ART. XII.—*Materials for the History of India for the Six Hundred Years of Mohammodan Rule previous to the foundation of the British Indian Empire.* By Major W. NASSAU LEES, LL.D., Ph.D.

[Read January 20, 1868.]

EVERY inquiry which can elucidate the history, the laws, the institutions, or the characteristics of the people of India, ought to have a very practical interest for the people of England, and especially for that small section of them which is entrusted with her government, either more directly as connected with the India Office, or less so as members of the British Parliament. Nor can it be said that information acquired by personal inquiry from people living on the spot is the most satisfactory for the purpose, or can be considered sufficient. Such is not the case. Englishmen in India, as a rule, never mix in social intercourse with the natives. They may receive friendly visits from a few; but, in ordinary, the relations between Englishmen and the higher classes of the natives of India are either purely official or purely of a business nature, and with the lower orders those of master and servant. Again, the few natives of India who have received an English education have been effectually isolated from the great body of their fellow-countrymen, with whom they have as little *real* sympathy as with their English rulers. In the former case, sometimes from fear, but more often from a desire to coincide with and to please or flatter his superiors, as the Hindu historians did in the reigns of Akbar and his successors,—and in the latter, sometimes from ignorance, but sometimes also from interested motives,—the opinions of natives with which Europeans are likely to be favoured are not always a safe guide. On the contrary, in some respects, the greater the progress that is made in educating the upper classes of the natives of India on the English model up to our own

standard, the greater will be the necessity most cautiously to guard against the tendency that will arise, and naturally so, to depend for our knowledge of the feelings, prejudices, and wishes of our native subjects on native public opinion, as expressed through the medium of that section of the native community which we have separated from the mass of their fellow-countrymen.

And the reason why I have so far transgressed the rules which ordinarily should guide contributors to a learned Society or Journal, as to discuss these matters from a material point of view, is this,—I desire to show how deeply interested the Government, the Legislature, and the people of Great Britain are in the researches of any Society whose object is to investigate the social and political history and the antiquities of India, and I am quite certain that my best chance of success is to combine the practical with the literary and scientific.

It is true, I admit, and it is very gratifying that it is true, that the spirit of enquiry regarding the history and the traditions of the Hindus which has sprung up in Europe within the last few years has awakened a deep interest in this ancient people, their institutions, and their languages. This interest, moreover, has extended far beyond the boundary limits of that comparatively small section of European communities which is connected with India, and which may be said to be directly interested in the welfare of her peoples; or that fraternity of literary and scientific men who occupy themselves with old stones and bones, foot-prints of ages long since passed away. Not only the antiquity of the Aryans, and their influence and that of their language on the peoples and languages of the West, but the brotherhood of the race have been fully recognized.

But if the study of the literature of the Hindus makes us acquainted with ancient India, and the modes of thought, the institutions, and the degrees of civilisation attained by the peoples of India in former times, it is not until we are brought in contact with the Moslim in India that we are enabled to assign accurate dates to kings, or that the sequence of events

can be recorded with that guarantee for their accuracy which is necessary for the requirements of history. Even here we are sadly at fault; for, regarding the early Moslim conquests in India, little reliable evidence has been recorded, some of that little has been lost, and much of that which remains is still unavailable to the public, being locked up in MSS. which are daily becoming more scarce from the ravages of time, climate, and moths, insects, and worms, upon whom nature imposes the necessity of sustaining life.

Many able men have occupied themselves with the history of India, and each and all of them have contributed in their degree to dispel the mists of ignorance which cloud the knowledge of even the best informed persons in England on this subject. The Hon. Mountstuart Elphinstone has written, perhaps, the most generally approved history of India. Still how very incomplete it is, and how very incomplete is every history of India that has yet appeared! Yet the materials for a history of the Mohammadan period, if incomplete for the whole, exist in abundance for a great if not the greater part; and it does not reflect credit on the English name or nation, that having been the paramount power in India now for upwards of a century, and having been for upwards of half that period in complete possession of the greater portion of it, no efficient effort has been made to collect and consolidate these materials in such a manner as to make them available for the service of the future historian and for the instruction of the patient student, or of those who come to India to rule, to trade, to travel, or for any other purpose of business or pleasure. True it is, as just stated, that the materials for the compilation of a history of India for the six hundred years of Mohammadan dynasties are not so complete for all portions of that period as could be wished; indeed, for some they are very scant. True it is that the great mass of Mohammadan historical works partake more or less of the character of biographies, and are rather chronicles of the deeds of kings than of the events of the period, the institutions of the people, the progress of civilization, and the results of policy and contemporaneous opinions regarding them, and are deficient in

many of those characteristics which enable posterity to derive valuable lessons from the experiences of the past. More true still is it that most of the historians were for the most part court chroniclers who wrote to order, and whose business it was to employ their eloquent language to draw a veil over the vices of those whose virtues they were hired to extol. Still, I do not coincide in opinion with those who estimate as of little worth the large body of historical works which has been bequeathed to posterity by the many very able writers who flourished at intervals within the period above mentioned. Where are the historians from the ages of the Greeks and Romans down to our own time, to whose writings many and grave objections may not be taken? You might almost count them on the fingers. In reading Oriental histories, moreover, all due allowance must be made for the influences of despotism, bigotry, love of flattery, and personal vanity, which is peculiarly characteristic of the men and the times of which they wrote; but though exaggeration may sometimes have been resorted to, a main peculiarity of Mohammadan writers—which is of the essence of all sound history—is regard for truth. Nor are we altogether dependent upon court chroniclers; we have in some instances contemporary and independent historians; besides which, writers have never failed to comment freely upon the histories of those authors who have preceded them, and their testimony in such cases may be considered impartial. Where, again, is the Emperor in modern times who would so truthfully and so frankly record his own follies and vices as the Emperor Jehángir has done in his memoirs or auto-biography, commonly called the *Túzak-i-Jehángiri*? Where is now-a-days the empire in which an author could dare to write of his despot ruler in the unmeasured terms in which 'Abd al Kádir of Badáon has written of the Emperor Akbar? Where in the whole range of the literature of that period of the world's history can we find a more valuable and complete compendium of the political, religious, social, commercial, and agricultural institutions of a nation than is contained in the Institutes of Akbar compiled by Abul Fazl? That much valuable information is to be acquired,

and that many useful deductions may be drawn from the facts and events found recorded in the pages of the Mohammadan historians of India there can be little doubt; and it is the more to be regretted that though attention was called to this subject now nearly twenty years ago, and a beginning was made, since then little has been done towards rescuing from destruction what the moths and insects have left behind.

The person who first drew attention to this important subject was Sir Henry M. Elliot, late Foreign Secretary to the Government of India, and one of the ablest public officers and most accomplished scholars who ever adorned the Indian Civil Service. But the death of the author at the early age of forty-five not only put an end to the immediate completion of his original design, but the idea seems to have been abandoned by the Government, for whom, and on whose account, this lamented scholar prepared the materials which are now going through the press. This design was, to print or lithograph a "Uniform Edition of the Historians of India." The proposal, it is true, was not accepted by the Government of the North-West Provinces of India, to which it was addressed, on the grounds that the education funds at the disposal of Government were not sufficient to defray the expense of such an undertaking. It was intimated, however, that it was desirable that an index should be prepared so that the MSS. should be sought for, and the works deposited in some College Library, "to be printed or lithographed hereafter should circumstances render it expedient, and *should the public taste, at present lamentably indifferent, show any inclination for greater familiarity with the true sources of the Mohammadan History of India.*"

Sir Henry Elliot published the first volume of his "Bibliographical Index to the Historians of Mohammadan India" in 1859; but neither then nor since, as far as I am aware, has any search been made for the MSS. therein indexed, which were to be placed in the College Library, to await that future favorable moment when they could be printed or lithographed. Whether it is to the inexpediency of "circumstances," or the "indifference of public taste," we are indebted for this unfor-

fortunate result, I cannot say; but, be that as it may, it is now too late to make the attempt.¹ With the overthrow of native dynasties, and the general break-up of Mohammadan society consequent on the mutiny and rebellion of 1857-58, all prospect of obtaining many rare or valuable MSS. in India disappeared; and though a good book may now and again be picked up, they are, in these days, seldom to be met with.

A circumstance occurred, however, about eight years ago, which, if it proved mischievous in some respects, was fortunate for the design of Sir H. M. Elliot. The *Bibliotheca Indica*, a series of Oriental works, liberally patronized by the late Court of Directors to the extent of £600 a year, had some time contained a large number of Arabic works. Indeed, the character of the works which, from time to time, appeared in this publication, was influenced by the acquirements and predilections of the editors. During the incumbency of Dr. Röer, or from the year 1847 to 1852, the majority of the works it contained were Sanskrit. During the incumbency of my learned and esteemed friend, Dr. Aloys Sprenger, activity was shown chiefly in the publication of Arabic works. It was during this period that those grand works, the *Kashfu 'z-zunún*, or, "Dictionary of the Technical Terms used in the Sciences of the Mohammadans," and the *Içbah fi tamyizi 'ç-Çihâbah*, or, "Biographical Dictionary of the Companions of Mohammad," were commenced. The value of such works as these to the students of Arabic philosophy and science, and the history of the first period of *Islâm*, is incalculable. But a Sanskrit scholar, Professor H. H. Wilson, could not bear to see so much of the Honourable the Court's grant expended in publishing Arabic works. At his instance the noble old Court of Directors ordered that no work other

¹ Since the above was written, Mr. Edward Thomas, the distinguished savant to whom the public are most indebted for the continuation of the papers of Sir H. M. Elliot, has brought to my notice that, under Mr. Colvin's orders, much search was made by Mr. Hammond, of the Bengal Civil Service, and that a number of MSS. were collected, but they were lost or destroyed in the mutiny. I remember the search made by Mr. Hammond, for he was in communication with me for some years; but I was not aware that his labours had resulted in the recovery of any MSS., or that they were lost. It would be interesting to have some record of what MSS. these were, so that, if possible, they might be traced. Possibly they may be amongst the Delhi prize MSS. (See Appendix to this Paper. Ed.)

than works relating to India should be printed in the *Bibliotheca Indica*, under pain of the grant being withdrawn ; and it was under these circumstances that the Asiatic Society of Bengal conceived the idea of devoting the funds hitherto expended in the publication of Arabic works, to a Persian series, which should contain chiefly works on the History of India. Dr. Sprenger having returned to Europe, the task of the selection of the histories to be printed, subject to the approval of the Council of the Society, devolved upon me ; as also their superintendence while passing through the press. I may, therefore, give my own explanation of the objects of the publication, as addressed to the Society from the Chair, at the general meeting for August, 1864, which was as follows :—“ The present object of the Society in regard to the Persian series of the *Bibliotheca Indica*, is to aid in working out an idea which originated with the late distinguished Sir Henry Elliot, viz., to place in the hands of the future historian the best original materials for compiling a history of this country ; and the plan proposed for accomplishing our task is, to publish texts of the most trustworthy authors, *giving the preference, when possible, to writers contemporary with the events their histories chronicle.*”

I have underlined the last passage in the above extract, because it has been the guiding principle which I have kept before me in my selection of the histories which have been printed, and those which remain to be printed—to obtain, if possible, the evidence of eye-witnesses of the events narrated ; failing this, that of contemporary writers ; and failing this, to obtain as *near* a view of the history of each period as possible ; always assuming the authors selected to be considered trustworthy by their contemporaries, or by subsequent writers of note. That this principle is sound will not be questioned ; but it has not, of course, been practicable to meet the first two conditions very often. Up to the reign of Akbar, we have not much contemporary history ; nor have we any histories that were not available to the Mohammadan historians of later periods ; but, still, when it is remembered that all European histories of India have been compiled from works written

centuries after the events they record, it will be a great stride in advance to get our materials first hand. One of the greatest faults of a large proportion of Mohammadan historians is their ambition to eclipse all writers of history who preceded them. Each historian seems to have set himself to write a history that would render all other histories obsolete. Hence, the great number of universal or general histories, commencing with the birth of Adam, and brought down to the period of the author. Now it is plain that an author's version of events which occurred one or two hundred, or one or two thousand, years before he lived, could be useful only in the event of his having had access to works no longer extant, or which are not now easily procurable. When we had to deal, moreover, with so extended a period as six centuries, and had very limited funds at our disposal, it became necessary to consider whether it would be possible, within reasonable limits of time, to publish complete editions of all the works whose author's histories of their own times, and of those immediately preceding them, it was desirable to publish. I was of opinion that it would not; and that we should confer greater benefits on the public by adding, as soon as we could, as many missing links to the chain of the historical record as our search for good MSS. would enable us. It was not intended, however, to leave what may be termed *standard* works incomplete. Such works, it was always my opinion, should be completed as soon as the immediately pressing want was supplied and funds were available for the purpose. And an additional reason for this arose when it was found that the natives of India did not approve of incomplete histories, and would not readily purchase them. On financial grounds then the completion of certain histories is desirable, though the contents of the previously suppressed portions may not add much to the information already available to the future historian.

The first work of the new Persian series published in the *Bibliotheca Indica*, was Abú'l Fazl Baihaquí's history of Mas'úd, the son of Maḥmúd of Ghaznin, edited by the late W. Morley, to whom was originally entrusted the task of

editing Sir Henry Elliot's posthumous papers. This work he styled the *Tārīkh-i-Baihaqī*, but it is simply a portion of a very much larger work in several volumes entitled the *Tārīkh-i-āl-i-Subuktāgīn*, or "History of the descendants of *Subuktāgīn*," the father of Maḥmūd the Great, and nominally the founder of the dynasty commonly called the Slave.¹ This is a great work, and a standard work for that period; and I was in hopes that more volumes of it might be found; but after much search I have not been able to hear of another volume, nor can I find even a complete notice of the work anywhere, nor that any late author has had access to it. I fear, therefore, that the remaining portion of this very valuable history has been lost. Shams-i-Sirāj, the author of the *Tabakāt-i-Nāṣirī*, had a copy of it; and he has taken a great portion of his account of the kings of this family from its pages, quoting Baihaqī often in preference to any other author, which gives an additional value to those portions of his work which treat of times anterior to his own.

Mas'ūd, however, was not one of the kings of India, or, as they were in earlier times styled, kings of Delhi. But the history of the kings of Ghaznīn and the Princes of the house of Subuktāgīn, from the time of Maḥmūd up to the final subjugation of Hindustan and the establishment of the Mohammadan power at Delhi, are so interwoven with campaigns and incidents connected with the foundation of the empire which the Pathāns succeeded in creating, that any history of India without some account of the rise, progress, and decline of the kingdoms of Ghaznīn and Ghor would be incomplete. I doubt much, however, materials being found to give a very full account of this important period of history. Sir Henry Elliot has given a long list of authorities for a history of the kings of Ghaznīn, but many of these books he had not seen, and his lists in great part are made up of the authorities he found referred to in the prefaces of Mohammadan histories. In his notices of authors and their books he has invariably stated what works he had himself seen and consulted, and those he had derived information of from others;

¹ Shams-i-Sirāj, in his *Tabakāt*, calls the work the *Tārīkh-i-Nāṣirī*.

but the notices which have been published are very few. The celebrated poet '*Unṣurī*' wrote a history of the life of Maḥmūd, and copies of it were extant about a century and a half ago, for it was consulted by the author of the *Khulāṣat-ut-Tawārikh*, one of the most carefully compiled general histories of India I know of. The author commences with the Pandus, and brings his narrative down to the end of the year 1107 A.H. It was continued for some years later by another hand; and here I may mention, as an instance of how desirable it is to print the texts of all the valuable histories of India compiled in former times we can, that the author of the well known *Siyar ul Mutaakhhharin*, who wrote his history when Lord Hastings was Governor-General, has transferred almost the whole of this work to his pages verbatim, without ever once mentioning the author's name. A more glaring instance of plagiarism it would be impossible to conceive, yet the author of the *Siyar* has a great reputation,* especially amongst European writers, and the name of the modest Subhān Rai, the real historian, is probably wholly unknown. To make matters worse, this dishonest copyist says, in the preface of his book, that he found a *few pages* of an old book prepared by some *Munshi* for one of the Mohammadan Emperors, which he made use of, but it was full of mistakes, which he corrected. This is nothing else but a barefaced falsehood; for if there are mistakes in Subhān Rai's history he has copied them all, and made very many of his own besides. Another dishonest writer translated the same history into Hindustani, and giving it a new name, the *Arāish-i-Mahfil*, passed it off as an original composition. He was, however, more honest than the other, as, though he denies that his book is a translation, he acknowledges *some* obligation. He deceived Mr. Shakespeare, however, the author of the *Hindustani Dictionary*, who always mentioned him as the author; and also Professor Dowson,¹ the able editor of Sir H. M.

