

could not have been the disciple of a man who died in 922. ‘Abdullah Marwārīd was a very well-known man, both as a public servant and as a writer, and Sām Mirzā speaks of his history as having considerable vogue. If the anonymous life is not his *Tārīkh Shāhī*, what has become of the latter? If we suppose that he died in 932 this would agree with the opinions of Professors Rieu, Ross, and Browne that the life was written shortly after the accession of Shāh Tahmāsp. As regards the mention of M. Zamān Mirzā’s death in the life, I would suggest that this fact, which occurred in 947, was added by a copyist or by ‘Abdullah’s son, Mirzā Mūmīn. He seems to have been connected with Muhammad Zamān, for the two names are bracketed together in Khwandāmīr’s notice of Mirzā Mūmīn (loc. cit., 554^a), and it is evident from the long details about M. Zamān which are given in the anonymous life that he and the writer must have known one another. Mirzā Mūmīn was Sām Mirzā’s preceptor, and a well-known writer and calligrapher. He afterwards entered Tahmāsp’s service, but left him for some reason and went to India (not improbably in company with M. Zamān), and died there. According to De Sacy this occurred in 948, but I do not find this date in the British Museum copy of Sām Mirzā’s work.

Finally, if we must take the date 922 as the correct date of ‘Abdullah’s death, may we not hold that the latter’s life of Shāh Isma‘īl was continued and completed by the son.

Notices of ‘Abdullah Marwārīd will be found in Mir ‘Alī Shir’s *Majālis*; in *Daulat Shāh*, p. 515 of Mr. Browne’s edition, and in *Bābar’s Memoirs*, in his account of the eminent men of Sultān Husain’s Court.

H. BEVERIDGE.

3. A CAMBODJAN MAHĀVAMSA.

Würzburg, Sanderring 20.

September 14, 1901.

MY DEAR PROFESSOR RHYS DAVIDS,—During the last three months I have possessed here at our University’s

library a MS. from Paris, containing, to judge from the catalogue in the J.P.T.S., 1882, p. 35, the Mahāvamsa in Cambodjan writing. But the catalogue is mistaken. The MS., which is not badly written, although it abounds with errors of every sort, and far exceeds in size the Mahāvamsa, as we know it from the published text, contains a secondary work, embodying the Mahāv. (i.e. the thirty-eight parichedas), only with many liberties in adapting it to the general plan the author had in view. You will better understand his intentions by the colophon. I quote from it the following verses:—

Buddhavamsam Mahāvamsam sikkhīnañ ca samāhaṭam
 Thūpavamsam gahetvāna sampiṇḍitvāna ekato
 atthato gandhato cāpi yuttato cāpi ettha ca
 ayuttam pāliruddham vā yadi passati kiñcāpi
 pubbāparam viloketvā vicāretvā punappunam
 dhīmantānam gahetabbam gahetabbam na dosato
 tividhopapadānam [written °dhoppapa°] gatiyo¹ duvidhā
 [written duvu°] ti ca
 tasmā upaparikkhitvā veditabbam [written °bbā] vibhāvinā
 antarāyam vinā cāyam yathā siddhim upāgatā
 tathā kalyāṇasaṃkappā siddhim gacchanti [written °cchati]
 paṇinam.

Then follow two ślokas containing the usual prayers. Then in prose: anena puññena mayā katena sikkheyyam [written °yyā] tam dhammavaram jinassa, paññāya silena kusalena cāti [written cāto or cāgo] anāgate ketumagyam [? ketumāghyam ?] bhaveyyam, yadā sutvāna saddhammam Mettayass' [thus clearly] eva santike pasanno pītiyā mayham pabbaji jinasāsane *Moggallāno* ti nāmāham. Then follow two ślokas of benedictions.

This Moggallāna, of whose date we as yet know nothing, was certainly no great poet, but, so far as he was led by the wish to banish darkness wherever the reader of the existent

¹ In Cambodjan *g* and *t* are the same. I read gatiyo, but the meaning of this verse is not quite intelligible to me.

Mahāvamsa may meet with it, and to amplify more and more the original text, his task is executed pretty well. To demonstrate this, I beg to point out only two instances.

(1) After the first four verses of the first chapter follows a section which bears the subscription : Uruvelagamanam niṭṭhitam, of about 490 ślokas, beginning with Pubbe kira gavesanto bodhiñāṇam narāsabho.

From bodhito navame māse (śl. 19 of the Mv.) the compilation agrees with the text, but already in the second half it disagrees and makes a digression, relating in detail and with many interspersed dialogues the affairs in Laṅkā on Buddha's first visit there. Whereas the original text consists of 24 ślokas from Bodhito (v. 19) to the conclusion (v. 43) of the Mahiyaṅgaṇāgamana, Moggallāna has brought them up to more than 200, a few only being identical with those in the printed text of the Mv. In other sections the additions are smaller, but every section has additions.

(2) In ch. v (ed. Turnour, p. 41) is simply related how Tissa propounded to the king (Asoka) the Tittirajātaka. From the circumstances under which this was done it follows that Jāt. iii, 64 sqq. is meant. In the compilation of Moggallāna, however, after the words "thero bodhesi rājānam vatvā Tittirajātakam," the whole Jātaka, i.e. a versification of the commentary, including the stanzas, is inserted, beginning with—

Atīte Brahmadattamhi kārente bhavanam kira
samiddhe nagare ramme pure Bārāṇasīvhave.

This addition consists of thirty ślokas, and it is connected with the 'Rahmenerzählung,' so to speak, by the words—

tam dhammadesanam sutvā rājā attamano tato
vasanto garu sattāham rājuyyāne manorame
sikkhāpetvā mahipālam sambuddhasamayam varam.

The verb fin. is missing, as often, and 'garu' instead of 'tattha' (reading of the printed text) was needed, in order to remind the reader that Tissa is spoken of in the second half of the śloka (which, in our case, has an additional line):

For a fuller report on this singular work, its sources and composition, I may be allowed to refer to my new edition of the *Mahāvamśa* now in preparation.—Yours faithfully,

E. HARDY.

4. A SANSKRIT MAXIM.

Redhill.

November 25, 1901.

DEAR PROFESSOR RHYS DAVIDS,—In the Preface to my pamphlet on Sanskrit Maxims, which was published last year and noticed in this year's July number of the R.A.S. Journal, I gave a short list of nyāyas contained in the lexicons, but which I had failed to find in the literature. Amongst them was the *andhagajanyāya*, "the maxim of the blind men and the elephant." I have since discovered it, however, in Sureśvara's huge vārtika on *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣya*, 4. 4. 566 (p. 1813 of Ānandāśrama edition). The verse is as follows:—

“Ekam evaika rūpaṁ sadvastvajñātaṁ nirañjanam |
Jātyandhagajadṛṣṭyeva koṭīśaḥ kalpyate mṛṣā.” ||

But a much more interesting fact in connection with this nyāya is that the story on which it is based is of Buddhist origin. Several months ago Monsieur Barth informed me that he had met with it in some Buddhist work which he could not then remember; and now the missing link has been supplied by Monsieur Louis de la Vallée Poussin, who referred me to p. 187 of your *Dialogues of the Buddha*. It is there stated that the story was told by Gotama himself to a number of non-Buddhist teachers who were disputing as to the meaning of the Ten Indeterminates ("Whether the world is eternal or not," etc.), and I now learn from yourself that the original is contained in *Udāna*, vi, 4, pp. 66–69 of the Pali Text Society's edition.

I hope to embody this information in a *Second Handful of Sanskrit Maxims* which I have in the press.—Yours sincerely,

G. A. JACOB.