ART. XXIII.—*Further Notes on the MSS. of the Turkī Text of Bābar's Memoirs.* By ANNETTE S. BEVERIDGE.

For convenience of reference, the following list of MSS. which have existed or do exist is reproduced from the J.R.A.S., July, 1900 :—

- I. *Bābar's autograph MS.*
- II. *Khwāja Kilān's MS.*
- III. (*Humāyūn's transcript.*)
- IV. *Elphinstone MS.*
- V. *British Museum MS.*
- VI. *India Office MS. (Bib. Leydeniana).*
- VII. *Asiatic Society of Bengal MS.*
- VIII. *Mysore MS. (Tipū's).*
- IX. *Bibliotheca Lindesiana MS.*
- X. *Hyderābād MS.*
- XI. *St. Petersburg University Library MS.*
- XII. *St. Petersburg Foreign Office MS.*
- XIII. *St. Petersburg Asiatic Museum MS. (Senkovski).*
- XIV. *Bukhārā MS.*
- XV. *Nazar Bay Turkestānī MS.*

IV. *Elphinstone MS.*

What I have learned of this text since July 1900, increases regret for its disappearance.¹ For by a curious coincidence it would seem to have been used, not only by Dr. Leyden for his English translation, but also for the two

¹ In Notes, J.R.A.S., July, 1900, p. 452, reference is made to an uncatalogued manuscript collection in the Advocates' Library. I have now ascertained that this is one of recently acquired Scottish MSS., and that it does not include any Oriental MSS.

Persian versions, *i.e.*, that of Mirzā Pāyanda Muḥammad and Muḥammad Qulī, finished 1586, and that reputed to be by 'Abdu-r-raḥīm Mirzā and presented to Akbar in 1590.

This supposition rests on the following points of identical content or gap:—

(1) The Elphinstone has lost the concluding part of A.H. 908. This is given both in No. X and No. XII.

The score of Persian MSS. which I have examined and also the regal Ulwar copy which Mr. Beveridge has seen, all lack this same part. Pāyanda Ḥasan's version, moreover, contains the identical scribe's note which Dr. Leyden has translated and commented on. (Mems., 122.)

(2) The Elphinstone does not contain the full account of Hindāl's adoption which is in No. XII, and with brief omission in No. X. Nor do the Persian MSS. contain it.

(3) The Elphinstone contains the "shaving passage" signed by Humāyūn. (Cf. J.R.A.S., July, 1900.) It is not in No. X or in No. XII.

It occurs in every one of a score of reputed 'Abdu-r-raḥīm versions. Pāyanda Ḥasan does not include the chapter in which it might occur.

(4) The Elphinstone does not contain the account of the Indian revenues (A.H. 932). Nor does any one of a score of Persian MSS. This is in No. X and No. XII.

Other less important points of identity could be mentioned, but the four cited suffice, when taken with Mr. Erskine's statement that the Elphinstone contains two marginal notes made by Humāyūn, to establish a probability that the Elphinstone was Humāyūn's own book, and the very MS. used for the two Persian translations made under Akbar.

Without seeing the Elphinstone so as to be sure that Humāyūn's notes are truly marginal and autographic, and are not merely interpolations, one cannot go beyond "probability" in the matter, but support is given to the probability by two other circumstances. (1) No Persian text reproduces the *amratphul* note. (Mems., 329 n.) Had it been *interpolated* in the text and not marginal, it would have been copied with the rest (cf. *infra* on this note).

(2) No other Turkī text which has the characteristics of the Elphinstone in notes and *lacunæ* has come to light. It is easy to understand tatters and tears in Humāyūn's library, because it was subjected to much hard travel—one story of its loss and recovery is historical—it will have gone where the royal exile went; the date of the “shaving passage” is that of the stay in Kābul (cir. 1553) before the Restoration.

