



to such a point that the sweet savour of his sincerity was made fragrant by the pastile of friendship<sup>1</sup> so that the great officers and relatives (of Āvang Khān) became jealous.

Jāmūqa, chief of the Jājarāt tribe, joined with Sankū,<sup>2</sup> the son of Āvang Khān, to speak evil of him and they devised falsehoods against him whereby the heart of Āvang Khān was drawn away from the right path and he began to entertain evil thoughts. Temūcīn became alarmed and escaped from that danger by the counsels and assistance of Qarācār Nūyān. Twice were great battles fought between them in which Temūcīn was victorious. 73

When in his 49th, or as some say, his 50th year, he, in *Ramazān* 599 (May-June 1203), attained the rank of a sovereign and ruler of the world. When three years of his reign and rule had passed But Tengri,<sup>3</sup> a seer of the invisible world and herald of the Divine Court, was inspired to give Temūcīn the title of Cingīz Khān or king of kings. Day by day, the star of his fortune rose higher and higher and year by year, the lightning of his majesty became more vivid. He acquired sway over all Cathay, Khotan, Northern and Southern China (*Cin ū Mācīn*), the desert of Qibcāq, Saqsīn,<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> According to one account, noticed by D'Herbélot, Cingīz married a daughter of Āvang.

<sup>2</sup> Also *Shankū* and *Shakūn*.

<sup>3</sup> Text, *Tab Tengri*; but I adopt the variant of But Tengri, given also in No. 564. Hammer-Purgstall (65) calls him Buttari, the son of Itschke and says he was step-brother of Cingīz, being son of Cingīz's mother by her second husband.

<sup>4</sup> Text, *ساقین* *Safin*, but the notes give variants, *Saqīn* and *Sabaqīn* and the *Āin* (Jarrett III. 100, where see note) *Saqsīn*. It is the *Sacassīn* mentioned in D'Ohsson. (I. 346 n.) "*Sacassīn, dit le géographe de Bacu, était une grande ville du pays des Khazares. Sacassīn est à présent submergée.*" As D'Ohsson remarks it seems connected with the *Salae* or *Scythi*.

Apparently it was a place or country near the Caspian and is used by A.F. to indicate the extent of Cingīz' conquests in the West. The *Zafar-nāma Prolegomena* says, in reference to Cingīz' conquests, that they extended *az ibtidā'i Bulghār ū Saqīn tā intihā'i Cīn ū Saqsīn (?) ū Mācīn* where apparently *Saqsīn* denotes an eastern country. Vullers s.v. *Saqsīn*, says "*nom. regionis ignotae*" and refers to the *Burhān-i-qāfi* and the *Farhang-i-Rashādī*. The latter says it is a country of Turkistān and quotes a line of Nizāmī which contains the expression "from *Saqsīn* to Samarkand."

In 1652 Greaves published two Geographical Tables one by Naṣīr-ūṣī and the other by Ulugh. These are in great measure





Bulgaria,<sup>1</sup> Ās,<sup>2</sup> Russia, Ālān,<sup>3</sup> etc. He had four sons, Jūjī, Caghataī, Ōkadāi, Tūli. He placed with Jūjī the management of feasts and hunting. Judiciary matters (*yārghū*) and the carrying out of punishment, in which administrative government is involved, were committed to the wisdom of Caghataī. Government and political matters were assigned to Ōkadāi. The management of military affairs and the protection of the camp were made over to Tūli.

In the months of 615 (1218), he marched to Transoxiana against Sultān Muhammad, king of *Kh*wārizm<sup>4</sup> and the people of that country received the chastisement of capital punishment.

When he had finished the affairs of Transoxiana, he crossed the Amu (Oxus) and turned his world-opening reins towards Bālk<sub>h</sub>. He despatched Tūli Khān with a large army to *Kh*urāsān and after conquering Īrān and Tūrān, he came from Bālk<sub>h</sub> to Tāliqān.<sup>5</sup> From thence he went off to put an end to Jalālu-d-dīn Mangbarnī<sup>6</sup> and in

identical and perhaps the repetitions in Āin (Jarrett III. 47 *et seq.*), are due to indiscriminate copying from both. In Greaves' Tables, Saqsīn is given in Long. 86° 36' and Lat. 43° and as belonging to the 5th climate; Bolgar, Long. 90° and Lat. 49° and as belonging to the 7th climate.

Quatremère (Hist. des Mongoles) states that Klaproth has treated at great length of the subject of Saqsīn.

<sup>1</sup> Bular, i.e. Bulghār, (Āin. Jarrett, etc.) III. 103) a town on the Caspian. This is therefore not the European Bulgaria to the west of the Black Sea but Great Bulgaria on the Volga.

<sup>2</sup> Vullers (34a) gives Ās as a town in Qibcāk from which the Osseti took their name. But the Ās of the Text appears to be the Crimea or its neighbourhood. See Jarrett III. 102 where it is spelled Aş a form not given by Vullers. Quatremère (Hist. des Mongoles, Pref. 70n. 8) says "Le mot Ās ou آس désigne d'

Alains qui portent encore aujourd'hui le nom de Ossets."

<sup>3</sup> See Vullers and D'Herb. Ālān is said to be a town in Turkistān but apparently the Ālān of the Text is the Allan of D'Herbélot which was in the Caucasus and the home of the tribe known as the Alāni, and which occupied country between the Caspian and Black Seas.

<sup>4</sup> The modern Khiva. The citizens were all massacred.

<sup>5</sup> Tāliqān, a town in *Kh*urāsān, E. of Bālk<sub>h</sub>. (Jarrett III. 87). The *Kh*urāsān and Badakhshān Tāliqāns seem to be identical. See Howorth's map.

<sup>6</sup> Text, Mankīrnī, but Āin (II. 204 and Jarrett III. 343) has Mangbarnī or Mankbardī, Jarrett observes that Hammer-Purgstall says it should be written Mankbarnī but that on Jalālu-d-dīn's coins it is Mankbarīn. If as Hammer states, (74) the term means short or flat-nosed (*stumpy-*





Ramazan<sup>1</sup> 624 (Aug. 1227), defeated him up to the banks of the Indus. From thence he went to Transoxiana towards his permanent encampment (Karakoram). He died in the year of the Hog which was also that of his birth and accession, on 4th *Şafar*<sup>2</sup> 624, in the borders of the country of Tangūt.<sup>3</sup>

Before his death, he directed that when the inevitable event occurred, they should keep it secret until the affair of the people of Tangūt was completed and that there might be no commotion in distant countries. His sons and officers carried out his instructions and took steps to conceal the event till the people of Tangūt had come out and been made the forage of the sword. Then they marched off bearing the body (of Cingiz) in a chest, putting to death every-

*nāsīq*) we should hardly expect to find such a nickname on coins. Vambéry (Hist. of Bukhara, 1342) says the word is Mengherdi, (heaven-sent); Raverty (*Tabaqāt-i-nāsiri*, 285) that it means having a mole on the side of the nose. (See also 299n.) *Mang* is given as meaning a mole in Shaw's Vocabulary of Eastern Turkish. The epithet would thus be equivalent to *Khāldar*, and,—a mole being regarded as a beauty,—the sobriquet is honorific.

For an account of the gallant Jalālu-d-dīn see Gibbon Cap. 64 and D'Herbélot art. *Jelaleddin* and *Āin* l.c.

<sup>1</sup> This date is wrong as perhaps the copyists might have inferred from the fact that just below Cingiz is described as dying in *Şafar*, the 2nd month of 624, whereas *Ramazan* is the ninth. Jalālu-d-dīn's defeat really occurred in *Rajab* 618 (Aug.-Sep. 1221). It was therefore the time of the rains which enhances the splendour of Jalālu-d-dīn's feat in swimming his horse over the Indus.

<sup>2</sup> D'Herbélot, 4th *Ramazan*. This

agrees with Howorth and Hammer-Purgstall who also give the corresponding European date as 18th Aug. Apparently A.F. had inadvertently written the date of death as that of the defeat of Jalālu-d-dīn. 4th *Şafar* is 24th Jan. (1227). *Şafar* is given in one place by Rashīdu-d-dīn whom A.F. copies. (See Hammer-Purgstall, G. Horde 92 n. 4.) But see Erdmann l.c., p. 573.

<sup>3</sup> Text, *Tankaqūt*. It seems to be the Tunkah of the Āin (Jarrett III. 98) in 5th climate and belonging to *Tashkand*. See D'Herbélot art. *Tangut* where it is stated that the Arabs call the town *Tanghikant* a form which approaches that in Text. The country is also called *Hia*. (See Howorth I. 4 on *Hia* or *Tangut*). It lies north-west of China and west of the Yellow River. On some modern maps the country is marked as that of the *Tarçats*. See Supplement (Visdelou, 302), for remarks on Scheidercou and *Tanghoul*.

<sup>4</sup> They came out under their king *Shīdaqu* (called by Minhāj, *Tingū Khān*) to treat with Cingiz who had





body whom they met, so that the news might not be quickly conveyed to the different countries. On 14th *Ramāzān* of the same year, they brought the body to the great camp and proclaimed the death. They buried Cingiz at the foot of a tree which he had, one day when  
74 hunting, approved as a site for his grave. In a short space of time, the branches became so thick that the tomb was hidden by them and no one could ascertain the spot. There is a strange mystery in this which cannot be understood, except by the wisdom of the wise and far-seeing, to wit, that as in life he was under God's protection, so also in death did he come under God's supervision, in order that the short-sighted might not put forth hands of disrespect against the place. Though to take much thought about a tomb is to make one self ridiculous to mankind, yet as rulers have to deal chiefly with the superficial-minded, this providential guarding (of Cingiz' tomb) is a great blessing. And why should not the Divine protection watch over one who was so great that an universe abode in the shade of his guardianship?

Though this great man be in the eyes of the vulgar and even to the *élite*,<sup>1</sup> at first glance, a leading exponent of Divine wrath, yet to the far-reading view of the wise, *élite* of the *élite*, he is an emanation of Divine blessings. For in the kingdom of Divine justice of which human government is a ray, there can be no injustice or oppression, and everything which comes into existence in the world of evil is based on certain spiritual principles, the real nature of which the superficial cannot perceive and which cannot be comprehended save by the intellects of the far-seeing and awakened-hearted.

His years were seventy-two complete and most of the seventy-third had also elapsed. Of them, twenty-five were spent in reigning and conquering. If we look to the dates<sup>2</sup> of his birth and his death,

promised them safety, but as he was dead, his heirs, I suppose, did not think themselves bound by his promise and put them all to death. Apparently it was to give a loophole for this that Cingiz bade the fact of his death to be concealed. (*Tabaqāt-i-naṣīrī*, Raverty 1087n.)

<sup>1</sup> Minhāj always calls Cingiz the accursed.

<sup>2</sup> i.e., reckoning the death as in *Ṣafar*. If *Ramāzān* be taken, the age would be 74, there being 10 solar months in a lunar year.





as stated in histories, his age comes to seventy-four years and three months. Apparently the discrepancy is due to the difference between lunar and solar months and years, or it may be owing to some cause other than the ostensible one. During this period, the high matters of government and administration were made illustrious by the world-adorning counsels of Qarācār Nūyān. Why should not a potentate who hath such a kinsman (*birūdar*) in blood and in spirit by his side as his director to dominion and fortune, brush with the head of majesty the highest zenith of conquest and rule?

*Verse.*

Qarācār and Cingīz are cousins (*ibn-i-'am* and).

In conquest too, they are allied (*qarīn-i-ham* and).

When the drum of death was beat, the Khānship was made over to Ōkadāi. The gist of this distressful occurrence is that when on the China expedition, he (Cingīz) had one night an intimation by a vision, that the time of leaving this mirage-like world was at hand. He called his sons, Qarācār Nūyān, the Commander-in-Chief, and the other nobles and pillars of his empire and after imparting to them counsels which might dominate mankind, he appointed Ōkadāi as Khān. He sent to the treasury for the covenant which had been executed by Qacūli and Qabal Khān and which was the Āltamgha of Tūmana Khān and which his high-souled predecessors had successively signed, and had it read before the noble assembly. He observed, "I swore to this deed together with Qarācār Nūyān, do you also fulfil its conditions." He also had another deed drawn up 75 between Ōkadāi and his other sons and his kinsmen and made it over to Ōkadāi.

Transoxiana, Turkistān, the borders of Khawārizm, the cities of the Uighūrs, Kāshghar, Badakhshān, Balkh and Ghazni as far as the Indus, he assigned to Caghatai Khān. He also made over the covenant of Qabal Khān and Qacūli Bahādur to Caghatai and said to him, "Depart not from the counsels of Qarācār Nūyān and regard him as your partner in rule and realm." He also established between them the bond of fatherhood<sup>1</sup> and sonship. In this way the noble line

<sup>1</sup> According to a MS. of Timūr's Memoirs Cingīz did this by marry-

ing Qarācār to a daughter of Caghatai. If so, Qarācār must surely



(Akbar's) came to be called Caghatāi;<sup>1</sup> otherwise the relationship of Caghatāi and his ancestors with his Majesty, the king of kings, is one of glory and superiority not of propinquity and similarity.

