

Sung shu, 97, 4a). European scholars have all along been agreed that Chên-tan represents «Cīnasthāna», but I must remark, (i) that the transcription is not satisfactory since we should expect at least *Chên-t'an (with *-t'ân; not the *chên-t'an* or *chan-t'an* with ancient *-d'ân of BEFEO, III, 253); (ii) that no Chinese commentary ever speaks of «Cīnasthāna», either with reference to Chên-tan or in any other case; (iii) that no case is known where Chên-tan actually renders «Cīnasthāna» of a Sanskrit original. Sanskrit texts speak of «Cīna», or of «Cīnadeśa», «kingdom of China» (cf. BAGCHI, *Deux lexiques sanskrit-chinois*, 76, 295; BSOS, IX, 522, 523), or of «Cīnabhūmi», «land of China» (for instance in the *Arthaśāstra* and in *JA*, 1915, I, 51; the two 秦地 Ch'in-ti, «land of Ch'in», of BEFEO, IV, 149, probably also translate «Cīnabhūmi», not «Cīnadeśa» or «Cīnasthāna») «Cīnasthāna» is found nowhere.

Nor is it a form which is to be readily expected. Names of countries formed with *-sthāna* are known in Sanskrit, but mainly in the north-west, *i. e.* in regions which had submitted to Iranian influence and in which they were used in imitation of the Iranian *-stāna* > *-stān* (the curious «Indrasthāna» of Hsüan-ying, ch. 18, in 爲, VI, 73b, given as the original name of India, may reflect the double contamination of «Indu» and «Hindustān»; for «Indudeśa», India, cf. BAGCHI, *loc. cit.*, 76, 295). The only instance of «Cīnasthāna» which I can trace at present is the *cinasthanade* of a Kharoṣṭhī tablet from Chinese Turkestan (cf. RAPSON, *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*, p. 12, No. 35). Yet, if I do not believe that the «Chên-tan» of Chinese Buddhist texts actually translate a «Cīnasthāna» of the Sanskrit originals, I have no doubt that they represent, etymologically, a form connected with it. But that form, in my opinion, instead of being the Sanskrit term «Cīnasthāna», is an Iranian form of the type of Sogdian «Čynstn». If we read this last name *Činstan as I suggested above, the interconsonantic *-s-* is likely to be omitted in the transcription and we have *Čintan, which is exactly the original pre-supposed by Chên-tan. Of course, the original of Chên-tan need not necessarily be Sogdian, but may be of a type similar to the Sogdian *Činstan. The names ending in *-stana* of the region of Khotan, and the very coexistence of Khotan and Gostana (see «Cotan») are perhaps to be considered as a case parallel to that of *Činstan and Chên-tan (*Čintan). It is well known that Khotan played an important part in the earliest spread of Buddhism to China. Whatever the true original of Chên-tan may be, it could not have been Skr. Cīnasthāna, and it was only because Chên-tan had become current in early Chinese Buddhism that its use was retained as a possible rendering of «Cīna», even after the accurate transcription of the Chih-na type had been adopted. The various Chên-tan forms were no longer understood; one of them was interpreted in connection with cinnabar (丹 *tan*); another was explained as referring to China's position in the East, where the sun rose (旦 *tan*; this occurs already in ch. 5 of Fa-lin's *Pien-chêng lun*, completed in 626; 露, VIII, 47a). Such fanciful hypotheses are on a level with the opinion of those who, losing sight of the Chinese origin of «Cīna», interpreted it as *cīvara*, «garment» because civilized China had «waistband and cap», or as *cintana*, «thought», because the Chinese were such deep thinkers (爲, X, 5a, 121a).

A last word on the subject of Chên-tan : even if the term comes from Khotan, and is not derived from a Sogdian original, it has left no trace in our Khotanese (the so-called «Śaka») texts. *Sthāna* occurs in them in the Prakrit form *thāna* (cf. KONOW, *Saka Studies*, 185).