¹ The author seems to have been under some misapprehension on the subject. Mr. Shakespeare heads his selections from the *Arāish-i-Mahfil* with the statement that this work "is for the most part founded on the *Khulāṣat-ut-Tawārikh*." Professor Dowson himself has on no occasion entered into the question of the authorship of this work, having merely quoted the work by name.—Ed.

Elliot's History of India, now going through the press. A great portion of the remainder of the *Siyar* is copied, though not verbatim, from *Kháfi Khán*. This author I suppose was too well known to admit of the perpetration of so disgraceful a fraud upon the public without the certainty of detection.

'Unçurí was a contemporary of Maḥmúd, and, from his high reputation as a scholar, a history of this king from his pen would be very valuable; but I fear the book has been lost. We have a history, however, by a contemporary writer, also a very accomplished scholar and distinguished poet, Abú Naçr Moḥammad bin 'Abd al-Jabbar al 'Otbí, the author of the *Tárikh-i-Yamini*. He wrote his history in the year 410 A.H., and it has always been considered in India a masterpiece of style and Arabic composition. It is consequently very difficult to understand; and having been written at the time the events it chronicles occurred, or when they were not only fresh in the memory of all, but the talk of half the continent of Asia, the facts related can be depended upon. Still as a history it would have been more acceptable had it been written in a simple narrative style. The consequence has been that the history has been overcome by the rhetoric, and what the author has gained in reputation as an elegant scholar he has lost as a truthful historian. Several commentaries have been composed on this work, one by Kásim bin al-Husain al-Khwárazmí, who died as early as 555 A.H.; and one by Abú 'Abdallah Maḥmúd bin 'Omar an-Najátí an-Nishápúrí, entitled the *Basátin al-Fuzalá wa Ridáhin al' Ukalá*, in 704 A.H., who says in his preface that he had consulted *five* previously written commentaries. A translation of the work in Persian was also made by Abú' sh-Sharf Naçíḥ bin Zafar.¹ The book is very highly esteemed, especially in India, and was lithographed at Delhi by Dr. A. Sprenger in 1847, and was formerly one of the test books in the Oriental Colleges in Upper

¹ (An English translation of the Persian text, by the Rev. J. Reynolds, was published under the auspices of the Oriental Translation Fund, in London, in 1853.) See also Nöldeke's article on the *Kitáb Yamini* in "Sitzungs-Berichte der Wiener Academie der Wiss.," vol. 23 (1857).—Ed.

India; yet I do not think it has ever been used by any European historian. For some years copies have not been procurable; but I have lately extracted and reprinted the portion relating to Maḥmūd's conquests in India in a test book which I compiled for the Calcutta University B. A. examination; and as the Asiatic Society of Bengal are precluded from publishing it in their Bibliotheca, I intend printing and publishing a complete edition of this work at my own risk if I can obtain good MSS.

But the most remarkable author, perhaps, of all those who wrote upon India at this period was Abú Raiḥān al-Bīrūnī (430 A.H.), of whom Rashīd ud-dīn, who wrote before and after 700 A.H., expresses the following opinion:—"He was the servant, the philosopher, and astronomer of Maḥmūd, son of Subuktagīn; he lived for forty years in India,¹ and has related everything connected with the religions, astronomy, laws, and psychology of the people, the height and density of their mountains, their deserts, rivers, cities, manners, customs," etc. But al-Bīrūnī was a traveller, and his book is valuable for the elucidation of the Hindu rather than the Mohammadan period of Indian history. There are two copies of his work in Europe, and we were promised an edition of it by Professor Wöpcke, but since the death of this distinguished scholar there is every reason to fear that the idea has been abandoned. Rashīd ud-dīn's history, or the *Jāmi'ut-Tawārīkh-i-Rashīdī*, has a great reputation amongst European scholars. The greater portion of it was supposed to be lost, and the discovery of the missing portions was welcomed with great rejoicing in Paris, London, and Calcutta. But except in so far as concerns the history of the reigns of Ghāzān Khān Oljāitū and of Rashīd ud-dīn's own times, for which it may be considered a standard work, and in the sense before mentioned, it is of little value. The *whole* of the *Tārīkh-i-Yamīnī* has been transferred by the author to his pages; and the same in regard to other works, may be said of the remainder of his history down to about 650 A.H. It is unnecessary, however,

¹ This, I think, must be a mistake, otherwise Abú Raiḥān must have left Khorasan too young to gain the high reputation he acquired in his own country.

here to go into this question. I have discussed it fully in the fragmentary materials for a treatise on the "Principles of Historic Criticism as applied to the writings of Mohamadan Historians," which I have for some years been collecting, but which I have not had time to attend to.

But to return to Al 'Otbí, who has been so long neglected by the Oriental literary world, and to my humble effort to restore to him that merit of which, though justly his due, he has been deprived. I am unable to say how far the distinguished and undoubtedly very able and accomplished Rashíd ud-dín is responsible for the disingenuousness involved in the suppression of Al 'Otbí's name, because I am not certain—rather, I should say, I have grave doubts—that we have his history in the form in which he wrote it; and because I do not know whether or not he made use of Sharf ud-dín's Persian translation of the *Tárikh-i-Yamíní*, or the work of some other author who had previously appropriated things not his own without due acknowledgment. Writers in Persian are unfortunately extremely unsatisfactory on all points of this nature, and this is especially noticeable when we have to deal with translations into that language. (Compare the Persian translation of *Tabarí* by Bal'amí with the original in Arabic.)

But with all this I have no concern just now. The translation of the *Tárikh-i-Yamíní* to be found in the *Tárikh-i-Rashidí* is extremely free, and, though in substance accurate, contains in the MSS. which I have consulted a good number of omissions. Still the author or translator would not seem to have availed himself of any fresh materials. He begins his narrative where Al 'Otbí began his; and although writing about three centuries later, he leaves off where Al 'Otbí has concluded. And as Rashíd ud-dín, at the present day, has a very great reputation, and Al 'Otbí is comparatively unknown, for the satisfaction of all who may be interested in the matter, I give the headings of the chapters of both authors, premising that while Rashíd ud-dín has followed the narrative of Al 'Otbí throughout, he has not thought it necessary invariably to adopt his division into chapters.

Tārīkh-i-Yamīnī of Al 'Otbī.	Page	Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī of Rashīd ud-dīn.	Page
Of the times of the late Amīr Abū Mansūr Subuktagīn and of his life.	16	Of the history of the genealogy and affairs of Naqir-ud-dīn Subuktagīn and the origin of his Sultanat.	467
The Conquest of Bust.	19	Conquest of Bust.	468
The Conquest of Kūçdār.	22	Conquest of Kūçdār.	469
Of the causes which enticed the Turks into the country of the Amīr Abū Kāsim Nūh b. Mançur, and the difficulties of his Government, and his flight from his country and province.	30	A leaf appears to be missing here.	
Of Segistan.	34	Of the affairs of Seestan.	470
Of Husain ud-Daulah Abī'l-'Abbās Tāsh al-Hājib, and his appointment to the Commander-in-Chiefship of the Army.	39	Story of Kūbur and Fakhr ud-Daulah.	
Of the return of Fakhr ud-Daulah towards his territories, and what took place afterwards in connection with engagement for mutual assistance, between him and Husain ud-Daulah, to the death of the latter.	54	Of Fakhr ud-Daulah's return to his country, and his friendship with Husain ud-Daulah.	474
Of the departure of Abū'l-'Abbās Tāsh towards Jurjān, and the arrival of Abī'l-Hasan bin Simjūr at Nishapur in command of the army.	60	No heading, but the accounts are the same.	
Of Abū 'l-Hasan bin Simjūr, Commander-in-Chief of the Army until he died; and the transfer of the command to his son Abū 'Alī.	69	Of Abū 'l-Hasan, son of Simjūr, and his Government in Khorasan until his death, and the succession to his office of his son Abū 'Alī.	477
Of Faīk, and what happened to him after the occurrence of the events mentioned in the foregoing chapter.	75	Of Faīk and his affairs at Marāçād after his defeat.	478
Of the arrival of Bughrā Khān at Bokhara.	78	Of the departure of Nūh bin Mançur from Bokhara and the arrival of Bughrā Khān at Bokhara.	479
Of the return of Rādhī to Bokhara after the departure of Bughrā Khān.	81	No heading, but the subject matter is the same.	
Of Abū 'l-Kāsim bin Simjūr, brother of Abū 'Alī, and what happened to him after separating from him.	120	Of Abū 'l-Kāsim bin Simjūr, brother of Abū 'Alī, and his circumstances after his separation from his brother.	485

Tārīkh-i-Yamīnī of Al 'Othbī.	Page	Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī of Rashīd ud-dīn.	Page
Of what took place between the Amīr Saif ud-Daulah Maḥmūd and his brother the Amīr Ismā'īl, after his (Ismā'īl's) accession to the throne of his father.	134	No heading.	
Of what took place between Abū 'l-Kāsim bin Sīmjūr Bukhtu Zūn after the above.	140	No heading.	
Of the Khilats or dresses of honour which the Khalīf Al Kādir Billah conferred upon Maḥmūd.	161	Of the sending of a Khilat or dress of honour by Al Kādir Billah to Maḥmūd.	490
Of the return of 'Abd al-Malik bin Nūh towards Bokhara.	162	Of the return of 'Abd al Malik bin Nūh to Bokhara.	491
Of the setting out of Abū Ibrāhīm Ismā'īl bin Nūh al Muntaḥir, and what took place between him and Ailak Khān at Māwaraulnahr, and between him and the Commander of the Armies of the Amīr Abū 'l-Muzaffar Naḥr bin Naḥr ud-dīn.	180	Of the setting out of Abū Ibrāhīm Ismā'īl, and what took place between him, Ailak Khān, and Amīr Naḥr bin Naḥr ud-dīn.*	
Of the Sāmānī Amīrs and the period of their dynasty from their accession to the succession of Maḥmūd.	182	Of the Sāmānī Amīrs and the period of their dynasty.	495
Of the causes of the friendship and enmity which arose between Naḥir ud-dīn Subuktagīn and Khalaf bin Aḥmad Wālī of Sajīstān; of the enmity and jealousy which afterwards took place between him and Maḥmūd, until the latter deprived him of his kingdom; and Maḥmūd's victories in India, until he accomplished his wishes by the aid of the Almighty.	185	Of the friendship and enmity which arose between Naḥir ud-dīn Subuktagīn and Khalaf bin Aḥmad; and how the Sultan deprived him of his kingdom.	495
Of Shams al-Ma'ālī Kābūs bin Washmīkar, and his departure to his kingdom after long and many vicissitudes.	207	Of Shams al-Ma'ālī Kābūs bin Washmīkar and his arrival on the borders of his own country.	
Of what passed between Maḥmūd and Ailak Khān regarding a treaty offensive and defensive, and allaying rebellion.	234	Of the friendship of Maḥmūd with Ailak Khān and their subsequent hostilities.	503
Of the battle of Bhātiyah.	258	Of the battle of Bhātiyah.	503
Of the battle of Multan.	261	Wanting.	

Tārīkh-i-Yamīnī of Al 'Otbī.	Page	Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī of Rashīd ud-dīn.	Page
Of the passing over of the army of Ailak Khān.	264	Wanting; apparently defect in MSS., as the next chapter begins, "The Sultan after these <i>two</i> victories," one only having been mentioned.	
Of the taking of the Fort of Bhīm Nāgar.	278	Of the taking of Bīmbughrā (Bhīm-nagar).	504
Of the descendants of Farīghūn.	282	Of the descendants of Farīghūn.	505
Of the Amīr al-Muminīn al-Kādir bi'llah, and his succession to the Khalīfat, and his confirmation in the office of Imām, and the acceptance of him by the people after At-Tāyī'i, and what took place between Maḥmūd and Bahā ud-Daulah, Abū Naṣr bin Adad ud-Daulah.	286	Of Al Kādir bi'llah and his succession to the Khalīfat after Tāyī'i, and his friendship with the Sultan and Bahā ud Daulah bin Adad ud-Daulah.	505
Of the battle (conquest) of Narain.	303	Of the battle of Narain.	507
Of the battle (conquest) of Ghor.	305	Of the battle of Ghor.	508
Of the famine which occurred at Nīshāpūr 401 A.H.	308	No heading, but account of the famine of 401 is there.	
Of what occurred with the Khāns of Turkistan after his return from Māwarāulnahr.	312	Of the Khāns after his (Maḥmūd's) return from Māwarāulnahr.	509
Of the conquest of Kūçdār.	316	Of the conquest of Kūçdār.	
Of the <i>Shārum</i> (two Princes), the father Moḥammad and his son Abū Naṣr.	317	No heading, but the account is there precisely as given in Yamīnī.	
Of the battle of Nārdīn.	329	Battle of Nārdīn. (No heading).	
Of the battle of Thanesur.	336	Of the battle of Thanesur. (No heading.)	512
Of the Wazirship of the Shaikh Shams ul-Kufāt Abū 'l-Kāsim Aḥmad bin Al-Hasan.	346	Wanting.	
Of Shams al-Ma'ālī Kābūs bin Washmīkar and the end of his affairs; the succession of the Amir Falak ul-Ma'ālī Abū Maṣṣūr Ma-nuchīhir to his inheritance.	357	Heading wanting; account precisely the same.	513
Of Dārā bin Shams al-Māalī, and what happened to him in the end.	362	Wanting.	

Tárikh-i-Yamíní of Al 'Otbi.	Page	Tárikh-i-Rashídí of Rashíd ud-din.	Page
Of Majd ud-Daulah Abú Tálib bin Fakhr ud-Daulah.	366	Heading wanting; account precisely the same.	514
Of Bahá ud-Daulah and his end.	371	Heading wanting; account the same.	515
Of Ailak Khán and what happened to him in the end.	376	Heading wanting; account the same precisely.	515
Of the Amír Abú Aḥmad Moḥammad bin Maḥmúd.	138	Wanting.	
Of At-Taharti, the Envoy from Egypt.	383	Wanting.	
Of the Amír Abú'l 'Abbás Mamún bin Mamún Khwárazm Sháh, and what happened to him until Maḥmúd took possession of his country.	389	Heading only wanting; contents the same.	516
The conquest of Mahrah Kin-nauj and the Province of Cashmir.	395	Wanting.	
Of the Great Maṣḥid at Ghaznin.	410	Wanting.	
Of the Afghans.	415	Of the Afghans.	519
Of what happened in Nishápúr after the Wazír Abú'l 'Abbás, in connection with those who were appointed to govern it until the appointment of Abú 'l-Hasan 'Alí bin Moḥammad As-Saiyáryi.	419	Here 'Abd ar-Rashíd closes his translation from the Tárikh-i-Yamíní; but the remaining chapters, in which he gives the history of Moḥammad bin Maḥmúd and Maudúd bin Mas'úd bin Maḥmúd, are contained in a page and a half, which would seem to establish that he had only a copy of Baihaqí's work,—provided always that we have his history as he wrote it, which would not appear to have been the case.	
Of Abú Bakr Moḥammad bin Ishák bin Mahma Shaz, and the Kadhí Abú 'l 'Alá Sa'id bin Moḥammad, and what happened regarding them at Nishápúr.	423		
Of the Commander-in-Chief Abú 'l-Muzaffar Naṣr bin Subuktagin.	469		
Of what took place regarding myself when having completed my history so far I submitted it to the Wazír Shams al-Kufát, and his recognition of my services.	454		

But to return to Abú Moḥammad bin al-Hosain al-Baihaqí (d. 470?) I have not been able to ascertain the date of his birth. It was probably about 400 A.H.; and as he wrote his history apparently between the years 450 A.H. and 460 A.H.,

he may be considered a contemporary author for the first sixty years of the fifth century. In speaking of Subuktagín he generally says, "I heard so and so from my father." During the reign of Maḥmúd's son Mas'úd, Baihaḳí's master, Abú Naḡr Mishkán, who also wrote a history, which is lost, was head of the Government Secretariat Department, and, according to Baihaḳí, was a very elegant letter writer. Baihaḳí was his chief assistant or secretary, and had frequent interviews, on business, with the Sultan. On the death of Abú Naḡr, not having been appointed to succeed him, he considered himself slighted, and placed his resignation in the hands of the king. Mas'úd, however, would not accept it; and although he acknowledged Abú'l-Fazl's fitness for the office, he said he was somewhat too young for so important a post. The portions of his history published, although they are chiefly devoted to the biography of Mas'úd, which is brought down to his imprisonment in 431 A.H., treat also of matters connected with the reigns of Subuktagín, Maḥmúd, Moḥammad, and, incidentally, of events of the reigns of Furrukhzád and Ibráhím, who ascended the throne, according to Baihaḳí, in 451 A.H. This latter king reigned forty-one years, and Baihaḳí died in the middle of this reign, so his work cannot contain a complete history of the dynasty founded by Subuktagín, which terminated with Khusraw Malik Khusraw Sháh, who was killed by Mu'izz ud-dín Sâm, the Ghorian, 598 A.H.

