

there his descendants still live. According to my calculation all that happened about 175 years ago, or say about the year 1720.»

To this Baron von Richthofen says in a note to a letter I sent him from Khotan in 1896:¹

Dr. Hedin's Berechnung scheint, auch wenn man die Angaben seines Gewährsmannes im allgemeinen als richtig annimmt, zu weit zurückzuführen. Denn wenn Numet im Jahr 1720 ein Alter von 25 Jahren hatte und sein Sohn 1783 geboren wurde, so hätte sich dies im 88 Lebensjahr des ersteren ereignet. Wahrscheinlicher dürfte es sein, dass Numet nicht vor 1750 sein 25. Lebensjahr erreichte und die hydrographische Änderung um diese Zeit sich ereignete.

The latest wandering of Lake Lop-nor from north to south should therefore, according to my first calculation have taken place in 1720, according to Richthofen in 1750. Richthofen's arguments prove that he must be right. As now Renat's map dates from his captivity in 1716—1733, the draughtsman, who proves to be so very well informed in hydrographical matters, has quite naturally placed his Lop-nor in the eastern prolongation of the Tarim—Kurruk-darya. Renat's map therefore provides me with a new proof that my theories regarding the wanderings of the lake were correct. When first studying Renat's map I found an insurmountable difficulty in the fact that it shows the desert north of the lake broader than that to the south. But this difficulty is, on closer examination, only apparent, the northern mountains being the Bogdo-ula and the Barkul mountains, and not Kurruk-tag. And the desert south of the lake is on Renat's map much broader than the present Kum-tag between Kara-koshun and Altyn- or Ustun-tag. On d'Anville's map, published 1733, Lop-nor is also placed in the northern part of the desert, much too far north, or at nearly $42\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$. Renat has the lake, as shown on Benzelstierna's copy, at $41\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$. The real situation of the now dried-up lake is at $40\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$, while Kara-koshun, the new lake, is at $39\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$. Even astronomically Renat is therefore more correct than d'Anville.

Strindberg has tried to show that Renat was the first European who travelled to Lop-nor, and not Prshevalskiy. This is so far wrong that Prshevalskiy never visited old Lop-nor, on the contrary, he denied its existence. And as to Renat it seems unlikely that he should have visited the lake personally. The text of the Russian Geographical Society concludes, on insufficient grounds, that Renat never travelled in Eastern Turkestan.² More conclusive is a statement by Bishop Benzelius who, in 1738 put some questions to Renat, amongst others about the map. To this question Renat answered: *Contaigen giordt Chartan sielf, or the Kontaiji has made*

¹ Zeitschrift d. Gesellsch. f. Erdkunde zu Berlin. Bd. XXXI. 1896, p. 341.

² Op. cit. p. 7 and 28. The Russian argumentation against Renat's visiting Eastern Turkestan is the following: Müller (in *Yeshemesyachniya Sochineniya*, 1760, p. 48) relates that Renat was commander-in-chief of the Kalmuks in their war with China; this war took place in eastern Dsungaria and in the country round Hami; but this very part of the map is drawn *»très superficiellement et d'une manière inexacte*», which indicates that Renat has never visited these regions.