

Further, Vācissara, in his introduction, refers to an earlier Thūpavaṃsa in Pāli, but says that as this was imperfect, and as the usefulness of the Sinhalese Thūpavaṃsa was necessarily limited on account of its language, he wrote the present Pāli work.

The India Office copy of the Pāli version in Burmese character (MS. No. 139), which seems to be complete in itself, contains only the twenty-seventh section, dealing with the history of the Ruvanṇeli-dāgaba; whereas the copies in Sinhalese character include in their usual order almost all the subjects treated of in the Sinhalese recension. Thus the Burmese copy commences with the *Thūpasādhana-lābha-kathā*. The text as far as fol. 26, line 9, is not found in the Sinhalese copies. That beyond the ninth line agrees to some extent only with the Sinhalese text, commencing at p. 54, line 21, of the printed edition.

DON MARTINO DE ZILVA WICKREMASINGHE.

## 10. GOTAMA IN THE AVESTA.

*Bombay, June 11, 1898.*

To Professor T. W. RHYS DAVIDS, Ph.D., LL.D.,

*Secretary and Librarian, Royal Asiatic Society.*

DEAR SIR,—In reference to the Avestic *Gaotema* it may be of interest to supplement my correspondence with the following note.

The passages containing *nāidyāo* are Yasna, xxxiv, 8, and lvii, 10, in the extant Avesta. Herein the name *gaotema* does not occur. Yasht, xiii, 16, is the only passage in which *nāidhyāo* and *gaotema* come together. The latter is nowhere else mentioned. In the Gāthic Yasna, xxxiv, we have: *hyaḍ as aojyāo nāidyāonhem* (according to the general interpretation), “when (the oppressor of thy holy vows) was as the stronger oppressing the weaker,” which the Pahlavi translates: *amat uītō zak ī aōjhōmand aharmōgō,*

*ólman i ná-aitó-dahishnô hávishtô*, "when there is a powerful apostate, a disciple of him who preaches the non-existence (of God)." In the Srosh Yasht, or Yasna, lvii, 10, we have the same combination cited: *yatha aojyáo náidyáonhem*, "just as the stronger (oppresses) the weaker," which the Pahlavi renders: *chígún aôjhómand ólman i nshân dahishnô*, "just as a powerful man (does to) him who is of obscure origin." It is quite possible that the contrast with the *powerful* one, as expressed in the Avesta *aojyáo*, may have suggested the idea of interpreting *náidyáonh* as a comparative adjective denoting *weaker*; because the Pahlavi translators seem to have no distinct idea of the meaning of the word, and hence European and Parsee scholars have simply to trust to guesswork in interpreting it. It is not, therefore, difficult to indicate that the meaning attached to the word *náidyáonhem* by translators in Yasna, xxxiv, 8, is not authentic but conjectural.

From the general drift of thought and language observable in the Farvardin Yasht, in which the son is generally named, in a majority of passages, along with his father or ancestor, we can easily understand the word *náudhyanhó* as the name of the son of *Gaotema*. The spelling of the expression is, doubtless, a corruption of the Avesta transliteration of the Vedic name *Nódhâh*, as there is no lack of such errors or corruptions in the text of Yasht, xiii, owing to the ignorance of copyists (vide § 65 *paourush*, § 111 *khshtávaeraen*, § 120 *Yóushtahe*, § 125 *Fraturáo*, and § 144 *Sainunám*). In fact, two of the MSS. already give the nearest variant *náuidhyanho*.

Consequently, it is certain that the Avesta does nowhere allude to Buddha, as Darmesteter supposes. If there were a Zarathustrian polemic against Buddhism, the names and expressions would be different, and not ambiguous. Instead of *Gautama*, which, besides Buddha, is the name of a Rishi and other distinguished characters in the ancient Indian literature, the author of the Yasht in the Avesta would have used rather *Buddha* or *Sákyámuni*, and spoken more emphatically if he had wished to refute a false religion.

Since I wrote to you last my attention has been drawn to the identification of the Avestic *Nāoidhyāñho* 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-samukkama.	(? 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-pariyāyā*, and it does not correspond to the meaning of the title used by Asoka. The noun *samukkama* 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.