Al Baihaḳí has also given some account of the kings of Khwárazm, which he has extracted from a work by Rashíd ud-dín's oracle, Al-Bírúní, who was a contemporary, though forty years his senior. His whole history is confused, and presents the appearance rather of a rough draft than of a revised text. That which he has related, however, is accurate, and can be accepted as truthful history; for we have not only his own statement, viz., "I have recorded nothing that I have not myself seen, or have not received on the most trustworthy authority," but the internal evidences of truth and honesty his history affords, and the high testimony borne to his character by other writers of note. Regarding the con-

fused style of his history, moreover, it is only doing him common justice to record here his own pathetic lament for the loss of the official documents which would have enabled him, he says, to make his history so much more worthy of posterity. In speaking of a despatch sent by Mas'úd to the Khalífah at Bagdad he makes the following remarks:—

“My master Bú Naçr made a draft of the letter in a style that he knew so well how to do, for as a letter writer he was the first man of his age (*Imám-i-rozgár dar dabíri*), I who am Abú'l-Fazl copied this letter. All letters to the Khalífah, the Kháns of Turkistan, and the kings of the neighbouring countries, were in my handwriting, and I had charge of the office copies; but, intentionally, they made away with them (*na chiz kardand*). Alas! many times alas! that that garden of Paradise is gone, for had it been otherwise, this history would have been very different from what it now is. But I am not hopeless that through the grace of God I may yet obtain these papers, and thus be able to publish them all. The public will then be in a position to judge of the worth of that high official (Bú Naçr).”

The poor fellow seems to have been sadly distressed by the loss of these papers, though how they were kept from him his remarks do not make clear. He refers to them again further on in his history, and repeats the above lament, adding that he had asked the sons of Bú Naçr for the copy of a letter without result. He mentions in very high terms a contemporary, Maḥmúd Warrák, who, he says, had written “the history of a few thousand years (*chandia hazár sál*),” bringing his narrative down to 409 A.H.; and adds, “he there stopped, because I had commenced my history from that year. And this Maḥmúd,” he continues, “is accurate and trustworthy. I have seen about ten or fifteen of his works on various subjects of great merit, and I wished to write a long eulogy upon him, and to quote much from him, but as soon as his sons heard of it they said to me, ‘We who are his sons are not willing that you should take more than you have already taken from our father.’ Being helpless, therefore, I desisted.” What foolish children those of Maḥmúd Warrák? Who now knows anything of their father? Where are the ten or fifteen works on various subjects of this able writer

and no doubt learned man ? Where are the numerous works of Abú Naçr Mishkân ; of At-Tálabí, of 'Imád al-Kátib ; of Aç-Çábí, the author of the *Tájî* ; of Abú Raihán al-Bírúní, the philosopher and astronomer royal of Maḥmúd ; of 'Alí al-Bustí, Subuktagín's Kátib ; of Ibn al-Mastaufí, and hundreds of other authors of this period, who were contemporaries with Al-Baihaqí or immediately preceded him, and of those whose names even are no longer known ? Where is the *Nasab Námah-i Salátín-i Ghor*, compiled in verse by Fakhr ud-dín Mubárah Sháh, and dedicated to 'Alá ud-dín Hosain Jehán Soz, and the abridgement of Baihaqí's own work, which Minháj ud-dín tells us was made by one of the illustrious men of Ghaznin in the times of Mu'izz ud-dín Moḥammad Sám (602 H) ? Al 'Otbí mentions the names of nine or ten poets of celebrity of his time, scarcely one of whom Ibn Khallikán or others have given us any notice of whatever ; besides a whole host of other authors might be mentioned whose works have been involved in the general destruction of MSS. which has been steadily progressing with the revolutions of the seasons and the wars of Islám. If anything is to be done in India it must be done quickly, for our climate is very different from that of the dry climate of Arabia, where neither the worm nor the moth abound. But I wander somewhat from the immediate subject in hand.

There are other special histories of the kings of Ghaznin, and perhaps of the kings of other dynasties, which it would be desirable to publish in a series devoted to the history of India ; but as I see no present prospect of obtaining materials in India for giving editions of them, I may pass on to the histories of those sovereigns of the house of Ghaznin who may legitimately be styled kings of Delhi. The first on the list is the *Táj ul-Maâşir*, by Hasan Nizámí,¹ who wrote the history of the times of Kutb ud-dín Aibak and Shams ud-dín Ailtimash, the first Mohammadan conquerors of Delhi, with whom he was a contemporary, and at whose courts he resided. Contemporary historians of this early period are very scarce ;

¹ Haji Khalifah calls the author Çadr ud-dín Moḥammad bin Hasan-i-Nizámí ; Zia-i-Barní calls him Kwájah Çadr Nizámí.

and although Hasan Nizámí's history, in regard to style, is open to the same objection as Al 'Otbí's, it will be published as soon as a sufficient number of good copies can be obtained. I have at present only one copy, but other copies are procurable in India. The author's preface breathes the same spirit as that of Al 'Otbí, that, indeed, of the times in which he lived—the true spirit of Islám, “universal dominion.” We find in it also the same complaint of want of appreciation of learning and learned men, which scholars have been making from the earliest ages down to our own times, and considerably more egotism and vanity than could well be tolerated at present. Still he was an accomplished scholar, and he has so truthfully given expression to the Mohammadan “idea,” that I think it worth while to make a short abstract of a portion of his remarks:—

“Be it known,” says he, “that in accordance alike with the canons of the law and the dictates of the understanding, to wage war with the enemies of religion is both desirable and incumbent. The virtue of a religious war (*jihád*) has been made evident by many very clear texts, viz., ‘Fight in the path of God the righteous fight.’ Again, ‘Fight the unbelievers in God and the last day.’ Again, ‘Fight the polytheists (*mushrikín*) every one of them.’ All persons of intelligence and understanding very well know that the stability of religion and good government, and the maintenance of the integrity of the law, are dependent upon *jihád*; and that the prosperity and vigour of the Church and State are bound up with it. The administration of the affairs of a State without the intervention of the sword is impossible; and although the government of a country without the instrumentality of the pen or the civil power is equally so, still until the foundations of empire have been laid and strengthened by the sword, and the boundaries about and around the frontiers of *Islám* are cleared of the enemies of religion; until laws and regulations of justice and right are enforced for the protection of the cultivators and the poor,—who are a sacred trust bequeathed (to kings) by the Creator,—and the hand of oppression and persecution is stayed from the shedding of blood, and the rapine and plunder of the property of the Moslims; until all this has been accomplished by the sword, the orders and legal decisions of the learned, who are the inheritors of the laws of the Prophets, can meet with neither honour nor respect, nor

can the affairs of a kingdom be well administered." The author then goes on to say that "proof of his position lies in the fact which is fully borne out by history, that in every age some one 'defender of the true faith' has arisen to fulfil the requirements of this theory; as, for instance, in the time of Mu'izz ud-dín Abú'l-Muzaffar Mohammad bin Sâm bin al-Husain, Abú'l Hárith Kutb ud-dín Aibak,¹ who having cleared Hindustan of the enemies (of Islám) by the sword, has left us the evidences and signs of his greatness and prowess to be the ornament of history."

Regarding the author himself, we glean from his work that he was born at Nishápúr, whence he came and settled at Ghaznin. He was a man of considerable attainments, and writes with much elegance, according to the Oriental idea, and consequently with great verbosity. He has devoted no less than fifty-seven pages to a recital of his objects and reasons for setting out from Ghaznin for Delhi, the objections his friends raised to it, and the circumstances which induced him to write his history. I can therefore only give a précis of his remarks. He says—

"I, Hasan Nizámí, although it is desirable to abridge my remarks, yet since elegant writing hath charms which dispel weariness, before commencing on my subject, I may as well acquaint my readers with certain misfortunes which befel me, and a few of the events of the times. And, first, I would observe that I had never before travelled, or even contemplated travelling, until wars and rebellion in Khorasan became the rule, and no one any longer paid the slightest attention to persons of learning or erudition. Then, certainly, I resolved firmly to get out of the country. My friends opposed my intention, and this caused me to waver. At last, however, I left Nishápúr, and, following the advice of Shaikh Muḥammad Kúf, I went to Ghaznin, where I had the distinguished honor of kissing the feet of Shaikh Muḥammad Shírází, and through the kindness of the Lord Chief Justice, *Majid al-Mulk*, my lucky star became in the ascendant. Some time I spent very pleasantly with him, but afterwards I was so unfortunate as to be separated from the companionship of these two most exalted personages. I, then, with a party of learned men and scholars, set out for

¹ *Aibak* means finger-cut; Kutbuddin the finger-cut, as we say Taimúr *lang* or Taimúr the lame. He had lost his little finger.

and arrived at Delhi, which is the seat of honor and the centre whence liberality radiates. The fatigues of the journey caused me to fall sick, but my illness was not very serious, and after a little I recovered. *Sharf al-Mulk*,¹ the Lord Chief Justice of Delhi, was very kind to me, and showed me, as his father had done before him, great attention. Other dignitaries also, seeing this, showed me the attention due to a stranger. Soon afterwards some of my intimate friends hinted to me that 'if a work in Persian,—because the inclination of the people of the times either from want of ambition or deficiency in scholarship is more partial to that [language than to Arabic],—were prepared, having a few couplets in praise of the men of the age interspersed throughout it, it would be very opportune at the present moment; it would remain as a memento of my scholarship for future ages, and the undertaking would certainly not be without some profit.' I naturally felt annoyed at this suggestion; lost my temper to such an extent that my sensitive understanding deserted me. I said to myself, is it not passing strange that the men of these times should think the highest result of education and the ripe fruit of hard and laborious study is the compilation of a book in Persian and the writing of a few verses? Nevertheless, reflecting upon the following words of the holy text, 'When the ignorant address ye, agree with them, or assent to what they say;'² and after many and extreme arguments I said to myself, after all the meaning of the proverb, 'a man is known by his parts,'³ will not be hid from the observant. More especially, since I had been instructed to write an account of the victories of the king, it did not seem to me that I had the power longer to refuse, and that I ought to comply with the royal order, and relate the events and victories of his imperial reign, and at the same time do so in a composition which by its language and style would lead captive the hearts of all who should read it, while rendering

¹ The words I have translated are *Qadr-i-Adli*. *Sharf al-Mulk* is a title similar to *Majd al-Mulk* of Ghaznin. The Chief Justice was generally known by his title and not by his name. *Sadr-i-Jihân* was not common. From Taimûr's time they were more generally known by the designation of Kâzî al-Kuzât, though this title is also used in India earlier, as Akẓa'l-Kuzât in Arabic.

² Koran 9th S. 3 v. : اِذَا خَاطَبَهُمُ الْجَاهِلُونَ قَالُوا سَلَامًا "they say, peace be unto them," and the meaning is precisely, "keep the peace with them, do not get into arguments or quarrels with the ignorant."

³ A *hadith* البر باصغريه *lit.* "by his heart and tongue." The author apparently means to imply that whatever he writes, men of understanding will easily perceive that it bears the impress of genius.

conspicuous the eloquence and rhetorical power of the author. I commenced to write my work in one of the months of the year 602 A.H."

The headings of the chapters of the *Táj al-Maášir* are as follows: "An account of the march [of *Ḳutb ud-dín Aibak*] to conquer Hindustan and the battle of *Ajmír* in the year 585 A.H.; of the consignment of the Governorship of *Ajmír* to the son of *Rai Pithora*; of the conquest of *Delhi*, may God protect its good fortune, and perpetuate its glory; of the Governorship of *Kahrám* and *Sámánah*; of the defeat of *Khunwán*? and the killing in battle of the *Rai*; of the rebellion of *Harráj*, brother of the *Rao* of *Ajmír*; of the march of his Highness towards *Ghaznin*; of his march towards *Kol* (*Köil* or *Alighur*) and *Banares*; of the battle of *Banares*; of his march towards *Kol*, and the consignment of its Government to *Málik al-Umará Hisám ud-dín Ughlabak*; of *Ajmír* again; of the consignment of the Government of *Thankar* to *Bahá ud-dín Tughral*; of the conquest of *Kaléwar* (*Gualior*); of the battle of *Nahrivalah*, and the defeat of the *Rao*; of the consignment of the Fort of *Kalingar* to *Huzab ud-dín Hasan Arnab*; of the return of the Emperor (*Sultán us-Salátn*) from *Khwárazm* and the battle of *Kokar*; of the martyrdom of the Emperor *Mu'izz ud-dín Moḥammad bin Sám*; of the resignation of the neighbouring Princes and of the acceptance of *Islám* by the kingdoms of *Hindustan*; of the death of his Majesty the Emperor *S. S. Ḳutb ud-dín*; of the accession to the throne of his Majesty the Emperor *Shams ud-dín*, may his reign last for ever; of the defeat of the army of *Ghaznin*, and the capture of *Malik Táj ud-dín (Yaldoz)*; of the fight with, and defeat of, *Náçir ud-dín*, and the conquest of *Lúhúr* (*Lahor*); of the consignment of the Government of *Lahore* to his Majesty's son *Náçir ud-dín*."

The book is brought down to the year 614 A.H., but having but one copy I am not certain that it is complete throughout. The above is sufficient to show that the author was a competent chronicler of the events of his own times, and that his history contains matter of interest; in short, that the selection is a fit one. It will be observed that *Hasan Nizámí*

omits all mention of Áráṃ Sháh, who has been included by later historians amongst the Sovereigns of Delhi, between Kutb ud-dín Aibak and Shams ud-dín Ailṭimash. The truth appears to be that one party set up Áráṃ Sháh and another Ailṭimash, and the latter was victorious; and of those who admit him to the honours of sovereignty, some say he reigned less than a year and others accord him only two or three days. None of his coins I believe are known to exist.

Another work which I have had before my mind's eye, and which should be published in this series, if materials can be obtained for an edition, is the *Jam'i ul-Hikáyát wa lam'i ur-Riváyát* of Jam'ul ud-dín Moḥammad Al 'Aufí, who also wrote in the time of the Emperor Shams ud-dín Ailṭimash, and by order of his Wazír Nizám ul-Mulk. It is in Persian, and was translated into Turkish by Aḥmad bin Moḥammad, commonly called Ibn 'Arab Sháh (d. 854). Ziá-i-Barní, Khwandahmír and others quote it; but as I have not seen the work I say nothing more about it, except that if any one has a copy I hope he will lend it to me. A copy is in the Paris Library, and copies could possibly be obtained elsewhere if they were sought for. These two works, the *Táj ul-Maášir* and *Jam'i ul-Hikáyát*, will give us a very near view of the events of the reigns of—I. Kutb ud-dín Aibak. II. Shams ud-dín Ailṭimash.

