

ART. XXII.—The *Khalāṣat-at-Tawárikh*, or *Essence of History*; being the description and history of India as told by a Hindu two hundred years ago. By H. BEVERIDGE, M.R.A.S.

THE *Khalāṣat-at-Tawárikh* is a history of India from the days of the Pandus and Kurus down to the defeat of Dárá Shikoh and the beginning of the reign of Aurangzeb. It was written two hundred years ago (1695–96) by an up-country Hindu, whose name has been variously given as Sanjan, Suján, Saján, Shuján, and Subhán Rái.<sup>1</sup> He does not name himself in his history,<sup>2</sup> but he tells us that he was a native of Batála,<sup>3</sup> in the Panjáb, and that he had been

<sup>1</sup> M. Garcin de Tassy and Dr. Rieu think it probable that the correct name is Suján—a word formed from the Sanskrit and meaning “clever” or “intelligent.”

<sup>2</sup> See note A at end of paper.

<sup>3</sup> I am indebted to Mr. Irvine for pointing out to me that the place is Batála and not Patiála. Batála is a town and district in Gurdáspúr, in the Panjáb. They are described in the *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, and more fully in the *Gazetteer of the Gurdáspúr (i.e. Gurudáspúr) district* (Lahore, 1883–84, p. 96). Batála is the largest town in the Gurdáspúr district, and had in 1881 a population of 24,281. It lies 24 miles N.E. of Amritsar and about half a mile from the high road to Patháankot. The town is best known to English people in connection with A. L. O. E. (Miss C. M. Tucker).

The account of the founding and embellishing of Batála given in the *Gazetteers* agrees generally with that in the *Khalāṣat*, but it does not seem correct to say that Shamsheer Khán was a foster-brother of Akbar. There was a Shamsuddin who was Akbar's foster-father, and who was killed by Adham Khán, but Shamsheer Khán does not appear to have been his son. One MS. calls Shamsheer Khán a eunuch. The others speak of him as Khwájah. According to the *Khalāṣat*, Rái Rám Deo Bhathí, *zamíndár* of Kapúrthala, was the founder of Batála. It is said that in his time the Panjáb was in a very desolate state on account of a flood, which had laid the whole country under water, from the Sutlej to the Chenáb, and also of the incursions of the Moguls. Rái Rám therefore got the whole of the Panjáb in farm from Tátár Khán, the *Súbahdár* (Governor) of Lahore, for nine lakhs of *tankás*. I understand this to mean *rupís*, but Sher 'Alí has taken it to mean *ṭakas*, i.e. double *piece*. If so, the rent would be about Rs. 28,000. It *chanced*, says Suján Rái, that Rái Rám embraced Mahommadanism, a circumstance which led to his advancement. In 877 A.H. (1472 A.D.), in the reign of Bahlól Lodí, Rái Rám founded Batála, and it was afterwards embellished by Shamsheer Khán and others. [Apparently the *Hijra* date given in the text is wrong, for 1522 is given as the corresponding *Vikramadditya* date, but this would agree with 870 A.H. (1465 A.D.).] Suján Rái says that *batáláh* means “change” in Panjábí, and that the town got the name of Batála because the site first chosen was not good, and so was altered to another place in the vicinity.

from his youth up in the employment of high officials as a *munshi* or secretary. Apparently he was a *kshatriya* by caste, but in my opinion he was almost, if not quite, a Sikh by religion.

The Khalāṣat-at-Tawārikh is well known in India, and is, I believe, much esteemed there. There are many MS. copies of it in Europe also, but, as far as I know, it has never been printed or lithographed. Nor has it been completely translated, though Sher 'Alī Ja'farī (Afsos) rendered the first part of it into Urdu at the instance of Mr. Harrington in 1804-5. Sher 'Alī's work, called by him the *Araish-i-Mahfil* (Ornament of the Assembly), is, in the main, a translation from the Khalāṣat, but it only comes as far as the death of Rājah Prithvī or Pithu, and the completion of the Muhammadan conquest (1193).

The *Araish-i-Mahfil* has been translated into French by Abbé Bertrand, a pupil of M. Garçin de Tassy, and the latter also has translated several extracts in his book on Hindu literature. There is a very useful, though inelegant and not always accurate, translation into English by Captain Court.

My attention was first drawn to the Khalāṣat-at-Tawārikh by Kavirāj Shyamāl Dās (who, I regret to say, has lately died). I had written a paper suggesting doubts as to Jahāngir's mother having been a Hindu. But the Kavirāj showed in reply that the Khalāṣat-at-Tawārikh distinctly states that Jahāngir's mother was the daughter of Bihārī Mall Kachhwāhah.<sup>1</sup> Since then I have picked up a manuscript of the Khalāṣat in India, and have read a considerable portion of it. It seems to me that the work

<sup>1</sup> The passage occurs in the account of Akbar's reign. It is there stated that Shāh Tahmāsp, the king of Persia, suggested to Humāyūn that he should ally himself with the Indian aristocracy. Accordingly Humāyūn afterwards married the eldest daughter of Jamāl Khān, the nephew of Husain Khān Mewātī, a leading Indian Mahommadan, who probably was originally a Janūhah Rājput (Blochmann's *Ain*, p. 334, note). At the same time Bairām Khān married Jamāl Khān's younger daughter, and she became the mother of 'Abdur-rahīm, the Khān Khānān. Akbar went a step further and married the daughter of a Hindu. The Khalāṣat wrongly says that it was Akbar who married into Husain Khān Mewātī's family, a mistake which throws some doubt on its accuracy about Jahāngir's mother.

has been unduly neglected, and that the text ought to be printed by our Society, or by the Asiatic Society of Bengal. My chief object in this paper is to call attention to the book, in the hope that this may be done. So long ago as 1868<sup>1</sup> Colonel Lees referred to the Khalāṣat, in a paper read before this Society, as one of the most carefully compiled histories of India. He subsequently wrote of it in the preface to his edition of the Araish-i-Mahfil as being altogether a most excellent compilation, and said that he should be very glad to see a good edition of the Persian text, and that parts of it would be well worth translating into English.

The neglect and discredit of the Khalāṣat-at-Tawáríkh have been caused, in part, by the unfavourable remarks of Sir Henry Elliot and Professor Dowson. Sir Henry was indignant with its author because he thought he had dishonestly used another man's labours. He said he had stolen his materials, and even his language, from the Makhtaṣirat-at-Tawáríkh, and that the Khalāṣat-at-Tawáríkh was one of the most impudent plagiarisms that even India could produce. The ground for these remarks is that Sir Henry discovered in one of the Royal libraries at Lucknow, an anonymous manuscript containing a number of passages identical with descriptions in the Khalāṣat-at-Tawáríkh. The MS. was incomplete and contained neither the name of the author nor the date of composition. Nor had it any title, but as it professed to be a Makhtaṣir (abridgment) Sir Henry gave it the name of Makhtaṣir-at-Tawáríkh or Abridgment of History.

As there is apparently nothing to show that the MS. was old, and the date of composition was not given, it is not easy to see how Sir Henry arrived at the conclusion that the Makhtaṣir was anterior to the Khalāṣat. The only reason he gives is, that the latest authority quoted in the book is a work which was written by a servant of Jahángír who died in the 13th year of Sháh Jahán, *i.e.* 1049 A.H. (1639).

<sup>1</sup> "Materials for the History of India," J.R.A.S., New Series, III. p. 423.

His words are: "Neither the name of the author nor the "date of the composition is given; but as, among the general "authorities which he mentions in his preface, the latest is "the *Iqbálnámah-i Jahángírí* of Mu'tamid Khán, we may "fairly assume that the work was written early during the "reign of Sháh Jahán." It seems to me that this is a rash inference, especially as we do not know how far down the author of the *Makhtaṣir* intended to carry his narrative. He described his book as being an account of "Ancient Sultáns," and in the only known copy, the general history did not go beyond the reign of Humáyún. There does not appear to be evidence that he ever wrote anything more, though the reference to the *Iqbálnámah* would imply that he meant to go down as far as the reign of Jahángír. On the other hand the inclusion of Jahángír among "ancient sultáns" might lead to the inference that the writer of the *Makhtaṣir* belonged to recent times—such as the last century. At all events why should we hold that the *Makhtaṣir* must have been written before the *Khalāṣat*? Why may it not have been written long afterwards? If the writer only meant to deal with ancient sultáns, and did not intend to go farther than the reign of Jahángír, there was no occasion for his quoting any book more recent than the *Iqbálnámah*, even had he been writing in the reign of Sháh 'Alam.