The Princes and Nūyāns acted according to the testament. Good God! could there be such a breach<sup>2</sup> of covenant by an eminently wise man like Cingīz Khān! The covenant which had been adorned by the seal-royal (Āltamgha) of Tāmana Khān should have been given to Ōkadāi Qā'an and he should have been made over to be educated and succoured by the weighty counsels of Qarācār Nūyān so that the provisions of the compact might be carried into effect; or did they not produce<sup>3</sup> that covenant till he (Cingīz) was carried

have been many years younger than Cingīz and hardly fitted to be his counsellor. The passage in the *Memoirs* is *dukhṭar-i-Caghatāi Khānrābā Qarācār Nūyān 'aqd kard ū bar āo Gurkān nām nihād*. But A.F.'s view and that commonly accepted is that Qarācār acted as a father to Caghatāi. (*Shajratu-l-atrak*, Miles 344.)

<sup>1</sup> This does not seem quite correct. Bābar's mother was a Caghatāi being a daughter of Yūnus Khān, a descendant of Cingīz,—a fact which A.F. notices later on in his account of Bābar.

<sup>2</sup> A.F. holds that Cingīz broke the compact by not attaching Qarācār to the Khāgān (Great Khan). But Caghatāi was the elder son though passed over in favour of the younger, Ōkadāi and thus; in one sense, the assigning of Qarācār to him was right.

The *Prolegomena* l.c. states that Cingīz made the arrangement because Transoxiana had been assigned to Caghatāi and as Jalālu-d-dīn Mangbarnī was still alive, it was necessary to have Caghatāi supported by an experienced general like Qarācār.

Timūr does not seem to have thought there was a breach of agreement for he tells us that when Taghlaq Timūr shewed him the agreement—which had been written on a steel plate and signed by Qabal and Qācūlī,—he acquiesced and accepted the Commander-in-Chiefship. (Timūr's *Memoirs*, Stewart 12.) See too page 22 (Stewart) where Timūr's father tells him that he had been *Sipāh-sālār*. Apparently if there were a breach of compact, it occurred when Timūr's grandfather, Amīr Barkal gave up his duties as *Sipāh-sālār* and retired into private life.

<sup>3</sup> I am not sure of the meaning of this passage. My friend Mr. Beames thinks it is that the courtiers should not have produced the deed before Cingīz so that posterity might have ascribed his conduct to ignorance and not to a deliberate design of breaking the compact. But Cingīz had asked for the deed, so that they could not well have evaded its production, and it is difficult to see how an intentional omission to consult the deed could make Cingīz's conduct or that of his courtiers any better. Apparently the words "*hāzīr namī-*





away by the inbred forgetfulness<sup>1</sup> of human nature, and thus the mark of censure in the book of his knowledge was obliterated by the line of obliviousness. It is strange too that old writers while treating of this subject with verbiage, cavilling and equivocation have not come to a right determination about it. It appears as if the world-adorning Deity desired to remove from the frame of this lofty lineage, the disguise of the Commander-in-Chiefship which Tūmana Khān had imposed but which had really been fashioned by the Divine artificers while completing the evolution of his Majesty, the king of kings, (and that so) a forgetfulness ensued which surpassed in excellence thousands of good desigus. Inasmuch as the Divine protection was ever guarding this lofty line, no failure in the compact and agreement occurred on the part of Qācūlī Bahādūr's descendants so that when the turn of sovereignty, which was due to their innate and acquired power of direction, arrived and they attained the divan-adorning Caliphate, there could be no reproach brought against them by the wise. Likewise this was the beginning<sup>2</sup> of the rise of that

*sākhṭand*" must refer to the officers and not to Cingīz for they are commonly used of the act of inferiors in bringing something before their superior. I am inclined then to think that A.F. means to suggest as an excuse for Cingīz, that he was at death's door and incapable of recollecting the contents of the deed. Or it may be that the important word is *ān* (that) and that A.F. means to suggest that possibly the courtiers did not produce *that* deed, i.e., the real deed, but some other.

The *Shajrat* (344) remarks that Cingīz exceeded in recommending Qaracār to Caghatāi. Probably this remark is based on A.F. and indicates that the *Shajrat* was written after the *Akbarnāma*.

<sup>1</sup> Alluding to the Arabic proverb (Abū'l-ghāzī, Désmaisons, Preface) *awwalu' n-nāsi awwalu' n-nās*, "the

first forgetter was the first man." This again, I believe, refers to the tradition that Adam surrendered 40 years of life in favour of his descendant, King David but repudiated or forgot having done so when the Angel of Death came to him at the close of his 960th year. In consequence of this forgetfulness by Adam, it was laid down in the book which Seth received from heaven, that all promises or agreements should be ratified by the presence of two witnesses.

<sup>2</sup> Tīmūr is regarded as a lineal descendant of Qaracār Nūyān, though according to Vambéry, the claim is without foundation. It seems that Rashīdu-d-dīn says nothing about Qaracār's being Caghatāi's generalissimo. (D'Ohsson II. 109 n.) But he is mentioned in the *Tabaqāt-i-nisrī* by Minhāj who was





light of fortune, his Majesty, the Lord of Conjunction (Timūr) whose holy existence was the forerunner of the perpetual dominion of his Majesty, the king of kings.

After his father's decease, Caghatāi Khān made Pēshbaligh<sup>1</sup> his capital and having made over the control of the army and of the subjects to Amīr Qarācār Nūyān, he spent most of his time in the service of Ōkadāi Qā'ān. Though Ōkadāi was younger than himself, he shewed no slackness in performing his duties and in the minutiae of obedience and heartily observed the conditions of the will.

76 When Caghatāi Khān arrived at his life's term, he appointed Amīr Qarācār Nūyān administrator of the kingdom and made over his children to him. He died seven months before Ōkadāi Khān,<sup>2</sup> in the year of the Ox, *Zī-l-qā'da* 638 (May-June 1241). Qarācār Nūyān, in accordance with his promise, took charge of the management of the kingdom and after some time, made over to Qarā Hulāgū Khān, son of Mawātkān,<sup>3</sup> son of Caghatāi, the government of his grandfather's dominions.

After some years when Giyūk Khān, son of Ōkadāi became Khān (i.e., Khāqān) Qarācār Nūyān deposed<sup>4</sup> Qarā Hulāgū Khān, and appointed Isū Mangū, son of Caghatāi in his room. Let it not be concealed that Ōkadāi Qā'ān had, during his sovereignty, nominated his eldest<sup>5</sup> son, Kūcū as his heir, but Kūcū died during his father's lifetime. He then made his (Kūcū's) son Shīrāmān who was his favourite, his heir. When the Qā'ān (Ōkadāi) died, Giyūk Khān was in Russia, Circassia and Bulgaria (i.e., Great Bulgaria) and came to the great camp<sup>6</sup> (i.e., the capital) three or four years afterwards

born 60 years, before Rashīdu-d-dīn. (Bib. Ind. ed. 365, 1.3 and Raverty, 1063.) In these the name is written Nūyān Qarācār but there can be no doubt that Qarācār is meant. There is also a great deal about him in the *Prolegomena* which was written in 822 (1419).

<sup>1</sup> D'Herbélot, Bishbaligh (Pentapolis) and this is no doubt right. It is described in Ney Elias' introduction to the *Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī* (62) but it is stated (l.c. 32 and 364) that

Caghatāi's capital was at Almāligh.

<sup>2</sup> Ōkadāi died 11th Dec., 1241.

<sup>3</sup> Blochmann 429.

(Howorth I. 158. D'Ohsson, II. 87.)

<sup>4</sup> The *Shajratu-l-atrāk* (Miles 355) states that Qarā Hulāgū was deposed at the instance of Giyūk who represented that a grandson could not succeed before his uncle (Isū Mangū).

<sup>5</sup> Third, Howorth, I. 160. Giyūk or Giyūk was the eldest.

<sup>6</sup> Karakoram, the Cambalu of Chaucer and Milton.





established justice and the cherishing of subjects. <sup>1</sup> Isn Mangū was covered with the veil of annihilation, Qarācār Nūyān again appointed Qarā Hulāgū to the government of the country and died during his reign in 652 (1254),<sup>1</sup> full of honours and success, at the age of 89.

### AIJAL NŪYĀN.

Aijal Nūyān was the most distinguished for wisdom and godliness of Qarācār Nūyān's ten<sup>2</sup> children. During the reign of Qarā Hulāgū he took, on account of his wisdom and vigour, the place of his father (Qarācār). In 662 (1264) he was confirmed on the divan of dominion. The Caghatāi tribe (*alūs*) was prosperous in his time, but as there was much opposition and strife among the descendants of Caghatāi Khān, he got disgusted with affairs and settled in his ancestral city of Kesh until the time when Mangū Qā'an, son of Tūlī Khān, son of Cingīz Khān, sent his brother Hulāgū to Persia (Īrān) and attached to him officers and men from each of the four tribes (*alūs*) of Jūjī, Caghatāi, Ōkatāi (Ōkadāi) and Tūlī. By universal request, Aijal Nūyān was selected from the Caghatāi tribe and appointed as companion<sup>3</sup> to Hulāgū Khān. That Khān treated him with great respect and assigned Marāgha-Tabrīz<sup>4</sup> to him.

<sup>1</sup> D'Ohsson (II. 109 n.) quotes Mīr Khwānd as saying that Qarācār died at the age of 79 but the lithographed ed. of the *Rauzat-i-safā* (Part V. 69) gives 89 as the age and Mīr Khwānd's source, the *Zafarnāma*, *Prolegomena*, gives also 89. He died in the year of the Hare in the Turkish cycle.

<sup>2</sup> Five, *Prolegomena* l.c. gives their names.

<sup>3</sup> Text, *bi-rasm-i-sālbūrī* *Sālbūr* does not occur in the dictionary and is perhaps *sālār-i-bār*, (*princeps aulae regiae*)—for which, see Vullers s.v. *sālār*. Possibly the true reading is *ساورى sāwari*, a present. For anac-

count of this word, see Quatremère, *Notices*, etc., XIV. 27 n. The meaning would then be "He was sent as a *nazr* or present to Hulākū." I observe, however, that *sālbūrī* occurs as a title in the *Zafarnāma*. (See extract therefrom, *Tārīkh-i-rashīdī*, 26, where we have Khwāja Sālībarī.) A MS. however of the *Zafarnāma* gives the word as *Salbarī*. So too, Bib. Ind. ed. I. 88 and II. 23 15 fr. ft.). *Sālbar* occurs in the *Burhān-i-qāṭi* but only with the meaning of a tree which bears every second year.

<sup>4</sup> Jarrett III. 81 n.





## AMIR AILANGAR KHĀN.

77

Amir Ailangar Khān was the most distinguished son of Aijal Nūyān. When Aijal departed from Tūrān with Hulāgū Khān to Īrān, Ailangar was made his father's representative in the Caghatai tribe and when Aijal left this deceitful world in Īrān, Davā Khān, son of Barāq Khān, son of Bisūtavā, son of Mawātkān, son of Caghatai Khān, son of Cingiz Khān who had become Sulṭān<sup>1</sup> made him *Amīr-ū-l-umārā*<sup>2</sup> and gave him his father's rank and assigned to him powers of binding and loosing. And being full of wisdom and insight, he undertook the management of the affairs of the kingdom. He embraced the glorious Muhammadan religion.

AMIR BARKAL.<sup>3</sup>

Amir Barkal was very high-minded and when his noble father, Amir Ailangar Nūyān left this comfortless world, in the time of Tarmashīrīn Khān, son of Davā Khān, he was the only surviving son. As he was always occupied with the care of his own soul, he had no leisure for other things and so, abstaining from the companionship of Khāns, he transferred the paternal avocations to his cousins and remained independent in Kesh. He was assiduous in seeking God's favour and in acquiring virtues. He spent his life in that neighbourhood and provided for his daily sustenance from the various estates and villages which belonged to his old possessions and was content therewith till he went to the holy kingdom and the eternal country.

## AMIR TARĀGHĀI.

Amir Tarāghāi was the distinguished son of Amir Barkal and is the father of the Lord of Conjunction (Tīmūr). From early years and the flower of youth, the lights of dominion and fortune shone from the court of his nature and the notes of greatness and glory illuminated the antechamber of his ways. That noble-minded man had a younger brother, Haibat<sup>4</sup> by name, who was a perfect paragon

<sup>1</sup> R. A. S. MS. No. 114 has *ki salṭanat* before *ba ō rasīda būd* and they seem needed.

