fu-po, *Navapa, of the 7th century, is a sanskritization of *Nop, which is written Nob in Tibetan documents of c. 800. A colony from the Lop region, which settled in the 6th cent. west of Qomul (see « Camul »), was known as 納職 Na-chih, *Napčiq, in T'ang and Sung times, and its name is still Lapčuq (cf. my paper in *JA*, 1916, I, 117-120). F. W. THOMAS (*BSOS*, VIII, 793-794; and cf. BAGCHI, *Deux lexiques sanskrit-chinois*, II, 360) has proposed to see another transcription of *Napčiq in the « Dapici » of a « Saka » (Khotanese) document of the 10th cent. The correspondence would be satisfactory if we could account for the absence of the final guttural consonant in Khotanese.

Navapa presupposes the form « Lop », with *-p*, and the name is thus spelt by Polo; the Tibetan Nob proves nothing, as the Tibetan script admits of no final *-p*. On the other hand, our Lop-nōr is a Mongol form (with Mong. *nōr*, « lake »), and theoretically there is no *-p* in Mongolian, so that we ought to transcribe Lob-nōr; the transcription in Chinese texts of the 13th cent. renders Lob; but the Turkish local pronunciation is now Lop-nōr.

Postal stages were established at 羅卜 Lo-pu (Lob) in 1282 and 1286 (*YS*, 12, 3*b*; 14, 1*a*). The city of 卜 Pu or 格卜 Ko-pu, near Čärčän (see « Ciarcian »), in a Ming itinerary (*China Review*, v, 233) is probably a misreading for 洛卜 Lo-pu, Lob (Lop).

In *JA*, 1916, I, 119, I had proposed to trace the name Lop (or Lob) to Han times, and to recognize it as the first element in the name of the kingdom of 樓蘭 Lou-lan (sometimes written 牢蘭 Lao-lan); this suggestion must be abandoned. We know now, from other sources, that the native name of Lou-lan must have sounded *Krorān (or *Grorān?); cf. *TP*, 1931, 459-460. This would confirm the otherwise theoretical view that 樓 *lou* was pronounced as **gləu* in Han times; but then the same would hold good for 牢 *lao* (**lāu* < **glāu*), and the conclusion would be that, contrary to the usual opinion, *lao* is probably not a purely figurative character (« an enclosure for oxen »), but is phonetically connected with 牛 *niu* (**ngiəu*), « ox » (? cf. Tib. *glan*, « ox »).