XXVII.

THE HAYDARABAD CODEX OF THE BABAR-NAMA OR
WAQI'AT-I-BABARI OF ZAHIRU-D-DIN MUHAMMAD
BABAR, BARLAS TURK;

KING OF FARGHĀNA 1494-1502 (899-908 H.); KING OF
KĀBUL 1504-1530 (910-937 H.); FIRST TĪMŪRID EMPEROR
OF HINDŪSTĀN 1526-1530 (932-937 H.).

By ANNETTE S. BEVERIDGE.

THIS article carries on and amends my notes on the Turkī manuscripts of the *Bābar-nāma* which appeared in this Journal in July 1900, and July 1902. It serves too, as broader basis to the formal preface of the photographic reproduction of the Haydarābād Codex which has been published recently under the E. J. W. Gibb Memorial Trust.

Several circumstances lead to the opinion that few copies of the original Turkī text of Bābar's book have ever existed; of those known by me to survive, the Haydarābād Codex only is at once good, complete and accessible. It is not too much to say therefore, that to multiply copies of it had become a literary necessity of the first importance. This has been accomplished in the reproduction just mentioned.

The chief aim of this article is to define the rank of the Haydarābād Codex; this done, it will be made clear that the first form of the Emperor's famous work was in real peril of extinction. Information about the *Bābar-nāma* is both scant and sparse; it will be useful therefore, if I set down here what I have learned about its history, its manuscripts, and the work done and to be done upon them.

On the book as a Turkī classic, scholars have passed judgment. On its author comment is equally needless; he speaks for himself and has witness in the labours he has inspired—Persian, German, English, Russian, and French.

THE BOOK.

The publication of the *Babār-nāma* obliges selection amongst the names by which Bābar's autobiographical writings have been mentioned in literature or described casually on the fly-leaves of manuscripts. The rank of the Haydarābād Codex will give weight to the title chosen to distinguish its replica, and there appears to be firm ground on which to base a rule and thus to work against confusion.

Three names are in common and indiscriminate use for the Turkī and Persian texts—*Wāqi'āt-i-bābarī*, *Bābar-nāma*, and *Tūzūk-i-bābarī*. Of these, the first has the best claim to distinguish the Turkī original, because Bābar speaks of his writings as *Wāqi'* (f. 363¹), and Gul-badan Begam calls them *Wāqi'a-nāma* (*Humāyūn-nāma*, f. 2b). But a modern tendency to define the Persian text as *Wāqi'āt-i-bābarī* has set in, and this precision is so useful that it dictates the use of the second good name, *Bābar-nāma*, to distinguish the Turkī text. Another advantage of thus appropriating the word *Bābar-nāma* is that it brings the recently effected reproduction under a rule already established in the Russian libraries, where three Turkī transcripts are catalogued under it. A somewhat early use of this title for Bābar's book is made by Khāfi Khān, and it is moreover the name which stands upon the reverse of the first page of the Haydarābād manuscript.

Those who know the use in India of the word *tūzūk*, in some one or other of its narrowed vocal forms, may question the propriety of its rejection as a title for Bābar's book. They may do this the more because by it Mr. Erskine mentions the Elphinstone MS., and because it is inscribed in at least one other Indian *Bābar-nāma*. There is however, a simple and valid ground for its rejection here: its use would not accord with its Turkī meaning.

In the "Fragments" which are attached to two Russian manuscripts, the word *Bābariyyah* occurs. Its weight is light; it is not used in an integral part of the *Bābar-nāma*.

¹ All such references are to the Haydarābād MS. and its reproduction.

With economy of words in view, it may be recalled here that the English translation is the *Memoirs*,¹ and the French *Les Mémoires*²; also that European writers have mentioned the *Bābar-nāma* as “Commentaries” and “Institutes.”

The *Bābar-nāma* is by no means exclusively autobiographical, but contains much general information about matters that interested its author. Nor is it a continuous or uniform narrative, since it is broken by lacunæ and is clean cut into two sections by change of style. This change is made on January 3rd, 1519 (Muḥarram 1, 925 H.); what precedes is a well-wrought narrative; what follows is a diary which varies in fulness, and which bears marks of a daily record in its unevenness and want of proportion. Judged from the literary standpoint, the book deteriorates therefore, after the close of the first section. This is a fact of enlightening value as to the often discussed cause of the first lacuna.

All Turkī manuscripts yet found in India open without preamble, but the three of St. Petersburg have a few words of invocation, to which one, the Senkovski, adds a considerable preamble of praise and prayer.

The first section of the book, with the exception of one year (909 H.), is a continuous narrative of the period from Bābar's accession in Fargḥāna, on June 10th, 1494 (Ramazān 5, 899 H.), to a point within 1508 (914 H.), where it breaks off in the middle of a sentence. No known manuscript goes beyond the Haydarābād here (f. 216b) and, as this first section was written at the end of Bābar's life, it may be that the broken sentence was his last.

The second section opens in Bābar's plain fashion, without a word to indicate that here is, or is not, his first attempt to keep a diary. It begins on January 3rd, 1519 (Muḥarram 1, 925 H.), runs on for thirteen months, breaks off for almost

¹ “Memoirs of Zehir-ed-din Muhammad Babar, Emperor of Hindustan.” Written by himself in the Jagḥatai Turki, and translated, partly by the late John Leyden, Esq., M.D., partly by William Erskine, Esq. London, 1826.