It is not easy to understand why the Persian translations were made only from an incomplete Turkī text. But there is the fact. The scribe of the Elphinstone, if one may judge from the translation, has not made any lament over gaps excepting the one of 908 H. This silence allows a conjecture (*a*) that he knew of the existence in Bābar's work of the missing portion, and that he was aware the gap was caused by lost pages; (*b*) that he acquiesced in some other *lacunæ* in the narrative, because they were left blank by Bābar; and (*c*) that some of the *lacunæ* found by Leyden and Erskine in the Elphinstone have been caused by loss of pages subsequent to the Persian translation.

Although I have not been able to trace the Elphinstone MS., I have found, in Persian, a passage it contained, *i.e.* the *amratphul* note (Mems., 329 n.), which Mr. Erskine attributes to Humāyūn. This is bound up in one of Mr. Erskine's volumes of manuscript remains (B.M. Add. 26,605, p. 88). It is not, either in this copy or in Mr. Erskine's English reproduction, in any way authenticated as Humāyūn. His “shaving note” is signed *harara-hu* Muḥ. Humāyūn (Mems., 304; cf. Notes, J.R.A.S., July, 1900). The expression in it “dar zamān-i-mā” shows it to be a royal entry, but its non-appearance in the Persian translation and its disrespectful tone, so unlike that of the first note in which Humāyūn speaks of his father, suggest that it is Jahāngir's or perhaps Shāh-jahān's.

X. *Hyderābād MS. (Library of the late Sir Salar Jung).*

It was my good fortune to hear of this valuable MS. through Mr. Beveridge, and I have now had an opportunity

of examining it, an advantage I owe to the kind help of Shamsu'l-'ulama Sayyid 'Alī *Bilgrāmī*. For it is the first complete Turkī text of the *Bābar-nāma* (*Tūzūk-i-bābarī*) which I have found existing "under the flag," and equalling, if not excelling, the St. Petersburg texts.¹ No public library in England or in India owns a MS. that approaches it for completeness; of the two St. Petersburg MSS. which carry the narrative down to A.H. 936 (Mems., 425), *i.e.* No. XI and No. XII, it is distinctly superior to the latter, as being oriental and a good text, and at least the equal of No. XI, concerning which some details have not reached me which would allow closer comparison. It may be the equal of the renowned Bukhārā MS., but of this text only the high reputation is known, a reputation fully established in India amongst the early workers on the *Bābar-nāma* in the nineteenth century, when there was talk amongst Elphinstone, Leyden, and Erskine of obtaining a copy from it.

No. X measures $7\frac{1}{4}$ inches by 4 inches; is bound in red leather, gold-lined; has been rebound; and has been worm-eaten both before and since the rebinding. It contains 382 folios, and on each page are 14 lines. It is written in Nastaliq and by two hands, neatly and without appearance of haste, but the concluding pages are less neat and less leisurely than the great bulk of the work. There is no adornment of any kind in the MS.; there is no distinction in the handwriting such as marks the beautiful Turkī *Tūzūk* (A.D. 1629–30) and its Persian rendering (A.D. 1638–9) of 'Alī'l-kashmīrī. Mr. Alexander G. Ellis estimates the date of its transcription as being about A.D. 1700. The quality of the paper precludes the sixteenth century.

The obverse of the first folio of the MS. is inscribed with *Kitāb-i-bābar-nāma ba zabān-i-turkī*; with an Arabic press-mark (?) in pencil, "3-16"; an ink entry in English,

¹ I have collated it with Leyden and Erskine—page by page or more, frequently. Twenty lines of L. and E. enclose fourteen (one page) of No. X, the average being somewhat less. With the exceptions, large and small, mentioned in the text, the copies are identical.

"S.R. 35," which is remarkably like Mr. Erskine's writing of about the same date (B.M. Add. 26,605); and one in Raqam — pencilled and deleted — "35." On the reverse of the last folio is scribbled what may be *Hāfiẓ*.

On the page bearing the title there appears also a seal, and this is impressed again on the last page of the text. It is that of the father or grandfather of Sir Salar Jung, an oblong with the inscription *Munīru'l-mulk*, A.H. 1206 (A.D. 1791). The second impression has been made in the space between the end of A.H. 935 and the beginning of A.H. 936, but nothing as to the date of transcription can be inferred from this interpolated position, because spaces similar to this one occur at the end of other years.