Professor Dowson apparently endorses Sir Henry Elliot's view, though he does not strengthen it by any arguments of his own. Dr. Rieu, however, in his valuable Catalogue of the Persian MSS. in the British Museum, sensibly remarks that the fair inference from Sir Henry Elliot's account seems to be that the two books, the *Makhtaṣir* and the *Khalāṣat*, have proceeded from one and the same pen. This is, I think, a legitimate comment, but I would go further and say that a still more natural inference to make is, that the so-called *Makhtaṣir* is a plagiarism from the *Khalāṣat*. The facts that the author of the *Makhtaṣir* neither gave his own name nor a title to his book, nor the date of composition, seems to indicate a consciousness

that he had no claim to originality. It may be said that the *Khalāṣat* is also anonymous. This is perhaps true of the original MS., though the author's name is mentioned in several copies, and seems to have been known in India for many years.<sup>1</sup> But if Suján Rái does not give his name he, at least, gives many particulars about himself. He tells us where he was born, of his having been in Kábul and in Sind, of his having honoured a *Deogarh hundi*, and of the circumstances that led him to write his book. He also tells us its title and the date of his writing it. Further, in his account of his birthplace (Batála), he mentions the name of Suján Singh Kanungo in a way which, I think, clearly shows that he either means himself or some near relative. With regard to the title given by Sir Henry Elliot to the Lucknow MS., it may be noted that Suján Rái also calls his book a *makhtaṣir*. He says in his preface that "after reading many Hindí and Persian "books it occurred to him that he might make a selection from "them and present a *makhtaṣir*"—*Makhtaṣari matazaman ahwál farmanroyán maziya Hindústán*—an abridged account of the former rulers of India, which should prove agreeable reading. Very likely this is the passage from which Sir Henry constructed the title *Makhtaṣir-at-Tawárikh*. But Suján Rái does not stop here. He goes on to describe the scope of his work, and says he begins with Judisthir (the eldest of the five Pándavas), on whom he passes an encomium which, perhaps, could only come from the pen of a Hindu. He then gives us the title of his work, viz. the *Khalāṣat-at-Tawárikh*, and, as if foreseeing the criticisms of Sir Henry Elliot, he makes an emphatic statement that the plan and style of his work are his own and not stolen from other books. Sir Henry regards this statement as suspicious, observing that, as the author was under no necessity to make it, the statement of itself excites suspicions of his honesty. But it may be retorted that subsequent events have justified the precaution. Suján

<sup>1</sup> See note A at end of paper.

Rái's fate, indeed, has been rather a hard one. Probably he would have explained it by saying that it was the fruit of sins committed by him in a former birth. First he is copied without sufficient acknowledgment by Ghulám Husain Khán, in the *Siyar Mutaqarín*; then Sher 'Alí copies him—with acknowledgment indeed, but with additions and omissions, which are not always improvements, and with the effect of superseding him;—and lastly we have Elliot and Dowson accusing him of plagiarism, and of being a traitor to his religion and his country.

Even those who have a good word for Suján Rái are not always quite just to him. For instance, Mr. Morley, though admitting that the book has some value, yet says that it is vastly inferior to *Ferishta* in every respect. But the two works hardly come into competition. The *Khalāṣat* does not profess to be more than an abridgment, and yet there are a number of things in it which are not to be found in *Ferishta*—for example, the geographical details.<sup>1</sup>

After giving the title of his book, Suján Rái goes on to say that, having corrected his performance two or three times, he completed it at the end of two years, in the 40th year of Aurangzeb, 1107 A.H., 1753 *Vikramāditya*, 1618 *Sálivahan*, and 4796 of the *Káli Yug* (all of which dates correspond to 1695–96 A.D.). In the account of the Sikh leaders given in the course of the description of the province of Lahore, a somewhat different date is mentioned. There we are told that at the date of writing, Guru Govind had been *sajáda-nishín* (leader) for twenty-two years. Now, as we are also told that Tegh Bahádúr, the father and predecessor of Guru Govind, was put to death in the 17th year of Aurangzeb, and 1081 A.H., it would seem to follow that the book was written in 1103 (1081+22) and not in 1107. Apparently the discrepancy is due to a clerical error in the *Hijra* date, for Tegh Bahádúr was put to death in 1675 A.D., which corresponds to 1085 A.H. and not to 1081. Here it may be mentioned

<sup>1</sup> See note B at end of paper.

that the Romer M.S. has thirty-two instead of twenty-two for the duration of Guru Govind's leadership, but it is twenty-two in my copy, and no doubt this is right.

There can be no question that there is a close resemblance between the *Matkhaṣir* and the *Khalāṣat*. We have Sir Henry's word for this; and we have the fact that the description of India in the *Makhtaṣir*<sup>1</sup> resembles that in the *Khalāṣat* so closely that the one must be a copy from the other, or both must have been derived from a common source. They are not, however, identical, for an important and characteristic passage of Suján Rái's account—the poetical description of the rainy season—is altogether omitted in the *Makhtaṣir*. At one time I thought that this might be explained by the *Makhtaṣir*'s being a rough draft of the *Khalāṣat*. Apparently this is Dr. Rieu's idea, and it might receive support from Suján Rái's statement that he had corrected his book two or three times. We might suppose that an early draft found its way to Lucknow. However, there are difficulties in the way of this hypothesis, and I think the simpler and more probable explanation is what I have already proposed, namely, that the *Makhtaṣir* is subsequent to the *Khalāṣat*. It may be that it is the work of some mere copyist or abridger, who had no intention of passing off his work as an original.

When two books closely resemble one another, there are, I believe, certain canons of criticism to assist us in determining which is the original. I regret that I am not fully acquainted with them, but I imagine one must be that the racier and more complete book is probably the older of the two. The seven well-favoured and fat-fleshed kine of Pharaoh's dream preceded the ill-favoured and lean-fleshed ones. Applying this principle to the question before us we find there is a great deal in the *Khalāṣat* which is not in the *Makhtaṣir*. And evidently this must be the case, for the *Makhtaṣir* can only have been about half the size of the *Khalāṣat*. Sir Henry

<sup>1</sup> Elliot, viii. 3.

Elliot tells us that the copy he saw was an octavo, containing 352 pages of 15 lines each. The general history, viz. that to the end of Humáyún's reign, occupied 290 pages. Now my copy of the Khalāṣat is also octavo, and it contains 610 pages of 20 and 25 lines each. The portion to the death of Humáyún occupies about 374 pages, and, as each page has one-third more lines, we have 500 pages of the Khalāṣat against 290 of the Makhtaṣir. The Romer MS. belonging to our Society is a folio, and contains 696 pages of 15 lines each.

But the table of contents given by Sir Henry Elliot is enough to show that the matter of the Makhtaṣir fell far short of that of the Khalāṣat. Apparently it scarcely touched the Hindu dynasties of India, for it professed to deal only with ancient Sultáns, *i.e.* with Muhammadan rulers, and the authorities quoted in the preface were all Muhammadan except the Rájavalí.<sup>1</sup> Seemingly it did not contain anything about the Pandus and Kurus and their immediate descendants. The description, too, of India which Sir Henry Elliot's *munshi* translated, though agreeing with the Khalāṣat so far as it goes, is much shorter. It gives a very meagre account of the vegetable productions of India, contenting itself with the statement that a separate book would be required to describe the fruits, etc. The Khalāṣat, on the other hand, gives detailed accounts of several fruits, and is enthusiastic over *pán* (betel). I do not wish, however, to press this point, for it may be that Sir Henry Elliot's *munshi* did not translate the whole. But, at all events, it appears that the account of the different *súbahs* (provinces) of India, which form such an interesting feature of the Khalāṣat, were wanting in the Makhtaṣir. According to the Khalāṣat there are twenty-two *súbahs* in India, and it gives detailed accounts of eighteen.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It appears from the extract in B.M. Or. 2055 that the Rájavalí referred to in the Makhtaṣir is not any particular book. The anonymous author merely uses it as a general name for the chronicles and genealogies of Hindu kings.

<sup>2</sup> He says that there are in India twenty-two *súbahs* (provinces), 192 *sarkárs*, 4152 *mahals* (parganas); and that the revenue is 8 *arbs*, 68 *krors*, 26 *lakhs*,



In my copy these descriptions occupy seventy-seven pages, but in the *Makhtaşir* the only *sûbah* described was that of Sháhjahánábád, *i.e.* Delhi, and the pages devoted to it were only three in number. In the *Khaláşat* the number of pages about Delhi is fourteen and a half, *i.e.* about twenty of the *Makhtaşir*. I think I have said enough to show the improbability that the *Khaláşat* is a plagiarism from the *Makhtaşir*. I may remark, however, that if it be a plagiarism it is a fortunate one, for otherwise the information it contains would have been lost. Sir Henry Elliot never saw more than one copy of the *Makhtaşir*, and that, I presume, has been irretrievably lost in the Mutiny. No one has seen another, so far as I know. The fact of the plagiarism then, if it were established, would make little difference in the value of the *Khaláşat*.