² “Mémoires de Babar (Zahir-ed-din Mohammed), traduits pour la première fois sur le texte jagatai,” par A. Pavet de Courteille. Paris, 1871.

six years, starts again on November 17th, 1525 (Şafar 3, 932 H.) and, with slight omissions of record, goes on to September 9th, 1529 (Muḥarram 3, 936 H.), that is, to within some sixteen months of Bābar's death.

The Emperor's book, therefore, contains some fifteen years of biographical narrative and some five of diary, the first filling 217 folios of the Haydarābād Codex, the second 165.

As diaries fix their own dates, it is only necessary to consider at what time the narrative section was composed. Upon internal evidence Mr. Erskine assigned this to Bābar's later years, and the testimony which has gathered since he wrote supports this view. There are varied grounds for the assignment: the general one, that the charm of autobiography most allures successful men and would most allure Bābar when, in 1527 (933 H.), he looked back along his life through the roseate mist of the signal success which realized a long desire; the particular ones, that the narrative section contains numerous references to incidents recorded in the diary later than September 1527 (933 H.)¹; that there is a reference under date March 5th, 1529 (Jumāda II, 5, 935 H.), to the *Wāqi'* as being then in writing; and that Gul-badan describes a visit to Sikrī, where she saw a building in which her father "used to write his book" (*muṣḥaf*). This visit can have been made only late in 1529, because she came to Āgra from Kābul with Māham Begam, arrived on June 27th, 1529 (Shawāl 19, 935 H.), spent what she calls three months in the capital, and then first went to Sikrī. The last entry of Bābar's diary is dated September 7th, 1529 (Muḥarram 3, 936 H.). This leads to the opinion that even if his later entries were not made on or about the days of their dates—as they presumably were—the *muṣḥaf* she saw her father write was the narrative and not his diary.

The gaps in Bābar's record require consideration chiefly because inferences have been drawn from them which reflect upon his character as a frank and honest man.

¹ Cf. index *s.n.* Muḥ. Sl. *Bāyqarā*, Qāsim Sl. *Bāyqarā*, the several sons of the Little Khān, [Aḥmad *Chaghatāy*] Abū'l-faṭḥ *Turkmān*, etc.

It will be convenient to enumerate them in a form allowing easy reference and approximately in the order of their importance. They are as follows:—

- A. From within 914 H. to the end of 924 H. (1508 to January 2nd, 1519)—a stretch of over nine years.
- B. From early in Šafar 926 H. to Šafar 1, 932 H. (January 25th, 1520, to November 17th, 1525)—a period of almost six years.
- C. From Muḥarram 3, 936 H., to Jumāda I, 6, 937 H. (September 7th, 1529, to December 27th, 1530), the date of Bābar's death—a length of almost sixteen months.
- D. From about the middle to the end of 934 H. (April to September, 1528).

All the above occur after the end of the narrative section, and no material is known to fill their blanks.

- E. Part of 908 H. and the whole of 909 H. (1503–4). This falls within the first section, and Bābar's own doings are summarised elsewhere (text f. 3b).

The tenour of comment made upon the gaps which have been named above, is that as we have them, so Bābar left them, and that at least one—the first in my list—was so left deliberately and with intention to suppress unwelcome matter.¹

The impressions of long acquaintance with his book do not support an attribution of blame about any of the gaps. No one has been in a better position to judge justly on such a point than Mr. Erskine, and he does not accuse Bābar of suppression.

Perhaps the blame attributed by several writers to Bābar is the outcome of a dependent habit which, without return to the source of correct estimate, hands on slightly based notions through literature. Bābar's book is presented usually as an

¹ As an example of this, a few words may be quoted from Dr. Reginald Stuart Poole's preface to the Catalogue of the Coins of the Shāhs of Persia (xxix). Dr. Poole, having discussed a gold coin which indicates that Bābar acknowledged the suzerainty of Shāh Ismā'il *Šafawī*, adds: "We can now understand the omission in Bābar's 'Memoirs' of the occurrences which fell between the beginning of 914 H. and that of 925 H."

autobiography from which he has omitted the record of certain years; it is criticised adversely, and blame is attributed as though it were a composed and considered book. This it certainly is not; it is, in truth, a group of three fragments, two of which are a diary and one a narrative. What stands first in all versions of the *Bābar-nāma*, and is the record of his earlier years, was written eight years later than the thirteen (lunar) months' fragment of his diary that follows it. The second length of diary partly coincides in date of composition with the narrative, is probably partly earlier, and breaks off some sixteen months before Bābar's death—months during which there is good ground for believing he was occupied in the composition of the first section of the book (i.e. the narrative).

It is tolerably safe to say that both lengths of diary were with Bābar in Hindūstān; they were associated in his possession with the *Wāqi'* he was writing; they have remained so associated and they are its only known sequel. But these diaries are no integral part of his composed autobiography; they are rough material; they might have been incorporated if he had carried on his narrative; they remain unworked, awaiting the dead hand of the craftsman.

This analysis of the book explains lacuna A as simply due to Bābar's death.

It may be urged however, by those who blame him, that this gap is not due to failure to progress beyond the broken passage of 1508 (914 H.), but to rejection by Bābar of his diary antecedent to 1519 (925 H.).

