

His pupil was Dhammakitti the fourth. He lived at Gaḍalādeṇi Vihāra during the reigns of Parākrama-bāhu V and Vikrama-bāhu III (1351-72), and was the learned author of Pāramīmahāśataka, an important Pali poem on the ten Pāramitās of Buddha. He was the Saṅgharāja (hierarchy) of his time, and held a great convocation of Buddhist monks in 1369 under the auspices of the minister Niśsaṅkha Alagakkōnāra,¹ and effected reforms in the Buddhist Church.

The fifth known Dhammakitti and the last of the series, succeeded his master in the office of Saṅgharāja. He was also called Devarakkhita or Jayabāhu Mahā-thera, and lived in the reigns of Bhuvaneka-bāhu V and Vīrabāhu III (1372-1410).² He was the celebrated author of about six important works, viz. : Saddhammālaṅkāra, Jinabodhāvali, Saṅkhepa, Nikāya-saṅgraha, Balāvatāra,³ and probably Gaḍalādeṇi-sanna and Saddhammasaṅgaha. In conjunction with his colleague Galaturumūla Maitrī Mahāsthavira, he, further, held a synod of Buddhist monks, and by suppressing unorthodox doctrines is said to have rendered great service in the purification of the religion.—Yours faithfully,

DON M. DE Z. WICKREMASINGHE.

3. MAHUAN'S ACCOUNT OF BENGAL.

8, *Christ Church Avenue, Brondesbury,*
29th November, 1895.

DEAR SIR,—It will be remembered that in my paper relating to Mahuan's account of Bengal, which appeared in the July number of this Journal, the names of the kings of that country sending embassies to China in 1409 and 1415 could not be determined with anything like certainty owing to the discrepancy of dates.

¹ Nikāya-saṅgraha, p. 28.

² *Ibid.*

³ Saddhammālaṅkāra, Brit. Mus. Or. 2277, fol. 1ṛiḅ.

I stated that the king sending an embassy to China in 1409 was called in the Chinese annals Gai-ya-szû-ting, which name seemed to fairly represent King Ghiyas-ad-din, but who did not appear to have been reigning in Bengal at that time.

Mr. Beveridge, with whom I had a conversation and some correspondence on the subject, informs me that Ghiyas-ad-din *was* living in 814 (1412), and there are coins of his up to 812 (1410).

In addition to this information kindly given me, Mr. Beveridge sent me an extract from his paper on the "Rajah Káns," which he wrote for the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, in vol. lxi, part i, No. 2, 1892, in which he fully enters into the subject concerning the time that Ghiyas-ad-din lived and reigned.

If we accept the dates given in his paper as correct, the Gai-ya-szû-ting of the Chinese annals may with almost certainty be accepted as Ghiyas-ad-din, who was king of Bengal at the time the embassy was sent.

Being thus tolerably certain as to the name of the king sending the embassy in 1409, I again turned my attention to the embassy of 1415, to see whether the initial character given in the name of the king sending it could be read in any other way. I stated that the Chinese annals called him Kien-fuh-ting, 蹇弗丁, but I am inclined to think that the name should be read Sai-fuh-ting, 賽弗丁; the initial character Kien, 蹇, being easily printed in error for Sai, 賽.

The king of Bengal thus sending the embassy in 1415 would be, in Chinese, Sai-fuh-ting and not Kien-fuh-ting, the name given in my paper. Again quoting Mr. Beveridge, we are informed that a Sai-fud-din, the son of Ghiyas-ad-din, succeeded his father as king of Bengal in 1412. He reigned three years and four months, and consequently would be reigning in 1415, when the embassy started for China. In duly weighing the above facts, I think we are warranted in supposing that the Sai-fuh-ting of the Chinese annals is King Sai-fud-din of Bengal.

There is now the question, what city was the capital of Bengal from whence these embassies came? Mahuan gives no name to the capital, but simply its approximate distance from Sonargáon. Sonargáon in the Ming annals is also the starting-point for the capital, but the directions and distances given are misleading.

In a Chinese encyclopædia, the Yuen-chien-lei-han, 淵鑑類函, there is to be found a short account of Bengal, in which is given the name of the capital, and from which I quote the following:—

“Sona-urh-kiang, Sonargáon, is a walled city, where much trade is carried on; beyond which [no direction given] there is the city of Pan-tu-wa, in which the king of the country [Bengal] resides, 再行至板獨哇酉長居焉. It is a walled city and is very large. The king’s palace is very extensive, and the pillars supporting it are of brass, on which are engraved figures of flowers and animals. In the throne-room there is a raised dais, inlaid with every kind of precious stone, on which the king sits crossed-leg with his sword lying across his knees. The king and all his officers are Muhammadans.”

The characters can also be read Pan-du-wa, and in the Amoy dialect P’êng-du-wa.

Mr. Beveridge, to whom I submitted the above extract, informs me that he thinks Panduah answers to the whole of the description of the Chinese Pan-tu-wa except the distance.

Mr. Beames, with whom I have been also in correspondence, states that Panduah was the capital of Bengal at the time the embassies went to China, but, owing to the direction and distance from Sonargáon given by the Chinese writers, hesitates somewhat in accepting Pan-tu-wa as representing Panduah.

On due consideration of the subject, I think it would be as well to dismiss the Chinese accounts of the direction and distance of the capital of Bengal from Sonargáon, as faulty and contradictory, and this being done, I think we should be warranted in assuming that the Chinese Pan-tu-wa

fairly represents the Bengal Panduah, which, according to Hunter's "Imperial Gazetteer," vol. xi, page 39, was at the time the capital of that part of India of which we have been treating, viz. 1409-1415.

My best thanks are due to Dr. Codrington and Messrs. Beames and Beveridge, for the help they have afforded me in my attempts to identify the names of the kings of Bengal sending embassies to China, and also for kindly aiding me to identify the ancient Bengal capital Panduah with Pan-tu-wa of the Chinese annalists.—Yours truly,

GEO. PHILLIPS.