The interesting thing about the *Khaláşat* is, that it is the work of a Hindu. It is not the only historical work that Hindus have produced. The eighth volume of Elliot and Dowson's great work contains the names of several Hindu historians, of whom Suján Rái seems to be the

and 80,573 *dáms*, *i.e.* 8,682,680,573 *dáms*, or Rs. 217,067,014 = 22 *krors* of *rupis* nearly. A century before, viz. in 1594-95, in the reign of Akbar, there were 15 *sûbahs*, 105 *sarkars*, 2737 *qasbas* (parganas?), and the revenue was about nine *krors*, or ninety millions of *rupis*. (Ain, Jarrett's translation, II. 115. In addition to the *dáms* there were twelve *lakhs* of betel leaves. We are not told their value in money.)

The eighteen *sûbahs* described are: Sháhjahánábád (Delhi), Agra, Allahábád, Oudh, Bihár, Bengal, Orissa, Aurangábád, Birar, Barhanpûr (Khándesh), Malwah, Ajmír, Ahmadábád (Gujrát), Tattah and Bhakkar (Sind), Multán, Lahore, Kashmir, and Kábul. He has omitted (according to two MSS. he has included them in his description), he says, Talingánah, the Deccan, and Kandahár. I do not know how the number twenty-two is made up (perhaps Assam or Assam and Kámrúp, which are described under the head of Bengal, make up the 22). The Romer MS. gives twenty as the total number, and so does the Araish-i-Mahfil. Perhaps Suján Rái wrote Talingánah-Deccan, in which case the total number would be only twenty. Tieffenthaler, I. 66, says that in Sháh Jahán's time there were twenty-two provinces, but the list he gives contains twenty-three names. The names which he gives in addition to those in the *Khaláşat* are Balkh, Badakhshán, and Baglána. The revenue was 8,800,000,000 *dáms*, *i.e.* 22 *krors* of *rupis*. In his own time (about the middle of the 18th century) the number of provinces was 23, and the revenue about 33 *krors*.

Baglána was in Gujrát, and is described in the *Khaláşat* in the province of Ahmadábád or Gujrát. It is spoken of as being a mountainous district between Surát and Nandurbar. It is the last province mentioned in Bernier's list, which also contains only twenty names.

best, and he is perhaps the *first* Hindu who wrote history, with the doubtful exception of the author of the Rāj Taranginī. At the least, he seems to be the first Hindu who wrote a general history of India. This is sufficient to make the Khalāṣat worth looking into, but in my opinion the book has also real merit. Its author had a better notion of history than most Muhammadan writers, and his style, though flowery, is easy and intelligible, and is in marked contrast to the turgid and involved diction of pedants, such as Abul Fazl. Suján Rái is occasionally foolish and credulous, and according to our Western tastes he is much too fond of bespangling his pages with verses. These, he tells us, are taken for the most part from distinguished poets, but some are his own composition. He has a genuine love of nature and of India, and he has the art of telling a story. His simplicity and garrulousness enable him to see and relate things which pompous and *sultanised* historians, to use a phrase of Sir James Mackintosh, pass by. Indeed, it would not, I think, be improper to describe Suján Rái as the Indian Herodotus. They both wrote at a time when the boundaries between logography and history were not fixed, and both have the same charm of clear and interesting narrative. This has always been an Eastern gift, and perhaps it is worth noting that Herodotus was by birth an Asiatic, and may have been what we now call a Eurasian. Suján Rái is also, I think, a fair and impartial author. M. Garçin de Tassy has recognised this quality in him, and prefers him, on this account, to Ferishta.

I have a great respect both for Sir Henry Elliot and Prof. Dowson, but I think they have been unjust to the author of the Khalāṣat. After accusing him of plagiarism, Sir Henry Elliot goes on to say that there is little to indicate that this work was written by a Hindu except that the date of composition is recorded, not only in the *Hijra* and *Jalís* years, but in the era of the *Kālī Yug*, *Vikramāditya*, and *Sálivahan*. Prof. Dowson caps this by a still more extraordinary statement. He says that the book

"is written with the intolerance and virulence of a bigoted Muhammadan, and carefully records many stories about Muhammadan saints and their tombs. So it would appear to have proceeded from the pen of a Muhammadan rather than a Hindu."<sup>1</sup> I can only suppose that Prof. Dowson did not read the book through, and that in the search for "copy" he looked at the historical rather than at the geographical and introductory portions. No doubt there are many parts of the book which a Muhammadan might have written, and there are long accounts of Muhammadan saints, but I do not find anywhere either intolerance or virulence.<sup>2</sup> Suján Rái heads his preface with the Muhammadan formula, the *bismillah*: "In the name of God, the compassionate, the merciful," but this is a phrase which I suppose no religious man would object to use. He certainly was a Hindu, or at least a Sikh, and he writes like one, though not in the spirit of a bigoted and intolerant Hindu. Indeed, if he had been a Hindu pure and simple, he would never have written history at all. It was the association with Muhammadans and with rulers that enlarged his mind and freed him from the trammels of caste. Perhaps he carries his affectation of liberalism too far, as, for example, when he speaks of Hindus as *kaffár*,<sup>3</sup> but I suppose this is because he is writing in Persian and uses the conventional word. Similarly he calls the death of a Muhammadan in battle a *shahádat* or martyrdom. But I have not found him writing of Hindus being sent to hell. The words of Sir

<sup>1</sup> The account of Mahmúd of Ghazní is very full and might certainly have been written by a Muhammadan. The words *jahád* and *káfir* and *maláhid* are used, and the author is more favourable to the *Ghazí*, and describes the success of his expeditions with more zest, than might have been expected from a Hindu. But he does not praise him indiscriminately, and he tells, with many moral reflections, the story of Mahmúd's clinging to his possessions up to his last gasp. Perhaps Suján Rái was touched by Mahmúd's great abilities and his liberality to poets. It is clear from the description of the removal of the idol at Tháneswar (in Mahmúd's fifth expedition) and the verses which he composes or quotes on the occasion that he was not a believer in idols.

<sup>2</sup> I must admit that there are some unbecoming passages, e.g. the account of Mahmúd's fourth expedition and part of the account of Sultán Altamsh. Perhaps these were what Professor Dowson had in view.

<sup>3</sup> Infidels—plural of *káfir*.

Henry Elliot,<sup>1</sup> on this point, must, I think, refer to other Hindu writers. That Suján Rái does not use the word *shahádat* in an intolerant sense is apparent from his applying it to Abul Fazl, who was a very unsound Muhammadan. He calls Abul Fazl's death a martyrdom, because it was incurred by his zeal for his king and by his resolving to obey, at all hazards, Akbar's order to come to him. The words *kaffár* and *shahádat* occur, among other places, in the account of the battle between Aurangzeb and Rájah Jaswant Singh, and the author there seems to be putting himself in the place of the Emperor, and to be uttering his sentiments. I do not mean to say that Suján Rái writes in a perfectly straightforward manner, or that he always expresses his real sentiments. He was in the service of Muhammadans and he wrote in the reign of Aurangzeb. According to Mr. Morley, who in this matter has been followed by M. Garçin de Tassy, the book was dedicated to Aurangzeb. I do not find this, and I am inclined to doubt the fact. I question if Suján Rái would, in a book dedicated to Aurangzeb, have ventured to denounce bigotry, and to speak of all religions as coming from God. But no doubt he wrote under some restraint. I cannot question but that he was in his heart more inclined to Dárá Shikoh than to Aurangzeb. He tells us in his preface that one of the authorities used by him was the translations of the Bhágavat-purána and Yog Vasishṭha at the instance of Dárá Shikoh, and in his account of Batála he refers to Dárá Shikoh's interviews with the Hindu saint and poet Bábá Lál,<sup>2</sup> and praises the book by Chandra Bhán Munshi in which the conversations have been recorded.

In his account of the contest<sup>3</sup> between Dárá and

<sup>1</sup> "Historians of India," I. xxi.

<sup>2</sup> The name is not mentioned in the Persian MSS. which I have seen, but it occurs in the Araish-i-Mahfil. Just previously Suján Rái had mentioned the remarkable fact that the *khádims* or servants of the shrine of a Muhammadan saint, Shamsuddín Dariyái, were Hindus, and that they had preserved their position in spite of the efforts of Musalmans to displace them.

<sup>3</sup> The description of Dárá's heretical practices is mainly copied from the 'Alamgírnamah of Muhammad Kázim, Bib. Ind. pp. 34-36, but it is softened, and Suján never, I think, adopts M. Kázim's insulting way of speaking of Dárá as *Be-Shikoh*, i.e. "without magnificence."

