

And, once more, will the Government, or the Indian Exploration Fund, publish annual volumes, fully illustrated like those issued by Professor Flinders Petrie and his co-workers, containing the results of the work, not of past decades, but of the year immediately preceding the issue of each? It may be safely prophesied that, if this be done, the number of persons interested in Indian antiquities will rapidly increase, and both our Society and the Indian Exploration Fund will greatly benefit.

R. SEWELL.

2. THE AUTHOR OF THE LIFE OF SHĀH ISMA'ĪL.

DEAR SIR,—With reference to Professor Denison Ross's paper in the J.R.A.S. for 1896, p. 249, I beg leave to suggest that the author of the life of Shāh Isma'īl may have been Khawāja 'Abdullah Marwārid. He was a high officer under Sultān Husain Baiqra of Herat, and some years after the death of that prince he entered into the service of Shāh Isma'īl. Ill-health, however, obliged him to give up public employment and to retire into private life, when he occupied himself in writing the life of Shāh Isma'īl in prose and verse. He completed the prose history, which had the name of the Tārīkh Shāhī, but did not live to finish the poem. These facts are recorded by Shāh Isma'īl's son, Sām Mirzā, in his Taḥafat Sāmī, of which an abstract has been given by Silvestre de Sacy (Not. et Ex., iv, 273). It is true that Sām Mirzā says that 'Abdullah died in 922, and that Khwandāmīr makes a similar statement in the Ḥabīb-as-Siyar (B.M. MS. Add. 17,925, 438^b). But it seems to me that this date, which is only given in figures in the Taḥafat, must be a mistake for 932. In the first place, Sām Mirzā tells us that 'Abdullah completed his history, but he could hardly be said to have done this unless he lived to the end of Shāh Isma'īl's reign, which did not occur till 930. Secondly, Sām Mirzā tells us (see p. 283 of De Sacy's notice) that he had been 'Abdullah's disciple. Now Sām Mirzā, as we learn from the Ḥabīb MS. (loc. cit., 536^b), was born in 923, and so

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