

4. ARI.

Secretariat, Rangoon.

April 26, 1899.

DEAR SIR,—I have read with interest Mr. St. John's letter on the word 'Ari' in the Society's Journal for January, 1899. Mrs. Bode suggests that the word may be connected with the Pāli word *ariyo*, while Mr. St. John feels sure that it stands for *araññaka* or *araññako*, 'one who dwells in the forest.' I have consulted a number of pandits, and they all confirm Mrs. Bode's derivation. They tell me that အရိယ becomes အရည် in Burmese in the same way as ဝိနာယ becomes ဝိနည်း and ဝစ္စယ becomes ဝစ္စည်း, and that in Burmese literature the word အရည် has the meaning of 'noble, excellent,' when used as an adjective. A number of extracts have been shown me to support the latter portion of their statement.

Burmese history and Burmese archæology are almost a *terra incognita* in Europe. The field is large, but the labourers are few. However, an Archæological Department and a Provincial Museum are soon to be established in Burma, and it is hoped that the darkness, which now enshrouds things Burmese, will soon be dispelled.—Yours very truly,

TAW SEIN KO.

To the Secretary of the Royal Asiatic Society, London.

5. PERSIAN MANUSCRIPT ATTRIBUTED TO FAKHRU'DDĪN RĀZĪ,
WITH A NOTE ON RISĀLATU 'L GHUFRĀN BY ABŪ 'L 'ALĀ
AL-MA'ARRĪ AND OTHER MSS. IN THE SAME COLLECTION.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

May 17, 1899.

DEAR SIR,—I was much interested to learn from Dr. Horn's letter that a copy of the Persian MS.,

حفظ الصحه , which I described in the January number, is catalogued in the Aya Sofia at Constantinople under the title of حفظ البدن . This seems to put Rāzī's authorship beyond question. As regards his originality, perhaps I expressed myself rather carelessly when I said that my MS. had "every appearance of being an original work." As the context shows, I meant to say that in my opinion it was not translated from the Greek, and could so far claim to be an original composition. I never doubted that it was largely compiled from older sources: this was *a priori* to be expected, and in many cases Rāzī actually cites his authority. While I am not prepared to assert positively that he was indebted to the ذخيره خوارزمشاهي , a perusal of Dr. Horn's paper has convinced me that the two works, differing widely in scope, are yet to a large extent arranged on parallel lines. It is curious that I should have unconsciously anticipated Dr. Horn's admirable suggestion to identify the authority whom Rāzī cites by the name of Seyyid or Imām Ismā'il with Ismā'il b. Ḥasan b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Ḥusainī al-Jurjānī, author of the ذخيره خوارزمشاهي ; for Al-Sharīf Sharafu'ddīn Ismā'il, to whom I thought Rāzī might be referring, is in fact the same person (Rieu, Persian Catalogue, p. 467; Ibn Abī Uṣāibia, ed. A. Müller, vol. ii, p. 31 seq.).

Since writing my article on the حفظ الصحه , I have had occasion to make for my own use a rough catalogue of the Arabic and Persian MSS. gathered many years ago by my grandfather, the late Dr. John Nicholson of Penrith. The private owner of MSS. may not improperly be likened to the innocent receiver of stolen goods, whose best apology is straightway to publish what has befallen him. I hope therefore to be pardoned if I give some slight account of the rarer volumes and notice briefly a few more which have an interest apart from rarity.

The Persian MSS, both in number and quality, are much inferior to the Arabic. Besides the Ḥifẓu 'l Siḥḥa I need

only mention the *Tuḥfatu 'l Mū'minīn*, the *Tuḥfa-i Sāmī*, the *Khamṣa* of *Nizāmī*, *Jāmī's Divān* (two copies), and an exquisitely written *Kulliyāti Amīr Khusrau*, which belonged in turn to the libraries of Dr. Adam Clarke and Miss Richardson Curren.

There are about 150 Arabic MSS., and to one of these, the *Risālatu 'l Ghufrān*, I would call special attention, because it is, as I believe, a genuine work, hitherto unknown and undescribed, of the famous blind poet and man of letters, *Abū 'l 'Alā al-Ma'arrī*. The title runs:

هذه رسالة الغفران تاليف ابو (sic) العلا أحمد ابن عبد الله التنوخي

المعترى وارسلها لعلي ابن منصور المحدث بحلب

A work entitled *رسالة الغفران* occurs in *Hājī Khalīfa* (vol. iii, p. 422), but it has no connection with my MS. I think, however, that *Hājī Khalīfa* does mention this *Risāla* in the passage (vol. iii, p. 459) where he describes the *Rasā 'il* of *Abū 'l 'Alā* in the following terms:—

رسائل ابي العلا وهي ثلاثة اقسام الاول رسائل طوال مجرى

مجري الكتب المصنفة مثل رسالة الملائكة والرسالة السندسية

ورسالة الزعفران ورسالة العروس والثاني الخ

For the words *رسالة الزعفران* read *رسالة الغفران*—a very easy change. The MS. now before me fully answers to *Hājī Khalīfa's* description, that is to say, it is really a rhetorical composition, which cannot save in courtesy be styled an Epistle. It extends to 219 pages in all. The first and longer portion consists of a series of imaginary conversations between the Shaikh 'Alī b. Mansūr and poets of the Ignorance who have been forgiven (hence the title) and received into Paradise. Many verses are quoted and commented on, each poet explaining and defending his own, and various amusing incidents are introduced. The second part deals mainly with heresies and heretics, e.g. *الزنادقة والدهريون*. As I hope to print some extracts from the *Risālatu 'l Ghufrān* in an early issue of the Journal,

I refrain from giving further details just now. It appears to me to have great interest, not only as a new and probably unique specimen of Abū 'l 'Alā's literary powers, but also as being in itself a noteworthy accession to the huge mass of writings which fall under the general head of 'adab' or 'Litterae Humaniores.' The date is not formally stated, but we may infer from a passage on p. 156 that the *Risāla* was composed in 414 A.H.