Aurangzeb he tells, but with little comment of his own, how Aurangzeb stood up for the Muhammadan religion, whereas Dárá Shikoh had adopted Hindu practices and spent his time in listening to *bráhmans*. Perhaps in this remark we may trace a regret that Dárá was too much addicted to disquisitions, to the detriment of his practical statesmanship. But, as Tacitus tells us, the most difficult thing is to be moderate in the pursuit of philosophy. And though Suján Rái admits that it was the will of God that Aurangzeb should prevail, he yet does not spare him altogether, but describes him as actuated by carnal motives as well as by zeal for the Muhammadan religion. The truth is that, even supposing that Suján Rái was in a position to express his opinions fully, he was, like the majority of his countrymen, a fatalist and a worshipper of success. He fully believed that it was God's will that Aurangzeb should conquer. He takes a similar view of the contest between the Muhammadans and the Hindus.<sup>1</sup> The time had come for the latter to fall, and for the former to ascend, and he would have considered it as idle to lament over this as to mourn at the sinking of a star. *Factum valet* is a great maxim in Hindu law, and also in Hindu politics, and no sound Hindu would have had any difficulty in accepting Dean Sherlock's view of the position, after William III. had been firmly seated on the throne.<sup>2</sup>

I now proceed to describe the plan and contents of Suján Rái's work. He begins, like most Eastern writers, with some general remarks about the goodness of the Deity and the wonders of Creation. He then passes on to the subject of religions and speaks of the differences among them in language, which may remind us of Tennyson—

<sup>1</sup> See the remarks at the beginning of the Muhammadan period, where he says that God is no respecter of religions, and that it was His good pleasure that the Hindu supremacy should come to an end, and that India should come under the shadow of Muhammadan rulers.

<sup>2</sup> Bábar tells us the custom in Bengal was, that whoever succeeded in killing the King and placing himself on the throne was regarded as the legitimate monarch. *Memoirs of Bábar*, Erskine's translation, p. 311.

“ Our little systems have their day ;  
 They have their day, and cease to be ;  
 They are but broken lights of Thee,  
 And Thou, O Lord ! art more than they.”

He condemns the narrow views of those who imagine that the divine beneficence is confined to them, and that they are the sole depositaries of the truth.<sup>1</sup> With him all religions are from God, and no people has been left by God without a witness to the truth. Every sect, he thinks, has its special God-given messenger and its divine book. Those men who think it their duty to spread their own religion and to extirpate that of others, mistake, he says, bigotry for religion. Finally he quotes a Persian verse which says : “ I marvel at the enmity “ between faith and infidelity, seeing that one and the same “ sun shines upon the *ka’bah* and the idol-temple.” Indeed his words are so striking that I must try to render them into English, although I am unable to translate them with perfect correctness.

“ The Creator of the universe, in the same way as He has “ formed different worlds and variously coloured races of men, “ has created different religions and different customs. And “ for the establishment of religions He has, in every country “ and in every race, clothed one of His chosen spirits with “ the garment of humanity, and has given him power to “ know all mysteries, and has enabled him to exhibit miracles. “ God has also put in his hands a divine book, so that he “ may guide men in the method of worship, and that they “ shall not go astray after his death. But each tribe is in “ error in treating their religion as a hook in the nostrils “ of their hearts and a rope round their necks, and in “ esteeming the religion and laws of other people as idle “ folly. They think that the divine mercy is confined to “ themselves, and that they are pleasing God by inculcating

<sup>1</sup> We are reminded of Locke’s description of the people who “ canton out “ to themselves a little Goshen in the intellectual world, where light shines, and, “ as they conclude, day blesses them ; but the rest of that vast *expansum* they give “ up to night and darkness, and so avoid coming near it.”

"their own religion and suppressing that of others. Thus "the majority of them mistake bigotry for worship. But "the select spirits of each sect, whose minds have been "illuminated, know that the mercy of the Creator is far-reaching and not confined to any one tribe, and that, like "His sun and moon and refreshing rain, it exists for all "mankind. Such enlightened persons turn away from "bigotry and persecution, and live with their friends in "harmony and with their enemies without strife. They hold "that no sect is without a share of the divine support, "and they know that it is the boundless variety of the "universe and the limitations of human faculties which have "introduced religious disputes among mankind." Then follows the verse which I have already referred to:—

*"Dar khairat am kah dushmani kafar o din chara ast  
Az ek chiragh ka'bah o bútkhāna roshan ast."*<sup>1</sup>

Though it is true that Suján Rái tells long stories about Muhammadan devotees, it has to be said that he is equally copious about Hindu temples and Hindu saints. This has led to a protest by his Urdu translator, Sher 'Alí Afsos, who desires his readers to understand that the accounts about *Çúfis* and about Hindu temples, etc., have been inserted by him merely because they are in the original and not because he believes them. If there were nothing else to show that Suján Rái was a Hindu, his praises of *sati* and of perpetual widowhood would prove it. This led to another protest from Sher 'Alí, who laments

<sup>1</sup> Apparently this is a favourite verse with Suján Rái, for he uses it again, when praising Akbar for abolishing the *jizyah* or capitation-tax on infidels. He there, too, represents Akbar as applying the argument from the universality of God's goodness to kings. Kings, Akbar is represented as saying, are the shadows of God, and as His sun warms equally the good and the bad so should they regard all religions and all men with equal favour. A striking verse is quoted, which says that disputes about faith, *i.e.* the Muhammadan creed, and infidelity come at last to the same thing. There is but one dream, though the interpretations be different. (It is interesting to find the author of the *Riyaz-as-Salátin* ending his book with this verse; and making it the climax of his panegyric on the British Government.) He refers to the suspicions about Akbar's orthodoxy, and says that he was really more religious than most princes. He mentions a fact which I have not seen noticed elsewhere, *viz.* that 'Abdunnabi, the *Çadr* and opponent of Akbar, was put under the charge of Abul Fazl.

that the Hindu notions about widowhood have infected Muhammadan women, especially in the villages, and have led to their remaining in widowhood, contrary to the precepts of their religion.

Suján Rái, in language that may remind us of the phrase of the Shorter Catechism, tells his readers that man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy Him for ever; and after lamenting that few have the courage to give up the world altogether, and that we are overwhelmed by our desires and passions as by the waves of a stormy sea, he speaks of the value of history and says it is like the cup of Jamshed and the mirror of Alexander.<sup>1</sup> He tells us that from his youth up he had been in a Secretariat, and that he had studied many books. He gives us a list of these, amounting to twenty-two or twenty-three, exclusive of local histories.

After this introduction, he proceeds to give a general description of India. This is well written and very Oriental. He is enthusiastic in his praise of the country and its productions, and of its inhabitants. It is interesting to find that he chooses the rainy season for special commendation. He says that spring in all countries is a delightful season, but the rainy season in India surpasses the springtime in other countries. The most delightful period, he says, is from the end of Gemini to the beginning of Libra, *i.e.* from about the middle of June to the 23rd September. This view will sound strange to Anglo-Indians, especially to those who have lived in Bengal. I may remind them that Suján Rái was an up-country man, and that a similar preference for the rainy season is expressed by the Emperor Bábar.<sup>2</sup> Suján is quite poetical here. He speaks of the sky as clothed with clouds, like a bride with her veil; of the wind coming as

<sup>1</sup> It was fabled that these princes had cups or mirrors which showed the universe.

<sup>2</sup> "The chief excellency of Hindústán is that it is a large country and that it has abundance of gold and silver. The climate during the rains is very pleasant."—Bábar's Memoirs, p. 333.



a bridegroom, or rather, as he phrases it, like a son-in-law, and unveiling her. The moon and the planet Venus look out from their sphere, the lightning smiles, the *chinár* (aspen poplar) claps its hands with delight, etc. He gives a lengthy description of the vegetable products of India, and especially praises the stimulant known by the name of *pán*. He mentions the orange and the pineapple, but like Bábar, he regards the mango as the king of Indian fruits. He says nothing about the bamboo, nor does he refer to opium or tobacco. Perhaps as a Sikh he regarded tobacco as unlawful. He has a good deal to say about the rhinoceros and the elephant, and in particular, has a graphic description of an elephant fight. He concludes with praises of the women of India, and says that is in vain for him to try and depict the glories of the country. Even Aristotle, the master of those who know,<sup>1</sup> and Plato could only relate a few of them, and could but mention one of a thousand. How, then, can his poor pen do justice to the subject? He winds up by appealing to the fact that the inhabitants of the most distant countries abandon their love for their native land and come and settle in India. Greeks, Abyssinians, Franks, Arabs, Turanians, all come to India, and from being weak become powerful, and from being poor become rich.<sup>2</sup>

After this, we come to what is perhaps the most valuable part of the book, viz. the accounts of the different *súbahs* (provinces). The descriptions are of unequal value, one of the poorest being the account of Bengal. It is almost entirely derived from the *Áin-i-Akbarí* of Abul Fazl.

In the long account of the province of Sháhjahánábád (Delhi), perhaps the most interesting thing is the occurrence of the word *Angrez* (English). The author enumerates the nations which are to be met with in the Delhi bazar. There are men, he says, from Rúm and Zang, from Shám and Farang, i.e. from Greece and Abyssinia,

<sup>1</sup> This is not merely a translation of Dante. It is the Persian "*Aristo danishan peshin*."