<sup>2</sup> This is regarded as the third renewal of the compact between Qabal and Qāculi. (Miles 381).

<sup>3</sup> Ahmad b. 'Arab Shāh gives Abghai as the name of Tīmūr's grandfather.

<sup>4</sup> In the *Prolegomena* i.e. the name seems to be Salbita or Malbita, and in the *Khulāṣatu-t-tawārīkh* to be Bīta





of truth and truth-seeking. But the lot of spiritual and temporal eminence had fallen on the elder brother. Like his honoured father (Barkal) he always kept his face on the threshold of the lords of holiness and was favoured by the associates of the portals of eternity. Especially that pattern of the masters of ecstasy, Shaikh Shamsu-d-din Kalāl,<sup>1</sup> greatly honoured and respected the Amīr and by his spiritual insight apprized him of the advent of the star of the Lord of Conjunction.

I do not find his name in Timūr's Memoirs. An uncle, Hājī Barlās and another, Aidku, are spoken of, but they were probably his maternal uncles. They were unfriendly to him (Stewart's Timūr, 55).

<sup>1</sup> The *Prolegomena* l.c. and *Kbulāsat* call him Shamsu-d-din Kalār, and the former describes him as a successor of Shaikh Shihābu-d-din Shahrawardī (perhaps the famous Shahrawardī of Baghdād). The *Prolegomena* states also that in 775 (1374), Timūr removed his father's body to near Shamsu-d-din's shrine beside the chief mosque. Probably Kalār is right for the Amīr Kalāl whom Timūr often mentions seems a different person. (Price and Davey (Timūr's Institutes) call him Gulāl, a word which signifies red powder, i.e., *abīr*).

An Amīr Kalāl is described in the *Safinatu-l-auliyā* also. D'Herbélot mentions a Shamsu-d-din al-Fakh-aur who lived in Kesh and was con-

sulted by Timūr, but Timūr's special *Pīr* seems to have been Qutbu-l-aqtāb Shaikh Zainu-d-din Abū Bakr. (Davey and White's Timūr *in*.) Apparently Aḥmad b. 'Arab Shāh is the authority for this, who in the beginning of his Life of Timūr, speaks of a Shaikh called Shamsu-d-din Al Fakhuri whom Timūr consulted.

A.F.'s reference to Shamsu-d-din's foretelling the greatness of Timūr to his father is interesting because it seems to be an allusion to Timūr's Memoirs where the story is told. If this is so, it goes to support the genuineness of the Memoirs by showing that they were in existence before, at least the reign of Shāh Jahān. The story, however, about Shamsu-d-din's prophecy also appears in the *Ḥabibu-s-siyar*.

The *Āin* (Jarrett III, 358) mentions an Amīr Kalāl who was a saint of the Naqshbandī order.





## CHAPTER XVI.

THE LORD OF GREAT CONJUNCTIONS, THIRD POLE<sup>1</sup> OF THE UNIVERSE,  
POLE OF REALM AND RELIGION, AMĪR TIMUR GÜRGĀN.<sup>2</sup>

78 The eternal decree and unchanging will of God hath adorned the world by assigning thousands of designs to everything. Thus the Almighty, by implanting in the fifty-two persons who form the lofty line of the king of kings and who are the instruction of the wise,—command, wisdom, sovereignty, guidance, favour, bounty and other glorious graces and illustrious qualities, fashioned and finished the unique pearl of the Imperial Vicegerency (*Khilāfat*). And from and after Qācūli Bahādūr, He caused seven heroes of the sacred line to descend from the position of visible sovereignty and awarded them the status of Commander-in-Chief and king-making (*shāhin-shāhī*) so that by experiencing the stage of subjection in the garb of obedience, they might in an admirable manner, set forth to the apparatus of the universal laboratory. And as for the exalted ancestors who spent their days in Īrganaqūn, albeit we have no record

<sup>1</sup> *Ṣāliḡu-l-quṭbīn*. Probably this means that he is a Pole supplemental to the two Poles, making with them a Trinity. But it may mean umpire or arbitrator between the two Poles, or that he was three kinds of Pole, viz., *quṭbu-l-millat* (religion), *quṭbu-d-dunyā* (the world) *quṭbu-d-dīn* (faith), as Tīmār is styled in the *Prolegomena* (*Zafarnāma*). Ruy Gonzales de Clavijo (Clements R. Markham trs. 124) says, "The arms of Timur Beg were three circles like "o"s drawn in this manner °° and this is to signify that he is lord of three parts of the world." He adds that Tīmūr ordered this device to be stamped on his

coins and on everything that he had and that he ordered his tributaries to use it on their coins. Possibly the epithet in the Text alludes to this device.

<sup>2</sup> Tīmūr, we are told, never took any title higher than that of Amīr (officer) which is an allusion to the Commander-in-Chiefship held by his branch and was accordingly a title hereditary in his family. The title *Gürgān* (son-in-law) refers apparently to his ancestor Qarācār Nūyān's marriage with a daughter of Caghatāi, son of Cingiz. But it may also refer to his own marriage with princesses.





of them, yet they too, generation after generation, were seized of greatness. Though the name of sovereignty was not, they possessed the reality and shewed it forth by preserving their honour while shut out from the haunts of men. And now that the stages of solitude and society had been fulfilled and a complete preparation had been made for the coming forth of the unique pearl of his Majesty, the king of kings, God, the Creator of the world, stripped off the disguise of dependency which had seemingly been imported into the line by the counsels of Tūmana Khān, and displayed a hero fit for and capable of a great sovereignty. Such was the appearance of his Majesty, the Lord of Conjunction, Adorner of the Seven Climes, Exalter of Throne and Diadem, Amīr Tīmūr Gūrgān. This great one came forth and planted his foot in existence in the environs of Kesh,<sup>1</sup> commonly known as the *Shahr-i-sabz* (Green City) and one of the towns of Īrān,<sup>2</sup> on the night of Tuesday, 25th *Sha'bān*, 736<sup>3</sup> (9th April, 1336) in the Mouse Year (First of the Turkish cycle) under the Sign of Capricorn, from the fair womb and pure veil of her Majesty, the perfection of modesty and blessedness, glory of choiceness and purity, guardian of realm and religion, Tagīna<sup>4</sup> Khātūn. This axis of the sphere of the great vicegerency and ocean-centre of sublime sovereignty is the star of fortune which arose eighth from out the bosom of Qācūlī Bahādūr.

According to the view of one historian,<sup>5</sup> the true vision of Qācūlī Bahādūr was fulfilled thereby but, as has already been indicated, this

<sup>1</sup> About 40 miles S. by E. of Samarqand. It was called the Green City on account of the verdure of its gardens. (*Zafarnāma* I. 301.) It has been described by Bābar (Ers-kine, 54) P. de Courteille (I. 106) and E. Schuyler. It is also mentioned in the *Āin* (Jarrett, III. 97) as in the 5th climate and in *Badaḥshān* (!). It is generally reckoned a day's journey from Samarqand.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has Tūrān and so has Abdu-l-ḥamīd (*Bādshāhnāma*, Bib. Ind. I. 43) Īrān is perhaps right, for the word is vaguely used. (D'Her-

belot s. v.). Kesh is in what is usually called Transoxiana and a variant gives *Māwarā-n-nahr* (Transoxiana) instead of Īrān.

<sup>3</sup> Gibbon quoting Hyde says 1336, 9th April, 11-57 P.M., lat. 36.

<sup>4</sup> Sometimes Nagīna, e. g., in *Khāfi Khān*.

<sup>5</sup> *Sharafu-d-dīn* 'Alī Yazdī (*Zafarnāma*). The *Ḥabībū-s-siyar* says the same thing. A.F. has already censured *Sharafu-d-dīn* (Cap. I. near the end) for identifying the seven stars which emerged from Qācūlī's bosom, with the seven descendants





day was, according to the profound investigations of the wise and far-seeing,<sup>1</sup> only the beginning of the ascent of the constellation and the flashing of the first star.

In the fortunate Age in which the Lord of Conjunction was born, Tarmashīrīn<sup>2</sup> Khān, son of Davā Khān, son of Barāq Khān, son of

who intervened between Qācūlī and Tīmūr. A.F. says it is wrong to take for stars, men who did not rule, and holds that Tīmūr was the first of the eight stars and not the last. But his interpretation is liable to the same objection. It is true that Akbar was the eighth in descent from Tīmūr, but this was through a younger son of the latter, viz., the third, Mīrān Shāh, and neither Mīrān nor his son, Muḥammad Mīrzā (who also was not an eldest son) were ever kings. Certainly they were never what A.F. calls world-adorners and cannot for instance, be compared for kingly qualities, extent of dominion and duration of reign with Shāhrukh Mīrzā (Tīmūr's fourth son) or for intellectual eminence with Shāhrukh's illustrious son Ulugh Bēg. Indeed of the six who intervened between Tīmūr and Akbar, only three were kings, viz., Abū Sa'īd, Bābar and Humāyūn.

<sup>1</sup> This is singular and perhaps refers to Amīr Fathu-l-lāh of Shīrāz.

<sup>2</sup> This seems a mistake. Tarmashīrīn was killed in 1330 according to D'Ohsson (IV. Table II.), and Mr. Oliver (R. A. S. J. XX. New Ser.) thinks he died in 1334. It would seem that he was living in 1333, for Ibn Baṭūṭa apparently visited him in that year and Mr. Oliver (J. A. S. B. 1891, II. eleven)

gives one of his coins dated 733 (1333). Both D'Herbélot and Miles speak of Amīr Kazgān as ruling in Transoxiana at the time of Tīmūr's birth but Amīr Kazgān was only a rebellious subject. According to Sharafu-d-dīn—who ought to be a good authority and whom Mas'ūdī servilely copies.—Sultān Qazān was the nominal ruler when Tīmūr was born and his reign lasted from 733-747 (1332-1346) but the real authority was possessed by Amīr Qazān.

(Bib. Ind. ed. has Qarān Sultān Khān and *Prolegomena* (A. S. B. MS. Oa, 26, p. 69a) Qarā Sultān Khān. Pétis de la Croix has Cazan. See also Miles 374. Sharafu-d-dīn dilates in the *Prolegomena*, on the birth of Tīmūr in this reign).

Later on, (I. 43) Sharafu-d-dīn states that Tughlaq Tīmūr, a grandson of Davā and nephew of Tarmashīrīn, came to Transoxiana in *Rabi'u-g-ghānī* 761 (February 1360) and that in the 33 years previous, dating from the death of Tarmashīrīn, there had reigned eight kings of the Caghatai line. This would fix Tarmashīrīn's death in 728 (1328). This is also the date expressly stated in the *Prolegomena* (A. S. B. MS. Oa, 26, p. 68b) as that when Tarmashīrīn was put to death by his cousin Purān.

The evidence of Ibn Baṭūṭa against this is perhaps not of overwhelming





Isāthwā, son of Bisūkān, son of Caghatāi Khān was ruling in Transoxiana. In Īrān four months had passed since the death of Sultān Abū Saʿīd<sup>1</sup> and there was on that account universal confusion in that country.

Amīr Sāhib Qarān from his earliest years up to the flower of his youth, was occupied in practising the art of hunting<sup>2</sup> and the methods of war and battles. In the Mouse Year 762<sup>3</sup> (1361) Amīr Tarāghāi departed from this world. He had four sons and two daughters, viz., Šāhib Qarānī, ʿAlam Shaikh, Siyūrghatamsh, Jūkī, Qutlagh<sup>4</sup> Tarkān Aghā and Shīrīn Bēgī Aghā.

weight for he is always confused and vague about dates and he seemingly never clearly states when he saw Tarmashīrīn. But the evidence of the coin is more difficult to get over. It is not however quite conclusive for apart from the fact that posthumous coins are not unknown, we have the fact that there was an apparently fictitious claimant to the title of Tarmashīrīn and the coin of 733 might have been struck by him.

Mr. Oliver's opinion is that Jink-shī or Jinikishai was reigning in 736 and he doubts that Buzūn ever reigned. This is the statement in the R. A. S. J., but in the subsequent list in J. A. S. B., Buzūn is put down as having reigned from 742-44. On the other hand, Mr. Stanley Lane Poole, as quoted by Mr. Ney Elias, gives Buzūn as reigning in Transoxiana at Timūr's birth (*Tārīkh-i-rashīdī*, Intr. 49.)