The next work of importance on the list, and which has already been published under my editorship in this series, is the *Tabakát-i-Náçiri*, by the Lord Chief Justice Abú 'Omar Minháj ud-dín 'Othman bin Siráj ud-dín al Jauzjání. He was born at Fírozkoḥ, in Khorasán, 590 A.H., and came to India in the year 624 A.H., where he was made Principal of the College of Uchh, in Sindh. This was very shortly after Hasan Nizámí, the author of the *Táj ul-Maášir*, died. We subsequently find him in Oudh, at Lakhnautí, and at Gualior, always holding the highest legal and ecclesiastical offices; and finally at Delhi, first in the reign of Bahrám Sháh, and afterwards in that of Náçir ud-dín Maḥmúd, as Chief Justice. His work, as its name imports, is rather a book of dynasties than a history of any particular dynasty or number of reigns;

and owing to the number of Emperors, Kings, and Princes, he has given us notices of in the portion which I have printed, viz., ninety-seven, many of them are extremely brief. Indeed, with the exception of the reign of Nâçir ud-dîn, in whose honour he compiled his work, and in the fifteenth year of whose reign he wrote it (658 A.H.), most of his biographical notices contain a mere outline. It must be borne in mind, however, that in Minháj-i-Siráj's time Mohammadan India was divided into four kingdoms, the three minor ones acknowledging but a very nominal subordination to the Central Government, and that only under powerful Sovereigns. These were Hindustan, Bengal, the Punjab, and Sindh, each having their seats of Government at Delhi, Lakhnautí, Lahore, and Uchh. Now the peculiar and most important feature of the *Tabakát-i-Nâçiri* is that it gives us a biographical sketch of the contemporary rulers of *all* these kingdoms, as also of the Kings of the countries beyond the Indus, as well as of the Emperors of Delhi. An objection to the *Tabakát-i-Nâçiri*, however, is, that in the author's treatment of his subject he has generally applied his kingdoms to his kings instead of the reverse; and we therefore find Kings of Bengal mixed up in the same chapter, or *tabakah*, with Emperors of Delhi, and *vice versa*, because they were of the same lineage. Another very unsatisfactory point about his work is that he seldom names his authorities, contenting himself with that abominable habit, so sparingly adopted by good Arabian authors, of commencing a passage with "trustworthy persons relate." The brevity of the notices too, even of many of the Emperors under whom Minháj-i-Siráj himself held office, excludes them from the category of history. Still, short though they be, they are of the utmost importance as a means of checking the accounts of later and less trustworthy authors; and, looking to the comprehensive scope of the work and the very scanty remnants of the manuscript histories of the dynasties of which he has given us an account, the *Tabakát-i-Nâçiri* is certainly the most valuable historical record of the period which has been preserved.

Minháj-i-Siráj, in the preface, gives the following statement

of the objects and reasons for compiling his work. He says, briefly :—

“I found a chronological table of historical events which had been compiled by certain learned men in the times of the successors of Nāṣir ud-dīn Subuktagīn with the view of enlightening posterity regarding the history of the Prophets, Khalīfahs, and Kings, and their descendants in times past; and in the preparation of which they had indented on every available source of information.¹ After treating of the affairs of the prophets and their pure descendants and the Khalīfs of the *Bani Umayyah*, and the Bani'l-'Abbās, and the Kings of Persia and the Khusrōes, they concluded with an account of the affairs of the house of the auspicious Sultan Maḥmūd Subuktagīn, excluding the history of other Kings, and Emperors, and their collateral branches, anterior and contemporary. I therefore desired to enlarge this abridgement so as to include the history of all the Mohammadan Sultans of Arabia and 'Ajām, both in earlier and later times; and throw some light on the affairs of each separate house and family, such, for instance, as the Tobb'as of Yaman, and the Himyarite Kings; and after treating of the Khalīfahs, recount also the affairs of the 'Al-i-Boyah, and the Tāhīrian, Saffārian, the Sāmānian, Saljūkian, Rūmian, Shansbāniān, who were the Sultans of Ghor, and Ghaznīn, and Hind, and the Khwārazmshāhian, and the Kings of Kurd, who were the Sultans of Syria, and the Kings and *Salātīn-i-Mo'izziyah*, who sat on the thrones of Ghaznīn and India down to the auspicious times of the present reigning Sovereign Nāṣir ud-dīn Abū'l-Muzaffar Maḥmūd bin us-Sultān, who is of the dynasty of Ailtimash, and who has inherited the throne by regular succession. I wrote this history and adorned it by entitling it after this auspicious Sovereign, '*The Tabakāt-i-Nāṣirī*.' Minhāj-i-Sirāj continues in the introduction to his chapter on the Ghaznavī Kings: 'The *Imām* Abū 'l-Fazl al-Husain Baihaḳī in the *Tārīkh-i-Nāṣirī* relates on the authority of the Sultan Sa'id Maḥmūd, that he (Maḥmūd) had heard from his father Subuktagīn,' etc.; 'and the *Imām* Mohammad 'Alī Abū 'l-Kāsim Hammādi, in the chronological or historical table (*Tārīkh-i-Majadwal*) relates as follows,' etc. He also quotes the *Tārīkh-i-Mukaddasī*, and a work by

¹ Literally, “from every garden a flower, from every ocean a drop, they had collected. It is a pity Minhāj-i-Sirāj did not mention the names of these authors or the name of their book. Possibly it was Maḥmūd Warrāḳ of whom Baihaḳī speaks.”

Abú 'l-Hasan al-Haidham an-Nábi (²); but generally, as before mentioned, he has not given his authorities."¹

He concludes his chapter of the biographies of the Emperors of Delhi with an account of the events of the fifteenth year of Náçir ud-dín's reign (658 A.H.), or up to the date of his writing his book; and he there expressed a hope that if he lived he would be able to continue his history; but he does not seem to have done so. He wrote another work, however, named the *Náçiri-námah*, but I have no information of it except that it contains an account of the siege of the Fort of Nandanah, near Kinnouj, by General Balban, then styled Ulugh Khán, and afterwards Emperor, and of the capture and imprisonment of Dalkí and Malkí.²

Taking up the history where the author of the *Táj ul-Maâsir* lays it down, Minháj ud-dín has given us an account of the reigns of the following Emperors of Delhi:—

II. Shams ud-dín Ailtimash.

III. Rukn ud-dín Fíroz Sháh.

IV. Rádhiyah, the Queen.

V. Mu'izz ud-dín Bahrám Sháh.

VI. 'Alá ud-dín Mas'úd Sháh.

VII. Náçir ud-dín Maḥmúd Sháh, first 15 years.

Following in the wake of Minháj-i-Siráj, but about half a century later, Zíá ud-dín Barní wrote a standard history of very great merit, which has already been published in this series, under its title, the *Tárikh-i-Fíroz-Sháhi*. The author was born about the year 684 A.H. At least he says in his history that in the year 758 A.H. he was then 74 years of age. He frequently says throughout his book, "I heard so and so from my father;" and taking dates, and the standing and position of the authorities, I think I am authorised in including these two histories in the historical chain without any connecting link.

The preface of the *Tárikh-i-Fíroz-Sháhi* is rather long and somewhat bombastic. The author enters into a long dis-

¹ [A full list of the contents of the *Tabaqat-i-Náçiri* is to be found in Mr. Morley's Catalogue of the MSS. of the Royal Asiatic Society (1854.)—Ed.]

² The copulative has puzzled Orientalists, as it is plain from the context that one individual only is meant.

quisition on the value of history, and has given at length seven reasons for its superiority over other branches of knowledge, and why very few are competent to undertake the task of writing a history, and why he himself was possessed of peculiar fitness for it. I give a few extracts from it and his book below; but I may mention here, that my main object here is to show that the works selected for publication in the Persian series are the best available sources for the history of Hindustan under the Mohammadan Sovereigns of Delhi, and that the authors of them are trustworthy, and have been considered so by their contemporaries and those Mohammadan historians of celebrity who followed them.

Ziá-i-Barní mentions four historians of Delhi, who, he says, were trustworthy. Çadr Nizámí, the author of the *Táj ul-Maásir*; Çadr ud-dín Aúfí, the author of the *Jámi' ul-Hikáyát*; Kádhi Çadr-i-Jihán, Minháj Jauzjáni, compiler of the *Tabakát-i-Násiri*; and Kabír ud-dín, son of Táj ud-dín 'Iráki, who, in the times of 'Alá ud-dín, wrote his victories with great elegance. "All four," he says, "were trustworthy, honourable, and illustrious. And be it known that whatsoever trustworthy historians have written, others have accepted; but whatsoever upstarts and unknown people have written, wise men have treated with inattention and rejected, and the histories of such worthless writers having lain for years in the shops have been handed over to the manufacturers, and become again fine white paper." He adds an important condition as affecting the character of an author, viz., that he ought to be a man of sound and orthodox religious principles, as many writers from excessive bigotry have been induced to tell lies. He refers also to the precautions he has taken to state nothing but the truth; and further on (p. 237) he says, "I, who am the compiler of the *Tárikh-i-Fíroz-Sháhi*, have in my preface made this agreement, that whatever I shall write in this history shall be the whole truth (*rásta rást*). Of the persons whose history I relate I shall relate both their good and bad (actions). To publish men's good actions and to conceal their bad is what I shall *not* do; for if I should carelessly overlook (their bad actions) and

recount solely their excellent deeds, and shut my eyes to their evil deeds, then my writings in the auspicious eyes of my readers would be distrusted, and I myself should not be absolved by God." This is introduced in the midst of a passage in which he gives an account of the murder of Jalál ud-dín Fíroz Sháh, in which he has anathematized all who had a hand in this foul deed, including his own uncle, 'Alá ul-Mulk, who was a Kotwál, or Governor of Delhi,¹ and 'Alá ud-dín, the Emperor, and calls them *Káfirs* and other epithets, which sound equally elegant and polite in the ears of Moslims.

"Having in this preface before laid down the rules, etc., which should regulate the writing of history, and having treated of the excellence, etc., of this branch of literature in a manner which no historian, or writer of history in the Persian language, has ever done before, by intending in this lengthy treatise to show the great pleasure and profit I had derived from the study of this subject, I, Zíá-i-Barní, the compiler of the *Tárikh-i-Fíroz-Sháhi* wished to write a history myself, beginning with the birth of Adam and his two sons, etc., etc. After recounting the events of the times of the Prophets, etc., to that, I wished to take up the reigns of the Khalífahs and Sultans of Islám, down to the king of my own time, with whose name I have adorned the title-page of this history. While fully occupied with this intention, however, I recalled to mind the *Tárikh-i-Tabakát-i-Náçiri*, which Minháj ud-dín Jauzjáni had compiled with such wonderful ability. This work he compiled at Dehli, and included in it an account of the Prophets, Khalífahs, Sultans, from Náçir-ud-dín, son of Shams ud-dín Aitimash, and the Kháns of the Shamsí and Náçirí families, the whole being contained in twenty-three *tabakahs*. Now I said to myself, that if I should copy that which this illustrious and revered historian has written, the readers of my history who had already read his history would derive no profit; and if, on the other hand, I should write an account that should differ from his, or enlarge or abridge his history, then I should be accused of rashness and want of respect, besides which, the readers of the *Tabakát-i-Náçiri* would be involved in doubt. I, therefore, thought it wise to exclude every thing to be found in the *Tabakát-i-Náçiri*, and to confine myself to relating the

¹ *Kotwál* in these days means a city or town magistrate. In those days it was a very high office, as we read of Ghiyás ud-dín Balban having made the Kotwál his representative when he left Delhi.

history of the later kings of Dehli, not treated of by Kádhi Minháj ud-dín, etc., etc."

Ziá ud-dín brings history down to the sixth year of the reign of Fíroz Sháh, who was the son of Rajab Sálár, the brother of Ghiyás ud-dín Tughlak Sháh, and his commander-in-chief. His tomb is in Baraich, in Awadh. Rajab Sálár, strange to say, and another Mohammadan Badí' ud-dín Madár, whose tomb is near Kinnauj, are held in great veneration by the sweeper-caste throughout Hindustan, by whom they are called Sálár-o-Madár. In the *Tárikh-i-Fíroz-Sháhi* we have the history of eight Emperors of Dehli, commencing with Ghiyás ud-dín Balban, and ending with Fíroz Sháh. He has excluded from imperial honours Shams ud-dín Kaiomurth bin Kai Kobád bin Baghrá Khán, bin-i-Balban, who was only a few days on the throne; Rukn ud-dín Ibráhím bin Jalál ud-dín Fíroz Sháh Khaljí, who was a few months on the throne; Shaháb ud-dín 'Omar bin 'Alá ud-dín and Náçir ud-dín Khusrau Khán, who sat on the throne—the one for three months and a few days, and the other for four months.

Some discrimination, perhaps, is necessary in ranking as sovereigns *all* who have taken advantage of the absence from Dehli of the rightful heir or the successful usurper to don the regal purple. Thus Kaiomurth sat on the throne but for a very few days; and though Rukn ud-dín occupied it for some months, what were the circumstances? 'Alá ud-dín had invited the king to Allahabad, nominally to tender his submission, but really for the purpose of murdering him; and, having accomplished his wicked purpose, he at once assumed the reins of power. The Queen, who was at Dehli, hearing of the King's murder, set up his son in his stead, and wrote letters to all the nobles and governors north of Dehli to come to his support; but on 'Alá ud-dín marching to Dehli he defeated the troops she was able to bring against him, and took possession of the capital. Rukn ud-dín Ibráhím and Shaháb ud-dín, though short-lived, were king's sons; but Khusrau Khán was simply a king's murderer, and not having popular suffrage even in his favour, is looked upon

by Mohammedans as a rebel. The first act of all such temporary kings no doubt was to assume the umbrella, to have the *Khutbah* read in their names, and to coin money, which are the principal insignia of royalty; and these facts are worthy of notice by numismatists, who might otherwise be puzzled at finding the coins of two kings of the same date. Still although an established and recognized ruler may lawfully be considered the sovereign as long as he holds his capital, it is questionable whether the accidental presence at the capital and the occupation of the throne by the lawful heir or a usurper, for a few days, weeks, or months, as the case may be, can give an aspirant to the throne a claim to descend to posterity as the emperor of a great nation, when he has not had the power to retain it against a competitor *then* in the field, nor has ever been acknowledged beyond the limits of a very small division or district of the empire.

Ziá-i-Barní undertook to continue his history to the close of Fíroz Sháh's reign, but he seems to have been disappointed in his expectations and hopes, and to have abandoned his task. He retired to a village in the suburbs of Delhi. This place was afterwards the burial place of many saints and distinguished men, and to the present day is celebrated as containing the shrine of the holy and revered Nizám ud-dín Ouliá. In his latter days Ziá ud-dín was reduced to such extreme poverty that no more costly shroud than a piece of coarse matting could be furnished for his funeral obsequies. He was the friend of the poets Amír Khusrú and Mir Hasan, the former of whom he quotes often in his history, and whose tomb is not far from his.

The portion of Fíroz Sháh's history which Ziá ud-dín left uncompleted, was finished by Shams-i-Siráj 'Uffí, who also entitled his book the *Tárikh-i-Fíroz-Sháhi*. This work is often confounded with the history of Ziá-i-Barní, and is generally supposed to be a continuation of it; but it is in itself a complete history of the life and reign of Fíroz Sháh, and may therefore more appropriately be entitled the *Tárikh-i-Fíroz-Sháhi* than the work of Ziá ud-dín, which contains so much of the reigns of other monarchs, and so little of that

of Fíroz Sháh. I have selected this work also for the series ; but copies of it are more rare even than of the *Tárikh* of Zíá-i-Barní. One copy is in General Hamilton's library, and I have heard of another at Delhi, in the possession of Nawáb Zíá ud-dín Lohárú, of which General Hamilton's is perhaps a transcript, but I have not seen the work, nor yet the little work styled the *Futúhát-i-Fíroz-Sháhi*, said to be written by Fíroz Sháh himself, and inscribed on the walls of his Masjid, which have long since been destroyed. It is contained in eight chapters, one of which Ferishtah has reproduced, copied apparently from the *Tabakát-i-Akbari*, and very incorrectly (see Bombay edition, p. 271).

