

206) is difficult to explain if we start from the Syriac writing, but very easy to account for and common if the confusion be between Arabic , ū and , r. It seems to me extremely probable that the diary of the journey from China to Mesopotamia also passed into Syriac from a Persian original. The Syriac form «Hōṭōn» postulated by CHABOT's correction is unlikely, since there is no known example of the Iranian and Mussulman form Ḥōtān being written with vowels in a Semitic writing, and particularly with an -ō- in the second syllable. Our two pilgrims, of Altaic origin and living under the Mongol domination, must have known Khotan under its Turco-Mongol name Odon. Rabban Ḥauma wrote اوتون *Oton (although we should have rather expected «Odon»), and it is this «Oton», which, misread لوتون *Lōtōn, became the «Lōṭōn» of the Syriac version. The case, in my opinion, is the exact counterpart of that of *Lōnbār misread Ōnbār.

The old Turco-Mongolian form Odon had been forgotten when the Kalmuks extended their power over Chinese Turkestan in the 17th cent. The Kalmuk map brought back by RENAT when he came back to Sweden in 1734, gives Ḥoton as the name of Khotan (BADDELEY, *Mongolia, Russia, China*, I, cxcviii). In Eastern Mongolian, the same form had prevailed, and this explains why the Mongol author 'Jigs-med nam-mkha, writing in Tibetan in 1819, mentions Khotan as «Ho-thon» (HUTH, *Geschichte des Buddhismus*, II, 17; despite BLOCHET, *Moufazzal*, 691, «Sanang Setsen's» Ḥara-ḥotan [cf. SCHMIDT, *Gesch. der Ost-Mongolen*, 259] is not Khotan, but the now well-known Ḥara-ḥoto [«Kara-khoto»] to the north of Kan-su; see «Eçina»).

But this Mongol form Ḥoton raises a new problem. In modern Mongolian, Ḥotong is the name of the settled population of Chinese Turkestan (cf. KOWALEWSKI, 916-917), and the same obtains in Kalmuk, with the pronunciation Ḥotŋ. RAMSTEDT (*Kalm. Wörterbuch*, 190) is in doubt whether that name is derived from ḥoto, ḥotŋ, «city», or from the name of Khotan (RAMSTEDT actually says in German «Chotand» [=Khotand] and speaks of «die chotandische Sprache»; it can only be a slip for «Chotan» = Khotan). The use of the term goes back at least to the beginning of the 18th cent., since RENAT has added «Kottonner», as an ethnic, to the names really given by the Kalmuk map (BADDELEY, *loc. cit.* I, CLXXIV, CCV). In the same manner, the notice due to FILISOFF, written in 1734 and describing a lost companion map to that of RENAT, speaks of Western Chinese Turkestan as «the Khoton towns» and «the Khoton country». When referring to Khotan, FILISOFF uses the curious expression «Khotoni Khoton» (BADDELEY, *loc. cit.*, I, CLXXXI). This seems to be Ḥoton-i Ḥoton, «Ḥoton of Ḥoton». The second Ḥoton is certainly Khotan, and I feel inclined to believe that the first one also represents it. It seems to me that Khotan, on account of its importance, had become a sort of a generic term for the whole region among the Kalmuks, so that «Ḥoton-i Ḥoton» really means «[the city] Ḥoton of [the country] Ḥoton», or «Khotan of Chinese Turkestan». The Ḥotong of modern Mongolian and modern Kalmuk is a nasalized pronunciation of Ḥoton (we know of many similar cases) which is easier to explain if we start from Ḥoton < Ḥotan, Khotan, the final -n of which had to be preserved and was actually preserved by -ng, than if we think of qotan > qoton > ḥoton, «city», with a quiescent final -n which is usually dropped in the current form ḥoto. The use of «Khotan» as a generic name of Western Chinese Turkestan finds some support in the late account translated by S. C. DAS (*JASB*, LV, 203), when it mentions, to the east of «Akasu» (= Aq-su) «Guchhe of Li-yul», which would literally mean «Kučā of Khotan»; Li-yul, «Khotan», is clearly here the equivalent of the