<sup>2</sup> See note C.

from Syria and Europe, and also *Angrez* and *Olandez*, i.e. Englishmen and Dutchmen. The Englishmen then in Delhi must, however, have been very few.

The account of the course of the Ganges is partly borrowed from the *Áin-i-Akbarí*, but there are some additions. After describing the source and upper course of the river, he speaks of its passing Akbarnagar, i.e. Ráj-mahal, Jahángírábád (Jangipúr?), Maksudábád, i.e. Murshidábád, Mirdadpúr, and Hazrahatí, and as entering the sea near the port of Sátgáon. He then ends with the following hit at the inhabitants of the Ganges valley:—

“It is reported by travellers that the dwellers on the “banks of the Ganges, from its source in the mountains to “its mingling with the ocean, are all of a rebellious nature, “given to violence—thieves, and highwaymen, bloodthirsty “and troublers of mankind. Inasmuch as bathing in this “river wipes away men’s sins from their bodies, it may be, “that these same sins are born again on the banks in the “human shape and become the roots of evil actions.”

In the account of B́ihar there is a description of Deogarh in the Sonthal Parganas, and of a peculiar kind of bill of exchange known as a Baijnáth, i.e. Baidyanáth *hundi*. The author says that there is a *pipal* or sacred fig tree at the Baidyanáth temple, and that if anyone stay under it for two or three days, without eating or drinking, and pray for assistance from Śiva, a leaf flutters down containing, in Hindu characters, the amount of money he requires and the name and residence of the payer, etc. This is afterwards exchanged for a paper, and the worshipper takes this to the residence of the obligor, though he may be a thousand miles off, and gets payment for it. Suján Rái says that a *bráhmaṇ* presented him with one of these papers, and that he paid it, thinking that to do so was a meritorious action.

Sher ’Alí Afsos, in his account of B́ihar in the *Araish-i-Mahfil*, expresses his doubt of the correctness of the statement in the *Khaláṣat* that in the *sarkár* (division) of Monghyr a stone wall had been built from the Ganges to

the hills, and that this formed the boundary of Bengal. M. Garçin de Tassy rather unfortunately takes occasion from this passage to vindicate Sher 'Alí from the charge of being merely a translator. He says this passage and many others, prove that the work of Sher 'Alí is not a translation of the Persian book, but that, as he has said elsewhere, Afsos has merely taken the *Khalásat* for his groundwork. No doubt the passage proves this, but it also shows that Sher 'Alí had not as much knowledge as Suján Rái. The statement in the *Khalásat* is copied from *Áín-i-Akbarí*—a work which Sher 'Alí seems not to have read—and is quite correct. The hills referred to are not the Himálayas, but the range on the south of the Ganges, and which run down close to the edge of the river. The stone wall is nothing but the out-works of the fortress of Teliágari, which used to be called the "Gate of Bengal." I have myself seen the ruins of the fort. There is a similar wall or line of defence in the neighbourhood at Sikrigali, which was in existence in the time of Father Tieffenthaler.

Sher 'Alí's account of Bengal is much fuller than Suján Rái's. He has here brought the description up to date, and among other things has given a long account of Calcutta and its Botanic Garden, and has noticed the tomb of Colonel Kyd. He has also told the story of Job Charnock's leaving Húglí, of his setting fire to the town by means of a burning-glass, and of his success with Aurangzeb. I am afraid, however, that all this will not add to his fame for research, as it is all copied from the *Riyáz-us-Salátín* of Ghulám Husain (Salím). The whole story may be read there, including the incident of Charnock's cutting the boom at Makhua with a European sword.<sup>1</sup>

In the account of Tattah, *i.e.* Sind, we have a wonderful description of the wizards and witches of that country. They are liver-eaters, we are told, and that the only way to deal with a witch is to mark her on the sides of the head, stuff her eyes with salt, and hang her up in a room for forty days,

<sup>1</sup> Persian text, p. 35.

giving her food without salt. All this the author has borrowed from Abul Fazl, but he goes on to say that he himself has seen liver-eaters. Sher 'Alí describes him as saying that he actually saw a witch take out a child's liver, but I am not sure that Suján Rái means anything more than that he had seen people who were reported to do such things.

In his account of the Panjáb, or *súbah* Lahore as he calls it, he is very copious, and he enters into great detail about the Sikhs. From the way in which he speaks of them, it seems to me that he was either a Sikh himself, or had a great respect for their creed. We have seen that in his introduction he speaks of *hommes d'élite* or chosen spirits, as recognising that God's mercy is not confined to any one tribe, and as being able to live in harmony with friends and foes. Now, it is remarkable that he uses the same phrase, "*ba dostan ekrang o ba dushman be jung*," in describing the tenets of the Sikhs. He also tells us that many distinguished men are followers of Nának, and that the principle of the Sikhs is to regard kinsmen and strangers with equal affection. The faith of the Sikhs in their religion is, he tells us, such as is hardly to be met with elsewhere, and they are much given to hospitality and very kind to travellers. If at midnight a man arrive at the house of a Sikh, and utter the name of Nának, he is received and fed, though he be a stranger and even a thief or a robber.

Suján Rái is extremely diffuse about Batála,<sup>1</sup> giving as

<sup>1</sup> He calls it "*Batála dīlkusha o ma'mur*," i.e. pleasant and heart-expanding Batála. After mentioning that in the 12th year of 'Alamgir (Aurangzeb), Mīrzā Muhammad Khān, also called Mīr Khānī, had built a bazar at Batála when he was *amin* of the *pargana*, and that Qāzī 'Abdul Hye had built a house of stone and a masonry caravanserai, he says that Mánkī Rái and Suján Singh Kanungo and their sons had erected rest-houses and mosques, etc. He then speaks of a masonry well, made by Gangádhār, the son of Hīrānand Dhīr, and of a garden made by Amar Singh in imitation of the gardens of Shālāmār. He also gives an enthusiastic description of a fair held in September at a place called Achal, about four miles from Batála. He praises the beauty of the women who assemble there, and says that even the sun pauses in its course to admire the festival, and that there is no native of Batála, though he were hundreds of *parasangs* away, and living in great prosperity, and surrounded with delights, but would wish to be at home at such a time, and to take part in this fair. As the country is his own birthplace, he has, he remarks, thought it right to

his reason that it was his birthplace, and speaking of it in a way which may remind us of Dr. Johnson's "*Salve magna parens*" when introducing the name of Lichfield in his explanation of the word *lych*. He gives a curious and interesting description of the way in which rock-salt was dug out of the Salt Range, in the Panjáb, in the time of Aurangzeb. He tells us that the miners enter a pit or gallery 200 or 300 yards long, quite naked, with a lamp in the hand and a pickaxe on the shoulders, and get out blocks of salt of three *maunds* in weight. The men are called *Lásakash*, he says, and the mines are near Shamsábád. Abul Fazl has described this in the *Áin*,<sup>1</sup> but Suján Rái is fuller.

There are also long descriptions of Kashmír and Kábul, but I have not space to notice them. They may be read in Captain Court's translation of the *Araish-i-Mahfil*. I may remark, however, that it is interesting to compare the Hindu accounts of Delhi and of Kashmír with those given some thirty years before by Bernier. For a Hindu, Suján Rái was a considerable traveller. He speaks of visiting the rose-gardens of Bijnaur, of his having seen the witches of Sind, and of his having been in Afghánistán—where he saw women who had had fifteen or twenty husbands. His descriptions of the various provinces are, undoubtedly, the most original part of his book, and give a great deal of interesting geographical information which is probably not to be found elsewhere.<sup>2</sup> Certainly it is not to be met with in the ordinary Muhammadan chroniclers.

say a little about Batála, and the splendid festival. It seems evident that he only mentions the above obscure names because they are connected with himself, and that Suján Singh Kanungo must be either himself or a near relative. The mention of Híránand Dhír is interesting, as the writer describes himself in the extracts in Or. 1924 in the British Museum as Suján Singh Dhír.

It should be mentioned that in the Romer MS. and in the Hull MS., B.M. Add. 6564, the above-named building of a mosque or mosques is ascribed to Qázi 'Abdul Hye, and that the name Mánki is spelt Bánki. B.M. Add. 5559 says the same thing, so that I suppose my MS. is in error in connecting the mosques with the names of the Hindus.

<sup>1</sup> II. 315, Jarrett's translation.

<sup>2</sup> In the account of Gujrát he states that the people collect the rain-water in underground reservoirs, which they call *tánkhas*. This agrees with the statement in Wilson's Glossary that the word "tank" is said to be Gujrátí.