These two *Tawárikh-i-Fíroz-Sháhi* will give us the connected history of the following Emperors of Dehli:—

VIII. Ghiyás ud-dín Balban.

IX. Mu'izz ud-dín Kai Kubád.

X. Jalál ud-dín Fíroz Sháh, *Khaljî*.

XI. 'Alá ud-dín, *Khaljî*.

XII. Kutb ud-dín Mubárah Sháh.

XIII. Ghiyás ud-dín Tughlaq Sháh.

XIV. Abú'l-Fath Muḥammad Sháh.

XV. Abú'l-Muzaffar Fíroz Sháh.

But here I regret to say that there is a hiatus of about sixty years, which I fear there will be very great difficulty in closing up with the aid of contemporaneous historians. The period alluded to is that between Fíroz Sháh, 790 A.H., and Bahlol Lodí, 854 A.H., and the kings who reigned during this interval are as follows:—

XVI. Tughlaq Sháh II.

XVII. Abú Bakr Sháh.

XVIII. Náçir ud-dín Muḥammad Sháh.

XIX. Sikandar Sháh Humáyún.

XX. { Náçir ud-dín Maḥmúd.

{ Náçir ud-dín Naçrat Sháh.

XXI. *Dawlat Khán Sádî*.

XXII. Khizr Khán, the *Saiyid*.

XXIII. Mu'izz ud-dín Mubárah Sháh.

XXIV. Muḥammad Sháh.

XXV. 'Alá ud-dín bin Muḥammad Sháh.

Histories are mentioned, such as the *Jawáhir ul-Akhdár*, the *Tárikh-i-Mubárah-Sháh*, etc., but I do not know where to seek them. Information may incidentally be obtained from the several histories of Taimúr and his conquests, and some general histories. I only mention those histories, however, which have been printed in our series, and those special histories which I have selected, and of which I see a probability of obtaining materials upon which to found a tolerably accurate text. Nor do I think it at all probable that much contemporaneously written history will be discovered for this period, for I find that subsequent authors, and not of a very recent date, have lamented its absence.

Thus, in the next work which I have selected and already recommended for publication in this series, viz., the *Tárikh-i-Afághanah*, it is stated, as will be seen in the extract given below, that since the publication of the *Tabakát-i-Náçiri* and the *Tárikh-i-Fíroz-Sháhi* no history of merit has been written, and hence this history was compiled. The name of the author is Aḥmad Yadgár. I do not find a biographical notice of this historian, but in his preface he has given an account of the origin of his work, from which it is clear that he was attached to the Court of Dáúd Sháh, by whose order he wrote it. He says:—

“One day, when in the presence of the king, Abú'l-Mozaffar Dáúd Sháh, the history of Hamzah 'Açif Khán was produced, and the conversation turned on this subject. The king said to me, ‘Minháj ud-dín Jauzjáni compiled and dedicated a book to Sultán Náçir ud-dín, son of Sultán Shams ud-dín Ailimash, embracing a history of the world from Adam to the time of the Sultán alluded to, and in truth he executed a noble work. After him Zíá-i-Barní wrote his history, styled the *Tárikh-i-Fíroz-Sháhi*, including an account of the times from Ghiyás ud-dín Balban to those of Fíroz Sháh, thus giving the history of eight kings. But no one has written a history of the Afghan kings who after Amánat Khán (?) sat on the throne of Delhi. It would be a good thing, therefore, if you would undertake to relate some of the events which took place during the sovereignty of the Afghans.’ Since I have been a servant of this monarch for a long time, I see no alternative but to undertake the history of six of these kings,

and relate the events which happened during their reigns, fully, completely, and in the order in which they occurred, so that the memory of the departed may remain, and may the beloved Allah aid me in my task. And since this dynasty began with Bahlol Lodí, I commence my history with his reign."

In the same strain the author of the *Tárikh-i-Dáúdí* says:

"History is not simply information regarding the affairs of kings who have passed away; but it is a science which expands the intellect and furnishes the wise with examples. Since this humble individual has spent a considerable portion of his life in studying historical works pregnant with instructive examples, and has examined the conditions of things under many sovereigns; and it appeared that the records of the reigns of the Afghan kings (of Hindustan), who were one of the dynasties of the times, existed only in a scattered form, I involuntarily conceived the design of collecting them, with the aid of the Almighty, in one volume." I therefore undertook the work, and in a very short time completed it. "I commenced with the reign of Bahlol Lodí, who was the first king of the Afghan dynasty, and brought my history down to the (end of) the reign of Muhammad 'Adlí Súr Dáúd Sháh, who was the last ruler of this race, and I entitled it the *Tárikh-i Dáúdí*."

Aḥmad Yadgár quotes the *Tárikh-i-Nizámi* and the *Ma'dan al-Akhhbár*; but the former was not written till the year 1001-2 A.H., and Dáúd Sháh, in whose time the *Tárikh-i-Afághanah* was compiled was killed 984 A.H. Sir H. Elliot includes the latter in his list of authorities for this period, but whether or not he had ever met the work, I cannot say. Aḥmad Yadgár commences his history with Bahlol Lodí (854 A.H.), and concludes it with 'Adil Sháh (965 A.H.), giving the history of six kings.

There has been, apparently, a little confusion in the titles of some of the histories of this period. The authors of the *Khuláṣat ut-Tawárikh* mentions a history called the *Tárikh-i-Afághanah*, by Hásaní Khán Afghán, which I do not know. Sir H. Elliot gives two histories under the title of *Makhzan-i-Afghání*, and only one entitled the *Tárikh-i-Afághanah*. Sir H. Elliot is, probably, right; but I have only met with one *Makhzan*, and later authors, it appears to

me, confound all. Aḥmad Yadgár does not make mention of the name of his book in his preface; and in my copy the book is styled the *Tárikh-i-Saláṭin-i-Afághanah* on the fly leaf; I have a copy of the *Makhzan-i-Afghání*, by Ni'mat Ullah, and he names it in his preface *Tárikh-i-Khán wa Makhzan-i-Afghání*. He calls himself Ni'mat Ullah bin Khwájah Ḥabíb Ullah al-Haruwí, and says that he compiled his work in the year 1020 A.H., by order of Khán Jihán Lodí, who was high in the favour and also in the service of the Emperor Jihángír and the conqueror of the Deccan. He is thus a later author than Aḥmad Yadgár by some forty years. He has divided his book into seven chapters, but two only are of interest for this period, viz., the third and fourth. The first treats of Saul and the children of Israel, from whom the Afghans trace their descent; and the second of the first four Khalífahs, and of the conquest of Khálid bin al-Walid, in Syria and 'Irák. The third treats of the reigns of the Lodí's—Bahlol, Sikandar, and Ibráhím; and the fourth of the Súrs and 'Adlí Shír Sháh, Islám Sháh, and Muḥammad 'Adil Sháh, and the arrival of Humáyún in India for the second time and the extinction of this dynasty, as he brings his history down to a later period than Aḥmad Yadgár; these two chapters might be published in an appendix to the *Tárikh-i-Afághanah*, if materials for editions of the *Ibráhím-Sháhi* of Maḥmúd bin Ibráhím Kaṭwání, or the other valuable authorities he quotes cannot be obtained. These are the *Tárikh-i-Nizámí* of Khwájah Nizám ud-dín Bakhshí; the *Tárikh Shír-Sháhi* of Shaikh 'Abbás of Serdanah, and a work by *Mawláná* Mushtáqí, of Delhi, the name of which he does not give; or better, perhaps, would be a portion of the *Zubdat ut-Tawárikh*, by Núr al-Haḳḳ, son of the celebrated 'Abd al-Haḳḳ of Delhi, especially that based on the *Tárikh-i-Bahádur-Sháhi*, which is written in a clear style. If any one has good copies of any of the above-mentioned books, I hope they will send them to me. Of the *Tárikh-i-Nizámí* I have two copies, but none of the *Tawárikh Ibráhím, Sháhi Bahádur-Sháhi*, and *Shír-Sháhi*.

The times subsequent to the reign of Ibráhím Lodí were

troubles, and the record of them unsatisfactory. The authors mentioned, however, will give us the history of the following six kings, the two last of whom, however, can hardly be said to have obtained complete possession of the dominions over which they nominally ruled. Indeed, after the memorable defeat of Ibráhím Lodí by Bábar, with the exception of the interval of the reign of Shír Sháh, one of the least honoured of the Mohammadan sovereigns of India, though one of the most worthy of honour, there was little settled government in India. The glory of Delhi was gone, and the nominal sovereigns resided chiefly in Bengal; their power was broken, and the prestige of the empire had disappeared.

XXVI. Bahlol *Lodí*.

XXVII. Sikandar Sháh *Lodí*.

XXVIII. Ibráhím Sháh *Lodí*.

XXIX. Shír Sháh bin Hasan *Súr*.

XXX. Islám Sháh.

XXXI. 'Adil Sháh '*Adli*.

Mr. Erskine's translation of the memoirs of Bábar, and his History of India for the conquests and sovereignty of Bábar and Humáyún, throw much light on the events of these epochs, and, though his materials were scant, he has provided fairly for this eventful period of Mohammadan rule in India. It cannot be said, however, that either Bábar or Humáyún founded a dynasty in India,—that honour in my judgment being the right of Akbar, whose generals, on Humáyún's death, had to defeat 'Adlí and Sikandar *Súr*, and to retake Agra and Delhi. Though quite a youth, it was he who conceived the idea of cementing the heterogeneous elements of the various nations of India into one whole, and of consolidating the empire; and it was he, with the able administrators he called to his aid, who accomplished the task. And amongst all the sovereigns of Asia, it is of him we have the fullest information.

Of histories of this period, general and special, we have such an abundance that we may exercise a choice. We have first the *Akbar-námah* of Abú'l-Fazl pronounced by all com-

petent judges to be an admirable history of the great Emperor's reign, but from the most favourable point of view,—a mirror, in short, warranted to reflect *only* his virtues. Next we have the grand history styled *Alfi*, or the history of a thousand years, in the compilation of which Akbar employed “all the talents” of his Court, and which is no doubt a work of very great merit, but unfortunately copies of it are *very* scarce. Thirdly, we have the *Tárikh-i-Nizámí*, *Tabakát-i-Akbar-Sháhi*, compiled by Khwájah Nizám ud-dín Aḥmad Bakhshí, which is the basis of all the Mohammadan histories of this, and many of the preceding periods. Again we have the great work of Moḥammad Kásim, the *Gulzár-i Ibráhímí*, commonly called the *Tárikh-i-Ferishtah*, which has served European historians as usefully as the work of Nizám ud-dín Bakhshí has served Oriental writers. Fourthly, we have the *Muntakhab ut-Tawárikh* of 'Abd al-Kádir, of Badáon, a work which, as a history, is second to none in the whole range of historical works by Mohammadan authors. These, with the exception of the *Akbar-námah*, are all general histories, but special of course for the period of the author's own times, which are those of the period under notice. Besides them there are a number of special histories, none of which, however, deserve mention along with the important works above given, and several by late compilers. I exclude from these remarks of course the *Áin*, or Institutes of Akbar, compiled by Abú'l-Fazl, which some consider simply the third volume of the *Akbar-námah*, but which is a large work in three volumes complete in itself.

The *Akbar-námah* I had recommended for publication in this series, but it has just been published at Lakhnau. The *Tárikh-i-Alfi* contains the history of Akbar and his predecessor's times up only to the year 1000 A.H., or thirteen years before the great monarch's death. Of the *Tárikh-i-Ferishtah* two editions have been published, one at Bombay in 1832 A.D., and one at Lakhnau about two years ago. The Bombay edition, though not free from errors, is the best. The work has also been translated into English. The *Tárikh-i-Nizámí* or *Tabakát-i-Akbar-Sháhi* is brought down

to only two years later, or the thirty-eighth year of Akbar's reign, but this history seems to have been recognized by all contemporary historians as a standard history, and was held in the greatest estimation by all subsequent writers of note. The author died at the early age of forty-five. 'Abd al-Kādir-i-Badāonī passes the highest encomium upon him, both as a man and an author, and says that there were "few either high or low at his funeral who did not shed tears over his loss, and bit the hands of remorse." Abú'l-Fazl, also, in the *Akbar-nāmah*, alludes to the general mourning that followed the death of this distinguished author; and says that the emperor was deeply affected by it and offered prayers for his soul. 'Abd al-Kādir's history professes to be simply an abridgement of Nizām ud-dín's; and *Ferishtah* states that of all the histories he consulted it is the only one he found complete. I recommended it for publication in 1864, but it has not, I regret to say, yet been commenced. The following extract I take from a report of mine to the Council of the Bengal Asiatic Society on that occasion :

"The history of the greater portion of the earlier periods we shall already have placed in the hands of the public, in the histories of Minhāj ud-dín and Zíá-i-Barní, far earlier and possibly far better sources of historic evidence than many of those consulted by 'Abd al-Kādir-i-Badāoní. We have thought it therefore undesirable to go over the same ground while the history of other periods remained uncompleted. I think it well worth consideration, however, whether in conjunction with this work we should not publish in lieu thereof certain portions of the *Tabakāt-i-Akbari*, which 'Abd al-Kādir professes only to have abridged, and which all later historians have made such good use of. Sir H. Elliot in his *Muhammadian Historians* (I. p. 178) says that 'notwithstanding that Ferishta pronounces this work defective, he has borrowed from it very freely.' But Sir H. Elliot's translator (for he generally marked his passages, and gave them to others who had more time for translating than he had), has misinterpreted the passage; for what Ferishta does say has quite the opposite sense. He says, 'Of all the histories of Hindustan that have come into my hands, I have not found a single one complete, *except* the history of Nizām ud-dín

Aḥmad-i-Bakhshí,' meaning this 'Ṭabakát;' the only thing wanting, according to Ferishta, being the additional information which he himself possessed, and which we may assume he supplied in his own large work.

"It would seem hardly fair, also reviewing the question of character from that even, disinterested, and unbiassed point, and with that jealousy proper to the honest and truthful historian—to publish a history, the greatest value of which consists in correcting by its prevalent tone of censure and disparagement the fulsome eulogium of the *Akbar-námah*; without, at the same time, supplying the panegyric, the more especially as I find in Badáoní's history abundant proof that his religious bigotry was such as to render it difficult for him to give an unbiassed and impartial sketch of the character, or to draw right conclusions from the actions of so tolerant a monarch as Akbar. No recommendation has yet been made on this subject to the Society, but I hope soon to bring it forward.

"We will then have to consider the reigns of the three great successors of Akbar, Jahángír, Sháh Jehán, and Aurangzeb, during which, including the reign of Akbar himself, the glory of the Muhammadan power in India may be said to have attained its zenith. But for this and the fourth period, which we may call the *decline* of the Muhammadan power, no arrangements have as yet been made."

