

(*Armen. Grammatik*, I, 49), in his list of Armenian forms borrowed from Iranian, gives Arm. « Čen-kh », China, the Chinese; « Čenastan », China; « Čenbakur », the Emperor (see « Facfur ») of China; « čenik » (adj.), Chinese. According to HÜBSCHMANN, the corresponding Pahlavī forms are « Čēn », « Čēnastān » (WEST's « Čīnistān »), \*čēnik; Pers. « Čin », « Čīnistān », « čīnī ». In view of Cosmas's Τζινίστα[ν], I have little doubt that a pronunciation « Čīnistān » existed in Pahlavī, not at the early date of the Armenian borrowings, but at any rate in the 6th cent., and prior to the redaction of the *Bundahišn*. The same name occurs in a Sogdian document probably of the end of the 2nd cent.; it is written « Čynstn », which may be \*Čīnastan or \*Čēnastan, or perhaps \*Čīnstan (cf. *TP*, 1913, 428; 1931, 458). The « Čīnstān » of the Nestorian tablet of 781 renders the same form (cf. HAVRET, *Stèle chrétienne*, III, Syriac part, 1; *Mo*, 35). In the same monument, the ethnical name is « Čīnāyē » (HAVRET, 2; *Mo*, 48), based on \*Čīn < Čin (cf. also *Mo*, 75).

The Persian چين « Čin » passed to the Arabs as صين « Šin ». In other words, the Arabs, having no č, rendered it, as usual, with š; but this is not a sufficient reason to read š as if the Arabs had pronounced it č, as has been arbitrarily done by FERRAND throughout his last publications. When an Arab author wished to render the Persian « Čin » and not the Arabic « Šin », he transcribed it, for lack of a better equivalent, as شين « Šin » (cf. *Fe*, 269); he would not have done so if the Arabic š had sounded č. Moreover, Syriac writers have followed the same course. While their early borrowed forms render the Iranian č with ç (« Čin », etc.) as the Arabs did with š, all the č of Turkish and Mongolian words are transcribed š by Bar Hebraeus. Arabic form « Šin » is used by Kāšyarī. But this does not imply, as BARTHOLD thought, that « Šin » had been adopted by the Turks in the west (*12 Vorlesungen*, 97 : Kāšyarī knew that the term was not Turkish, and the reason why he preferred the Ar. « Šin » to the Pers. « Čin » is simply that he was writing his *Dīwān* in Arabic. A few years before Kāšyarī completed the *Dīwān*, the Persian form « Čin » is actually found in Turkish in the *Qutad̄yu bilig* (Radlov, III, 2120).

The translators of Buddhist texts into Chinese, when finding « Čina » in the original, sometimes rendered it etymologically as « Ch'in », at other times translated it with some term meaning « China », or lastly transcribed it phonetically. The ordinary transcriptions are 脂那 Chih-na (for instance in 587; cf. *BEFEO*, IV, 574; V, 294; the 指那 Chih-na of LAUFER, in *TP*, 1912, 722, seems to be merely copied from EITEL, *Handbook*<sup>2</sup>, 176, where it is a slip or a misprint, unfortunately repeated by SOOTHILL and HODOUS, 152); 支那 Chih-na (for instance in 683; cf. *BEFEO*, IV, 575); 至那 Chih-na in Hsüan-tsang. Hsi-lin's *Hsü i-ch'ieh ching yin-i*, ch. 2 (Meiji *Tripit.* of Tōkyō, 爲, VIII, 5 a) gives a form 眞那 Chên-na, which seems to be corrupt for 眞丹 Chên-tan (on which cf. *infra*). ODA Tokunō, 750, adds 斯那 Ssü-na and 脂難 Chih-nan, for which I can find no authority.

But, apart from this mechanical transcription of « Čina », another occurs in the forms 震旦 Chên-tan (\*T'šjēn-tān; in the *Lou-t'an ching* [*\*Lokasthāna sūtra*?] translated in 265-316 [according to 露, VIII, 47 a; I cannot trace the passage in the *sūtra* itself]; in a *sūtra* translated in 317-322 [成, VI, 49 a; cf. *BEFEO*, V, 304-305]; in the *Avatamsaka*, ch. 45 [天, III, 22 b]; also in 雨, V, 107 b, and in *Hsin T'ang shu*, 221A, 11 a), 振旦 Chên-tan (\*T'šjēn-tān; cf. 爲, VI, 13 b, 73 b) and 眞丹 Chên-tan (\*T'šjēn-tān; cf. in the translation of an *Āgama*, 宿, VIII, 44 b, and in