<sup>1</sup> The Abū Saʿīd "b. Algiaptou (i.e., son of Oljaitu)" of D'Herbélot who gives a long account of him and states that he was the last prince of the house of Cingīz whom the Mughals recognized. He was descended from Hulāgū Khān. The *Shajratu-l-atrak*

(Miles 309) says he died at the age of 32, childless, on 13 Rabʿu-l-ākhār 736 (D'Ohsson and Beale, 30 Nov., 1335; Gladwin 1 Dec.). It was Abū Saʿīd who put to death the famous historian and minister Rashīdu-d-dīn. D'Herbélot mentions that as the year 736 was full of calamities, it was designated *lauz*. This word both gives by *abjad* the figure 736 (viz., l=30, w=6, and z=700), and also indicates by its meaning of "taking refuge," the necessity for a protector of the Age, viz., Timūr.

<sup>2</sup> This is from the *Zafarnāma* (15) which states that Timūr practised hunting and the art of war from 10 years of age.

<sup>3</sup> Apparently he died in 761 or very early in 762, otherwise the corresponding cycle-year must have been that of the Ox. The *Zafarnāma* too, although not explicit, seems to say that Timūr's father died in 761,—the year in which Tughlaq Timūr invaded Transoxiana and Timūr's uncle, Hājī Barlās fled to Khurāsān. However the *Tārīkh-i-Jahāngīr* (the *Prolegomena*, of the *Zafarnāma*) gives (near the end) the date of Tarāghāi's death, 762.

<sup>4</sup> She died 785 (*Zafarnāma* I. 355).





When Šāhib Qarānī arrived at the age of 34<sup>1</sup> solar years, he with auspicious horoscope and lofty fortune and by the counselling of his God-given wisdom which is a station of Divine inspiration, placed on his head on Wednesday, 12 *Ramazān*, 771 (9, April,<sup>2</sup> 1370), corresponding to the year of the Dog (Īt) the diadem of rule and the crown of world-conquest and made lofty the throne of sovereignty and world-government. And for 36<sup>3</sup> years which was the time of his supremacy and world-adornment, he brought under his control and into his permanent possession, the countries of Transoxiana, *Khawārizm*, *Turkistān*, *Khurāsān*, the two 'Irāqs,<sup>4</sup> *Āzarbāijān*, *Persia*, *Māzandarān*, *Kirmān*, *Diyārbakr*, *Khūzistān*, *Egypt*, *Syria*, *Asia Minor* (*Rūm*), *etc.*, by means of his world-conquering courage and his capacious intellect, and uplifted the banners of authority and sovereignty in the four quarters of the world and in the seven climes.

Whosoever was befriended<sup>5</sup> of Salvation, came forward to meet him with the foot of obedience and for such an one, the rose of auspiciousness bloomed on Fortune's pinnacle. Whoever had misfortune and eventual destruction enfolded in his skirt, and disengaged his head from the collar of submission, arrived with tearing of hair<sup>6</sup> at the Judgment-seat of the Dispenser (*Qahramān*) of Justice and beheld in his own bosom the thorn-brake offspring of his acts.

On Monday of *Zī-l-qa'da*<sup>7</sup> 789, he massacred the inhabitants of

<sup>1</sup> Abū-l-ḥamīd (*Bādshāhnāma*, 43), gives Tīmūr's age then as 35 yrs. 17 dys.

<sup>2</sup> Apparently on his birthday.

<sup>3</sup> Abū-l-ḥamīd says for 35 yrs. 11 ms. 5 dys.

<sup>4</sup> This might mean either Media and Babylonia or the cities of Kufa and Basra but here it is the former for Abū-l-ḥamīd who copies A.F. says (43) the 'Irāqs of Arabia and Persia.

<sup>5</sup> *Lit.* to whomsoever Salvation was the friend of his fortune's day. Four MSS. have *dawlatash* instead of *dawlat* as in Text.

<sup>6</sup> *Mūi-kashān lit.* hair-dragging but here perhaps "dragged by the hair."

<sup>7</sup> It was 6 *Zī-l-qa'da* (6th November, 1387), according to Price (Retrospect III. 72.) The inhabitants rose against Tīmūr while negotiations for the surrender of the city were going on and killed many of his soldiers. Tīmūr thus alludes to the affair (Institutes, White and Davy, 119) "And I conquered the city of Ispahān. And I trusted the people of Ispahān and I delivered the castle into their hands. And they rebelled and the *Darogha* whom I had placed over them, they slew with 300 of the soldiers. And I also commanded that a general slaughter should be made of the people of Ispahān."





Isphāh on account of their sedition and rebellion. Thence he turned the reins of resolution towards the capital (Shīrāz) of Persia (Fārs) where the Muzaffar<sup>1</sup> family (Āl-i-muzaffar) became his servants. When news came of the opposition of Tūqtamish<sup>2</sup> Khān the ruler of Dasht Qipcāk<sup>3</sup> (the desert of Qipcāk, i.e., the Khirgiz Steppe) and one of those who had been supported<sup>4</sup> by his Majesty (Tīmūr), he twice led his army against him and having exalted the banners of victory, he returned. He traversed Dasht Qipcāk which is a thousand leagues (*farsangs*) long and six hundred wide and cleared it of the rubbish of strife.<sup>5</sup> A second time he marched against Īrān in 795 (1393) and brought death to Shāh Manṣūr<sup>6</sup> who had cocked<sup>7</sup> the bonnet of frowardness, and he extirpated the Muzaffar race.

And in that country, he performed feats which obliterated those of Rustam<sup>8</sup> and Afrāsīāb<sup>9</sup> and for the sake of the repose of the ministers<sup>10</sup> of his victorious dominion, converted the country of Persia into a thornless garden (*gulzār-i-bīkhār*). After<sup>11</sup> that he conquered Baghdād by the strength of his dominion and fortune. He went several times into Georgia and brought there as his companion, victory and conquest. In 12 Muḥarram, 801 (23rd September, 1398

<sup>1</sup> D'Herbélot art. Madhaffar, and Rieu's Cat. I. 82 and 168a. The dynasty was known by the name of Āl-i-muzaffar. It began in 718 (1318) and was overthrown by Tīmūr in 795 (1393). It ruled over Kirmān.

<sup>2</sup> D'Herbélot art. Tectamish.

<sup>3</sup> Jarrett III. 102.

<sup>4</sup> Tūqtamish at one time owed his kingdom to Tīmūr. He was a descendant of Cingiz through his son Jūji.

<sup>5</sup> *Khas ū khāshāk* "weeds and briars."

<sup>6</sup> D'Herbélot art. Mansor; Zafarnāma Bib. Ind. I. 608, and Gibbon Cap. 65. Manṣūr was killed by Shāhrukh and Gibbon says Tīmūr declared his esteem of the valour of

his foe by extirpating all the males of so intrepid a race.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Macaulay's account of Sir John Fenwick cocking his hat in Queen Mary's face.

<sup>8</sup> Alluding apparently to the taking of the famous White Fort (*Qil'a-i-safid*) 45 miles N.W. of Shīrāz and which was taken by Rustam also. (Hist. of Persia, Malcolm I. 27 and 46.)

<sup>9</sup> Afrāsīāb, i.e., conqueror of Persia. He was afterwards killed by Zāl and his son Rustam.

<sup>10</sup> *Auliqā-i-daulat*, but this phrase is often only a respectful way of mentioning the king himself.

<sup>11</sup> This was the first taking of Baghdād, in Sep. 1393. It was taken again 20th June, 1401.





He made a noble<sup>1</sup> bridge over the Indus and by dominion and fortune conquered Hindūstān.<sup>2</sup> In 803 (October 1400) he made an expedition against Syria,<sup>3</sup> and then raised the morning-breeze of fortune. 80 The lights of celestial victories illumined that world-conqueror. On that occasion Aleppo was taken and then the army went to Damascus and shed the blood of the rulers of Syria who were confined in the wretchedness<sup>4</sup> of prison.

Next year he raised his standards for the purpose of subduing Rūm and on Friday, 19<sup>5</sup> Zi-l-hijja, 804 (20th July, 1402), having arrayed his army and adorned the flag of contest with the crescent of victory,

<sup>1</sup> The bridge was of boats and rafts and made in two days and hardly entitled to be styled a *jasr-i-ālī*. Timūr crossed where Jalālu-d-dīn Mangbarnī swam the river.

<sup>2</sup> A. F. has a short notice of this expedition in the *Āin*, under the heading "Comers into India." See *Errett* 349, where instead of "the booty obtained was not considerable" we should read "they did not value it" (the conquest of India). Sir A. Cunningham (*Indian Eras*) gives the date of the capture of Delhi as Wed. 18th Dec., 1398.

<sup>3</sup> The reference appears to be to the slaughter of prisoners from Aleppo, etc., after the first battle before Damascus (*Zafarnāma* II. 314).

Among them were *Shadūn*, governor of Damascus and apparently many other rulers of Syrian cities. These had all assembled at Aleppo under the orders of the king of Egypt (l.c. II. 287.) *Aḥmad* 'Arab *Shāh* tells how a number of the chief men of Damascus surrendered themselves to Timūr after the Sultān of Egypt had deserted the city and that many of these were afterwards put to death (*Manger*, II. Cap. VI and XIII).

Timūr killed them and also the prisoners taken in the battle, apparently because the king of Egypt had tried to have him assassinated and because he (the king) had put one of his ambassadors to death and imprisoned *Altamsh Qujīn* (l.c. II. 275). But the Text may also refer to Timūr's severities against the principal men of Damascus after he had taken the city. He was incensed against them because they were Sunnīs and belonged to the house of Yazīd, the slayer of Ḥusain, and because they had neglected the tomb of the Prophet's widows.

<sup>4</sup> I am not sure of the meaning of *gall-i-qaid*. Several MSS. write it without the *izāfat* and as if it were the name of a place. There is a town and fortress of Zillah in Asia Minor (near to which Cæsar gained his *Veni, Vidi, Vici* victory) but I cannot find that the Syrian Amīrs were confined there or that Timūr was ever there. Possibly *gall* is a variant for *gill*, shadow.

<sup>5</sup> *Aḥmad* 'Arab *Shāh*, Thursday, 27 Zi-l-hijja (*Thamuz*). (*Manger*, II. 255.)



had fought near Angora (Anconra), a glorious battle with İlderim (Thunderbolt), the Cæsar of Rûm, and by the secret aids which rode always beside this royal cavalier of the plain of supremacy, the assembled armies of victory and conquest became his stirrup-holders, and the proclamation<sup>2</sup> of success was issued in the name of that world-subduing lord. İlderim Bâyezîd (Bajazet) was made prisoner and when they produced him at the foot of the lofty throne, he was, out of perfect kindness and chivalry, given a seat above the princes.<sup>3</sup>

From thence<sup>4</sup> Timûr went to Âzarbâijân and spent there eighteen months in the administration of justice. Kings and kings' sons from

<sup>1</sup> *Ham'-inân*, lit. equal-reined.

<sup>2</sup> Referring to announcements of victory sent to Persia, Tartary, etc. (*Zafarnāma* II. 447).

<sup>3</sup> Text, *şîr-i-dast-i-şâhşâda* but most MSS. have *şâhşâdahâ* and no doubt this is the true reading. I am also convinced that *şîr* is a mistake for *zabar* which I have found in one A.S.B.MS. See Vullers s.v. *zabardast* where the meaning prior locus in *concessu* is given and also the phrase *zabardast nishastan*, *locum altiore*, i.e., *magis honoratum occupare*, together with a very apposite Persian couplet.

I do not know whether A.F. was justified by his authorities for the statement in the Text. The *Zafarnāma* merely says Timûr gave Bâyezîd a seat near himself and the *Rauzat-i-şafâ* that Bâyezîd was given an honourable seat (*sharaf-i-jûlûs*).

A.F. knows nothing or says nothing about Bâyezîd's subsequent confinement in an iron cage (Gibbon). The story is, however, now regarded as disproved. The *Rauzat* states that according to the testimony of an eye-witness, Timûr at

first spoke roughly to Bâyezîd and reproached him for his obstinacy and folly. The *Zafarnāma* admits this but represents the reproaches as given after the removal of his chains.

Bâyezîd was restored to his kingdom and allowed the place of a subject or vassal prince (*Zafarnāma* II. 461). According to Hammer, the "cage" was a woman's litter. But a recent writer in the Z. D. M. G. has refuted Hammer and has, apparently unconsciously, vindicated the acumen of Gibbon.

\* This statement is misplaced. Timûr went to Âzarbâijân before the battle of Angora and the "18 months" referred to seems the interval between the taking of Damascus in January, 1401 and the battle of Angora in July, 1402. A.F. says nothing of the capture of Smyrna from the Knights of St. John which occurred after the battle of Angora in 805 (December, 1402) and was one of Timûr's greatest achievements. The whole of A.F.'s account of Timûr is very poor and bears marks of haste.





various countries came and did homage. The ruler of Egypt coined much red and white money in his name and sent it to the world-protecting Court. Other rulers of the surrounding countries raised the flag of well-wishing on the plain of obedience. And from the pulpits of Mecca, Medina and other holy places, the *khutba* was read in his name. In Zī-l-qa'da, 806 (May, 1404), he marched against Firūza-kūh<sup>1</sup> and having won victory there that very day, he, without delay, turned towards Khurāsān. In the beginning of Muḥarram 807 (9th-10th July, 1404) he went by Nishāpūr to Transoxiana and there in his native country inaugurated a great feast<sup>2</sup> such as astonished the lords of greatness and splendour.