Poetry and Commentaries thereon.

(1) *Tanwīru 'l Siqt*, containing the text of Abū 'l 'Alā's *Siqtu 'l Zand* with an excellent commentary called *Tanwīru 'l Zand*. This commentary is mentioned by Hājī Khalīfa (vol. iii, p. 601), who says that it incorporates with many enlargements and corrections the commentary which Abū 'l 'Alā himself dictated, and which was called *Dau'u 'l Siqt*. The author of this commentary is not known; Hājī Khalīfa says بعضهم. An ancient hand has ascribed it on the title-page to the Imām Fakhru'ddīn Rāzī. Rāzī did indeed compose a commentary on this *Dīvān*, but Ibn Abī Uṣāibia (ed. A. Müller, vol. ii, p. 29, fifth line from the foot) declares that it was left unfinished, which is clearly not the case here. Moreover, Rāzī was born in 543 A.H., two years after the date of this work (541 A.H.). This copy was written in the year 709 A.H., في مدرسة البهائية, in the city of Jājarm in Khorāsān. My MS. is undoubtedly identical with the commentary which De Sacy mentions in his *Chrestomathy* (vol. iii, p. 92) and cites as 124 R.

(2) *Sharḥu Tarjumāni 'l Ashwāq*. This MS. contains a *Dīvān* by the celebrated Muḥiyu'ddīn b. al-'Arabī, entitled ترجمان الاشواق, with the author's own commentary, which is here called الذخائر والاعلاق (see Hājī Khalīfa, vol. ii, p. 276). It has the preface (quoted in the Leyden Catalogue, vol. ii, p. 74 seq.) giving the date of the author's arrival in Mecca as 598 A.H., not 611 A.H. as is stated by Hājī Khalīfa, and begins with the same doxology, viz. الحمد لله الحسن الفعال. It would be interesting to know

whether the text of the poems in this MS. agrees with that in the Leyden MS. (No. 596) and the Gotha MS. (No. 2,268); and I hope to investigate this point at the first opportunity. Inscriptions on the last page of this volume certify that it has twice been diligently collated and corrected, so that it should be an uncommonly exact manuscript. It was copied in 1029 A.H.

(3) *Sharḥ Lāmīyati 'l 'Ajam*. The title of this commentary by Ṣalāḥu'ddīn Ṣafadī on Ṭoḡhrā'i's celebrated poem is—

غيث الادب الذى انسجم وشرح لامية العجم.

The copy of Ṣafadī's commentary from which the original of this MS. was transcribed was written from the author's autograph in 888 A.H., and the present copy was made in 1071 A.H.

Among the remaining poetical MSS. I may just mention the *Mu'allaqāt*, with commentaries by Tibrizī and Zauzanī, the *Dīvān* of Mutanabbī (two copies, one of which contains the commentary by Wāḥidī), the *Siqtu 'l Zand*, *Dīvānu 'l Ṣabāba*, the *Dīvān* of 'Alawān b. 'Aṭīya (cf. Ahlwardt, Berlin Cat., Nos. 3,283 and 7,936), and a mystical *Dīvān*, which at present I am unable to identify, with the following title:

كتاب ديوان ابن العربى العالم الغاضل المرشد الزاهد الورع سيدى
العارف بالله محمد وفا المصرى.

It begins:

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم وبه العون
وقال رضى الله عنه
توّهم ذات الفرق اقصى كما ادنا
فلا غرضاً اقصى ولا مقصداً اسنى.

As the words *كتاب ديوان ابن العربى* in the title are by a different and apparently older hand, I think it likely that

the others are a spurious addition. In any case I shall be grateful for information throwing light upon this work or its alleged author.

My account of those MSS. that are not strictly poetical must be deferred to some future occasion.—Yours sincerely,

REYNOLD A. NICHOLSON.

6. THE AUTHOR OF THE SĀSANAVAMSA.

June 14, 1899.

DEAR SIR,—Feeling that it would be of interest to hear something of the author of a modern Pali work from one of his contemporaries in the Buddhist community, I wrote, a short time ago, to the Venerable Subhūti, of Waskaduwa, asking him some questions about the author of the *Sāsana-vam̐sa*. He has not only replied most kindly, giving me a few particulars and mentioning his own relations with Paññāsāmi, but also sends me a copy of a letter written by the Burmese *rājaguru* himself to Ceylon, on the occasion of a visit of certain Singhalese monks and others to Mandalay, in the year 1862.

Of Paññāsāmi Subhūti writes as follows:—

“The venerable priest was known by the name of Rājaguru Paññāsāmi. He lived at a monastery called ‘Sahassarodhārāma’ in the neighbourhood of Mandalay about thirty-five years ago. The friendly feelings that existed between him and me and the pleasant correspondence we then carried on are still fresh in my memory. ‘Sāsana-vam̐sa’ was compiled in 1864, and the sad death of its author occurred several years later. He was also the author of many other works, the last of which was ‘Saddanītiṭikā,’ which his death unfortunately rendered him unable to complete. He was a pure Burmese, and does not at all belong to the Singhalese nationality, nor did he ever visit Ceylon. ‘Sāsana-vam̐sa’ was compiled at the request of the High Priest Sumaṅgala, the Principal of the Vidyodaya College, and Saraṇaṃkara Indāsabha Waraṇānasāmi, the