1. REPLY TO MR. BEVERIDGE'S NOTE ON THE PANJMANA INSCRIPTION.

DEAR SIR,—If I may be permitted to add a few words in reply to Mr. Beveridge's very interesting note, I will do so as briefly as possible.

In the first place I would submit that if Shaibānī Khān had represented a defeat as a victory, he would not be the first, or the last, who has done such a thing. In all ages and among most nations it has been a common practice for both sides to claim a victory on one and the same field; and histories are full of national colouring of this particular kind. There is nothing extraordinary, therefore, in Shaibānī endeavours to hand down his action with the Qazāks in the light of a victory for himself.

Secondly as to Khwāndamīr. This author was not only a “compiler” of history. In the instance under note, he was an inhabitant of the country to which his statements refer, and was a witness of the events that occurred at the period in question. He was a native of Herat, the capital of Khorasan, and was living at his home at the time. He even took a part in the affairs of his country which ended in its invasion by Shaibānī Khān. Thus, in 909 H. (1503–4) he joined the embassy despatched from Herat to Kunduz to invite the Sultan of the latter province to co-operate with the Khorasani rulers against the Usbegs. Again, in 913 H. (1507–8), when Herat had
succumbed, it was Khwāndamīr who drew up the conditions of surrender to the Usbeg chief. He appears also to have continued to live in Herat for some time during the Usbeg occupation, and probably until as late as 916 H. (1510), when the invaders were finally driven out by the Persians, and Shaibānī was killed. He must, therefore, have been thoroughly acquainted with the affairs of 1509–10 to which the inscription relates, and could have had no reason to compile his account of them from other authors. The Ḥabīb-us-Siyar seems to have been finished about 1528–9, and the author died in 1534–5.1

The Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī was begun only in 1541, and was completed in 1546–7; but the account found there of the proceedings in question bears no resemblance, in detail, to that in the Ḥabīb. It is just possible, though extremely improbable, that Mirza Haidar may have seen a copy of the Ḥabīb-us-Siyar, before he wrote his own book, but there is not a shadow of internal evidence in the latter that he derived any information from the Ḥabīb regarding Shaibānī’s times. Moreover, the fact that Mirza Haidar agrees with Khwāndamīr goes far towards showing that no personal animosity coloured the Mirza’s statements.

Thirdly, Vambéry’s statement respecting a defeat experienced by Shaibānī’s son at the hands of the Qazāks in the autumn of 1510, may be correct; but it is noteworthy (a) that M. Vambéry does not give the authority on which it is made; (b) no other author known to such careful and accurate searchers and writers as Sir H. Howorth and the late Sani-ud-Daulah,2 mentions it; (c) Mirza Haidar tells us (p. 234) that Timur Sultan (or Muhammad Timur), Shaibānī’s son, was close to his father’s camp in the neighbourhood of Marv with a large body of men, at the beginning of December, 1510. If

---

1 See Elliot’s Hist., pp. 142–3 and 155. Also Ḥabīb-us-Siyar, iii, p. 310 (Persian printed edition).

2 The historiographer of Persia who writes in his Mantazim-i-Nasivi, under date 915 H.: “During this year Shaibak Khan [Shaibānī] was defeated by Qasim Sultan, a ruler of Ćasht-i-Kipčāk, and came in distress to Khurasan.”
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defeated by the Qazâks on the Jaxartes in October or November, it is just possible that he himself might have been at Marv in the first days of December, but somewhat improbable that he should have been able in that short interval to raise a fresh force. (d) It might, I think, be quite as fair to assume that M. Vambéry had “mixed up the two campaigns” (if two there were) as that the contemporary writers should have done so.

Fourthly. The Tarîkh-i-Rashidî, as Mr. Beveridge says, “does not speak of Shaibâni having been personally defeated” by the Qazâks. Just so: but the date it indicates for the defeat is that which the inscription gives for the victory, and it makes no mention of any subsequent defeat of Shaibâni’s troops in the same year.—Yours faithfully,

NEY ELIAS.

2. BUDDHAGHOSA’S SAMANTAPÄSÄDIKA IN CHINESE. By J. TAKAKUSU, M.A., Ph.D.

MY DEAR PROFESSOR RHYS DAVIDS,—As an additional note to my article on “Pâli Elements in Chinese Buddhism” (J.R.A.S., July, pp. 415–39), I should like to point out some matters which I ought to have incorporated in that article when I wrote it.

First of all, Professor Max Müller’s notice of the “Dotted Record of Past Sages,” to which I referred on p. 437, appeared in the Academy for March 1, 1884, p. 152, and is reprinted in the Indian Antiquary for May, 1884, p. 148, entitled, “The True Date of Buddha’s Death.” The translation quoted in that article by my friend Bunyu Nanjio is fuller than mine, and gives the name of the Chinese assistant of Saṅghabhadrâ and that of the monastery where the translation was made. The assistant was a Chinese named “Sang-i,” and the monastery “Bamboo Grove,” in Canton. These names may perhaps lead to a knowledge of further particulars about the translator himself.

Next I have to add here that Professor W. Wassilieff, of St. Petersburg, noticed the book in question, and gave a