Natural as is the supposition that Bābar would keep a diary from the time of his conquest of Kābul in 1504 (910 H.) and after the custom of kings, it must be said that nothing is known which shows that he did so earlier than 1519 (925 H.). Let it be assumed however, that he had kept one, and that when he was composing his autobiography in Hindūstān, he was in a position to choose from it what to preserve and what to suppress, just as a person might do to-day if he feared the evil day of publication of his affairs. What was there to lead him to destroy the

record of almost nine years? Was there nothing done in these parallel to events chronicled? Were there no triumphs of which he might be proud? Assuredly there was much to tempt recital. In those unrecorded years he put down the Mughūl Rebellion of 914 H. with acts of daring personal bravery, himself five times the champion of his cause in single combat; he crushed another revolt of the same faithless horde in 920 H.; he was the thrice-crowned king of Samarqand, with lands that stretched from Tartary to Ghaznī;¹ he was King of Kābul throughout the missing period; during five of its years he kept backward pressure on the tribes that hemmed him round; he took the forward steps which later gave him Qandahār; moreover, in it there were sons born to him—Kāmran and ‘Askari—and several daughters, home events these such as he is apt to chronicle.

The gap includes also defeat and loss of Samarqand, coquetry with Shi‘a heresy and relations with Shāh Ismā‘il. As there is this gap, history fails us, for Bābar was both maker and writer of the history of his time. How a man of whom nothing is known will deal with untoward topics is matter of pure surmise. Of Bābar it is known that he was a frank and fearless writer who did not spare to blame himself, and who, in a considered narrative, has written down much defeat and misery. That he would blot out record is not a just inference from what is known of him as man and author.

The second gap is more difficult to explain than the first, because it occurs in the diary, and there seems no reason why the habit of a daily chronicle should be laid aside by a man whose interest in letters was not casual. That there was no remission in Bābar’s literary activities is clear from the fact that within this gap, in 1522 (928 H.), he produced a religious poem of 2,000 lines on the Muḥammadan faith.² It is not

¹ “History of India—Bābar and Humāyūn.” William Erskine; London, 1854, vol. i, p. 339.

² I am indebted to my husband for details about this poem. It is the *Mubīn*, of which half has been published by Professor Bézine in his *Chrestomathie Turque*. It has been described by Dr. Sprenger in the Z.D.M.G., xvi (1862), p. 87, and as highly orthodox. It is mentioned by Abū’l-faḥl when enumerating the writings of Bābar (*Akbar-nāma*, H. Beveridge, i, 278), in the “Fragments” (Pavet de Courteille, ii, 461), and by Teufel (Z.D.M.G., 1883, p. 141). It is quoted from by Bābar (i. 351b).

as though he had lived a life too dull to stimulate record; the silent years were full and stirring, much on the march or in camp it is true, but so were those earlier and later. Like any other considerable length of his life, this was a tissue of triumph and failure and held some lasting success.

In truth, it is the presence in Hindūstān of the thirteen months' fragment of diary which makes explanation of its succeeding gap difficult. But for this, an earlier diary than that of 1526 (932 H.) might be supposed kept and left behind in Kābul when Bābar set out on his last expedition to Hindūstān; or it might be thought that no earlier diary had been kept, in which case lacuna B would be explainable, like lacuna A, by death.

The cause of lacuna C may well be personal. It is a matter of history that Bābar withdrew from active part in public affairs some time before his death. His family, Māham, Dil-dār and his girls, had joined him after some years of absence; there were excursions made together; he was working on his autobiography; he was, as Gul-badan says, "awearied of ruling and reigning," and thought of abdication; a son, Alwār, died; Humāyūn fell grievously ill; then came Bābar's self-dedication, last illness, and the end.

To drop a record of events in which he had little part was the outcome of his circumstances.

The six months' gap of 1528 (934 H.) suggests no reason for its occurrence. It would suit, but it would not be warranted, to attribute it to loss in a storm of May 26th, 1529 (Ramazān 16, 935 H.), which blew down Bābar's tent and scattered his papers, so that they were soaked and were gathered in again with difficulty.

The blank of June, 1503 *cir.* to June, 1504 (end of 908 H. and 909 H.), has accretions of some interest. Occurring as it does within the considered narrative, it may be deliberate, and this because its record is summarised elsewhere (f. 3b), or because it, Bābar's twenty-second year, was one of destitution and homeless wandering.

The Haydarābād MS. gives a hint that Bābar once wrote or meant to write the record of this year. It is but faint, the

involved dates are uncertain, and it may be nothing, but it deserves attention both as conveyed by a careful scribe and, as may be inferred from other instances of what look like exact copying, because it is derived from that scribe's good source.

On f. 120 of the text the second and third lines contain the statement that Bābar quitted Farghāna for Khurāsān. It is natural to regard the two lines as recording the same act, but this is not necessarily so, because Bābar's acts may well have allowed the two departures mentioned below.

