

his recent work (*Ancient India*, p. 183) as ruling from 184 to 72 B.C., an approximation no doubt. This brings us rather near to 58 B.C., and it is a plausible conjecture that the reconstitution of the *Mālava-gaṇa* may have been a consequence of the overthrow of that, or an allied, dynasty, whether due to a Śaka invasion (cf. the story of Gardabhila) or to some other cause.

F. W. THOMAS.

#### THE DATE OF VASUBANDHU<sup>1</sup> "IN THE NINE HUNDREDS"

As regards the article of Professor Otto Franke (JRAS. April, 1914, pp. 398-401) against my interpretation of "in the 900 years" and "500 years" in the life of Vasubandhu, it is certainly a peculiar use of numerals not often found in Chinese literature. *Wu-pai-nien-chung*, lit. "five-hundred-years-in", in an ordinary Chinese sense would mean "during" or "within the five hundred years". But that it is not meant for a duration of time is seen from the context, which requires a point of time either 900th (500th) year, or may be some years after the named year (but not before it). In this sense I used "the tenth century" for 900. Vasubandhu's date is, as M. Péri himself says, "900 years A.N. generally", but sometimes "900 et plus" or "900 ans passés", or even "1100 years A.N."<sup>2</sup> So here it is certain that the ninth century elapsed is meant by 900 and not that current. Perhaps my explanation 900-99 for 900 and 500-99 for 500 may sound too exact; but, if "900 years +" is meant, it is

<sup>1</sup> This note was sent in the form of a letter to Mr. F. W. Thomas.

<sup>2</sup> See *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-orient*, Juillet-Décembre, 1911, p. 356, n. 2. Instead of 900 another text has 1100; see l.c., p. 357. As regards M. Péri's article on the date of Vasubandhu, I am studying the materials once again. When I proposed my date 420-500 for Vasubandhu, a still later date was being assigned by M. Lévi and others. So I limited myself to the safest materials. Several of those rejected by me were taken up by M. Péri. I myself am in favour of an earlier date for Vasubandhu-Asaṅga; but I shall see whether or no I can agree with him and give up my own proposal.

natural for a Chinese to mention 900 and leave the odd years. And I thought it quite reasonable to include all odd numbers 1-99 in the year-period of 900.<sup>1</sup> In any case, 900 and odd years will be the tenth century, and not the ninth century, as Professor Franke puts it. Besides, I don't think that there is an example of e.g. *chiu-erh-nien*, i.e. "900 years", being used for the ninth century in Chinese literature. I am quite ignorant about the case.

If an early part of the tenth century is meant, and not the ninth century, it is best to stick to the round number as M. Wassilief did, simply saying "fünf hundert Jahr" or "neun hundert Jahr, nach dem Nirvāṇa des Buddha", thus leaving odd years to the imagination of the reader.<sup>2</sup>

Lately, however, I found a strong reason to suppose that we should be all wrong if we translated such numeral phrases according to the usual Chinese sense; for they are, after all, translations of a Sanskrit, or at any rate of an Indian, original.<sup>3</sup> To prove this we have an excellent work called the *Samaya-bhedoparacana-cakra*, by Vasumitra, of which we have three different Chinese translations.<sup>4</sup>

From these we can clearly see that *chung*, lit. "within", "in", is simply the Sanskrit locative or *antare*; for Hiuen-tsang translates it as such, while Paramārtha uses *chung* here, as in the life of Vasubandhu. Here Paramārtha's translation abounds in the expressions such as "after 100 years",<sup>5</sup> "full 100 years", "16 years over 100 years"

<sup>1</sup> In Japanese, if we say *Go-hyaku-nen-dai* (五百年代), lit. "in the five hundreds", it means exactly the period of 500-99. Further, if we say *Go-hyaku-go-ju-nen-dai* (五百五十年代), it is for the period of 550-9, just as you say "in the fifties", "sixties", or "seventies" of the current century. I think that this ought to be also the Chinese custom, if any era or dynasty lasts so many hundreds or thousands of years. Unfortunately, no era being in use in China, I cannot adduce any evidence for this.

<sup>2</sup> Wassilief, *Buddhismus*, pp. 238, 240.

<sup>3</sup> [Cf. my remarks *supra*, p. 749. —F. W. T.]

<sup>4</sup> Nanjio Cat., Nos. 1284, 1285, 1286; Wassilief, l.c., p. 244.