After describing the provinces, he begins the historical part of his work, with an account of the Hindu dynasties, commencing with Vicitra-vírya, the grandfather of the Kurus and Pandávas, and giving the details of the births of Dhrita-ráshtra and Pandu. He ends with the death of Rájah Prithví of Ajmír. This occurred in the reign of Sháhábuddín, 200 years after Sabuktigín's victory, and about 193 years after his son Mahmúd of Ghazní's first expedition. Much of his narrative is taken from the Mahábhárat and such-like sources, and is, of course, fabulous. It may all be read in the translation of the Araish-i-Mahfil. He is especially copious in his account of the wonderful adventures of King Vikramáditya. In his account of Rájah Prithví, the last of the Hindu kings, he first gives the romantic story of Chand Bardai's inducing the Sultán to witness an exhibition of the captive Rájah's skill in archery, and how the Rájah, when he got the bow and arrows into his hand, shot the tyrant, and then, together with his faithful bard, fell, oppressed by numbers. Then he adds that Persian books tell the story differently, and say that the Rájah was killed at the battle of Talaurí, and that the Sultán was afterwards assassinated. God, he says, knows the truth. He ends this part of his work with reflections on the instability of the world and the inevitableness of death.

He opens his account of the Muhammadan princes with remarks on the omnipotence of God. God, he says, is no respecter of forms of religion, but extends His goodness to everyone. It was now His will that the Hindu dynasties should come to an end, and that India should rest under the shadow of Muhammadan rule. He then proceeds to describe the reign of Sabuktigín. I do not suppose that there is much value in these accounts.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps the most valuable thing in them now is the extraordinary digressions that Suján Rái indulges in. Thus,

<sup>1</sup> He ascribes Sabuktigín's victory over Jaipal to supernatural causes. The Sultán was worsted, and then raised a storm of sleet and snow by defiling a fountain!

he takes advantage of Mahmúd of Ghazní's various expeditions to describe the seasons of India, and in his account of Maizuddín Kaíkobád, the fact that the young prince was fond of pleasure and of games is sufficient to set him off on a rhapsody about chess.<sup>1</sup> In his account of 'Aláuddín, he tells with great spirit the story of Rái Ratan Singh, of Chítor, and his beautiful wife Padmávatí. His account is different from that in Tod and in Ferishta, but agrees generally with that in the Aín-i-Akbarí. Suján Rái, however, can tell a story better than the ponderous Abul Fazl, and here, as well as in his account of the heroism of Raní Durgávatí, he shows that he has not forgotten that he is a Hindu. In the account of Humáyún, he tells graphically the story of the Emperor's escape at Chausá, and how the water-carrier who saved him was rewarded by being seated on the throne for half a day. The account of Akbar is full and sympathetic, and he praises him for remitting the *jazyah*<sup>2</sup> or capitation-tax, and for his Thursday evening conferences, in a way which shows how far he was from being Muhammadanised.

He gives an interesting sketch of Todar Mall's career,<sup>3</sup> and praises him in a discriminating fashion. No doubt, if he was Suján Singh the Kanungo, mentioned in the account of Batála, or his descendant, he would be here on known ground, and able to speak with authority. He has also a good deal to tell us about Abul Fazl and his distinguished father, Mubárah. In noticing Abul Fazl's wide reading, he observes that he was acquainted with the Pentateuch and the Gospels.

The most interesting of his accounts is, perhaps, his

<sup>1</sup> Similarly the circumstance that Ghiásuddín Balbán was fond of birds leads him into a disquisition on ornithology.

<sup>2</sup> The passage in which Suján Rái describes this measure is enough to absolve him from the charge of intolerance or bigotry. Compare it with the extract from the Tārīkh-i-Firúz Sháhí quoted by Blochmann, Aín i. 237. He also praises Akbar for putting a stop to cow-killing (*gokashí*), a practice which is, he says, abhorrent to the Hindus.

<sup>3</sup> He ascribes to Todar Mall the introduction of Persian into the *zamindari* papers. In another place he exculpates him from the charge (mentioned by Blochmann, Aín i. 432) that he had to do with the murder of Sháh Mançúr.

mention of the reign of Sher Sháh. He is more just to him than Abul Fazl is, or could be expected to be,<sup>1</sup> and yet he does not conceal his faults. He describes the treacherous way in which Sher Sháh took Rohtas, in Bihar, from the Rájah Chintáman; and he also tells us how he broke the capitulation with Púran Mall, of Ráisín. Here he mentions something that is not in Ferishta or Elphinstone. Both these writers tell us that Sher Sháh broke the treaty, on the faith of which the Rájah had surrendered, because his lawyers advised him that it was not necessary to keep faith with an infidel. But Suján Rái adds the detail that the ground of the lawyers' *fatwá* was, that Púran Mall had kept Muhammadan concubines. They said that such conduct was worthy of death. It may be observed that though Muhammadans do not, or at least did not, altogether disapprove of Muhammadans taking Hindu wives, they thought it dreadful that Hindu men should have Muhammadan women in their keeping. The Emperor Jahángir remarks in his Memoirs, that for Muhammadans to marry Hindu women was not so bad<sup>2</sup>—which is pretty well, considering that his mother was a Hindu, and that he had more than one Hindu wife—but that it was monstrous that Hindu men should have Muhammadan wives. Suján Rái, however, does justice to Sher Sháh's great qualities. He tells how well he behaved to Humáyún's queen, Hájí Begum, and what a just and beneficent ruler he was.

Like other great men who have had to breast the blows of circumstances, Sher Sháh felt that he had attained success too late in life. "Alas!" he said, on looking into a mirror, "I have reached my goal at evensong." Suján Rái adds that when Sher Sháh was entering Delhi

<sup>1</sup> Abul Fazl never gives him the title of Sháh, but calls him either Faríd Khán or Sher Khán.

<sup>2</sup> *Wákiát-i-Jahángirí*, Elliot vi. p. 376. "They associate and intermarry with Hindus, giving and taking daughters. As for taking, it does not so much matter; but as for giving their own daughters—Heaven protect us!" The Emperor is here speaking of the people of Rajáin, who were converts to Muhammadanism.



a milkwoman looked at him and exclaimed, "Yes, Delhi has got a husband, but he is an old man." But when Sher Sháh stayed his horse and listened for more, the wise woman cried out, "*Pir ast amma zarif*"—"Yes! old, but good." Suján Rái also tells the following story illustrative of Sher Sháh's even-handed justice:—

"One day Prince 'Ádil, the eldest of his sons, was passing through a lane in Ágra on an elephant. By chance a shopkeeper's wife had undressed herself and was bathing in her courtyard. The prince, being high up, could look over the wall; and, seeing a beautiful girl, he wickedly enough flung down a *bíra*, or confection of *pán*, towards her, and thereby made her look up. He went off at once, but the chaste Hindu felt outraged by a strange man having seen her while bathing, and was about to commit suicide. Happily her husband came in just then from the bazaar and stayed her hand. But he, too, was indignant, and, snatching up the *bíra*, he rushed off to the *jharókah* of complaints," i.e. the window or gallery where the Sultáns were accustomed to give audience and to administer justice. "Here he told his grievance to Sher Sháh. The latter was much grieved, and, in order to redress the wrong, directed that the shopkeeper be mounted on an elephant and be taken to Prince 'Ádil's house, that Prince 'Ádil's wife should be produced before him, naked, and that the shopkeeper should then throw the *bíra* to her. His *Vazir* and other counsellors besought him not to be so strict, but he stuck to his point, and only gave way when the shopkeeper exclaimed that he was satisfied, that justice had been done him, and that he withdrew his charge."

Another of Suján Rái's stories is one of two soldiers in the time of Akbar who were twins, and so alike that nobody could tell the one from the other. One day both of them went with the army to a place near Ágra on an expedition against some rebels. By chance one was killed, and his body was sent into Ágra to be burned. No information was sent as to which brother had been killed, and when the body arrived, the wife of each brother claimed it as her

husband's, and demanded to be burnt along with it. The dispute rose high, and was referred to the *kotwāl*, or Head of the Metropolitan Police. But the *kotwāl* found he could not settle it, and so it was referred to the Emperor. The women having come before Akbar, he asked the wife of the eldest twin—for there was a difference of a minute or two in the births of the brothers—what evidence she had that the body was that of her husband. "Oh," she said, "I am certain of it, and if you want proof I tell you this—that about a year ago we lost our son, aged ten. My husband was excessively fond of him, and I am positive that if you could examine his liver you would see his grief engraved there." The Emperor thereon sent for skilful surgeons, and had the body opened, when it appeared that there was a hole in the liver, as if it had been pierced with an arrow. Everybody agreed that the woman was right, and so, she was rewarded by having the body made over to her, and by her being allowed to burn along with it. Just then the truth of her claim was established by the return of the other brother safe and sound, and the *satī* was performed to the satisfaction of everybody.

The Khalāṣat-i-Tawārīkh has a good deal to say about Jahángír. It tells the story of Sher Afkan and his beautiful wife, who afterwards became Núr Jahán, and it gives the circumstances of Jahángír's death. But it passes very lightly over the reign of Sháh Jahán. The disputes between his four sons are told at considerable length; but the work ends rather abruptly with Dárá Shikoh's flight to Gujrát, etc., and does not tell us of his death.