In the end of 908 H., but not chronicled by Bābar, there occurred the defeat of the Khāns by *Shaybānī* in the Akhsi territory, which led Bābar, who escaped capture, to take refuge in the hills of Asfera. He tried in vain to leave that region, and was hunted from place to place by *Shaybānī* for "as much as a year." When he first found himself separated from his uncles and without following, he would and did try to get away. This must have been early in 909 H.; his actual escape for Khurāsān was in 910 H. The two statements vary in a slight fashion which suits the facts. In 909 H. he was an exile and without much following, but he had just left a hospitable base and must have fled from the rout on horseback. He "mounted" to ride forth. When he started in 910 H., after his year of destitution and harassment amongst the hills, he was in far worse case (3*b*); he had with him a ragged crew, "mostly on foot." There is no word of "mounting."

So far as I have been able to examine, this hint is given only by the Haydarābād MS.; it adds to the testimony detailed later, that this may be a transcript made direct from Bābar's autograph manuscript. I must add however, that if further research show there can be nothing in the doubled statement, this will not weaken the scribe's position for care; it will dissipate only my small surmise. The period concerned has not been written of fully, and at least I have advanced nothing which is contradicted by Mr. Erskine's "Life of Bābar."

At this point (909 H.) I shall take leave for a short excursion amongst the manuscripts.

The Memoirs and its bases, the Elphinstone and the 'Abdu'r-raḥīm Codices, have all lost some part of the record of 908 H. The last topic of this year in the fullest known transcripts is an expression of resolve by Bābar to go to Khurāsān. Mr. Erskine did not see all the record of 908 H., or know of Bābar's resolve. He places the departure, with historical correctness, under 910 H. Dr. Ilminsky, on the other hand, had before him the full record of 908 H., and started the exile off at once in 909 H. He (perhaps Dr. Kehr) made a little chronological slip because he had the better text before him; it would not be easy to divine, without more historical touch than Dr. Ilminsky lays claim to possess, that an expressed intention of departure would wait through a blank year for fulfilment.

What has just been said illustrates the singular extent to which work on Bābar's book has been done on single Turkī transcripts and without collation. That this has been so enhances the value of the Haydarābād replica, and supports the opinion that few Turkī copies were ever made.

What will now be said on single-text work is surprising, but it rests on a good basis and is easily tested. If we begin with what may be grouped as the Indian work on the *Bābar-nāma*, we find that from one and the same mutilated manuscript, which was the Elphinstone or its exact replica, were made both the Persian translations, i.e. those of 1586 and 1590. This same Turkī copy, or its Persian rendering, is all of Turkī that is behind the Memoirs. Upon it Humāyūn made his note, *sub anno* 932 H., and on it a later emperor, who may well be Shāh-jahān, made his, *s.a.* 935 H.

If we now turn to the stream of work which has issued from a Russian source, we find that behind Ilminsky's imprint, Pavet de Courteille's French translation and Teufel's discussion of the "Fragments," there is no other Turkī basis than the defective but valuable transcript made by Kehr.

A modern worker enjoys an unearned increment of ease and opportunity through spread of information and by numerous small *agréments* of civilisation and courtesy. This advantage is emphasised by the facts that when

Mr. Elphinstone, in India, was sending to Bukhārā in 1813 for a *Bābar-nāma*, the Haydarābād MS. had been settled long in its Dakhin home; and when Dr. Ilminsky, in Russia, had to say he did not know Dr. Kehr's source, the Senkovski, text and colophon of which are guideposts to Bukhārā, was in St. Petersburg.

Mr. Erskine worked from two Persian manuscripts, one not first-rate, the other far below it; his Turkī source was very incomplete through mutilation. To-day a score of Persian copies, some of the highest rank, can be consulted with ease; and without leaving England, I have examined seven out of the eight accessible Turkī examples.

THE MANUSCRIPTS.

I shall now endeavour to show that of the Turkī manuscripts available, the Haydarābād Codex only is worthy of reproduction. The following table enumerates all of which I have heard, and gives of these, particulars such as to allow comparison of decisive points, while further details are grouped later under the head of each transcript.

The number of manuscripts tabulated is thirteen. Of these two have eluded my search altogether; a third is well known, but missing from its assigned place; a fourth and fifth are known only through their descendants, which are imperfect; a sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth are defective or incomplete, or both; an eleventh¹ is complete,² western and defective; a twelfth appears to be a transcript of the last-named, shares its defects, and is modern; the thirteenth is complete, well-preserved, careful, and is the Haydarābād Codex.

¹ By the kindness of Professor C. Salemann and Dr. Alexander Kreisberg, Nos. 11 and 12 were lent for my use in the India Office, where I am indebted to Mr. F. W. Thomas for taking them into his charge.

² By 'complete' is meant here, with minor omissions but a transcript of the whole book, not a copy of a part.

TABLE OF THE TURKI MSS. KNOWN TO HAVE EXISTED.

