

Since I wrote to you last my attention has been drawn to the identification of the Avestic *Nâoidhyânho* with the Vedic *Gautamasya Nodhasa*, which has been hinted at and supported by Windischmann in his *Mithra*, 25, in the *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Bd. i, S. 29, in 1857 (before there was any Avesta Grammar or Lexicon). Windischmann considers Nodhasa to be the sage "Changra-ghâch mentioned by Anquetil," but the latter has been since identified with Sankarâchârya of much later time.—I am, yours truly,

DARAB DASTUR PESHOTAN SANJANA.

11. ASOKA'S BHABRA EDICT.

As the seven passages (*pariyāyā*) mentioned by name on this Edict have now been (with various degrees of certainty) identified, it may be of use to record the result:—

ASOKA.	PĀLI.	WHERE FOUND.
1. Vinaya-samukkāṃsa.	(? Pātimokkha.)	J.R.A.S., 1876.
2. Ariya-vasāni.	Ariya-vāsā.	Dīgha (Sangīti Sutta).
3. Anāgata-bhayāni.	Anāgata-bhayāni.	Anguttara, iii, 105–108.
4. Muni-gāthā.	Muni-sutta.	Sutta Nipāta, 206–220.
5. Moneyya-sutta.	Moneyya-sutta.	It., No. 67 = A., i, 272.
6. Upatissa-pasina.	(Upatissa-pañho.	Vin., i, 39–41.)
7. Rāhulovāda.	Rāhulovāda-sutta.	Majjhima, i, 414–420.

Nos. 1 and 6 are the most doubtful. The Pātimokkha can scarcely be rightly called a *dhamma-pariyāya*, and it does not correspond to the meaning of the title used by Asoka. The noun *samukkāṃsa* has not been found in the Pitakas. The verb always means 'to exalt.' (S.N., 132 = 438; M., i, 498; Th., i, 632.) 'The Exaltation of Vinaya' or 'of the Vinaya' is much more probably meant, as the title of some short sutta or passage in praise of Vinaya in one or other of its two senses, ethical or legal. And I quite agree, therefore, with M. Senart (p. 204) in regarding this identification as unsatisfactory.

As to No. 6, short edifying passages of the Vinaya are distinguished by titles. Vin., i, pp. 13, 14, §§ 38–47 (=S., iii, 66–68), is the Anatta-lakkhaṇa-sutta; Vin., i, pp. 34, 35 (=S., iv, 19, 20), is the Āditta-pariyāya, etc. And the passage identified with No. 6 might have been called Sariputta- or Upatissa-paṇho. But no mention of the title has yet been found in the Pitakas, and the identification, though otherwise suitable, is therefore at least uncertain.

No. 2 is no doubt the passage on the ten Ariya-vāsā, not yet published, but contained in the Sangīti Sutta of the Dīgha. A similar passage may also be looked for in the Nipāta of the Anguttara dealing with the Tens. The difference of gender is no objection. So *pariyāyāni* = *pariyāyā*.

With regard to No. 7, it is not without reason that a special qualification is introduced in the Edict. There are so many 'Exhortations to Rāhula' in the Pitakas that it was necessary to specify the one meant. The ones excluded, or some of them, will be found at S.N., 325–342 (dated in the 14th year after the Nirvāṇa); M., i, 420 foll. (dated in the 12th year of the Nirvāṇa); S., ii, 244 foll.; and S., iii, 135 and 136. All these are spoken by the Buddha. The expression in the Edict would seem also to imply that there is at least one other, not yet published, spoken by some one else.

No. 4, the Muni-gāthā, called Muni Sutta in the Pāli, is called Muni-gāthā (exactly as in the Edict) in the Divyāvādāna. Other instances of such slight variations in titles are given in my article on this Edict in the Journal of the Pāli Text Society, 1896.

Nos. 2 and 5 are, I believe, identified here for the first time.

T. W. RHYS DAVIDS.