Since the above remarks were made, the *Akbar-námah*, as before mentioned, has been published; but it is inconceivable to me why so erroneous an estimate seems to have been formed of the *Ṭabakát-i-Akbar-Sháhi*, that it has not attracted more attention. It is the history which joins on to the *Tárikh-i-Firoz-Sháhi*, and is admitted by all contemporary and subsequent authors to be the standard history in continuation of those authorities. Unquestionably then the thread of the narrative as given by Nizám ud-dín Aḥmad should be taken up where the authors of the *Tárikh-i-Firoz-Sháhi* have dropped it, giving him the preference to 'Abd al-Kádir of Badáon, or any other author however excellent. The following extract from his preface fully bears out what I have so often repeated on the authority of almost all good Muhammadan authors, that Minháj ud-dín, and Zia-i-Barní, were the great historians of the early Muhammadan

period, and that after their times up to the times of Akbar, however diligently we may search, few valuable historical works of a comprehensive nature will be found. The author of the *Tabakát-i-Akbar-Sháhi* says :—

“I, Nizám ud-dín Ahmad, son of Moḥammad Muḳím al-Harawí, who am one of the favoured protégés of the Court of His Imperial Highness, the increasing shadow of the most True, and the vicegerent of the Almighty, etc., Abú'l-Fath, Jalál ud-dín Muḥammad Akbar Bádsháh Ghází,—I, Nizám ud-dín, beg to represent that from my youth, according to the advice of my father, I devoted myself to the study of works of history, which are the means of strengthening the understanding of men of education, and of affording instruction by examples to men of observation; and by continually enquiring into the affairs of the travellers on the high road of life, which is to make the tour of realities: I thus removed the rust from my inert disposition. Now in the wide plains of Hindustan, which is an empire of vast extent, composed of several geographical divisions of the earth, (*chand akálim*),¹—and the surveyors of the plains of the world have described it as a fourth of the earth's surface,—many times in every division of this great country sections of the governing classes, obtaining an ascendancy, have assumed the title and discharged the duties of rulers, and the authors of their times having written histories of the affairs of their government, have bequeathed them as memorials to posterity. Such, for example, as the histories of Delhi, Guzerat, Málwa, Bengal, and Sindh, and similarly all the divisions and frontier provinces of the kingdoms of Hindustan have formed the subject of separate histories. It is most extraordinary, therefore, that not a single work containing a complete compendium of the affairs of that division, the historical events of which it professed to chronicle, has yet been written by any historian; neither have the events connected with the centre of Hindustan, the seat of government of this empire, the capital of Delhi, been collected in one book. The work which is best known is the *Tabakát-i-Náçiri*, which Minháj compiled, commencing with the Sultán Mu'izz ud-dín Ghori, and concluding with Náçir ud-dín bin Shams ud-dín: from thence to the time of Sultán Fíroz is written in the history of Ziá-i-Barní; but from that time to to-day,

¹ This is rather loosely expressed; India comprises nearly two *Aklims* according to Mohammadan geographers. (See *Kazwini*, ed. Wüstenfeld, page 84.)

because, for the greater portion of the time, there was much disturbance in India, and the people had the misfortune to be deprived of a powerful Imperial Government, I have only met with a few detached and incomplete compilations. I have not heard of a single history that comprises an account of the whole of India, and now, since the whole of the inlying and outlying provinces of Hindustan have been conquered by the world-subduing sword of God's vicegerent, and all the fractions of the empire have been united in one grand whole, and many kingdoms, beyond the confines of Hindustan, which none of the great sovereigns who preceded his Majesty had ever acquired, have been included in his empire, and it is to be hoped that the seven climes will yet come under the shade of the standard of the good fortune of that illustrious personage, and thus be protected, and secure peace and prosperity, I conceived the idea of compiling, in a simple style, a history which should embrace an account of the affairs of all the kingdoms of Hindustan, from the times of Subuktagín 367 A.H. (which is the date of the introduction of *Islám* into Hindustan), up to 1001 A.H., or the 37th year of the *Iláhi* era (which commenced with the accession of His Imperial Highness), dividing it into chapters according to the several dynasties which reigned, closing each chapter with an account of the conquest, by His Imperial Highness, of the particular province under notice. This abridgement of all the victories of His Imperial Highness will be given in the proper place; the account of these victories, in full detail, being found in the *Akbár-námah*, which *Allámi* Abú'l-Fazl has compiled with so much ability."

Next in order to the *Tabakát-i-Akbar-Sháhi* is the *Muntakhab ut-Tawárikh*, compiled by 'Abd al-Kádir bin Mulúk Sháh of Badáon. For that portion of the history of India anterior to his own times, his work cannot be placed before those histories which formed the basis of his own work, viz., *The Táríkh-i-Mubárah-Sháhi* and the *Táríkh-i-Tabakát-i-Akbar-Sháhi*. Its great value lies in its giving us a view of the character of the great Emperor from an opposition point, which is a somewhat rare qualification to find in contemporary Mohammadan writers of history, and the ability of its author and his superior qualifications for the task he undertook. He was a very bigotted *Moslim*, and the true spirit of *Islám* which so largely leavened his composition,

became enflamed and blazed forth at the conduct of Abú'l-Fazl and his brother Faizí, and the extremes of toleration to which they not only permitted the Emperor to go, but in which they actually encouraged him. He has, however, unquestionably allowed his bitterness to impair his judgment and impartiality; and as pointed out by me in the extract from my report to the Philological Committee of the Bengal Asiatic Society, it would be the grossest piece of injustice to the dead Emperor to present the public with 'Abd al-Kádir's review of his character and no other. In my humble judgment it behoves the honourable historian of past ages to be most sensitive on the point of character; and I would far prefer to give hastily an unfavourable review of the character of a king who was living, or one who had friends living to defend him, than I would of one who lived a thousand years ago. And while I greatly admire the high qualifications of 'Abd al-Kádir as a recorder of events, I think that his statements taken alone are calculated to give generally a very erroneous impression of the character, and particularly of the motives which actuated the greatest Sovereign that has ever ruled the destinies of India, in many of the measures of his Government. Europeans are too apt, and Englishmen far more so, I fear, than people of other nationalities, to take a disparaging view of the character of all Asiatics, and especially of Asiatic Sovereigns; and although I freely admit that any comparison between the Government of India under British and Mohammadan rule would be absurd, I cannot but think that it is equally as absurd as it is unfair of those who love to make such comparisons, to make them with British rule *as it is* and not with British rule here or elsewhere *as it was* two hundred and eighty or three hundred years ago. Considerations of this nature induced me to recommend the publication of the *Akbar-námah* and portions of the *Tabakát-i-Akbar-Sháhi* along with the *Muntakhab-i-Tawárikh*, as with both the eulogistic and the disparaging review of the character before it, the public would be in a position to form its own conclusions, or, in other words, to take the mean of the two extremes. And the same instruction I

fancy was intended to be conveyed, though perhaps it is not quite so clearly expressed, by Kháfí Khán, when he said in the preface to his history of Akbár's times, "If any one wishes to record in detail the events of the fifty-one years of that Emperor whose good fortune was like unto that of Alexander the Great, the account would not be contained in one volume. Whoever wishes to be accurately informed regarding the affairs of that world-conquering Khusrau, he should attentively read the *Akbar-námah* and the *Tárikh-i-Badáoní* of 'Abd al-Kádir." Further on, in regard to this author, he says:—

"'Abd al-Kádir, the compiler of the *Tárikh-i-Badáoní*, who was long one of the confidential courtiers, the Chaplain Royal, and one of the special councillors in attendance on the Emperor, in common with other learned men of the time, differed openly regarding the tenets of the faith from Shaikh Faizí and Abú'l-Fazl, the sons of Shaikh Mubárak, who were special courtiers and in the secret confidence of the Emperor. He consequently imputed to the two brothers, and to those of their *protégés* who had access to the Emperor, many acts contrary to the tenets of *Islám*. Similarly he has said many things regarding the Emperor himself which are quite incredible, and which it would be improper to repeat or commit to writing. Indeed, if I should retail one hundredth part of them it would be disrespectful (to his memory);¹ nevertheless, 'by repeating the heretical sayings of others one does not himself become a heretic.' I extract some passages from the work of 'Abd al-Kádir, etc., etc."

There is no question, however, of the great value of 'Abd

¹ In another copy of Kháfí Khán, which differs materially from the copy from which the above extract is made, it is stated that, "Some of these passages having been brought to the notice of the Emperor Jehángír, he ordered 'Abd al-Kádir's son to be imprisoned, and his house to be plundered. He further took an agreement from the booksellers of the capital that they would not sell the book; nevertheless this book was found in their shops in greater numbers than any other. In consequence, however, of the well-known anger of the Emperor on the subject, Ferishtah and Mir al-Haqq, the compiler of the *Tárikh-i-Zubdah* and another (?), who were the three contemporary authors at the commencement of Jehángír's reign, do not mention whatever of this matter. But since the writer of this history, having nothing to do with princes and wazírs, has no occasion to suppress the truth, and since a person by repeating the heretical sayings of others does not himself become a heretic, such extracts as with much research he has collected from Badáoní and others he has written down." The same story is told by the author of the *Mirát ul 'Álam* with this difference, that he says nothing about 'Abd al-Kádir's son being imprisoned or his house pillaged. He simply states that the Emperor sent for his descendants (*Aulad*) and took an agreement from them, etc.

al-Kādir's work for the history of this period, and Kháfí Khán admits it; but while he states that the author of the *Tabakát-i-Akbari* is not so correct in his account of the affairs of the Deccan, he seems to think that his history of the life and times of Akbar, as far as it goes, is the most accurate; and as his opinion on a point of this nature is important to the future historian, I quote his remarks:

"Nizám ud-dín Harawí, who was in the Paymaster General's department of Akbar's government, wrote a history containing an account of the Kings of the twenty-one Subahs of the Deccan, called the *Tárikh-i-Nizámí*. Generally his account of the kings of the Deccan is not to be trusted; and with the exception of Mohammad Kásim Firishtah, no writer has compiled a history of the kings of the Deccan which can be fully credited. But since Nizám ud-dín spent his life in the service of the Emperor Akbar, his history in all that relates to the reign of that sovereign can be implicitly relied upon."¹

As Sir H. Elliot has given very copious extracts from 'Abd al-Kádir's work, it is unnecessary to allude to it further. The work is divided into three parts—the first containing the history of Ghaznín and Hindustan from the times of Subuktagín to Humáyún; the second is devoted to the reign of Akbar up to the 40th year; and the third to notices of the learned men and poets who flourished in his time. The first portion of his work,—which, excepting the addition of some verses, is simply an abridgement of the *Tárikh-i-Nizámí*, and not free from the defects attributable to all reproductions in manuscript,—it was not originally intended to publish at present. With a view, however, to meet the wishes of the native community, it has been put in the press, and will appear in two or three months. The second part has already been printed, and the third will follow in due course.

With the *Akbar-námah*,² the *Tárikh-i-Nizámí* or *Tabakát-i-Akbari*, the *Tárikh-i-Firishtah*, and the *Tárikh-i-Badáoní*, not to mention the works of later authors, such as the

¹ This is a proverbial saying with Moslems از نقل كفر كفر نميآشد

² This work has been translated into English, but the translation has never been published, and I cannot say how it has been done. Elphinstone has used it.

Khulāṣat ut-Tawárikh (*apud* the *Siyar-al Mutaakhhkharin*), *Kháfi Khán*, etc., etc., the materials for the history of India for the reign of Akbar will be as complete as it is possible to make them.

For no other period of the history of India, anterior or subsequent, can we expect to find such perfect and complete materials as for the reign of Akbar; while, in some instances, the period subsequent to Akbar is, if possible, more difficult of illustration than that which preceded it. For illustrating the reign of his son, the Emperor Jehángír, I had suggested, and the Council of the Asiatic Society had approved and accepted, the *Jehángír-námah*, or autobiography of this monarch, and the *Ikbál-námah*; but before we could put our design in practice, the *Jehángír-námah* had been published in India by a native gentleman.¹ This freed the Society from half their obligation, and the *Ikbál-námah* of Mu'tamad Khán only was published. Some discussions arose regarding the merits of this work; but they were very conclusively disposed of by a "note" of mine, read at the July meeting of the Society in 1865. No writer of the period was more competent or more favourably circumstanced for writing a history of the reign of Jehángír than Mu'tamad Khán. He was his amanuensis, and a large, if not the greater portion of the Emperor's memoir was written by him. He would seem, moreover, to have been in the confidence of Jehángír, for the Emperor, at the point of his memoirs when he ceased to record the events of his life, says:

"By reason of the weakness which for two years I have experienced, and which still afflicts me, my brain and heart did not support me in drafting the events and occurrences [of my life]. About this time Mu'tamad Khán returned from service in the Deccan, and had the good fortune to make his obeisance, and since he was one of those servants who best understood my temper, and one of my most intelligent pupils, and, in addition, had formerly been employed in the performance of this service, and the recording of these events

¹ I stated at a meeting of the Asiatic Society of Bengal that this work was published by a native Society, but the whole credit is due to Sayyid Ahmad Khán, of Alighur. The work was edited, printed, and published at his own expense.

appertained to the duties of his office, I gave him my commands that, from the date up to which I had written (my memoirs), he should continue them, and add to them my draft; and whatever occurrences should take place subsequently, these he should enter in a diary, which, having submitted to me for correction, he should afterwards write out fairly."

This passage is sufficient, I think, to define the position of the author of the *Ikbal-namah-i-Jehangiri*, both as to his qualifications and the resources at his disposal for compiling a history of the reign of Jehangir. Regarding the autobiography, however, questions have been raised which have afforded a field for discussion for the last seventy or eighty years, or since Mr. James Anderson first translated some extracts from it in the "Asiatic Miscellany," in 1785. In 1788 Gladwin published other portions of the work in his *History of Hindustan*, and in 1829 Major Price published, in the series of the Oriental Translation Fund, the translation of a work which he entitled "The Memoirs of the Emperor Jehangir, written by himself," and which the critical Baron de Sacy at once detected to be a different work to that which Anderson and Gladwin had made use of. Further investigations of the subject by Mr. Morley, when engaged on the preparation of his Catalogue of the MSS. of the Royal Asiatic Society (1850-54), led to the discovery of two texts of the "Memoirs." Several later authors quote the *Jehangir-namah*; but their quotations do not help the solution of the difficulty as to the identification of the Emperor's own edition of the work called his autobiography; but rather point to the conclusion that there were more than two editions of the work. I myself have seen four that differ so widely as to warrant the supposition that they are distinct editions, if not separate works. It may be mentioned, and the fact is interesting, that, after the Emperor had completed the record of twelve years of his reign, he distributed copies of the book to the members of his family, and his principal officers of State; as was done by Her Majesty the Queen with the early life of the late Prince Consort. The passage in which this is

recorded is placed at the end of the history of the twelfth year, and is as follows :—

“I ordered that this twelve years’ Record should be bound up in a volume and several copies made of it ; that I should present it to my confidential servants, and send it to all the Provinces of the Empire, so that the great officers of the State and my trusty servants should make it the rule of their conduct.”

The *Ikbál-námah-i-Jehángiri* has been published, and this History and the *Jehángir-námah* seem to have afforded the basis of the accounts given of this Emperor’s reign by subsequent historians. The *Jehángir-námah* is doubtless open to the objection to all autobiographies, and they will apply with almost equal force to the *Ikbál-námah*, because the relationship of the author was that of private or literary secretary. But Mírza Kámgar, who wrote in the reign of Sháh Jehán, three years after the death of Jehángir, has transferred a great portion of the *Ikbál-námah* to his pages, the first portion indeed being copied verbatim from it. Kháfí Khán, while giving praise to Mu’tamad Khán, reasonably objects that he and other contemporary historians were precluded by the circumstances of their position from being so free and outspoken on certain points as the independent and truthful historian ought to be ; and as the future historian should be guarded on these points, I quote the passage :—

“Let it not be concealed from the intelligent that Muḥammad Kásim Ferishtah, and other historians who were contemporary with the Emperor, out of consideration and regard for his Majesty, were content with slightly glancing at his rebellion when a prince ; and did not enter into detail on the subject. But Mírza Kámgar, who was entitled Ghairat Khán, the nephew of Ḥamíd Ullah Khán,¹ who wrote a history of the life of Jehángir, and who has been less guarded in concealing the truth than Mu’tamad Khán, has mentioned something about the rebellion of Prince Salím (Jehángir).”

¹ I am not certain whether this author is Kámgar Husainí, the author of the *Madṣir-i-Jehángiri*, or not. If not, both the book mentioned by Kháfí Khán, viz., the *Jehángir-námah*, and the author, are new to me. Possibly the four *Jehángir-námahs* purporting to be from the pen of the Emperor, are by different amanuenses. One copy I have seen is styled the *Salím-Shahí* on the fly-leaf.