	DATE OF COMPLETION.	NUMBER OF FOLIOS. ¹	LOCATION.	NAME OF SCRIBES.	WHY INELIGIBLE FOR REPRODUCTION.
1. Babar's autograph MS. ...	Conjectural, 937 H. (1530).	At least 382.	Not known, 1905.	Bābar.	Not known to exist.
2. Khwāja Kalān <i>Ahrārī's</i> MS.	935 H. (1528).	At most 363.	Āgra, 1529.	Unknown.	Not known to exist.
3. Elphinstone MS. ...	Conjectural only.	In 1816, 289.	Edinburgh, 1842 and 1843; missing, 1905.	Conjectural only.	Missing and mutilated.
4. Bukhārā MS. ...	Uncertain, 1026 H. or 1126 H. (1617 or 1714).	Approx. and conj., 382.	Reputed in Bukhārā, 1900.	Unknown.	Not available; copies defective.
5. British Museum MS. ...	1039 H. (1629-1630).	97.	British Museum, 1905.	Dāwūd bin 'Alr'u'l-kashmirī.	Fragments only.
6. Nizār Bāy's MS. ...	Rajab 5, 1121 H. (Aug. 31, 1709).	Unknown: its copy has 215.	Owned by a Bukhariot, 1824.	'Abdu'l-wahhāb <i>Ghājdawānī</i> .	Not known to exist; copy partial only.
7. Kehr's Transcript, St. P. Foreign Office.	1150 H. (1737).	Approximate, 382.	St. Petersburg, 1905.	George Jacob Kehr.	Defective and western.
8. John Rylands Library MS. (<i>Bib. Lindesiana</i>).	Scribe alive in 1035 H. (1625).	71.	Manchester, 1905.	Nūr Muhammad, nephew of Abū'l-faḡl.	A partial transcript.
9. Asiatic Society of Bengal MS., conj. the Mysore.	Conjectural only, 1780 A.D. to 1800 A.D.	Approximate, 222.	Calcutta, 1900, and presumably 1905.	Unsigned.	Defective.
10. India Office MS. (<i>Bib. Leydeniana</i>).	Between 1805 and 1811.	Approximate, 222.	London, 1905.	Unsigned.	Defective.
11. Senkovski MS., St. P. Asiatic Museum.	Ramāzān 5, 1239 H. (May 4, 1824).	215.	St. Petersburg, 1905.	Joseph Ivanovitch Senkovski.	A partial transcript.
12. St. P. University MS. ...	Sha'ban 29, 1255 H. (November 6, 1839).	Approximate, 370.	St. Petersburg, 1905.	Mullā Faizkhanov (?)	Defective and modern.
13. Haydarābād MS. ...	Unestimated.	382.	Haydarābād, 1905.	Unsigned.	[Reproduced.]

¹ The standard taken is the 382 folios of the Haydarābād MS., and by this all others have been approximately estimated.

No. I. *The Emperor Bābar's Autograph MS.*

No information has reached me which allows surmise that the original autograph manuscript of the *Bābar-nāma* still exists. It would be natural to look for it in the library of some descendant of the Timūrid Emperors; but unfortunately, all questions of the preservation of books in Hindūstān have been complicated by political turmoil and its sequel of destruction. A case in point involves a *Wāqī'āt-i-bābarī* which, with one fellow-survivor, now represents the former library of the Āgra College and which owes its safety during the Mutiny to its having been lent out.

Some points about the Elphinstone MS. suggest that it is Bābar's original, but they are points which turn on the exact use of words and cannot now be decided.

One thing is on record of Bābar's original MS.; as far as it had then gone, it was copied in 1529 (935 H.). (See No. II.)

Two conjectures may be made about it, but only in lightest fashion. The first is that it was copied by 'Alī'u'l-kātib for Humāyūn in 1530 (937 H.), a surmise extracted from the Alwār colophon which will be found printed at p. 761; the second, that to it Jahāngīr added his Turkī chapters (p. 756).

Its likely fate after Bābar's death is that it left Hindūstān at the Timūrid exodus in 1540, and went either with Humāyūn into his wandering exile or with Kāmran to Kābul. It does not seem probable that it was in Hindūstān when the Persian translations were made, since these are both from a mutilated transcript. To this improbability, however, there is the alternative that the Elphinstone MS. (from which the translations were made) is Bābar's original MS. If the now missing Elphinstone Codex should be found, it will become clear whether it is Bābar's or whether it is an exact transcript of an early and now lost manuscript on which were made the various royal notes.¹

¹ The Bukhārā MS. has not these, and thus is excluded from consideration here.

No. II. *Khwāja Kalān's MS.*

Of this I have not been able to learn more than is told by Bābar (f. 363), viz., that a copy of as much as had then been written was made by the Emperor's order and at the request of Khwāja Kalān *Ahrārī Samarqandī* in 1529, and that it was despatched from Āgra on March 5th, 1529 (935 H.), after the Khwāja had set out for home.

No known transcript ends where this must have ended if the diaries were sent as well as the narrative section of the book.

No. III. *The Elphinstone MS.*

Of this transcript it is desirable to write at length, not only because of its varied points of interest, but because it is missing and thus the more demands full description. As will be seen, it propounds several riddles. Moreover, it has the real and abiding interest of having been used by both Persian and English translators of Bābar's book. In addition to this, if a word of Mr. Erskine's is strictly used, and its royal notes are 'marginal,' it bears an autograph attested note by Humāyūn, and another, un-attested but royal in style, which may well be Shāh-jahān's. Moreover, as a royal possession, Jahāngīr may have made to it those additions in Turkī of which he writes under the second year of his reign in his (so-called) *Tūzak* and which seem likely to be portions of the "Fragments" that were first brought to public notice by Dr. Ilminsky, have been discussed by Dr. Teufel, and still remain for final examination.

As has been said, there is even much that makes for the surmise that the Elphinstone MS. is the text of supreme importance, Bābar's autograph manuscript. This can only be known if good fortune brings it from its long seclusion.