I have already mentioned that the author of the Khalāṣat does not give his name. Perhaps this was because he did not live to finish his book. He speaks, certainly, of his having finished it in 1695–96, and I doubt if he ever contemplated carrying his history further than the beginning of Aurangzeb's reign. Indeed, he tells us that his design was to carry it up to that reign. But there is an abruptness about the termination which appears to point to the hand of the author having been

arrested by death, or the fatigue of age, before he had completed his task. He was an old, at least an elderly man, when he began to write, and two years afterwards he finished, in the fortieth year of Aurangzeb. The last pages describe the defeat and wanderings of the unhappy Dára Shikoh; and one would expect the writer not to stop there, but to go on and tell us of Dára's capture and death. Instead of this we have only a brief note, and that not in all the copies, of the date of Aurangzeb's death. Probably this has been added by the copyist, though Suján Rái might have lived to insert it himself, seeing that Aurangzeb died in 1707, *i.e.* eleven or twelve years after the completion of the *Khalásat*.

It is to be regretted that Suján Rái has not described the capture and death of Dára Shikoh, and has not given us a sketch of his character and abilities. To my thinking Dára Shikoh is one of the most pathetic figures in Indian history. By his name and calamities we are reminded of Alexander's victim—

“Darius, great and good,  
By too severe a fate  
Fallen, fallen, fallen, fallen,  
Fallen from his high estate  
And weltering in his blood.”

Dára's birth might seem to be fortunate, for he was the son of the magnificent Sháh Jahán, and of the beautiful Mamtáz Mahall, niece of Núr Jahán, and the lady in whose honour the Táj was built. He was the eldest of the four sons of Sháh Jahán, and so had the best claim to the succession, but before it had opened to him and while his father was still reigning, he was defeated and driven into exile, and after enduring much anguish and many hardships, he was betrayed by the Rájah of Jún, and put to death by Aurangzeb. He appears to have been the only one of Sháh Jahán's sons who inherited the liberal and enquiring spirit of their great-grandfather Akbar. He was fond of discussing religious questions, and of Hindu literature, and

he even went so far as to write a book called the *Majmaal-Bahrin* (the Meeting of two seas), with the intention of reconciling the two religions, Muhammadanism and Hinduism. Nearly all that we know of Dárá is favourable. Bernier, indeed, casts some doubts on the sincerity of his religious beliefs, and, half sneeringly says that he was a Christian with Christians and a Hindu with Hindus. But, as Elphinstone observes, Bernier was in the service of a personal enemy of Dárá; this, at least, has to be said—that Dárá suffered for his beliefs and was put to death as a *Çufi*. His worst fault appears to have been a want of prudence. He was indisputably a gallant as well as an enlightened man, and he must have been lovable, for we find that his sister, Jahánará Begum, was devoted to him, and that the common people of Delhi were so attached to him that they nearly rose in rebellion when he was brought there a captive.

I do not think we are bound to believe the scandalous gossip of Bernier about the beautiful and unfortunate Jahánará. Even if she had her faults she was, at least, a loving sister and daughter, and Mr. Keene has well called her the Mogul Cordelia. Apparently Dárá and she were kindred souls for the epitaph<sup>1</sup> which she wrote for herself shows that she was spiritually minded. Dárá was married to his cousin Nádira Begum, the daughter of Prince Parváz. Such was his love for her that when she died, worn out by sufferings on their flight,<sup>2</sup> he became quite unhinged, and, in his anxiety to fulfil her last wishes and to bury her in Lahore, lost precious time, and failed to make his escape to Kandahár.

There is a curious parallelism between the Mogul emperors

<sup>1</sup> "Let no rich coverlet adorn my grave; this grass is the best covering for the poor in spirit, the humble, the transitory Jahánará, the disciple of the holy men of Chisht, the daughter of the Emperor Sháh Jahán." (The epitaph plays upon her name—Jahánará—the ornament of the world.) She was Sháh Jahán's firstborn, and was Dárá's full sister—the daughter of 'Açaf Khán, i.e. Mamtáz Mahall, being the mother of both. Jahánará was also called Begum Sahib and Pádisháh Begum.

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps it was she whom Bernier was called in to prescribe for near Ahmadábád.

and the princes of the West. Akbar indeed stands alone in his combination of strength and tenderness, though he and his minister, Abul Fazl, bear some analogy to Henry IV. of France and the Duke of Sully. But his son Jahángír was in many respects like our James I. Both of these were inordinately fond of wine and of hunting, both fulminated against tobacco, both were pedants and fond of talking about absolutism and the divine right of kings, and both were essentially men of low character, and yet had a strain of simplicity and easy good-nature which makes us at times almost like them in spite of their terrible faults. Macaulay, it may be remembered, draws a striking parallel between the Emperor Claudius and James I.,<sup>1</sup> but I think the likeness between the latter and Jahángír was still closer. We cannot imagine James as a Roman, but we can figure him to ourselves as a Hindu<sup>2</sup> or a Bengali. The career and character of Aurangzeb have many points of resemblance with those of Augustus,<sup>3</sup> and I do not know to which of them we should give the preference. Aurangzeb had not Augustus' love of literature, and he was much more of a bigot than was Augustus. On the other hand, he seems to have been of an austere life, and he is entitled to honourable mention as a codifier of the laws. Dará reminds us of our Charles I. There was, in him, the same uxoriousness, the same arrogance and want of prudence, the same love of literature, and both Dará and Charles may be said to have died as martyrs to their religion. Both of them were gallant gentlemen, but they had not the imperturbable nerves of Cromwell and Aurangzeb.<sup>4</sup> *Samaghar* was Dará's Naseby, and

<sup>1</sup> In his review of the "Memorials of Hampden." It is curious that Archdeacon Farrar has overlooked this passage when he draws a similar parallel in his "Seekers after God," p. 77.

<sup>2</sup> Jahángír was a Muhammadan, but an Indian one, and his mother was a Hindu.

<sup>3</sup> This has been remarked by Mr. Seton-Karr in an article in the *Calcutta Review*—"Selections from C.R.," iii. 500.

<sup>4</sup> Muhammad Kázim, Kháfi Khán, and Suján Rái all accuse Dará of want of courage. But it seems to me that he had plenty of pluck, though he had not the coolness of a Marlborough. Muhammad Kázim is an unblushing panegyrist of Aurangzeb. Suján Rái and Kháfi Khán have both copied from him, but I think that Kháfi Khán has also copied Suján Rái.

though he fought well in it for a time, the strain was too great, and he lost the day by a precipitate descent from his elephant. It is interesting to think what would have been the result to India if Dárá had succeeded instead of Aurangzeb. He had not the strength of Aurangzeb, nor his staying powers and talent for administration, but on the other hand he had not his limitations. He would not have alienated the Hindus, and he might have found a *modus vivendi* with the Mahrattas. Aurangzeb was in one sense the stronger man, and bound to prevail over his brilliant but unequal elder brother. The maxim, however, that "whatever is, is right," is of doubtful correctness, and we may remember the line of the poet which tells us—"How far high failure overleaps the bounds of low success." We may recall, too, the words of a greater poet—

"The low man seeks a little thing to do,  
Sees it and does it;  
This high man, with a great thing to pursue,  
Dies ere he knows it.  
The low man goes on adding one to one,  
His hundred's soon hit;  
The high man, aiming at a million,  
Misses an unit."

---

#### NOTE A.

In the British Museum there is a MS., numbered Or. 2055, which contains papers relating to the works noticed in the eighth volume of Elliot's History. Dr. Rieu in his Catalogue (iii. 1050a) says, that the first extract in the volume is from the anonymous history of India described by Elliot under the title of Makhtaṣir, with a table of its contents by Dr. Sprenger. The preface, he says, agrees

to some extent *verbatim* with that of the *Khalāṣat-at-Tawárikh* of Suján Rái, and the verses introduced are mostly identical, but the list of authorities is far less extensive. It is to all appearance due to the same author, and represents an early recension of the work, which was recast and enlarged under the title of the *Khalāṣat-at-Tawárikh*. At p. 908 *l.c.*, under heading Or. 1924, he says that at fol. 3 of the MS. the author designates himself as Suján Singh Dhír, inhabitant of Patialá.

The MS. Or. 1924 here referred to is a small book of extracts by Sir Henry Elliot. In the extract at fol. 3, referred to by Dr. Rieu, we have the words "*ain hechmadán faqir haqir Suján Singh Dhír sákin qaṣba Batála az-'unfwán zahúr,*" etc., whereas in other copies we have only the word *hechmadán*, i.e. humble individual. His name, too, is given in the extract from the beginning of the preface, immediately below the *bismillah*. The MS. Or. 2055 gives the preface of the *Makhtaṣar*, which certainly, as Dr. Rieu says, agrees with the *Khalāṣat*, but the description of India is not given. There is such a description at p. 21, but it is marked in Persian as taken from the *Khalāṣat-at-Tawárikh*. It agrees with the translation given in Elliot, vol. viii., as from the *Makhtaṣar*, but it contains the poetical description of the rainy season, which is omitted in the English.