After gratifying mankind with largesses and favours, he set forth to subdue the territories of China (*Khītā*).

On the night of Wednesday, 17 Sha'bān, 807 (18th February, 1405) in the village (*mauza*) of Utrār<sup>3</sup> which is 76 leagues (*farsakh*) from Samarqand, he, by the irresistible order of God turned his face towards the eternal city and rode the steed of life into the spacious abode of the everlasting world. They brought his sublime corse to Samarqand with the respect due to so great a man. The following lines record the years of the events of this world-adornor.

### Quatrain.

Sultān Tīmūr is he to whom no king was like;  
In 736, he came into existence;  
In 771, he ascended the throne,  
In 807, he bade the world adieu.

<sup>1</sup> A town in Māzindarān, on the Caspian. It takes its name from a neighbouring mountain which yields turquoise or according to another derivation, is the "Hill of Victory." (D'Herbélot art. *Firouscouh* and Réclus 242.) It was seen by Clavigo who calls it Berescote, when on his way to visit Tīmūr (Markham, 101).

<sup>2</sup> The Diet and entertainment described by Clavigo and Gibbon and

at which six marriages of Tīmūr's grandchildren were celebrated. It took place September, 1404, at Samarqand.

<sup>3</sup> Lat. 44 N. Long. 67 E. and about 300 miles N. by E. of Samarqand on right bank of the Sīhūn (Jaxartes). Bābar (Erskine I. 11n.) says it was called also Yenghi. Hence it is the Yenghi-kent (New Town) of Turkistan mentioned in the *Āin* (Jarrett, III. 101).





This auspicious Lord of Conjunction had four sons. (1) Ghiyāṣu-d-dīn Jahāngir Mirzā. He died in Samarqand in 776<sup>1</sup> (1375) in the early part of his father's reign. He left two sons, Muḥammad Sultān 81 whom Timūr made his heir but who died after the conquest of Asia Minor (Rūm) on 17 Shā'bān, 805, at Sūrī<sup>2</sup> a fort of Rūm; and Pīr Muḥammad who was made his heir after his brother's death and in whose favour his Majesty Ṣāhib Qarānī made a will at the end of his life. At that time he (Pīr Muḥammad) was ruler of Ghaznīn and the borders of India. But he was martyred on 14 Ramaṣān, 809 (22nd February, 1407), by Pīr 'Alī Tāz,<sup>3</sup> one of his officers and thus the stain of an eternal curse was affixed to the brow of that disloyal one.

The second son of his Majesty Ṣāhib Qarānī is Mirzā 'Umar Shāikh who ruled over Persia. He too died in his father's life-time in Rabi'ū-l-awwal, 796 (January, 1394), below the fortress of Khar-mātū.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Timūr's Memoirs and *Zafarnāma*, 777. See *Zafarnāma* I. 271 where it is said that 777 corresponds with the Crocodile Year. The death was in the beginning of 777 and so about June 1375.

<sup>2</sup> I do not know the authority for this statement. Sūrī Hīṣār is mentioned in the *Zafarnāma* (II. 448) and Pétis de la Croix says it is a fortress between Angora and Kutaya (Cotyaecum). See also Retrospect, Price, III. 397. In Réclus' map it is Sivri Hissar.

But the *Zafarnāma* does not say Muḥammad Sultān died there. What it says is (II. 492) that he died three stages from Qarā Hīṣār (Black Fort) while his father was having him conveyed in a travelling-litter,—apparently from Qarā Hīṣār for change of air. (See for account of his illness and death, *Zafarnāma* II. 490. Also Price l.c. III. 424.) The *Zafarnāma* gives date of death 18 Shā'bān, (11th March, 1403), and thus

about a fortnight after Bāyazīd's; according to Hammer, four days only—he putting Bāyazīd's death 14 Shā'bān, 803 (8th March, 1403). According to Aḥmad 'Arab Shāh (Manger, I. 147) Muḥammad Sultān died in Āq Shahr where died also Bāyazīd.

One MS. (B.M. Add. 27, 247) has *dar sawārī* for *dar sūrī* and possibly this is the true reading, for apparently Muḥammad Sultān died in his travelling-litter.

<sup>3</sup> D'Herbélot and several MSS., *Yār*. Tāz appears right. For account of the murder (which was committed near Shibarghan, W. of Balkh) see Hist. of Bukhārā, Vambéry 215 and 'Abdu-r-razzāk, Quatremère, *Notices et Extraits* XIV. 101. Pīr 'Alī was afterwards put to death by Shāhrukh.

<sup>4</sup> Also Kharmānū. It is a petty fort in Kurdistān. The prince had been sent for by his father from Persia and was on his way to join





The third son was Jalālu-d-dīn Mīrān Shāh Mīrzā of whom a short account will be given as he belongs to this noble series.

The fourth son was Mīrzā Shāhrukh who governed Khurāsān and who attended his father's stirrup in many battles. Shortly after his father's death, he became confirmed in sovereignty; and Īrān, Turān and such other countries as had been under his father's control, were under his successful sway for 43 years. He was born on Thursday 14th Rabi'ū-l-ākhar, 779 (21st August, 1377), and died on New Year's Day (Pers. Era) Sunday morning, 25th Zī-l-hijja, 850 (13th March, 1447).

### JALĀLU-D-DĪN MĪRĀN SHĀH.

Jalālu-d-dīn Mīrān Shāh is the sixth ancestor of the king of kings. His noble birth was in 769 and in his father's lifetime he governed the Arabian<sup>1</sup> and Persian 'Irāqs, Āzarbāijān, Diyārbakr (Mesopotamia) and Syria.

When his Majesty Šāhib Qarānī marched against India, all these countries<sup>2</sup> were placed under his (Jalālu-d-dīn's) management so that not for a moment, was there intermission of justice and sovereignty.

One day while hunting roebuck,<sup>3</sup> his horse shied (or perhaps took fright) in galloping and he was thrown from the point of the

him in Diyārbakr. He was killed by an arrow from the fort while reconnoitering it. (*Rauzat-u-s-safā* B.M. Add. 27, 236, 107b, and lith. ed. VI. 69; also *Retrospect*, Price, III. 172).

<sup>1</sup> Text *wa*, after 'Irāq, is wrong.

<sup>2</sup> Syria can hardly have been among these for it was not conquered until after the Indian expedition.

<sup>3</sup> Text سَرِقُوج *sar-i-qūc*, but *Zafar-nāma*, *qūc* which Vullers translates *aries bellicosus*. But *sar-i-qūc* also means roe-deer and Pétis de la Croix translates it *chevreuil* (Book V. Cap. I. 189). The *Ḥabīb-u-s-siyar* calls the animal a *qūc-kuhi*, qu. ibex. *Sar-i-*

*qūc* does not occur in the Dictionaries and is perhaps a mistake for *sāi-qūc*, a desert-antelope. Shaw's voc. gives *Sāi-kūk*, for an antelope.

For an account of the accident which occurred in the autumn of 798 (1396) and thus some two yrs. before the Indian expedition, see *Zafar-nāma* II. 200; *Retrospect*, Price, III. 292 and *Rauzat-u-s-safā* Book VI. 98 lith. ed. where further details are given such as that Mīrān Shāh took up the deer on his saddle bow and that it fell off and so startled the horse. The accident was near Tab-rīz where there were not likely to have been wild sheep.





saddle to the ground and sustained grave injuries to his head and face.<sup>1</sup> Able physicians and surgeons applied remedies and restored him to physical health but his mind remained clouded (*lit.* a mist encircled the centre of his mind's equability) from the accident. After Tīmūr's death, Mīrān Shāh's eldest son Abābākr Mīrzā read the *khutba* and struck coins in his father's name. His Highness the Prince (Mīrān Shāh) lived principally in Tabrīz<sup>2</sup> and all affairs of sovereignty were carried on by Mīrzā Abābākr. On 24th Zī-l-qa'da, 810 (21st April, 1408), he was killed<sup>3</sup> in a battle with Qarā Yūsuf Turkmān in the environs of Tabrīz. He had eight sons,<sup>4</sup> Abābākr, Alankar Mīrzā, 'Uṣmān Calbī Mīrzā, 'Umar Khālīl, Sultān Muḥammad Mīrzā, Ījīl Mīrzā, Siyūrghatamish.

#### SULTĀN MUḤAMMAD MĪRZĀ.

Sultān Muḥammad Mīrzā is the dominion<sup>5</sup>-holding son of Mīrān Shāh. His noble mother was Mihr Nūsh<sup>6</sup> and of the tribe of Fūlād

<sup>1</sup> *Zafarnāma*, head and face.

<sup>2</sup> Clavigo (Markham 95) saw Mīrān Shāh at Sultania and describes him as 40 yrs: of age and a large, corpulent and gouty man. He describes his misconduct and why he had been deprived of power by his father.

<sup>3</sup> *Notices et Extraits*, Quatremère XIV, 135 and *Rauzat-u-s-safā* lith. ed. VI. 168 and Price l.c. IV. 504. The last two give date 26 Zī-l-qa'da 810.

<sup>4</sup> See Blochmann's *Āin*, Genealogical Table.

<sup>5</sup> This is said merely for the jingle *farzand-i-daulat-paivand*. In fact Sultān Muḥammad never reigned. It seems (*Zafarnāma* II. 735) that he died before his father and grandfather, i.e., before 807, for he is not named in the *Zafarnāma*, among Tīmūr's surviving 36 sons and grandsons. This may account for Clavigo's not mentioning him and

it also shows how confused and unreliable A.F.'s account is. A.F. would lead us to suppose Sultān Muḥammad living when Khālīl was sent by his uncle Shābrukh (Price l.c. IV. 521) in 812 (March, 1410), to Rhey or Rey (Rhages) where he died in Rajab 814 (2nd November, 1411). If as is most probable, Sultān Muḥammad Mīrzā died so early—before even his father had acceded to power—A.F.'s representing him as a *Jahān-ārāi wālā-qadr* (powerful world-adornor) and as typified by one of the seven stars of Qacūlī's dream, becomes doubly ridiculous.

<sup>6</sup> Perhaps the lady called Khānzāda by Sharafu-d-dīn (205), Clavigo, etc., who went off to Samarqand and reported her husband's insanity to Tīmūr. Clavigo says she was the mother of Khālīl and it seems probable from their living together that Khālīl and Sultān Muḥammad were



**Qiyā.** The Mirzā always lived with his brother Mirzā Khalil in Samarqand and when the latter proceeded to 'Irāq, Mirzā Shāhrukh told Mirzā Ulugh Bēg (his son) what he knew of Muḥammad Mirzā's good qualities and praised his noble character; and the Prince (Ulugh Bēg) always shewed him brotherly (i.e., cousinly) kindness. Muḥammad Mirzā had two sons, Sultān Abū Sa'īd Mirzā and Manūcihr Mirzā. When he was ill and about to die, Mirzā Ulugh Bēg came to inquire after him and the latter strongly recommended his son Abū Sa'īd to Mirzā Ulugh Bēg. Accordingly Abū Sa'īd was brought up with all enjoyment under the care of Ulugh Bēg and daily moved upwards on the steps of dominion and fortune under his guidance. One day,<sup>1</sup> one of Ulugh Bēg's intimates observed to him "Your cousin (Abū Sa'īd) is serving you very zealously," to which the Mirzā replied, "He is not serving us but is learning the arts of conquest and victory from our companionship." And in this the Mirzā was speaking from his perfect insight and perception.

#### SULTĀN ABŪ SA'ĪD MIRZĀ.

Sultān Abū Sa'īd Mirzā's auspicious birth was in 830 (1427) and he became Sultān when he was 25. For 18 years he ruled Turkistān, Trausoxiana, Badakhshān, Kābul, Ghaznīn, Qandahār and the borders of Hindūstān and in the end of his reign, 'Irāq too came into his possession. And with this prosperity and extent of territory which might become a thousand-fold source of intoxication, he was discreet and open-minded and sought for enlightenment from dervishes and ascetics. In 872 (1468) Mirzā Jahān Shāh, son of Qarā Yūsuf, the ruler of Āzarbāijān, had marched to put down Āzūn Ḥasan Āq-quyanlu<sup>2</sup> but owing to his great carelessness and complete want of

full brothers. Clavigo (147) calls her Hansada. He says "She was of the lineage of the old emperors and for this reason, Timur Beg treats her with great respect." This points to her identity with Mihr Nūsh to whose lofty lineage A.F. refers. Qiyā seems the same as Qiyāt mentioned by A.F. in the account of Irganaqūn but I do not know the tribe Fulād (steel).