From internal evidence, it may be asserted that the Elphinstone MS. or its exact archetype was owned by Bābar's descendants. If it is not his own, it may be the copy

completed for Humāyūn as mentioned in the incongruous colophon of the Alwār Persian text which is inserted later in this notice (p. 761). The transcript mentioned there as finished in 1530 (937 H.) cannot but be a Turkī one if the Persian translations were made at the dates recorded for them.

The next news about the Elphinstone Codex is conveyed in a note made upon it by the Emperor Humāyūn, which is attested by him, and which Mr. Erskine describes as 'marginal.' The date of its inscription is to be inferred as 1551-2 (959 H.), because Humāyūn says in it that he was 46 (lunar) years old when he made it, and he was born on March 6th, 1508 (913 H.). The first part of this note is made as though it were a sentence of Bābar's text; the second part of it is an explanation given by Humāyūn of his reason for adding the first part and is followed by his attested signature; and the third, in every Persian MS. that I have seen (no Turkī one has it in this form), consists of a scribe's note to the effect that what he has copied is a copy, more or less remote, of the blessed royal handwriting.¹ If this note be truly marginal, the manuscript

¹ This note does not appear in the Haydarābād MS.; its place would be on f. 263, after the topic of Rahmat *piāda*. It can be seen in the form given below in the 'Abdu'r-raḥīm Persian translation. Mr. Erskine does not say in what language it was written in the Elphinstone MS. With slight intervariation, the bare statement of the ceremonial act which Humāyūn enters as for Bābar is given by Ilminsky and by the University MS., and therefore presumably by Kehr. The passage varies much in form from that in the Persian text, is shorter, unattested, and, after the *pseudo*-Bābar statement, differs widely. It draws an inference as to the year of inscription. It is safer to conclude from it nothing until the Bukhārā or Elphinstone Codex can be seen.

The note in all the 'Abdu'r-raḥīm translations is as follows. There are slight variations in the scribes' entries, as they are nearer or further from the 'blessed handwriting.'

B.M. Add. 26,200, f. 248, l. 6:

در همین منزل همین روز همایون در روی خود استره یا مقراض
رسانید چون حضرت مرحومی استره رساندن را در آن وقایع ذکر
کرده بودند بنده داعی بتتبعاً آنرا ذکر کرد در آن تاریخ هشتده
ساله بودم الحال در سن چهل شش سال بوده باشم حرره محمد
همایون از نقلِ نقلِ خطِ مبارکِ آن حضرت منقول شد

It should be said here that doubt rests upon Mr. Erskine's interpretation in the Memoirs of this note.

on which it is inscribed can hardly be other than Bābar's original or the surmised copy made for Humāyūn and of almost contemporary date.

Our next scanty gleaning of news is in shape of a note entered on the MS. where the record of 908 H. breaks off, and which laments loss of matter. It is reproduced in Pāyanda Ḥasan's Persian translation, and it may have been made in both places by him. It is repeated and its lament echoed by Dr. Leyden in his manuscript translation, and from this it has found its way through Mr. Erskine into the Memoirs. Such early mutilation of the Elphinstone MS. makes for its having shared the historic vicissitudes of travel to which Humāyūn's library was subjected.

This note brings the story of the MS. down to not later than 1586 (994 H.).

Next in time is news conjectured from a reference which the Emperor Jahāngīr makes to a *Bābar-nāma* under date of his second year, 1015 H. (1606).¹ It is the earlier and later ownership of the Elphinstone MS. by Timūrid emperors that gives force to this conjecture. If a true surmise, it brings the story down to 1607.

The passage is as follows:—

بتقریب احوال کابل واقعات حضرت فردوس مکانی بنظر
میگذست تمام بخط مبارک ایشان بود مگر چهار جزو آن را که
بخط خود نوشتم و در اخر اجزای مذکور هم عبارتی بترکی بقلم
آوردم تا ظاهر شود که این چهار جزو بخط من است با وجود آنکه
در هندوستان کلان شده ام در گفتن و نوشتن بترکی عاری نیستم

¹ *Tūzak-i-jahāngīrī*, Sayyid Aḥmad; Aligarh, 1864, p. 52. Also B.M. Add. 26,215, p. 79. Mr. Erskine has translated the passage (B.M. Add. 26,611, p. 82) with restriction of the word *khatt* to 'handwriting' in a way which does not agree with the reading of M. Langlès, who based on it a statement that Jahāngīr added to the text of Bābar's book. (*Biographie Universelle*, art. Babour.)

Reference to M. Langlès' view will be found in the preface of the Memoirs, but it must be remembered that when this reference was made Mr. Erskine did not know the *Tūzak-i-jahāngīrī*.

I refrain from offering any translation of this, because from it Mr. Erskine and M. Langlés have derived differing statements through varying reading of the word *khatt*, and I have little better material yet than they had for arriving at correctness. The Elphinstone MS. might help to translate accurately, but I surmise that the Bukhārā would be the better guide.¹

No codex I have seen contains anything signed by Jahāngir in accordance with the statement made in the passage just quoted. No signature to the "Fragments" is quoted by Ilminsky from Kehr; but in Kehr's copy they are displaced, and they may be signed where they first occur in any Russian *Bābar-nāma*—i.e. presumably, in the Bukhārā manuscript. Something might and almost certainly would be learned from the Bukhārā either for or against the suggestion that these "Fragments" or parts of them are Jahāngir's Turkī additions.