There are other special works in which something of the history of this reign may be found ; the *Haft-Fath-i-Kangrá*, *Baidh-i-Jehángirí* and the *Tuhfat-ush-Sháh-i-Jehángirí*. These are mentioned by Sir H. M. Elliot ; and there are one or two other works quoted by Mohammadan historians, of which I find no mention. Kháfí Khán gives extracts from the *Minháj-uṣ-Ḥadīkin*, by Muḥammad Ḥadīk-i-Tabrízí, and the author of the *Mirát-i-Aʿftáb-numá*, who wrote in the times of Sháh 'Álam, quotes a work called the *Makálát-i-Jehángirí*, but by this latter I rather think the author means the "Memoirs," to one of the editions of which he has perhaps given another name.

For the reign of the Emperor Sháhjehán, the principal authorities are the *Bádsháh-námah* of 'Abd al-Ḥamíd-i-Láhorí and its continuation by Muḥammad Wáris, and the *'Amal-i-Ḥálih* of Muḥammad Ḥálih. There are other works, but none of very great value. There is a copy, for example, in the Royal Asiatic Society's Library of the *Sháh-Jehán-námah* by Muḥammad Ṭáhir, commonly called 'Ináyat Khán, son of Zafar Khán, some time Wazír to Jehángír ; but Mr. Morley says the author professes simply to have abridged the *Bádsháh-námah*. He adds that the style is simple ; but the extract given by Major Price in his Catalogue is taken verbatim from 'Abd al-Ḥamíd's work.

Another *Bádsháh-námah*, by Múnshí Muḥammad Amín is mentioned by Muḥammad Ḥálih in the *'Amal-i-Ḥálih*, a copy of which is also in the Royal Asiatic Society's Library. It only embraces, however, an account of the first ten years of the emperor's reign, and according to Mr. Morley contains nothing that is not to be found in 'Abd al-Ḥamíd's book. Elliot and others mention some other works, such as the *Mukaddima-i-Bádsháh-námah*, *Latáif-ul-Akhhbár*, *Tárikh-i-Sháh Shujá*, *Sháh-Jehán-námah* of Ṭálib Kálím, *Maáṣir-i-Sháh Jehán*, but contemporary and subsequent authors do not seem to have considered any of these histories of importance, or to have made any use of them. A copy of the *Latáif ul-Akhhbár* is in the Bengal Asiatic Society's Library. (See also Stewart's Catalogue, No. 43.) It is devoted to an account of

the expedition of Dará Shakoh to the relief of Kandahar. There is a copy, or a portion of a copy, of a third *Bádsháh-námah* amongst the MSS. taken at Delhi, by Jalál ud-dín Ṭabatabai. It is styled the "*Bádsháh-námah-i-Sháh-Jehán-i-taḡríf-i-ustád ul 'Aḡr Mauláná Jalál ud-dín Ṭabatabai.*" The MS. begins abruptly with the fifth and concludes with the eighth year of the emperor's reign, and is written as if the author was contemporary with the events he chronicles. It contains 586 pages of seventeen lines, in a small and closely written hand; and to embrace the entire reign would extend to at least ten or twelve volumes. I find no mention of this history anywhere. 'Abd al-Ḥamíd mentions amongst the doctors or learned men of this reign one Saiyid Jalál, who was an author, an elegant writer, and a poet, and who had two or three interviews with the emperor; but there are no grounds to suppose that this apparently distinguished man is this author. I know of no histories then for this reign equal to the *Bádsháh-námah* and its continuation, by Wáriṣ Khán and the '*Amal-i-Ḷáliḥ*. All three authors were contemporary, though Muḥammad Ḷáliḥ was the youngest of the three. He speaks in the highest terms of the other two; and an equally good proof that, in selecting these works, no mistake has been made, is that Kháfi Khán has followed the order of the *Bádsháh-námah* as far as it goes, and seems to have based his history for the first twenty years of Sháh-Jehán's reign almost entirely on this work. The greatest objection to the work is the author's style which is of that adulterated kind of Persian introduced into India apparently by the brothers Abú'l-Fazl and Faizí.

The two parts of the *Bádsháh-námah* of 'Abd al-Ḥamid have been printed, forming together two bulky volumes of 1662 pages 8vo.; but copies of the continuation of the *Bádsháh-námah*, by Wáriṣ Khán, have not been procured,—so the publication is stopped for the present. The copy of the second part of the *Bádsháh-námah* which has been used for this edition is the finest MS. I have ever seen. It is written by Muḥammad Ḷáliḥ Kambú, the author of the '*Amal-i-Ḷáliḥ*, and bears on the margin the autograph of the Emperor Sháh-

Jehán.

Next in order of the Mughal Emperors comes 'Abúl-Muzaffar Muḥí ud-dín Muḥammad Aurangzeb 'Álamgír. The special authorities for this monarch's reign are not numerous. Elliot mentions no less than fifteen;¹ but most of them are of little value; some relate but remotely to history, and a few, as far as I know of, are not procurable anywhere. In the Royal Asiatic Society's Library are some papers (No. 133) relating to this reign, which may contain some materials of value, and also some general histories. One cause of the paucity of good materials for this reign is that the Emperor himself in the eleventh year of his reign issued strict injunctions that no one should write the record of his times. The reason for this injunction is attributed to a bigotry similar to that which caused the destruction of the Alexandrian Library, but it is not very plainly stated. It is more than probable that it is to be found in the fact that from this year dates the commencement of the disruption of the great empire Aurangzeb inherited from his father. The history of the reign of Aurangzeb is of singular importance for the British Government in India, and cannot be too fully elucidated, for in this reign the latest attempt was made to reorganize the Government and to re-settle the whole country. For this period I selected the '*Álamgír-námah* of Múnshi Muḥammad Kásim, the *Maáṣir-i 'Álamgíri* of Muḥammad Sákí Musta'id Khán, and the latter half² of the *Muntakhab-i-Lubáb*, commonly called the *Tárikh-i-Kháfi Khán*.

These three works, I believe, will give a tolerably clear and comprehensive view of the history of the period, in spite of the Emperor's prohibition to write. The first is a Court Chronicle, and consequently open to the objections before alluded to. It was written by order of Aurangzeb himself. It comprises only ten years of his reign; but for that

¹ *Makál-i-Sultání*; *Roz-námah-i-'Álamgíri*; '*Álamgír-námah-i-'Akil Khán*; '*Álamgír-námah-i-Muhammad Kázim*; *Tárikh-i-'Álamgír-i-Mir Hāshim*; *Maáṣir-i-'Álamgíri*; *Tárikh-i-'Álamgíri-'Abd ul-Hādí*; *Futúḥāt-i-'Álamgíri*; *Wikáyd-i-Ni'amat Khán 'Alí* (printed repeatedly); *Tárikh-i-Bindrāban*; *Ruk'at-i-'Álamgíri* (printed repeatedly); *Tárikh-i-Dilkushái*?; *Tárikh-i-Mulk-i-'Ashám* (printed at Calcutta); *Wáq'iat-i-'Álamgíri*; *'Azam ul-Ḥarab*?

² The Bengal Asiatic Society, I believe, proposes to publish the whole, as so much objection is raised by the natives to mutilated editions.

period it is the most complete chronicle we have, though it was not commenced till the thirty-second year of Aurangzeb's reign. Subsequent authors do not express any very decided opinion upon the qualifications of Muḥammad Kásim as a historian. The author of the *Mirát ul-'Álam*, however, speaks of him as an author of great erudition, the author of the *Maásir-i-'Álamgiri* has made an abridgement of his work the first portion of his history; and Kháfí Khán, the author of the *Khulāṣat ut-Tawárikh*, has made the *'Álamgir-námah* a chief authority. The *Maásir-i-'Álamgiri* is a small work, but the author had good opportunities of consulting the records of Government, and of obtaining information regarding the events of this reign. 'Abd ur-Raḥmán Bakhtáwar Khán (a eunuch), the distinguished author of the *Mirát ul-'Álam*,¹ was for about thirty years in the service of Aurangzeb, and when he died (1095 A.H.), was Controller of the Household or held some such office (*dároghah-i-khawáṣán*). Muḥammad Sákí was his secretary or head-clerk (*múnshí-i-diwán*). After the death of Bakhtáwar Khán, some changes were made in the household, by which Muḥammad Sákí was appointed keeper of the daily record (*i. e.* of the Emperor's proceedings). His book, therefore, short though it be, as also that portion of the *Mirát ul-'Álam*, which treats of this reign, are valuable authorities for the period.

But the most comprehensive of these histories is the history of Kháfí Khán. This history has been used freely by Elphinstone and other European historians, and is so well known that I might be excused from noticing it in detail; but my object, as before mentioned, is not to catalogue indiscriminately all the authorities for each particular epoch of the Mohammadan period which are extant; but rather to discriminate, if possible, between those authors who had good opportunities of acquiring information about the events they recorded whilst they were actually taking place, and of testing, by personal enquiries from eye-witnesses, the truth of

¹ This author also wrote a work which he entitled *Chahár A'ina*, giving an account of Aurangzeb's four great campaigns; and abridged the *Tárikh-i-A'fí*, and the *Rauzat ul-Aḥbab*, and many other works, which are probably lost.

current reports, and those who were mere transcribers of what they found in the writing of others: Now Kháfí Khán's history is a very important work. There can be no doubt that he was a historian of very great merit, and had singular capabilities for the task he undertook. He was contemporary moreover with Aurangzeb for the greater portion of his reign; and a story is current that he wrote his history during the lifetime of the Emperor, and concealed it until after his death. As far as I can ascertain, there is no truth whatever in this fable, but it has been put forth with so much apparent substantiality, that it is proper to notice it; as there can be no question that a record of events made at the time is of more value than one compiled from memory thirty or forty years after the events occurred, unless such record be supported by some documentary evidence. Mr. Morley, in his catalogue of the MSS. of the Royal Asiatic Society's Library (No. 98, page 100), says:

“The author was of good family, and resided at Delhi in the latter part of Aurangzeb's reign; he composed his history during this period, but owing to the well-known prohibition of this monarch, he concealed his work, and, from some other causes, did not publish it till 1145 A.H. (1732 A.D.). The book was well received on its publication, and from the circumstances of it having been so long concealed (Kháfí) the author received the title of Kháfí Khán.”¹

Mr. Morley would hardly make this statement without some authority, but he has not stated it. I think I have seen it somewhere else, and I have no doubt it had its origin in an imperfect and somewhat ludicrous misinterpretation of what Kháfí Khán himself says, to which has consequently been given a sense the very opposite of its true meaning. Kháfí Khán certainly says that he kept all these things locked up in a box; but it was the box of his “memory.” The passage I allude to is as follows:—

“And, whatsoever, after arriving at the years of intelligence and perception, I had for thirty or forty years seen with my own eyes, and laid up in the strong box of my

¹ See also Note 3, p. 125.

memory, that I have written.¹ And since I heard that Bindrában Dás Bahádur Sháhí, who was long a *Mutaṣaddi* of Sháh 'Álam during the time he was a prince, had compiled a history, and had included in it an account of upwards of thirty years, being exceedingly anxious to see it, I made great search for it. Subsequently when, after great trouble, I obtained a copy, and examined it carefully from beginning to end, in the hope that I might gather the rich fruits of his labours, I discovered that his work did not contain one half of what I had included in my own history."

There might be some apparent reason for Kháfí Khán concealing his work for a year or two after the death of Aurangzeb; but there seems no sound nor apparent reason for his concealing his work for nearly thirty years after that event. If such an assertion can with truth be made of any historian of the period, whose work is extant, it is of the author of the *Madāṣir-i-'Álamgiri*, Musta'id Khán. Of him Kháfí Khán says—and his statement affords pretty good proof of the correctness of my opinion—

"After the expiration of ten years authors were forbidden from writing the events of that just and righteous Emperor's reign; nevertheless some competent persons [did so], and particularly Musta'id Khán, who *secretly* wrote an abridged account of the campaign in the Deccan, simply detailing the conquests of the countries and forts without alluding at all to the misfortunes of the campaign [and Bindrában, who wrote an abridged account of the events of some years of the second and third decades]. I have neither seen nor obtained any history that contains a full and detailed account of the forty remaining years of this reign. Consequently, from the eleventh to the twenty-first year (22nd) of the Emperor's reign, I have not been able to relate the events in the order in which they occurred, giving the month and year; but after this year, with very great labour and pains, I collected information from the papers in the public offices, and by enquiry made from truthful persons, the confidential and old servants of the Emperor and old eunuchs, and what-

آنچه خود بعد حدّ تمیز رسیدن در مدت سی چهل سال برای
العین مشاهده نموده بصندوق حافظه سپرده بود بقید قلم در آورد

soever, etc., I saw with my own eyes, I laid up in the strong box," etc., etc. (*Vide supra*).¹

I would here observe that in editing the *Tārīkh* of *Khāfi Khān* considerable difficulty will be experienced. Copies are very numerous; but, strange to say, no two copies that I have met with—and I have compared five apparently very good MSS.—are exactly alike, while some present such dissimilarities as almost to warrant the supposition that they are distinct works, some passages being quite accurate and others again *entirely* dissimilar. In the copies to be found of Abū'l-Fazl's *Ain-i-Akbarī* and other well known MSS., which have been copied and re-copied repeatedly, we find omissions, and a variety of readings, but not such broadcast discrepancies as I have found in some of the copies of *Khāfi Khān* which I have consulted. From this cause and the general ignorance and carelessness of the

¹ This passage is confused; but I think I have given the author's meaning. The passage is as follows:—

چون بعد انتضای ده سال مورخان ممنوع از تسطیر احوال آن
بادشاه عدالت گستر دین پرور گشتند مگر بعضی مستعد آن خصوص
مستعد خان بطریق خفیه برخی از احوال مهم دکن را مجمل بلا
تذکار مکروهات که همان ذکر فتوحات بلا دو قلاع را بزبان قلم داده
[وبندربان احوال چند سال عشر ثانی و ثالث را مجمل نوشته]
تاریخیکه احوال چهل سال باقی مجمل مفصل دران درج باشد دیده
ویافته نشد لهذا از سنه یازده هجری (?) لغایت بست و یک جلوس
که بضبط تاریخ و سال و ماه بتذکار سوانح حکم رانی عشر ثانی
حضرت خلد مکانی تواند پرداخت سر رشته بدست نتواند آورد

The passage between brackets is in two of the copies I have consulted, but not in a third, nor in the copy of this extract given in the *Siyar al-Mutaakhkharin*, which differs from all three in many respects. The word *هجری* for *جلوس* occurs in three copies. *Khāfi* is a patronymic from *Khwāf*, a district near Nishāpūr; the author's name was Hāshim 'Alī Khān *Khāfi*. The patronymic is a very common one about this period, as Khwājah-i-Jihān *Khwāfi*; Saiyid Amīr Khān *Khāfi*; Shaikh Mīr *Khāfi*; Qalābat Khān Khwājah Mīr *Khwāfi*, etc. Authors write *Khāfi* and *Khwāfi* indiscriminately.

compilers of the only catalogue there is of the MSS. in the valuable library of the Bengal Asiatic Society, two copies of portions of *Kháfí Khán* (Nos. 181 and 382) have been styled the *Tawárikh-i-Bádsháhán-i-Hind wa Dakhan*, and the *Tárikh-i-'A'lamgiri*.

It is proper also to mention another work as an authority to be consulted for the history of this period, as the author stands on the same footing with *Kháfí Khán* as a contemporary historian. With limited funds, however, the publication of the one history must suffice. I allude to the *Tazkirat-us-Saláṭin-i-Chaghatá* of Muḥammad Hádí, styled Kámwár Khán.

I do not know the exact limits of the period within which this author flourished; but it is evident that he was contemporary with Aurangzeb for a considerable portion of his reign, and, for some portion of the time at least, had good opportunities of obtaining accurate information: I find that in the forty-fifth year of this reign he went in company with the Paymaster-General Kifáyat Khán bin Arshad Khán *Kháfí* to Ahmadábád; and as he has brought down his history only to the sixth year of Muḥammad Sháh's reign or A.H. 1136,¹ and *Kháfí Khán* has continued his to the fourteenth year of the same reign, or 1144 A.H., we may conclude that Kámwár Khán was not the later of the two. He opens his history modestly, stating that he commenced it after he had completed the compilation of the *Haft Gulshan*, which treats of the Kings of Delhi, Bengal, Málwa, Dakhan, Multán, Thathah, Kashmír, and the other provinces of Hindustan; and after stating that he commenced this work, the history of the life of Taimúr, he continues:—

“I humbly crave the students of history, regardless of the impropriety of the words I have used or the want of elegance in my style, to take into their consideration, and do me the justice to remember, that without any royal order, and without the aid or assistance of any of the nobles of the times, which in an undertaking of this

¹ So far the Bengal Asiatic Society's copy. Mr. Morley says, the Royal Asiatic Society's copy is continued for another year; and I think the Bengal Asiatic Society's wants a page, though the loss has been ingeniously repaired.

important nature is very necessary, how many nights I have turned into days and *vice versa*, and what anxiety of mind I have suffered, in communicating the information contained in this history in a new form."