<sup>1</sup> Bābar, Erskine, Introduction LIV.

<sup>2</sup> White sheep. (Price l.c. III. 608). The proper spelling appears to be *Āq-quyan-lū*. The Black sheep are the Qarāquyanlū. Āzūn Ḥasan, i.e., Ḥasan the Long, was maternal grandfather of Shāh Ismā'īl Ṣafavī, king of Persia.





management, was killed by him.<sup>1</sup> The Sultān (Abū Saʿīd) led an army against him (Āzūn Ḥasan). Though Āzūn Ḥasan proffered peace, it was not accepted and being driven to extremity, he cut off the supplies of corn. Consequently a great famine arose in the camp (of Abū Saʿīd) so that for 14 days the royal horses had no barley and as a result of the famine, the soldiers dispersed. Āzūn Ḥasan gained the victory and on 22 Rajab, 873 (4th February, 1469), the Sultān fell by fate into the hands of Āzūn Ḥasan's men. Three days afterwards he was made over to Yādgār Muḥammad Mirzā, son of Sultān Muḥammad Mirzā, son of Bāysanghar Mirzā, son of Shāhrukh Mirzā who was an ally of Āzūn Ḥasan. This worthless inauspicious one slew that powerful king on the pretext<sup>2</sup> of the murder of Gauhar Shād Bēgum who was the wife of Shāhrukh Mirzā. The words *Maqṭal-i-Sultān Abū Saʿīd* (the slaughter-spot of Sultān Abū Saʿīd) give the date (873=1469).

‘UMAR SHAIKH Mirzā.

‘Umar Shaiikh Mirzā was the fourth<sup>3</sup> son of Abū Saʿīd Mirzā, being

<sup>1</sup> This is the occurrence referred to by Herbélot in his notice of Abū Saʿīd. He says that in 861 (1457), Abū Saʿīd was in a bad humour owing to having failed to capture the citadel of Herāt and that at this time, some evil-disposed persons told him that Sultān Ibrāhīm Mirzā (a grandson of Bāysanghar and great-grandson of Shāhrukh) had sent messengers to Sultāna Gauhar Shād and that he had a secret understanding with her. In consequence, Abū Saʿīd hastily ordered her to be put to death. She was the widow of Shāhrukh, the great-grandfather of Yādgār and had been living in Herāt which had been her husband's capital and where he had died in 850 (1447). Abū Saʿīd had taken the town but had failed to get possession of the citadel.

<sup>2</sup> Gauhar Shād (Jewel of Delight) seems to have been Shāhrukh's

favourite wife, and Vambéry states (Hist. of Bukhārā, 236) that some of his verses about her are still remembered by the people of Herāt. Bābar speaks of visiting her tomb. She must have been an elderly woman when put to death, and the vengeance taken by her descendant was not excessive and was in accordance with the Muhammadan law of retaliation. She was put to death on 10 Ramaẓān, 861 (31st July, 1457. Price l.c. IV, 598.) See inscription on her tomb in Cap. Yates "Notes on the City of Herāt." (J.A.S.B. 1887, Vol. 56, p. 98.) She is there called Gauhar Shād Āghā and the date of her death is given only as the middle of Ramaẓān, 861. Yādgār was only a boy at the time, for Bābar (88) speaks of him as an inexperienced lad of 17 or 18 when he was killed at Herāt in the following year, 1470.

<sup>3</sup> A. F.'s list of Abū Saʿīd's sons





younger than Sultān Aḥmad Mīrzā, Sultān Muḥammad and Sultān Maḥmūd Mīrzā and older than Sultān Murād Mīrzā, Sultān Walad Mīrzā, Ulugh Bēg Mīrzā, Abū Bakr Mīrzā, Sultān Khalīl Mīrzā and Shāhrukh Mīrzā. He was born in Samarqand in 860 (1455). Sultān Abū Saʿīd Mīrzā at first gave Kābul to the Prince and sent him off under the guardianship of Bābā Kābulī, but he recalled him from Dara-gaz<sup>1</sup> for the purpose of a festival.<sup>2</sup>

After it was over, he gave him the country of Andijān and the Takhtī-Ōzjand<sup>3</sup> and after providing him with officers, sent him to that country under the guardianship<sup>4</sup> of Timūr Tāsh<sup>5</sup> Bēg. The reason for giving this country to the best of his sons was an exceeding desire to preserve his ancestral territory and as his Majesty Sāhib Qarānī gave it to his son 'Umar Shāikh Mīrzā who was of singular ability, so did Abū Saʿīd on account of the sameness of name, gave it to his son 'Umar Shāikh. Sāhib Qarānī is reported to have repeatedly remarked, "We conquered the world by the might of 'Umar Shāikh Mīrzā's sword, by his staying in Andijān and being a strong barrier between our territory and the desert of Qipcāk and by his guarding the passes, the people of Qipcāk were not able to rebel or be turbulent and we could in security brace ourselves up for the conquest of the world."

And this wise ruler ('Umar Shāikh the Second) also took extreme precautions that no hostile army should be able to cross this territory

does not agree with Khwāndamīr and is incorrect. S. Maḥmūd was the second, and S. Muḥammad the third son. Abū Saʿīd left eleven sons, and it would appear in spite of Bābār's own statements, that his father was the 6th and not the fourth son, the 5th being Ulugh Bēg. The 11th son was apparently a Sultān 'Umar, who was distinct from 'Umar Shāikh.

<sup>1</sup> "The valley of Gez or Manna which lies on the Dihās or Balkhab, south of Balkh." (Erskine l. c. 7n.) According to Sir H. Rawlinson, (R. G. S. Pro. 1876, 170n.) Daragaz means

valley of the tamarisk. As Abū Saʿīd had sent 'Umar Shāikh from Samarqand, the latter would pass Dara-gaz on his way to Afghānistān.

<sup>2</sup> Abū Saʿīd's famous six months' festival which he celebrated at Merv, in 1465 and in honour of the circumcision of his sons.

<sup>3</sup> Apparently Ōzkand in Eastern Farḡāna.

<sup>4</sup> 'Umar Shāikh was then only ten years old. Much of this is from Bābār's Memoirs.

<sup>5</sup> His full name is Khudābandī Timūr Tāsh. (Bābār, Erskine 8 and 14.)





which was the boundary of Mongolia. And though Yūnus<sup>1</sup> (Jonas) Khan tried, he could not get possession of it and not the slightest injury happened to its tranquillity. That fortunate and lofty-starred 84 Prince was one who weighed his words and was eloquent; he had a great liking for poets and could recite poetry. He had a poetical temperament but was not solicitous of writing verses and spent most of his time in reading books, historical and poetical. The *Shāhnāma* was often recited before him and he was an excellent companion; of open brow and good disposition and fond of quoting good poetry. A lofty genius warmed his soul and the beauty of fortune was manifest on his brow. He had no equal among his contemporaries for administrative ability, care of his subjects and dispensing of justice. His courage and generosity were on an equal footing and his genius was companioned by his energy. He adorned the throne of sovereignty.<sup>2</sup>

For example, once a caravan from China (*Khitā*) had come to the hill-country east of Andijān. There was a heavy snow-storm and the caravan was overwhelmed so that only two persons escaped. When this just man heard of the catastrophe, in spite of his necessities at the time, he did not touch any of the goods but appointed trustworthy persons and attached the property until the heirs were collected from their native country to receive the goods, the rights of each being ascertained.<sup>3</sup>

This king was always of a dervish mind and inclined to the society of religious persons and asked for wisdom at the doors of the hearts of the God-knowing. Especially the holy Nāsiru-d-dīn<sup>4</sup> *Khawāja* 'Abidu-l-lāh, known by the name of *Khwāja Ahrār*.

<sup>1</sup> This is hardly a fair description of Yūnus *Khān's* proceedings. 'Umar *Shaikh* made over his capital *Akhsi* to Yūnus and then repented and made war on him. He was defeated and taken prisoner and owed his life to Yūnus' generosity. (*Tār. Rashīdī*, 96.)

<sup>2</sup> All this is from Bābar. (Erskine 8 and also Pavét de Courteille.) But the Turkish seems more concise than the Persian. A.F. probably used the latter for his account is in

closer accord with Erskine than with De Courteille.

<sup>3</sup> This story is told in Bābar's *Memoirs* (8). The stress laid on this simple act of honesty by Bābar and A.F. is rather significant of the morals of the time. Probably 'Umar *Shaikh's* self-denial on this occasion inspired his son Bābar to similar action towards the Hindustānī merchants at Kilāt-i-ghilzāi. (*Memoirs* 225.)

<sup>4</sup> For references to this saint, see





In succession to his father, he ruled in Andijān, the capital of Farghāna and also Tāshkand, Shāhrukhiya and Sīrām were in his possession. He several times led an army against Samarqand and he several times brought to his help Yūnus Khān who possessed the dominions of Caghatai Khān and was Khān of the Mughals and was nearly related to him. Whenever he brought him, he assigned some province to him and then as occasion served, Yūnus Khān would go back to Mughalistan. On the last occasion 'Umar Mirzā gave him Tāshkand and up to 908 (1502-3) this and Shāhrukhiya were in the possession of the Caghatai rulers. At this last date the Khānship of the Mughal tribes belonged to Maḥmūd Khān, eldest son of Yūnus Khān. This Maḥmūd Khān and Sultān Aḥmad Mirzā brother of 'Umar Shaikh ruler of Samarqand, having concluded an alliance, marched their forces against the Mirzā ('Umar Shaikh). Sultān Aḥmad Mirzā proceeded from the south of the Khajand river and Sultān Maḥmūd Khān from the north of it. Just at this crisis an extraordinary thing happened to the Mirzā. The brief account of it is as follows.

Akhsikat which is known as Akhsī, is one of the seven towns of Farghāna. Mirzā 'Umar Shaikh had made it his capital. The town was on a precipitous ravine and all the buildings were on its edge. As fate would have it, on Monday 4th Ramazān, 899 (9th June, 1494), he was sitting near his pigeon house which was one of these buildings, watching the motions of his birds, when an attendant reported that the precipice was breaking away. The Mirzā at once got up and had put one foot into its slipper but had not had time to put in the other, when the whole precipice gave way and the terrace fell down. The Mirzā's outward form fell to the bottom but in reality, he ascended to the zenith. He was then 39 years old, having been born in 860, at Samarqand. (This last fact has been mentioned already.)

Be it known that Farghāna belongs to the fifth climate and is on

Tār. *Rashīdī* 97, etc., and *Nafahātu-l-uns*, Lees, 465. He lived in Samarqand. Dr. Rieu gives the date of his death as 29th Rabī' I, 895 (2nd March, 1490), (Pers. Cat. III, 1086a). See also Blochmann 423.

1 Apparently only the fort was on

the edge of the ravine and the town some distance off. The fort looked down on the Sīhūn and 'Umar Shaikh had increased the steepness of the precipice by scarping the rock of the ravine. Perhaps this partly caused the accident.





the borders of the civilized world. East of it is Kāshghar and west, Samarqand; south, the mountains on the borders of Badakhshān. To the north, although formerly there were cities such as Almālīgh, Almātū, Yāngī, known as Utrār, but at present no traces or ruins even of them remain. In the west where are Samarqand and Khajand, there are no mountains. Except in this direction, there is no entry for foreigners. The river Sihūn, known as the Āb-i-khajand, coming from the north-east flows west. It then runs on the north of Khajand and south of Finākat which is known as Shāhrukhīya. Then inclining to the north, it flows towards Turkistān and meeting no other river in its course, it disappears beyond Turkistān in the sands. In this country there are seven towns, (*qaṣba*) five to the south of the Sihūn and two to the north. The southern towns are Andijān, Ūsh, Marghīnān,<sup>1</sup> Asfara (var. Isfaraḡ) and Khajand. The northern are Akhsī and Kāsān.

This unique pearl of sovereignty had three sons and five daughters, the eldest son being his Majesty Firdūs-makānī Zahīr-u-d-dīn Muḥammad Bābar Pādshāh. Jahāngīr Mīrzā was the next and younger by two years and was the son of Fāṭima Sultān who belonged to the Tōmān officers (i.e., chiefs of 10,000 men) of the Mughals. The third was Nāṣir Mīrzā younger than Jahāngīr by two years. His chaste mother was from Andijān and was a concubine named Ummad. The eldest daughter was Khānzāda Bēgum, full sister of his Majesty Gītī-sitānī Firdūs-makānī and older than he by five years. When Shāh Ismaʿīl Ṣafawī defeated the Uzbēgs (Shaibānī) at Merv, that chaste one was in Merv and Shāh Ismaʿīl sent her with all respect to his Majesty Gītī-sitānī Firdūs-makānī at Qunduz.<sup>2</sup> 86

After a lapse of ten years, an interview took place between them, and his Majesty Gītī-sitānī Firdūs-makānī says, "When they came I and Maḥmūdī Kōkultāsh (foster-brother) went to meet them "but the Bēgum and her attendants did not recognize us, although "we made ourselves known. After a while they recognized us."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The modern name is Marghīlān (Erskine l.c. 3n.) It is west of Andijān.