Mr. Erskine found, 'marginal,' on the Elphinstone MS., a second royal note which he attributes to Humāyūn. There is much against this attribution. High as is the estimate of his work which all who know it must form, it is to be remembered that, although he went over his translation both with Dr. Leyden's translation of a part of the Elphinstone MS. and with the Elphinstone itself (or all it then contained), this was collation only; he could not have had with the Turkī that close touch which he had with the Persian text. Little points must have escaped him. A moment's occupation in thought of his position will show that details which he could not have missed from his Persian text might easily have passed unnoticed in collation. This implies no blame; it explains blanks in information which would have been filled had his basal transcript been in Turkī.

As to this second note, which concerns the *amrat* fruit,

¹ The help of the Elphinstone MS. could not be direct since it had lost all but a short passage of the record of 932 H. before it came into Mr. Erskine's hands, but I have a hint of collateral help in slight marginal notes upon it, of which the handwriting might be decisive.

what makes against its being Humāyūn's is that it is not attested, as is his first; at least, no attestation is quoted in the English version, or with the copy of the note which chances to be in the British Museum amongst Mr. Erskine's papers.¹ Moreover, it does not appear in the Persian translations, an absence which implies that it was entered later than their dates and therefore cannot be by Humāyūn. Again, it mentions Bābar by a style unlike Humāyūn's, and speaks of him with disrespect.

This *amrat* fruit note cannot be Jahāngīr's, because he made his additions in Turkī, and it is in Persian. It occurs only in the Elphinstone Codex; its royal style, its *dar zamān-i-mā*, testifies to its origin. Its author is plausibly Shāh-jahān. If truly marginal, the finding of the Elphinstone MS. would allow recognition of the handwriting.

It is a long stride to another item of news, which is one of great importance since it brings the manuscript into the European world and spreads wider Bābar's fame. Unfortunately we learn merely a fact—that it was purchased in Peshāwar by Mr. Elphinstone in 1809, and when on his mission to Kābul. Later on he wrote of it to Mr. Erskine as "old and valuable,"² but no details as to seals or other marks of earlier ownership have come down to us. It must have been soon after its purchase that it was lent to Dr. Leyden, who translated a part of it, was cut short in his work by death, and had honour done with amplest measure to his unfinished fragment by Mr. Erskine, who incorporated it in the Memoirs in 1811.³

¹ B.M. Add. 26,605, p. 88.

² These words are quoted from an unpublished letter, for access to which, as to all others quoted, I am indebted to Mr. William Erskine's grandson, Mr. Lestock Erskine.

³ Dr. Leyden translated (see Haydarābād Codex) as far as f. 180, and a fragment from f. 216b to f. 223b. His share in the Memoirs is small, but with characteristic generosity Mr. Erskine equally divided the honour of its production with him. Dr. Leyden was a man who would have rivalled his friend in generosity; he would have wished posterity to allot to Mr. Erskine the just share of praise. The story of the genesis of the Memoirs, with its pleasant accompaniment of friendly acts and words, is agreeable reading and should be made accessible to a wider public.

In 1814¹ it was collated by Mr. Erskine with his translation from the Persian text, and with him it remained, because Mr. Elphinstone said it was safer so.

In 1816 there being correspondence between the two men as to the best place in which to deposit it and certain Turkī papers (its vocabularies ?), it was decided to entrust it to the chief library of their mother city. That it was so deposited there appears to be no doubt. The following three items of testimony, two from M. Garçin de Tassy and one from Mr. Erskine, confirm the decision taken in 1816, and locate the manuscript down to 1848 in the Advocates Library.

The first is a letter (hitherto unpublished) addressed to Mr. Erskine :—

“44, BLOOMSBURY SQUARE,
LONDON.

August 30, 1841.

“MONSIEUR,

Mon estimable ami et confrère, M. le Chevalier A. Jaubert, professeur de turc, etc., m'a chargé lors de mon départ pour Londres, il y a quelques semaines, de m'informer où se trouve en ce moment le MS. jagatai des *Mémoires de Babar*, dont vous avez publié une intéressante traduction accompagnée de savantes notes. Personne à Londres n'a pu répondre à cette question; mais M. le Professeur Wilson m'a engagé à vous écrire pour vous la faire à vous-même. Je vous prie de m'excuser la liberté que je prends et de croire que je m'estimerai heureux de bonne vous être à mon tour bon à quelque chose. Je partirai dans une quinzaine pour Paris; je me chargerai volontiers de vos commissions. J'ai l'honneur d'être, avec respect, Monsieur,

“Votre très humble serviteur,

GARÇIN DE TASSY.”

The following is quoted from the *Journal Asiatique* of February 11th, 1842 :—

¹ The MS. got mislaid after Leyden's executors had returned it to Elphinstone, and to this circumstance we owe our knowledge that there was a Turkī text in Bukhārā at the time, news of which had reached Mr. Elphinstone, for he wrote to Mir 'Izzatu'l-lāh—the author of “Travels in Central Asia in 1812–1813” (Calcutta, 1872)—to ask him to procure another copy in Bukhārā for Mr. Erskine.

“À M. le Redacteur du ‘*Journal Asiatique*.’