The author was appointed Controller of the Household of Prince Muhammad Ibráhím, and received an increase of pay and the title of Kámwár Khán in the second year of the reign of Bahádur Sháh Sháh 'Álam; and he received a Khilat from the king the following year. He was in a position then to know what was going on; and the apparently straightforward manner in which he has written his history inspires the confidence of the reader.

There is another history with a very similar name, which compiled about the same time, viz., the *Tárikh-i-Chaghatái*, by Muḥammad Shaḥī'-i-Ṭahrání whose poetical sobriquet was Wárid. The book is in one volume, and that not very large (668 pages, royal 8vo. 15 lines to a page of large *Nastalík*). It is a very elegant composition, and the record for about twenty or thirty years may be considered that of a contemporary writer. The author says:

"From the year 1100 A.H., the greater portion of what I have recorded I have myself seen, and that which I heard from trustworthy persons I took the utmost pains in sifting and inquiring into, and whatever statements I had the slightest doubt about I discarded. But from the commencement of the war of the late Sultan Muḥammad 'Azam, up to the present time, or for twenty-two years, I have seen everything with my own eyes."

He closes his work with the following statement:—

"In short, after the departure of Nádír Sháh, a Royal order was issued by Muhammad Sháh to the following effect: 'All public officers should occupy themselves in the discharge of their ordinary duties, except the historians. These should refrain from recording the events of my reign, for at present the record cannot be a pleasant one. The reins of Imperial or Supreme Government have fallen from my hands. I am now the Viceroy of Nádír Sháh'; and notwithstanding that, the nobles and great officers of the Court, hearing these melancholy reflections of the Emperor, in many complimentary and flattering speeches recommend him to withdraw this order. His Majesty would not be satisfied. Conse-

quently, being helpless, all the historians obeyed the royal mandate and laid down their pens."

I mention this work as, in consequence of the title, it might be mistaken for the *Taskirah-i-Salâtîni-Chaghatâi*, which is much better known. Elliot, I observe, mentions it amongst the general histories of the House of Taimûr, but as he has not mentioned the *Taskirah* at all, I assume that that is the work he means. The *Maâsir ul-Umarâ*, by Samsâm-ud-Daulah Shâh Nawâz Khân (the later edition by his son 'Abd al-Haijî) affords some valuable information; but this, and latter portions of the *Taskirat us-Salâtîn-i-Chaghatâi*, the *Târikh-i-Chaghatâi*, and the *Târikh-i-Khâfî Khân*, belong to a later period. Khâfî Khân brings his history down to the fourteenth year of the reign of Muḥammad Shâh, 1144 A.H. (A.D. 1731), so that his history gives us a contemporary record of the history of the reigns of seven kings after Aurangzeb, viz., 'Azam Shâh, Bahâdur Shâh, Shâh 'Âlam, ('Azim ush-Shân),¹ Jihândâr Shâh, Muḥammad Farrukh Siyar, Rafî'i ud-Darajât,² Rafî'i ud-Daulat,³ Raushan Akhtar, commonly called Muḥammad Shâh (fourteen years). For the period subsequent to this, I have as yet taken no thought; and I fear it will not be very easy to add many very valuable works. Sir Henry Elliot gives a very long list of histories, but most of them are of little value.

The historians, however, which have been mentioned as completed, and in course of completion, will give as good an account of the reigns of the following sovereigns as can well be obtained from any materials likely to be procured elsewhere, viz. :—

XXXII. Jalâl ud-dîn Muḥammad Akbar.

XXXIII. Nûr ud-dîn Jehângîr.

XXXIV. Shahâb ud-dîn Muḥammad Shâh Jehân.

XXXV. Muḥî ud-dîn Aurangzeb, 'Âlamgîr.⁴

¹ This King sat upon the throne but for a few days.

² Reigned three months and fourteen days.

³ Reigned two months and some days.

⁴ I have omitted here Muḥammad 'Azim Shâh, the second son of Aurangzeb, who held the reins of power for a few months, although he coined money and the *Khutbah* was read in his name. He ascended the throne on the 10th Zi-l-hijjah, A.H. 1118, and was killed in battle 18th Rabi' ul-Awwal, A.H. 1119.

XXXVI. Kutb ud-dín Muḥammad Mu'azzam Sháh 'Álam Bahádur Sháh.

XXXVII. Mu'izz ud-dín Muḥammad Jehándár Sháh.

XXXVIII. ————— Muḥammad Farrukh Siyar.

XXXIX. Abú 'l-Barákat Rafi'i ud-Daraját.

XL. Rafi'i ud-Daulat Sháh Jehán-i-Sáni.

XLI. Raushan Akhtar Muḥammad Sháh (14 years).

To this long list of Emperors, our predecessors in the sovereignty of India, I append a list of the works which contain their history, and which have been published, or are in course of publication, in the Persian series of the *Bibliotheca Indica* of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. The works which have been already published, I print in small capitals, those which are in the press, or about to be published, in italics, and those which have been recommended for publication, but the publication of which has not yet been sanctioned, in plain Roman letters.

1. TÁRÍKH-I-'ÁL-I-SUBUKTAGÍN OF BAIHAQÍ. LIFE OF MAS'ÚD.
2. Táj ul-Maášir, by Hasan Nizámí.
3. TABAKÁT-I-NÁÇIRÍ OF MINHÁJ UD-DÍN JAUZJÁNÍ.
4. TÁRÍKH-I-FÍROZSHÁHÍ OF ZÍÁ-I-BARNÍ.
5. *Continuation of the above, by Shams-i-Siraj 'Afi.*
6. TÁRÍKH-I-SALÁṬÍN-I-AFÁGHANAH OF Aḥmad Yadgár.
7. Tabakát-i-Akbar Sháh of Nizám ud-dín Nakhshohs.
8. MUNTAKHAB UT-TAWÁRÍKH OF BADÁONÍ.
9. ÁIN-I-AKBARÍ OF ABÚ'L-FAZL.
10. IKBÁL-NÁMAH-I-JEHÁNGIRÍ OF MU'TAMAD KHÁN.
11. BÂDShÁH-NÁMAH OF 'ABD AL-ḤAMÍD LÁHORÍ.
12. *Continuation of the above by Muḥammad Wáris.*
13. 'Amal-i-Çáliḥ of Muḥammad Çáliḥ Kambú.
14. 'ÁLAMGÍR-NÁMAH OF MÚNSHÍ KÁSÍM.
15. MAÁŠIR-I-'ÁLAMGIRÍ OF MUSTA'ID KHÁN.
16. Tazkirat us-Saláṭín-i-Chaghatá of Kámwár Khán. One Half.
17. *Muntakhab ul-Lubáb of Kháfi Khán.*

Similarly I have omitted, between Sháh 'Álam Bahádur Sháh and Jehándár Sháh, 'Azím ush-Shán, the son of the former, who reigned one month, fled, and was drowned in crossing the Rávi, one of the rivers of the Panjáb. He ascended the throne on the 19th Muḥarram, and was drowned on the 19th Safar, A.H. 1124.

In addition to the above works, there are available for the purposes of the future historian of India other works which have been published in India and in Europe, many of which I have mentioned in this paper: in the *Tārīkh-i-Yamīnī*, or Life of Maḥmūd of Ghaznī, in Arabic, by Al-'Oṭbī, lithographed at Delhi; the Travels of Ibn Butātah, published in Arabic, with a translation in French, by the Société Asiatique of Paris; the *Tārīkh-i-Tīmūrī*, or Life of Tīmūr Lang, in Arabic, by Ibn 'Arabshāh (Calcutta, 1818); the *Akbar Nāmah* of Abū'l-Faẓl (Lucknow, 1867); the *Tārīkh-i-Firishtah* (Bombay, 1832, and translations by Briggs, Dow, and Scott); *Mirāt-i-Iskandarī*, or an account of the Kings of Guzerat, by Muḥammad Iskandar, (Bombay, 1831); the *Ḥabīb us-Siyar* (Bombay, 1857); *Rauzat uṣ-Ḥafā* (Bombay, 1848); *Tūzak-i-Jehāngīrī* (Allyghur, 1865); *Wikāyā-i-Nī-mat Khān 'Alī* (class book in schools); *Tārīkh-i-A'shām* (Calcutta, 1849); *Tārīkh-i-Nādirī* (Bengal Asiatic Society, 1845); *Durra-i-Nādirī* (Bombay, 1863); *Siyar ul Mutaakhhharīn* (Calcutta, 1836); *Imād us Sa'adat* (Lucknow, lately printed, no date); *Gulistān-i-Raḥmat*; ¹ *Zubdat ut-Tawārīkh*, in Urdū (Calcutta,); *Karnama-i-Haidarī*; *George-nāmah*, or account of the Conquest of India by the English, from the earliest times, in heroic verse (Bombay, 1837).

Doubtless some other works have been printed which I have not got, and which I do not recollect at present; leaving them, however, out of the question we have here a large number of texts containing a vast amount of valuable information regarding the history and people of India, which, if it has been rescued from the dangers incidental to a manuscript literature is still as much a sealed book to the English public as it was before. These books may remain for years on the shelves of the Bengal Asiatic Society's Library, and no one, with the exception of the few German Oriental scholars who make Oriental languages the study or the recreation of their lives, will know any more of them than if

¹ I have no copy of this work to refer to. It contains the history of Ḥafīz Raḥmat Khān, and an account of his war with Subadār of Oudh, assisted by the English, in 1774. The last two or three works all relate to the history of modern times.

they never had been printed. Many of these works, and especially those printed and published by natives of India, may go out of print and be lost. Looking to the supersession of the native classical languages in India by the English language, and the gradual disappearance of men brought up in that school in which Oriental literature was appreciated and cultivated for its own sake, there is little chance of any of them being reprinted.

It seems to me, then, that unless some measure be adopted to secure English translations of these works, our labour will in great part be lost. The books, it is true, will be available for the Orientalist, and will occasionally be dipped into by *savans* to illustrate papers written for literary and scientific journals; but Orientalists are not often historians, and the chief end aimed at in these publications will not be attained. Many of these works are ably written, and most of them contain much that would be read with interest even by the general reader in England if it were available in a European language. But how, by whom, or under whose auspices, are these translations to be made? The "Oriental Translation Fund," which for so many years supplied Orientalists throughout Europe with the means of publishing the Oriental works they translated, and which has bequeathed to posterity such noble monuments of its usefulness, has expired, and I am told for want of support.¹ Much has been done certainly to render the literary treasures of the East more accessible to European scholars, but the mine is by no means exhausted; and it seems to me strange indeed that the more familiar the English become with India and the East the less they seem disposed to drink deep at that fountain of knowledge a draught from which is absolutely necessary to a thorough understanding of the people. But if the Oriental Fund has ceased to exist, there must be very many in England still who are deeply interested in bridging the gulf of ignorance which divides the sympathies of the races which are brought in contact on the plains of India. I cannot but believe that they would sup-

¹ [The unfinished translations of Ibn Khalikan and Tabari are still in course of publication.—Ed.]

port a fund formed to co-operate with the Asiatic Society of Bengal in this good work; and what learned Society more competent or more fit to inaugurate such a movement than the Royal Asiatic Society? Competent Oriental scholars now-a-days are more plentiful in Europe than in India; the greater portion of the texts which are published in the *Bibliotheca Indica* are edited by natives. All Europeans in India, moreover, are overworked; and consequently the few who have the ability have not the leisure to make translations from Persian works. Even the abstracts of the works which the rules of the Society require, have never been written; and if the public look to India for translations, it may be centuries before they see them. If the Royal Asiatic Society, then, would entertain the proposition, and undertake the translation of all the works which are published in the *Bibliotheca*, much profit would be gained.

APPENDIX.

Mr. Hammond has drawn up the subjoined memorandum of the works adverted to in note, page 419, suprâ.—ED.

In 1855 the late Mr. Colvin, then Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Provinces of India, at the suggestion of Mr. Edward Thomas, of the Bengal Civil Service, entrusted to me the task of collecting and collating MSS. of the Moham-medan Historians of India, in continuation of the late Sir Henry Elliot's work.

Accordingly the following MSS. were purchased or borrowed by me :

Tárikh-i-Fíroz-Sháhi of Zíá Barní	6 MSS.
Tárikh-i-Fíroz-Sháhi of Shams Siráj 'Aff	3 „
Ikbál-námah-i-Jihángirí of I'timád Khán	6 „
Túzak-i-Jihángirí, by the Emperor Jihángir	3 „
Maáşir-i-Jihángirí, of Hasnı	1 „
Siyar al-Mutaakhkharín	3 „
Tárikh-i-Ferishtah.....	3 „
Khalácat ut-Tawárikh	2 „

Zubdat ut-Tawárikh of Mír al-Hak̄k, from Mu'izz ud-dín to Akbar	1 MSS.
Zubdat ut-Tawárikh of 'Abd al-Karím, from Muḥammad Sháh to E.I. Company	1 „
Akbar-námah, Part I.	4 „
Idem, Part II.	1 „
Srivánah Akbarí	3 „
Sháh Jahán-námah	1 „
Tárikh-i-Badáuíní	2 „
Maásir 'Alamgírí of Muḥammad Sáki	1 „
'Alamgír-námah Dosálah, by the same	1 „
Maásir 'Alamgírí, by Múnshí Muḥammad Kázim	1 „
Tárikh-i-'Alamgírí, author unknown	1 „
Muntakhab ul-Lubáb.....	1 „
'Ibrat-námah, Vol. II.	1 „
Tárikh-i-Muzaffarí	3 „
Tabakát-i-Jímúriah (abstract of Vol. I.)	1 „
Zafar-námah	1 „
Túzak-i-Tímúrí, by Amír Tímúr	2 „
Tárikh-i-Tímúrí (by ?)	1 „
Malfúzát Amír Tímúr, by Muḥammad Afzal	1 „
Nádir az-Zamání, by Múnshí Mehdí	3 „
Khalácat ut-Tawárikh	3 „
Hadikat al-Akálím	1 „
Idem, abstract of	1 „
Makhzan-i-Afghání	1 „
Maásir al Umará	1 „
(? ? ?) Sikandarí	1 „
Tárikh Mamálik-i-Hind	1 „
Total.....	67 MSS.

The MSS. of Zíá Barní's *Tárikh-i-Fíroz-Sháhi* were carefully collated, under my supervision, by Moulví Faiz Aḥmad, Serishtahdár of the Board of Revenue at Agra, a man well versed in Oriental literature, a good Persian and Arabic scholar, and much employed by the late Sir Henry Elliot. He disappeared during the mutinies, and I never could ascertain any particulars regarding his fate. In collating the MSS. he was assisted by two competent Moonshís. One copy of Zíá Barní's history, belonging to Sayyid Aḥmad, was

prepared for press, and (I believe) formed the basis of the text lately printed from in Calcutta. This and one other MS. of Zíá Barní alone escaped. All the others were placed by me in a strong chest on leaving India in 1856, and were deposited in the Record Office of the Board of Revenue at Agra, which edifice was burnt during the mutinies. There were in the same box some MSS. of Arabic and Persian Dictionaries.

The MSS. of Shams-i-Siráj 'Afif's history were also collated, and some others commenced upon. I defrayed from my private means all expenses of collection or collation of the MSS. herein referred to. I have no idea whether any grant for purposes of publication was subsequently made by the Government of India.

H. W. HAMMOND,
Late Bengal C.S.

PRISTON, 27th July, 1868.