<sup>2</sup> A town north, of Kābul and east of Balkh. Sometimes spelled Khunduz. (*Tārīkh-i-rashīdī*, 239.)

<sup>3</sup> Perhaps the meaning is that she could not distinguish Bābar from his foster-brother. (See Erskine, 10 and P. de Courteille, 17). The non-recognition of her brother is curious considering that she was about 24





## CHAPTER XVII.

HIS MAJESTY GĪTĪ-SITĀNĪ FIRDŪS-MAKĀNĪ ZAHĪRU-D-DĪN MUHAMMAD  
BĀBAR PĀD<sup>SH</sup>ĀH GHĀZĪ.<sup>1</sup>

King of the four quarters,<sup>2</sup> and of the seven heavens; celestial sovereign; diadem of the sublime throne; great of genius and greatness-conferring; fortune-increaser; of excellent horoscope; heaven in comprehensiveness; earth in stability; lion-hearted; clime-capturer; lofty in splendour; of active brain; searcher after knowledge; rank-breaking lion rampant; exalter of dominion; ocean-hearted; of illustrious origin; a saintly sovereign; enthroned in the kingdom of reality and spirituality, Zahrū-d-dīn Muḥammad Bābar Pādshāh Ghāzī. His pearl-like nature was a station for the marks of greatness and sublimity; freedom and detachment together with lofty restraint and majestic power flashed forth in his nature; in asceticism and absorption (*faqr ū fanā*<sup>3</sup>) a Junīd<sup>4</sup> and Bāyazīd; while the magni-

<sup>1</sup> World-gripper, Paradise-inhabiting, Defender of the Faith, Muḥammad ābar (Lion), the holy warrior-king. Bābar is commonly said to mean lion or tiger, but this seems to me a little doubtful, for the word for lion is *babr*, not *bābar*. Besides why should the Turks use a Persian word? May it not be connected with the Caghatāi word *bābari* or *bayarī* old or primitive. See P. de Courteille, Turc Dict. 155.

<sup>2</sup> *Čār bālīsh-i-haft manzar*, lit. four cushions or elements, seven scenes or theatres. The four cushions mean four thrones and so four quarters of the world.

<sup>3</sup> Another favourite expression is *fanā ū baqā* for which see *Notices et Extraits*, S. de Sacy, XII., 327n.

*Fanā* is used by mystics for the Sūfī's relation to externals, viz. his dying to them and *baqā* for his relation to God.

<sup>4</sup> Usually Junaid but here Junīd, unless Bāyazīd be written Bāyazaid. Junaid was a famous ascetic known as Al-Baghdādī and is said to have performed the pilgrimage to Mecca thirty times, on foot and alone. (Beale art. Junaid). He died about 909 A.D. See *Nafahātu-l-uns*, Lees, 89, No. 81 and Jarrett III. 352, where however A. F.'s account is only an abridgement of Jānī. S. de Sacy has translated Jānī's life of Junaid. (*Notices et Extraits* XII, 366 et seq.)

Bāyazīd is Bāyazīd Bisṭāmī, also known as Ṭayfūr b. ʿIsā. He, as well as Junaid, belonged to the Naqsh-





fience and genius of an Alexander and of a Farīdūn shone from his brow. The holy birth of this majestic one was on 6 Muḥarram 888 (14th February 1483) from the holy womb and pure veil of the gloriously chaste and nobly-born, Qutlaq Nigār Khānum. That jewel of fortune's ocean and sparkling star (*durrī*) of the heaven of glory arose from a happy quarter. She, the coiffure of purity and scarf of chastity, was the second daughter of Yūnus (Jonah) Khān and elder sister of Sulṭān Maḥmūd Khān. Her lineage is as follows:—daughter of Yūnus Khān b. Vais Khān, b. Shīr 'Alī Ōghlān, b. Muḥammad Khān, b. Khizr Khwāja Khān, b. Tughlaq Timūr Khān, b. Isān Bughā Khān, b. Davā Khān, b. Barāq Khān, b. Īsūn Tava,<sup>1</sup> b. Mutakan, b. Caghataī Khān, b. Cingīz Khān. Maulānā Ḥisāmī<sup>2</sup> Qarākūlī recorded the date of the noble birth as follows.

*Verse.*

Since on 6 Muḥarram was born that bounteous king,  
His birth's chronogram is also 6 Muḥarram (*shāsh-i-Muḥarram*.<sup>3</sup>)

87

Though the chronogram be of marvellous coincidence and unfathomable in its significance, there is something stranger yet, *viz.*, the chronogram is in six letters which are reckoned by the masters of

bandī order and he was Junaid's his predecessor and teacher. According to the *Khazīnatu-l-aulyā'* (I, 519) Junaid said, "Bāyazīd among us is like Gabriel among the angels." Bāyazīd was descended from a family of fire-worshippers and was a native of Bistām in Persia. (S.S.E. of the Caspian and 3 m. N.E. of Shāhrūd.) He died 261 A.H. (874 A.D.) and is buried in Bistām. See Meynard's Yāqūt 104, Jarrett III., 352 and 359 and Curzon's Persia I., 283 who spells the name of the town Bostam and notices the saint's tomb.

<sup>1</sup> Text, Bīsun Tava.

<sup>2</sup> T. R. 173, calls the author of the chronogram Munīr Marghīnānī and

describes him as having been one of the *ulamā* of Ulugh Bēg. The Luck. ed. calls him Jāmī Qarākūlī. I have consulted the B. M. MSS. of T. R., the name is not clear, it may be Munīr or Mushīr. Erskine (MS. trs. Add. No. 26, 612) calls him merely Maulānā Marghīnānī. Munīr means illustrious in Arabic and may here be descriptive, so that the difference between the two names may be only as to that of origin, *viz.*, Marghīnān or Qarākūl.

Qarākūl (Black Lake) is about 28 miles S. W. of Bukhārā. (Bābar, Ers. 54.)

<sup>3</sup> Bābar, Ers. Intro. LXI.





computation as a lucky number<sup>1</sup> and also the phrase (*lafz*) *shash harf* and the pips (*naqsh*) *'adad-i-khair* both indicate the date. Another wonderful thing is that the units, tens and hundreds of the date are all the same (8-8-8), thus pointing to equability of dispositions. His life corresponded to these mysteries of birth. That exemplar of high saints, Khwāja Ahrār himself with his own bounty-shedding tongue gave him—the auspicious one—the names of Zāhiru-d-dīn Muḥammad, but as this weighty appellation with its majesty and sublimity, was not readily pronounceable or current on the tongues of the Turks, the name of Bābar was also given to him.

His Majesty was the eldest and straightest of the sons of 'Umar Shaikh Mirzā. In his twelfth year, on Tuesday, 5 Ramazān, 899 (10th June, 1494), he sat upon the throne in Andijān. Few kings have encountered such difficulties as he, and the courage, self-reliance and endurance which he displayed in the battle-field and in danger were superhuman. When the inevitable accident of 'Umar Shaikh Mirzā occurred in Akhsī, his Majesty Gīti-sitānī Firdūs-makānī was in the Cārbāgh (Palace) of Andijān. Next day, viz., Tuesday, 5 Ramazān, the news was brought to Andijān. In a moment he mounted his horse and proceeded to the fort of Andijān. As he was alighting at the gate,<sup>2</sup> Shiram<sup>3</sup> Taghāi seized his bridle and carried him towards the namāzgāh (place of prayer) in order to take him to Ōzkand and the foot of the hills. His idea was that, as Sultān Aḥmad Mirzā was coming with great power, the treacherous officers might make over the country to him; if out of disloyalty, they did so, his Majesty's sacred person might be saved from this danger and be conveyed to his maternal uncles Ilanja<sup>4</sup> Khān or Sultān Maḥmūd

<sup>1</sup> Referring to throws at dice, I suppose. *Shash-harf* and *'adad-i-khair* both yield 888, viz.,  $2gh=600$ ,  $h=8$ ,  $r=200$  and  $f=80$ , total 888. Again,  $a=70$ ,  $2d=8$ ,  $kh=600$ ,  $i=10$ ,  $r=200$ , total 888. The great standard was called *shash tughī*. (T. R. I. c. 93.) The chronogram is in six letters, viz., gh, sh, m, h, r, m.

<sup>2</sup> Bābar, Ers., Mirzā's Gate.

<sup>3</sup> Apparently the Shirin Taghāi

mentioned in T. R. I. c. 228, as maternal uncle of Bābar and as a pillar of the State. See too Bābar, Ers. 59 and 94. Apparently he was Bābar's grand-uncle, being his mother's uncle. (Erskine, B. and H. I. 324) Taghāi or taqāi means maternal uncle in Caghataī and Firishṭa calls him the taghāi of 'Umar Shaikh Mirzā.

<sup>4</sup> P. de C. (I. 32), Alaja and Bābar,





88 Khān. The officers, on becoming aware of this intention, sent Khwaja Muḥammad Darzī to dispel anxieties that had arisen in his mind. The *cortège* had reached the *namāzghāh* when Khwaja Muḥammad came up with it. He calmed his Majesty and induced him to return. When he (Bābar) alighted at the citadel of Andijān, all the officers came to wait upon him and received marks of favour from him. It has already been mentioned that Sultān Aḥmad Mirzā and Sultān Maḥmūd Khān had united and come against ʿUmar Shaikh Mirzā. Now that by the decree of fate, an inevitable accident had occurred, all the officers, small and great, united to defend the fort. Sultān Aḥmad Mirzā had taken possession of Ūrātippa, Khajand and Marghinān which are districts of Farghana, and had encamped within four *kos* of Andijān. Though they sent ambassadors and knocked at the door of peace, he did not listen but continued to advance. But as secret aids were always in attendance on this family, on account of the strength of the fort and the unanimity of the officers and of a pestilence which broke out in the camp and of the deaths of the horses,<sup>1</sup> Sultān Aḥmad got into difficulties and came to despair of his former designs. He therefore came to terms and returned without effecting anything. Coming from the north side of the river of Khajand, Sultān Maḥmūd Khān invested Akhsi. Jahāngir Mirzā, brother of his Majesty, and a large number of loyal officers were there. The Khān made several assaults, the officers made a spirited resistance, and so the Khān also did not effect his purpose, and being attacked by a sickness, had to give up his vain enterprise and turn his reins towards his own country. For eleven<sup>2</sup> years, his Majesty waged great wars in Transoxiana against the Caghatāi princes and the Uzbēgs. Thrice he conquered Samarqand, *viz.*, once in 903 (end of November 1497) when coming<sup>3</sup> from Andijān, he took it from

(Ers. 18) Ilchēh. His real name was Sultān Aḥmad Khān and Ilchēh is a sobriquet meaning slayer. (Ers. l. c. 13). He was a son of Yānus Khān and half-brother of Bābar's mother.

<sup>1</sup> Many horses were drowned in crossing the Kaba and many died of disease.

<sup>2</sup> Apparently a clerical error for 18, *viz.*, for the period from 899 to 917. Some MSS. seem to have 15 (which is easily confounded with 11) and Price has 15. (Ret. IV, 666.)

<sup>3</sup> The Text reads as if it were Bāyasanghar who came from Andijān but Bābar's Mem. show what is meant.





Bāyasanghar Mirzā, son of Sultān Maḥmud Mirzā; secondly, from Shaibak (Shaibānī) Khān in 906 (autumn of 1500); and thirdly, after Shaibak Khān had been killed in 917 (October 1511). As God's plan was the revealing of that unique pearl, his Majesty the king of kings, and designed that the country of Hindustān should be acquired and that his Majesty should proceed to a strange land and there arrive at greatness and felicity,—he caused the gates of trouble to be opened in his own native land which is the meeting place of faithful servants, so that in no way could that be fit for him. He was compelled to proceed with a small force towards Badakhshān and Kābul. When he reached Badakhshān, all the people of Khusrū Shāh who was ruler there, accepted his service. And the ruler himself was compelled to do so, though this wretch was ring-leader of the unjust ones and had martyred<sup>1</sup> Bāyasanghar and blinded Sultān Mas'ūd Mirzā, which two princes were his Majesty's cousins. He (Khusrū) also showed signs of pitilessness and inhumanity when at a time of calamity,<sup>2</sup> his Majesty's army was passing into Badakhshān. 89

Now when he beheld the face of his deeds in the mirror of recompense, and fortune had turned away her countenance from his worthless self, his Majesty from perfect humanity and excessive generosity, did not exercise retaliation,<sup>3</sup> but gave orders that he should carry away as much of his property as he desired and go off to Khurāsān. So he took five or six strings<sup>4</sup> of mules and camels, laden

<sup>1</sup> (Bābar, Ers. 73.) Bāyasanghar, who was a poet, was second son of Sultān Muḥammad Mirzā of Herāt, the second son of Abū Sa'īd. He was put to death on 17th August, 1499. (Bābar, Ers. 72.) Mas'ūd was his brother. See account of his being blinded l. c. 63. It was in 1497 that Bābar drove Bāyasanghar out of Samarqand.

