

Another difficulty, however, remains to be solved. The Cīna are mentioned in the *Laws of Manu* and in the *Mahābhārata*, and these have long been supposed to be older than the days of Ch'in Shih-huang-ti. I do not think that such an objection can have many supporters now. More important is the mention, in the *Arthaśāstra* or *Kauṭīliya* attributed to Kauṭīliya, of «silk and Chinese ribbons (?) made in the Cīna country» (*Kauśeyam cīnapaṭṭāśca cīnabhūmijāḥ*; ought we not to read *citrapaṭṭāśca*, «variegated silks», «brocades»?). Kauṭīliya lived c. 300 B. C., and this would carry the name in India to a date earlier than Ch'in Shih-huang-ti. LAUFER stuck to the end to this early date for the *Arthaśāstra* (TP, 1912, 719; *Sino-Iranica*, 569), and so does HERRMANN (*loc. cit.* 38). In such a case, the name would have spread to Central Asia on account of the importance of the western state of Ch'in, and prior to Ch'in Shih-huang-ti's accession to the throne of China. There is nothing impossible in such an assumption, but I do not think it very likely. Moreover, it is useless, since, like S. LÉVI and FINOT, I am convinced that either the *Arthaśāstra* is of a much later date than was thought by JACOBI, or that it has been very much interpolated.

Another problem is to decide whether Cīna always meant China, or whether it was originally the designation of Himalayan tribes and has been extended to China only when the name of the «men of Ch'in» reached India. The latter view was held by RICHTHOFEN, who believed that the Cīna of the Indian epos were the «Šina» Dards; YULE expressed himself likewise in *Encycl. Britannica*¹¹, VI, 188, and also LAUFER in TP, 1912, 723. From the last sentence of LÉVI's paper in BEFEO, v, 305, it can be inferred that he too, while translating the Ch'in and the Chên-tan (on which cf. *infra*) of Chinese Buddhist texts as meaning «China», because they represented the «Cīna» of Sanskrit originals, doubted in 1905 the correctness of the equivalence and probably thought then of Himalayan tribes; but he never published the paper in which he intended to discuss this point. On the whole, I am not certain that such a hypothesis should be necessary. When Sanskrit texts use «Cīna» in a loose manner for people to the north and of the north-west of India, we must not forget that China, at the end of the 2nd cent. B. C., had sent expeditions across Chinese Turkestan, and in the following century and again in the 1st and 2nd cents. A. D. became the dominant power there. Although there was a direct road from early days from China to the Ganges *via* Yün-nan and Burma, it was mainly by the passes of the North-West that India was brought into contact with the Chinese, either as the result of trade or diplomacy. Provisionally, I feel inclined rather to suppose that the «Cīna» of Sanskrit texts represents the Chinese in principle and from the beginning.

The same holds good for Iran; unfortunately Pahlavi texts are often of doubtful reading and of uncertain date. The «Sēn» of the *Bundahišn* (xv, 29) is equated in the text with «Čīnistān» (cf. WEST, *Pahlavi Texts*, I, 59; better «Čīnistān»), but it may be, in this late text, under the influence of Ar. «Sīn» < Čīn. If it actually represents the Avestic form «Sāini» or «Sainu» of the *Yāšt*, XIII, 143, 144, it is doubtful whether it should be identified with «China», either as to the location or even as to the name. «Čīnistān» (read «Čīnistān») occurs a second time, as a country lying beyond «Türkistān», in *Bundahišn*, XXIX, 13 (WEST, *ibid.*, I, 120). An adjectival form «Sēnik» in the *Šāyast-nē-šāyast*, VI, 7 (WEST, *ibid.*, I, 296; J. C. TAVADIA, *Šāyast-nē-šāyast*, Hamburg, 1930, 97-98) probably does not refer to China. HÜBSCHMANN