“MONSIEUR,

Dans l'article plein d'intérêt que M. A. Bélin a consacré à l'examen des Chrestomathies Orientales (Janvier, 1845) il est dit que le MS. jaghatai des *Mémoires de Bābar* se trouve à la Bibliothèque du Collège de Fort William. Ce document manque d'exactitude, comme celui que feu Davids a donné dans sa Grammaire Turque, p. xxxiv de la préface, où il est dit que le MS. de *Mémoires des Bābar* qui appartenait au feu Dr. Leyden se trouve dans la Bibliothèque de la Compagnie des Indes (à Londres). Le fait est que ce précieux MS., d'après lequel MM. Leyden¹ et Erskine ont rédigé leur estimable traduction anglaise, est actuellement à la Bibliothèque des Avocats à Edinbourg. C'est de M. Erskine lui-même que je tiens ce renseignement qu'il me paraît utile de faire connaître. Agréez, etc.

“GARCIN DE TASSY.”

Next comes an authoritative and signed statement from Mr. Erskine himself, in the following note which is taken from a flyleaf of his Turkī MS. (British Museum, Add. 26,234). After having inscribed there what is virtually a table of the contents of the volume, Mr. Erskine writes: “N.B. The folios 25–28*b* are wanting in Mr. Elphinstone's copy of the original, now in the library of the Faculty of Advocates at Edinburgh. See ‘Memoirs of Bābar,’ p. 355, note. William Erskine, Edinburgh, December 25th, 1848.”²

Unfortunately, the Elphinstone Codex cannot be found by the Keeper of the Advocates Library, who has obliged me by twice making search for it. It may be discovered later, and it is allowable to listen to the single string of hope.

I have mentioned already that this transcript had lost much of its latter portion before it came into Mr. Erskine's

¹ The MS. belonging to Dr. Leyden which is mentioned above is really in the India Office, but was not the one translated from by Leyden, who used the Elphinstone Codex. Davids has, however, not been quite correct in his statement, and there is a MS. which belonged to the College of Fort William—i.e. that of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

² The above note suggests that Mr. Erskine had the Elphinstone MS. in his hands when writing it. This is not necessarily so, since he was comparing his own MS. (now in the British Museum) with the Memoirs, which is annotated to show the contents of the Elphinstone.

hands; it had no colophon therefore, to attract his attention. One exists however, which would fit it, and which, where it stands now, is singularly out of place. It is one appended to the splendid Persian copy of the 'Abdu'r-raḥīm Persian translation which belongs to the Mahārāja of Alwār. It is as follows:—

هذا الكتاب المسمى به تنزك¹ واقعات بابرى بحسب فرمان
واجب الاذعان شاهزاده عالم وعالميان مرشدزاده جهان وجهانيان
محمد همايون طلع الله نير اقباله وشوخته في يوم السلخ من شهر
جمادى الثانى سنة تسع وثلاثون وتسع مائة من الهجرة بفضل
وحسن توفيقه بيد العبد الضعيف على الكاتب غفر الله ذنوبه
صورت اتمام وطريق اختتام يافت²

This colophon, it must be admitted, offers an interesting little problem. Its remarkable character and incongruities were first published, I think, by Mr. Beveridge.³

Where it is, it not only contradicts, by its date, the historic ascription of the Persian translation to 'Abdu'r-raḥīm Mīrzā *Turkmān*, but, with date 1531, is attached to a book which has, interpolated in its text, the note made by Humāyūn in 1551-2.

Not only so, but besides the seals of Akbar and Shāh-jahān, that of Muḥammad Humāyūn is inscribed within the volume.

¹ The original reads *tuzuk*, but I suggest to read *ba turki*, or even *ba turk*. Cf. the extract of Jahāngir's own composition, p. 756, note. If this colophon be, as I surmise, a copy or part adaptation of one dated 937 H., it is unlikely that the Turki word *tūzūk* or *tūzūk* should be whittled down so early. Moreover, there is no apparent reason for calling Bābar's book by the inappropriate name, and one of which there is no other known example, i.e. *Tuzuk-i-wāqī'āt-i-bābarī*.

² The points of this colophon essential here are that a transcript of Bābar's book was made by the command of Muḥammad Humāyūn, and completed on the last day of Jumāda II, 937 H., by 'Alī'u'l-kātib.

³ To the incongruities of the Alwār colophon Mr. Beveridge has drawn attention in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* of July and October, 1900. The copy of the colophon printed here was made as check upon his own, by a scribe of the Alwār Rāj, Muḥammad Ibrāhīm of Dihlī, in 1900, and agrees with a third copy which we owe to Mr. E. Denison Ross.

The codex is of regal merit and of early date ; it has been estimated as dating even so early as 1590, the year in which the translation was made. The colophon cannot be right : it cannot be that of a Persian translation ; it cannot in 1590 describe work by 'Alī'u'l-kātib, who was living at the time of Bābar's death, a well-known scribe ; and Humāyūn's seal can only be here for some special reason.

Until some better explanation is discovered, I suggest that as the Alwār Codex is so early and so good, it may be the one presented to Akbar by 'Abdu'r-raḥīm Mīrā ; and that, because it was in this closest touch with its Turkī original, a spirit of piety brought over from that original its seal (Humāyūn's) and (modified?) colophon, thus linking source and outcome as one and the same book, even in differing verbal garb.

(To be continued.)