pp. 84–5, 1908). Buddha will, according to this tradition, have died after 400 B.C.; and, supposing the correctness of Professor Franke's interpretation, the "five hundreds" (Aśvaghōṣa) will still be the first century A.D., and the "nine hundreds" (Vasubandhu) the fifth century A.D.

These considerations seem sufficient to show that *in any event* Paramārtha's testimony is against placing Aśvaghōṣa, and consequently Kaniṣka, in the first century B.C.

I observe that Dr. Fleet speaks of a *tradition*. But, of course, this involves an assumption, since the dating in Paramārtha's work might very well be due rather to a calculation. As, however, we are speaking of traditions, let me call attention to a report which certainly seems to be of that nature, namely the statement of Hiuen-Tsang (trans. Beal, i, pp. 55–7), according to which Kaniṣka was the founder of a monastery 3 or 4 *li* to the east of the capital of Kapiśa (the Kabul territory). That being so, he will have been, as Hiuen-Tsang otherwise also implies, ruler of this country, which admittedly (JRAS. 1913, pp. 634–5, 929, 930, 941–2) cuts short any question of placing his date in the first century B.C.

F. W. THOMAS.

"NOTES ON THE EDICTS OF ASOKA"

As the "Notes on the Edicts of Aśoka", commenced on p. 383 above, are not continued in this issue, it is expedient to make a special reparation of two omissions which might seem to imply a neglect of previous writers. They are as follows:—

1. s.v. *Aṭhabhāgiya* (pp. 391–2). Mr. Vincent Smith should have been mentioned as having previously (*Indian Antiquary*, xxxiv, pp. 3–4) accepted the equivalence of *aṭha* in this word with Sanskrit *aṣṭa*. For the rest his interpretation differs from that propounded by me.

2. s.v. *samāja* (pp. 392–4). It should have been pointed out that Dr. R. D. Bhandarkar, who, however, does not anticipate the precise point of the exposition, had previously (*Indian Antiquary*, xli, pp. 255–7) shown the true character of a *samāja*, as an exhibition taking place in an arena or amphitheatre, which is in fact already made plain in the article cited by me from *Album Kern* (1903).

I may here add that the phrase *giriyaḡgasamāja* occurs (frag. 45), and probably more than once (see frag. 84), in the dramas of Aśvaghōṣa (Lüders, *Bruchstücke Buddhistischer Dramen*, Berlin, 1911), so that an entertainment of this nature seems to have belonged to the plot of one of the plays.

F. W. THOMAS.

A NEW POEM OF ASVAGHOSA

I should like to call attention to a remarkable work which has appeared as No. xv of the *Bibliotheca Buddhica* under the title *Kien-ch'ui-fan-tsan* (*Gaṇḍīstotragāthā*), edited with elaborate commentary and indices by Baron A. von Stael-Holstein (St. Petersburg, 1913). The work, which is a noteworthy literary achievement, might in this country escape observation, as the commentary is in Russian.

The poem is unknown from Indian sources. But a Chinese *transliteration*—if the expression is allowable—appears in Nanjio's *Catalogue of the Chinese Tripitaka*, under No. 1081, where the title is rendered as *Ghanti(kā ?)-saṃskṛita-stotra* or *Ghanti-sūtra*; and in the volume of the Tibetan Tanjur, which contains the collection of hymns (*Bstod . tshogs*), it is represented by a translation. With the aid of these materials Baron von Stael-Holstein has succeeded in restoring practically the whole Sanskrit text. The difficulty of such an undertaking will be apparent when we consider the varying or uncertain phonetic values of Chinese signs. It was aggravated by