It seems probable that the real name of the author is Suján Rái, or Suján Singh. *Subhán* is an Arabic word, and not likely to be the title of a Hindu. Still this is not impossible, especially in the case of an up-country Hindu whose family had probably long had relations with Muhammadans.

The difficulty in ascertaining the name arises in part from the words *Suján* and *Subhán* being written nearly alike in Persian. The chief difference is in the position of a dot. *Subhán* is written سبحان, and *Suján* is written سجان. In the MSS. that I have seen the dot is that of a *j* and not of a *b*. I should be inclined to prefer Elliot's *Subhán* on account of his local knowledge, if I knew that this had

guided him in the matter. But he makes no reference to local knowledge or inquiries. It ought to be possible to get particulars of Suján Rái's name and family at Batála, and I have written to the Magistrate now stationed there, to beg for information. Mr. Morley, in his descriptive catalogue of the R.A.S. MSS., says that in No. 53 it is written Shaján, شجان, but somewhat indistinctly, and that in Nos. 54 and 55 it appears respectively as سبجان and ساجان, i.e. Sabján and Suján. I think, however, that Mr. Morley's 53 is a clerical error for 55, as in the MS. called by me the Romer MS. the name appears as شجان, but with the dots over the s blurred. In an interesting note with which Mr. Irvine has favoured me, it is mentioned that Syed Muhammad Latif, in his book on Lahore (1892), speaks of the author of the Khalāṣat-at-Tawārikh as Suján Rái Kanungo of Batála. The Syed would therefore appear to identify him with the Suján Rái Kanungo mentioned in the Khalāṣat in the account of Batála. Dr. Rieu, *i.e.*, quotes a superscription on a MS. which calls Suján Rái, *almanasabi ba hazari* (apparently this means merely "author"—the phrase being equivalent to *mu-allif*), and says that he knew Hindí, Persian, and Sanscrit. Suján Rái himself does not claim a knowledge of Sanscrit, and refers only to Persian translations of the Mahábhárat, etc.

It seems probable that Suján Rái had lived for some time at Siálkot. His description of the place is very minute, and he speaks of buildings erected by the Kanungos there. Perhaps he received his education there, for he dwells upon the good teaching of one or two of its *maulvis*.

#### NOTE B.

Suján Rái does not name Ferishta among his authorities, but there is a close resemblance between the two writers in many passages, so that Suján must either have copied Ferishta or both must have consulted the same sources.



There are, however, some details in the *Khaláṣat* account of the Muhammadan princes which, I believe, are not to be found in *Ferishta*, and seem to me to be novel. For instance, there is the story about Prince Muhammad, the son of Ghiássuddín Balban. The prince was married to a daughter of Sultán Altamsh, and one day, being under the influence of wine, he accidentally used the word divorce with regard to her. This was irrevocable, and the only remedy was to marry the princess to somebody else, on the understanding that he would divorce her. She would then become *halálah*, i.e. the prince could marry her again. So they married the princess to a holy dervish, named Shaikh Baháuddín Zakariyá, and the dervish took her to his home. But afterwards, when the Shaikh spoke to her of the arrangement with the Prince and of his divorcing her again, the lady said: "I have come out of a wicked home and have found refuge with a holy man; for God's sake do not send me back again." The dervish was touched by her love and self-sacrifice, and, saying that he could not be inferior to a woman in courage and in fidelity, refused to divorce her and kept her as his own wife. The Prince was angry at this; and took advantage of an opportunity to avenge himself on the dervish. "No one," says the author, "injures a holy man without suffering for it, so shortly afterwards the prince was killed in a battle with the Moguls."

Then, again, there is the detail about the bigotry of Sikandar Lodí—that he prescribed a particular badge for Hindus, therein anticipating Husain Khán Tukríyah of Akbar's reign. According to the *Khaláṣat*, Sikandar was the first Muhammadan prince who treated the Hindus with contempt. Both *Ferishta* and Suján Rái mention the curious fact of the discovery of the fossil bones of elephants, etc., when Fírúz Sháh Tughlak excavated a hillock for the construction of one of his canals; but Suján has most details. The object of the excavation was to join the Saraswatí and Sutlej, and apparently the excavation was made near Fírúzpúr. Suján

says that the elephant bones were eight yards long, and that there were the bones of men's fore-arms, three yards long. Naturally he accounts for these bones by saying that a battle had been fought there between the Kurus and Pandávas, but may it not be that this was really a discovery in the fourteenth century of the fossils of the Siwálíks?

### NOTE C.

Anquetil Du Perron quotes<sup>1</sup> the remark about people of all nations settling in India, and also the stanza which follows it. He gives them as coming from the *Tazkarát-as-Šalátín*, a work which is evidently either the same as the K. T. or a derivative from it. Possibly it is the real title of the book which Sir Henry Elliot designated the *Makhtašír-at-Tawárikh*. The error in the *Vikramáditya* year (1233 instead of 1249) pointed out by Du Perron<sup>2</sup> occurs likewise in the *Khalāṣat*. It has apparently arisen from the mixing up of two chronologies. Suján Rái, in his notice of Rájah Prithví, first tells us that, according to the Rájavalí and the Ráj Tarangíní, Rájah Prithví was killed by Shihábuddín after he had reigned for fifteen years. Then he gives another account from the *Áin-i-Akbarí* and other sources, and says that Rájah Prithví was killed in the forty-ninth year of his reign and 1233 *Vikramáditya*, or 588 A.H. and 1192 A.D. As Du Perron observes, this *Vikramáditya* date is wrong by sixteen years, for 588 A.H. corresponds to 1249 A.V. We can, perhaps, reconcile the discrepancies, or at least conjecture at the truth, by supposing that Rájah Prithví reigned sixteen years, and that 1233 was the date of his accession. The *Khalāṣat* tells us that Rájah Prithví conquered Jivan Singh of Delhi, and after reigning for fifteen years was attacked by Shihábuddín. They fought seven battles, but in all the Rájah was victorious. Then occurred the episode of the quarrel

<sup>1</sup> Tieffenthaler's "India," II. lix. Berlin, 1787.

<sup>2</sup> *Loc. cit.* p. xxxix. n.

with Jai Chand of Kanauj, about the Rája-súya festival, and the abduction by Rájah Prithví of Jai Chand's daughter. A year elapsed, says the Khalásat, which Rájah Prithví spent in the society of his bride and the neglect of his kingdom, and then Shihábuddín, having leagued with Jai Chand, attacked Rájah Prithví for the eighth time, and defeated and killed him. Thus we have the sixteen years desiderated by Du Perron, and the date 1249 A.V. corresponding to 588 A.H. At all events, this is a more consistent account than the one which makes Rájah Prithví reign for forty-nine years and five months, and then lose his kingdom for excessive devotion to Jai Chand's daughter. By that time he must have been about seventy, and have been married for nearly thirty-five years.

Du Perron seems to regard the mention in the Tazkarát of the Tawáríkh Bahádur Sháhí as evidence that the work was not composed till about 1712. But the Tawáríkh Bahádur Sháhí is quoted in the Khalásat at the beginning of the account of Gujrat, and the Khalásat was certainly written in 1696.

#### NOTE D.

##### *Suján Rái on Stimulants.*

Suján Rái is very severe on opium in his account of Rájah Sakunt of Kumaon (Sakwantí) and calls it the worst of all intoxicants. It turns young men old, he says, and makes their sinews to be like threads. But in his notice of Rájah Badhal ("Parmal Sen" of Tieffenthaler) he had already drawn a still darker picture of the evils of *bhang*, i.e. Indian hemp, or *ganja*. A *bangí*, i.e. a *ganja*-smoker, barks like a dog and brays like an ass, and the evil effects of the drug are continued in his offspring. Suján Rái himself has seen, he says, many of the rich and powerful reduced to poverty and misery by this vice. He is also strong against the use of wine. His attitude towards tobacco is rather amusing.

In his account of Jahángír he has a paragraph entitled "Praise and blame of tobacco," and tells how the Emperor vainly endeavoured to prevent its use. He begins by saying that tobacco (*tambáku*) was introduced into India from the islands of the Franks, but that for some time it was not much used, and the import was small. In the reign of Jahángír, however, it began to be largely cultivated in India, and everybody, high and low, rich and poor, took to smoking. He then proceeds to describe the delights of tobacco in language worthy of Salvation Yeo, calling it a companion at home and abroad, and saying that its smoke-wreaths are like the musky tresses of beautiful women in their power of lassoing the necks of men. Then, as if recollecting himself, he says: "May God forgive me! What I am saying, and what I am writing? Tobacco is the "worst of intoxicants; it wastes time, shuts up the mouth "against the praises of God," etc. Evidently Suján Rái was or had been a devotee of the weed.