

As to the name of China, we find « Čiŋga » and « Čimŋga » (< *Cīnaka), « Chinese » (KONOW, *ibid.*, 130; LEUMANN, *Das Nordarische... Lehrgedicht*, 3rd fasc., 421), and « Čaiga » (< Cīna), « China » (BSOS, IX, 522-523).

Alongside of « Cīna », Chinese texts of the T'ang period give 摩訶支那 Mo-ho-chih-na (*Muâ-χâ-t'siē-nâ; Hsi-lin in 爲, VIII, 5a; in a letter of 795, 天, VI, 79b [cf. BEFEO, v, 254]), 摩訶至那 Mo-ho-chih-na (*Muâ-χâ-t'si-nâ; Hsüan-tsang, in JULIEN, *Vie*, 91; *Mémoires*, I, 255; II, 79; also in 結, III, 92b, and 致, IV, 76b [cf. BAGCHI, *Le canon bouddhique en Chine*, II, 552]), 莫訶支那 Mo-ho-chih-na (*Mâk-χâ-t'siē-nâ; I-ching in CHAVANNES, *Religieux éminents*, 56; 致, VII, 96a), and twice 摩訶震旦 Mo-ho-chên-tan (*Muâ-χâ-t'siēn-tân; in *Hsin T'ang shu*, 221A, 11a [cf. Y¹, I, 68; *Hobson-Jobson*², 197]). All these forms render « Mahācīna », « Great China », even the last one where « Chên-tan » is a survival, and used as a mere equivalent of « Cīna ». This is of course an honorific form for « China », but it is more than that. In the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the « Cīna » are mentioned before the « Aparacīna », both preceding the Tukhāra; the same names, in the same order, occur in the *Saddharmasmṛtyupasthāna*. The Tibetan translation of the latter text says that the rGya-nag, « Black Broad » (the usual Tibetan name of China) extends over 1,000 *yojana*, and the « Other Black Broad » (rGya-nag-gžan) over 200 *yojana*. The Chinese translation speaks only of 漢 Han, *i.e.* « China », but with a description which shows that, for the translator, « Han », or « China proper », was the « Aparacīna », and that with all its dependencies it constituted the « Cīna » of 1000 *yojana* (cf. LÉVI, in *JA*, 1918, I, 49, 122-123, 126-127). A text quoted by PÉRI (BEFEO, XVII, II, 42) distinguishes in the same way a 小支那 Hsiao Chih-na, « Small Cīna », and a 大支那 Ta Chih-na, « Great Cīna », but without telling us any more about the value of the two names. In a Sanskrit list of A.D. 1128, « Cīna » and « Mahācīna » follow each other among countries producing silk and other cloths (*Hobson-Jobson*², 197). We have more precise information in I-ching, who says that « Chih-na (Cīna) is Kuang-chou (Canton); Mo-ho-chih-na (Mahācīna) is the capital (Ch'ang-an, Hsi-an-fu) » (致, VII, 96a : 支那即廣州也莫訶支那即京師也; cf. CHAVANNES, *Religieux éminents*, 56). Thirty years after I-ching (in 730 in fact) a similar notice is to be found in the *Hsü ku-chin i-ching t'u-chi* (結, III, 93b) : « The kingdom of Yin-tu (Indu, India) commonly call Kuang-fu (Canton) 'Chih-na' (Cīna), and give to the Imperial capital (Hsi-an-fu) the name Mo-ho-chih-na (Mahācīna) » (印度國俗呼廣府爲支那名帝京爲摩訶支那). This note has passed into the *Sung kao-sêng chuan* (致, IV, 76b; cf. BAGCHI, *Le canon bouddhique en Chine*, II, 551-552).

I-ching's note, misplaced in CHAVANNES's translation, is in fact given in connection with a ruined « Cīna » temple of the Ganges, traditionally founded, in the 4th cent., for twenty Chinese priests who had come to India *via* Yün-nan and Burma (CHAVANNES, *Religieux éminents*, 82-83). In the *Hsü ku-chin i-ching t'u-chi* and the *Sung kao-sêng chuan*, « Chih-na », with the note on the name, is mentioned in the biography of an Indian monk who really landed at Canton. It is of course out of the question that all mentions of « Cīna » should in principle be referred to Canton, and the twenty priests of I-ching's narrative had not even passed through Canton on their way from China to India. But we may admit that, in the 7th-8th cents., there was a natural tendency to speak of the capital in the north as « Mahācīna », and to understand « Cīna »