<sup>5</sup> *Nikkhante paṭhame vassasate* (Dīp. 5. 16).

(*vassasatassa upari soḷasame vasse*),<sup>1</sup> “in the second, third, fourth, hundred years” (*dvitīye*,<sup>2</sup> *trītiye*, *caturthe varṣasāte*), or “in the 200th, 300th, 400th year” (*dvi-varṣasāte*, *tri-varṣasāte*, *catur-varṣasāte*).<sup>3</sup> M. Wassilief translates these last from the Tibetan text “im fortgang des zweiten Jahrhunderts”, “im dritten Jahrhundert”, “im vierten Jahrhundert”, and, in case Chinese puts “when the second hundred year is full”, the Tibetan seems to put “im zwei hundertsten Jahre”.<sup>4</sup> From this it is pretty clear that when *ti* (第)<sup>5</sup> is prefixed to a “hundred-years”, the hundred-years means “century” (*varṣasātam*), entirely against the common usage of the Chinese language; for commonly *ti-erh*-(*san*, *ssü*)-*pai-nien* would mean “the 200th, (300th, 400th) year”, but never “the second, third, fourth century”. No such century system exists in China. So far it is clear enough. Further, in the Treatise on the Eighteen Nikāyas (Nanjio, No. 1284), which is assigned to Paramārtha, but is in reality a translation of Kumārajīva,<sup>6</sup> 200, 300, and 400 are used without the ordinal sign *ti*, and the case is exactly the same as for the 900 and 500 in question. In this text 116 years and 100 and odd years are not called the “200 years”, while in the other texts they are called the “second century”; but when we come to the time which the other texts indicate with the words “the second century is full”, then, and then only, it is said in this text “in the 200 years A.N.”, and after that we have only 300 or 400 years A.N.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Samantapāsādikā*, p. 294.      <sup>2</sup> *Dvītiye vassasatantare* (Dīp. 5. 53).

<sup>3</sup> Or these may be *dvi-varṣasāte*, *tri-varṣasāteṣu*, *caturṣu varṣasāteṣu*, or something like these, as we find in some inscriptions. See *Bombay Archaeological Report*, March, 1913, pp. 58-9.

<sup>4</sup> Wassilief, l.c., pp. 249, 251, 252, 255.

<sup>5</sup> *Ti* is the sign of an ordinal.

<sup>6</sup> Especially the latter part of the book, which corresponds to Vasumitra's work.

<sup>7</sup> The list is not quite clear on some points; therefore I add the whole list at the end for a reference.

From these analogies we can judge that "in 500 years" and "in 900 years" of Paramārtha's *Life of Vasubandhu* mean the 500th and 900th year respectively, but not the fifth century and the ninth century. Thus, it would be the best after all to translate them simply "500 years" or "900 years" A.N., as Wassilief did. But, if we understand that these are simply expressed in the round numbers, it will be only fair to assume that a few years after or before the named year are included therein. This will not be against the Chinese usage nor the Indian either.

How various year-periods are expressed in the three different translations of the presumably same original of the *Samaya-bhedoparacana-cakra* :—

No. 1286. <i>Huen-tsang.</i>	No. 1285. <i>Paramārtha.</i>	No. 1284. <i>Paramārtha (Kumārajīva).</i>
100 and odd years A.N.	116 years A.N.	116 years A.N.
In the second 100 years.	In the second 100 years.	In 100 and odd years.
" "	" "	<i>Deest.</i>
" "	" "	In 100 and odd years.
When the second "100 years" is full.	The second "100 years" being full.	In the 200 years.
In the third "100 years". <sup>1</sup>	In the third "100 years".	In the 300 years.
" "	" "	" "
" "	" "	" "
" "	" "	" "
" "	" "	" "
At the end of the third "100 years".	In the third "100 years".	In the 300 years.
At the beginning of the fourth "100 years".	In the fourth "100 years".	In the 400 years.

J. TAKAKUSU.

## TROI'S NOTES

### I. *La date de Kaṇiṣka*

Le Vinaya des Mūla-Sarvāstivādins insère dans la section des Médicaments (Bhaiṣajyavastu) une sorte de *māhātmya* bouddhique du Gandhāra; le Bouddha y prédit entre autres la construction du stūpa de Kaṇiṣka.

<sup>1</sup> The text has 300 years, but we have to read "the third 100 years" from the context.