Under the lining-paper of the boards are sheets inscribed, as Mr. Blumhardt has kindly informed me, with shopkeepers' accounts in the commercial Nagari of Central India, of date about A.D. 1800. This date agrees with that on the seal, and is probably the approximate date of acquisition by Sir Salar Jung's ancestor, and of the repair and rebinding of the book.

The text opens with a plain bismillāh, and, like the Elphinstone, but varying from Kehr, with the words, "In the month of Ramzān." Even a cursory examination has shown me that its variants in proper names are useful both biographically and orthographically. Moreover, it gives in pure Turkī some passages which are corrupt and alloyed, or pieced out with Persian in Kehr's text. It contains all that Leyden and Erskine gathered from the Elphinstone and their two Persian MSS., and over and above this, the concluding portion of A.H. 908, the longer account of Hindāl's adoption, several short passages which are omitted in the Memoirs and the Persian sources, and the revenue account of India, set down, moreover, by an Oriental.

No. X is a veritable *trouvaille*. Its excellence and rarity claim reproduction in facsimile, since there are so very few texts of equal merit and volume that Bābar's book might easily be lost for ever. At the present time Ilminski's imprint, the reproduction of a western and defective text, is only to be purchased as a rarity; and there is no complete

Turkī text accessible to students either in England or India. As is known to many of his friends, the late Mr. John Beames occupied the closing months of his life with work on the *Bābar-nāma*, but there was no Turkī text of critical value for his use more accessible than in St. Petersburg. He had heard with pleasure of the excellence of the Hyderābād, and I had hoped to enable him to use it, even in his invalid retirement, by a photographic reproduction which I desire to carry out.

Every MS. has its points of human interest. Here is one in No. X, a minor matter, but showing a thought of the scribe. Sultān Aḥmad Mirzā is said by Bābar to have had three daughters by Pasha Begam, but particulars are given of one only, the eldest. This silence as to the others seemed to me as unnatural as it was inconvenient, because one of the *anonyma* was, I believed, a wife of Bābar. Now I find from No. X that its scribe, like myself, thought some further particulars were needed, for he has left a blank space where they should come in. (Cf. *Memoirs*, 30 : No. X, f. 27a.)

Here is another and somewhat similar point. Mr. Erskine is fully borne out by No. X in his supposition (*Mems.*, 230, l. 4 and n.) that Bābar may have omitted the name which is missing here, for No. X (211b) has a space of about an inch where it should come in. There is another instance of this expectancy on the scribe's part that something would fill the blank. Or possibly in both cases the royal writing was illegible.

A curious little variant, which may be due to reconsideration on Bābar's own part, is contained in the narrative of Hindāl's pre-natal adoption by Māham. Kehr has a long account of this, and includes in it a quaint taking of omens as to the sex of the coming child. No. X has the same account, minus the casting of the fates.

Neither of Humāyūn's notes occurs in No. X, which at the point where the Elphinstone contains the "shaving passage" runs on from "*Raḥmat piāda*" to the "sun in Aries." As has been already said, these notes appear in no Turkī text examined by me, except the Elphinstone. There

seem good grounds for leaving the *amratphul* note out of consideration here, for it is not known to us to be Humāyūn's, and it occurs only in the Elphinstone so far as we know. But the first of the notes attributed to Humāyūn, the "shaving passage," is of great interest in the genealogy of the Turkī and Persian texts. It divides them into two branches, the Elphinstone and its descendants in Persian, and (as a minimum) the Kehr, with Ilminski's imprint and its French descendant, and the Hyderābād.

ERRATA IN NOTES, JULY, 1900.

p. 450, l. 4, B.M. 16,623. Read 201*b*.

p. 450, l. 8, Bodl. 405. Read 263*b*.

p. 455. The I.O. number of the *Tūzūk-i-bābarī* here given as No. 178.

This is a mistake; it should be No. 214 *passim* (Ethé's Cat.).