<sup>2</sup> Text *ṣāhibqarānī* which does not make sense. Luck. ed. and several MSS., *qarānī*, calamity or crisis. *قارآن* seems to be Turkish for breaking. This passage must refer to Khusrū Shāh's treat-

ment of Bābar when he came to Hīṣār (Hīṣār-i-shādmān) on his flight from Samarqand in 907. Bābar says, (Ers. 126), "Twice did my course lie through the country of this Khusrū Shāh, so famed for his liberal conduct and generosity, and that humanity which he displayed to the meanest of men, he never showed to me." See also T. R. 175. See Ers.'s remarks on Bābar's behaviour to Khusrū Shāh (125).

<sup>3</sup> Bābar, Ers. 131 and 132. T. R. 176.

Leiden states that seven mules





with jewelry and gold ornaments and went off to Khurāsān. And his Majesty Gīti-sitānī Firdūs-makānī having put Badakhshān into order, went to Kābul.

At that time Muḥammad Muqīm, son of Zū-n-nūn Arghūn had taken Kābul from ‘Abdu-razzāq Mirzā, son of Ulugh Beg Mirzā, son of Sultān Abū Sa‘īd Mirzā, who was his Majesty’s cousin. On hearing the noise of the coming of the victorious standards, he fortified himself, but after some days he sought for peace and obtained permission to go to his brother Shāh Bēg in Qandahār with his property. Kābul fell into the hands of his Majesty’s servants in the end of Rabī‘u-l-awwal 910 (beginning of October 1504). After that his Majesty proceeded in 911 to capture Qandahār, and Qilāt (Khelat) which is a dependency of Qandahār was conquered. After that, for reasons of state policy, he abandoned the taking of Qandahār and went south and having attacked the Afghān tribes of Sawāsang and Alātāgh,<sup>1</sup> returned to Kābul.

In the beginning<sup>2</sup> of this year there was a great earthquake in Kābul and its environs. The ramparts of the fort and many buildings in the citadel and city fell down. All the houses in the village of Pemghān<sup>3</sup> fell down and there were three-and-thirty shocks in one day and for a month the earth shook two or three times day and night. Many persons lost their lives, and between Pemghān and Baktub a piece of ground a stone’s throw<sup>4</sup> in breadth separated itself and

go to a string (*qaṭār*), (Bābar 132) but A. F. (Blochmann 152) gives five as the number.

<sup>1</sup> Bābar, Ers. 171n.

<sup>2</sup> The year 905 began 4th June but the earthquake must have been in July. From Bābar’s Memoirs, it appears that it occurred about 40 days after his mother’s death which was in the beginning of the year.

<sup>3</sup> Also Pemghān. Bābar, Ers. 146. It is S. or S. W. of Kābul.

<sup>4</sup> Text, *yak kata bāsh andāz* which is unintelligible. I have examined the two B. M. Persian MSS. of Bābar’s Memoirs. In both, the passage is the same but in the margin

of Add. No. 26, 200—the copy used by Erskine—we have *bir kata tash andāz*. No doubt *tash* (Turk. stone) is correct. *Kata* is Turkish for large but its use here in that sense is not apparent unless we take *tash andāz* as one word and say “a great” or “long stone-throw.” Neither Erskine nor P. de Courteille translates *kata* by great. I should be inclined to regard it as the Hindūstānī *kitta* and as pleonastic; *yak kitta tash* might then mean merely a stone. The passages in the B. M. MSS. are p. 135b of No. 24,416 and p. 141a of No. 26,200.





descended the length of a bowshot and springs burst out from the breach. From Istirḥac<sup>1</sup> to Maidān,<sup>2</sup> a distance of six *farsangs*, (cir. 24 m.) the ground was so contorted that part of it rose as high as an elephant. In the beginning of the earthquake, clouds of dust rose from the tops of the mountains. In the same year there was a great earthquake in India.<sup>3</sup>

One of the occurrences of this time was that Shāibak (Shāibānī) Khān collected an army and proceeded towards Khurāsān. Sultān Husain Mirzā assembled all his sons and marched to oppose him. He also sent Sayyid Afzal, the son of Mir Sultān 'Alī Khwāb-bīn (vision-seer) to urge on the advance of his Majesty Firdūs-makānī. Accordingly he proceeded towards Khurāsān in Muḥarram 912 (end of May 1506). On the way he received at Kāhmard<sup>4</sup> the news of Sultān Husain's death. His Majesty Firdūs-makānī, thinking it still more necessary<sup>5</sup> to advance, went on towards Khurāsān contrary to the calculations of politicians. Before his army reached Khurāsān, short-sighted<sup>6</sup> and inexperienced men had placed jointly on the throne the Mirzā's sons, Badi'ū-z-zamān and Muẓaffar Husain Mirzās.

On Monday, 8th Jumāda-l-ākhar his Majesty met the Mirzās at the Murghāb and at their request came on to Herāt. But as

<sup>1</sup> Now Sirghac. Bābar, Ers. 146n.

<sup>2</sup> Ers. (Bābar, 170) has "to the plain" (*maidān*) but P. de C. (I, 349) seems correct in taking it as the name of a place, Maidān. His trs. completes the description by saying there were holes large enough for a man to hide in.

<sup>3</sup> Ers. (B. and H. I, 229) notes that there was an earthquake at Āgra on 5th July, 1505. Elliot (V, 99) gives Sunday, 3rd *Ṣafar* (6th July).

<sup>4</sup> P. de C., Kāhmard: Wood (Journey to Source of the Oxus, 132), Kamrūd. It is in Afghanistan, N.-W. of Kābul and according to Bābar (Ers. 199) in a valley not far from the Dandān-shikan (tooth-breaking) Pass.

<sup>5</sup> Bābar (Ers. 200) says that he went on "from a regard to the reputation of our family though I also "had other motives," apparently to try conclusions once more with Shāibānī.

<sup>6</sup> The folly consisted in the dual appointment for A.F. and his school held that kingship, being the shadow of Godhead, must be single. Bābar, referring to the joint appointment, says, (199) "This was a strange arrangement. A joint kingship "was never before heard of. The "well-known words of Shāikh Sa'dī "in the *Gulistān* (I, 3) are very applicable to it. Ten dervishes sleep "in one coverlet (*galīm*) but two "kings have not room in one clime " (*iqīm*)." See also *T. R.* 132.



he did not perceive in them signs of guidance and dominion, he set out on his return to Kābul on 8th Shā'bān (24th Dec., 1506). While in the Hazāra Hills, news arrived that Muḥammad Ḥusain Mīrzā Daḡhlāt<sup>1</sup> and Sulṭān Sanjar Barlās had drawn over to their side all the Mughals left in Kābul and had raised up Khān Mīrzā<sup>2</sup> and were besieging Kābul. They also spread among the commonalty a report that the sons of Sulṭān Ḥusain Mīrzā were meditating<sup>3</sup> treachery against his Majesty Firdūs-makānī. Mullā Bābā<sup>4</sup> Bashāgharī, Amīr<sup>5</sup> Muḥibb 'Alī Khalifa, Amīr Muḥammad Qāsim Kōhbar<sup>6</sup> Aḥmad Yūsuf and Aḥmad Qāsim to whom the protection of Kābul had been entrusted, were looking after the defence of the fort. As<sup>7</sup> soon as he heard this news, he made over the baggage to Jahāngīr Mīrzā who was somewhat ill,<sup>8</sup> and accompanied by a few men crossed the passes of the Hindū Kōh which were full of snow, under great difficulty, and descended one morning early upon Kābul. The rebels all crept into concealment at the news of his Majesty's approach. He first went to his step-grandmother (mother's step-mother) Shāh<sup>9</sup> Bēgum, who

<sup>1</sup> Text, wrongly, *vafāt kard ōghlat* (Bābar, Ers. 214). This Muḥammad Ḥusain was the father of Bābar's cousin Ḥaidar, author of the *T. R.*

<sup>2</sup> Bābar's cousin; being son of Sulṭān Muḥammad Mīrzā, third son of Sulṭān 'Alī Sa'īd and Sulṭān Nigār Khānum, daughter of Yānus Khān and Shāh Bēgum. He was thus doubly Bābar's cousin, being son of Bābar's father's elder brother and of his mother's half-sister. Mīrzā Khān's proper name was Sulṭān Vais Mīrzā. Khusrū Shāh killed his brother Bāyasanghar and blinded his brother Mas'ūd. He afterwards became king of Badakhshān.

<sup>3</sup> The report was that they had imprisoned Bābar in the Eagle Castle, near Herāt. (Mem. 214).

<sup>4</sup> *T. R.* l. c. 356. Both Bābā and Muḥammad Aḥmad Kōhbar afterwards rebelled against Bābar.

<sup>5</sup> Bābar, Ers. 214, Khalifa Muḥibb 'Alī Qurca.

<sup>6</sup> Price (Ref. IV, 67) renders this, mountain-piercer, but it probably comes from the town Kōhbar, in Sind, mentioned by Jarrett, (II, 337). Kōhbar appears also to be the name of a Caghatāi tribe (Blochmann 613n.) Mr. Blochmann quotes the name of Muḥammad Qāsim Kōhbar as that of a poet; perhaps this is the Kōhbar of the Text.

<sup>7</sup> Taken from *T. R.* l. c. 200.

<sup>8</sup> Apparently from excessive drinking.

<sup>9</sup> Daughter of the king of Badakhshān and widow of Yānus, Bābar's maternal grandfather. Bābar's own grandmother was Ais or Isān Daulat Bēgum. (Memoirs, Ers. 12.)





had been the cause of the putting forward of Khān Mirzā, and addressed her after kneeling down before her. Knowing well what her state of mind was, he spoke to her with modesty and magnanimity, and with soothing words observed to her, "If a mother have special affection for one child, why should another child be aggrieved?", "there is no limit to her authority." Then he said, "I have been up long and have come a long way," and laying his head on her lap, he went to sleep. Thus in order to reassure the Bēgum who was very uneasy, he behaved in a very kind manner<sup>1</sup> to her. Ere he had fully fallen asleep, his aunt, Mihr<sup>2</sup> Nigār Khānum, came in and his

<sup>1</sup> Ers. B. and H. I, 253 and *T. R.* 200. The Text is not quite clear.

<sup>2</sup> Eldest daughter of Yūnus Khān. She was first married to Sultān Aḥmad Mirzā, uncle of Bābar, and on his death, to Shāibānī. (*T. R.* 96 and 196). Bābar, in order that he might escape from Samarqand, gave his sister Khānzāda in marriage to Shāibānī and as she was niece of Mihr Nigār, Shāibānī divorced the latter "as it was unlawful for both to be married to the same man." Mihr Nigār died childless. (*T. R.* 155).

A.F. has apparently taken his account from the *Tārīkh-i-rashīdī* but has altered its language. Erskine who, I believe, had not read the *T. R.* when editing Leyden's Bābar, makes some mistakes here. (Bābar, 217 and 218). It is clear that the Khānum was Mihr Nigār, Bābar's maternal aunt. She was probably called Khānum because she was the eldest daughter and indeed eldest child of Yūnus Khān, by his chief wife, Isān Daulat Bēgum. (*T. R.* 86). She was also the only surviving daughter of that marriage, for her younger sister, Bābar's mother,

had lately died. The Khānum was certainly not Khāb Nigār for she had died some years earlier. (Bābar, Ers. 99 and *T. R.* 157 where we are told that Khāb Nigār died a year and a half before 907=1500 or 1501). Nor is it correct to say that A.F. speaks of Mirzā Khān's being brought by his mother Sultān Nigār. His mother was the daughter of Yūnus Khān by Shāh Bēgum but, as Erskine correctly states, she does not appear to have been at Kābul at the time. (It should, however, here be said that Gulbadan, in her *Memoirs*, describes Khān Mirzā as having been brought before Bābar by his mother, Sultān Nigār. This must be a mistake, I think). She was first married to Sultān Maḥmūd, son of Sultān Abū Sa'īd, and had by him one son, viz., the Mirzā Khān or Sultān Vais of the Text and afterwards king of Badakhshān. Sultān Maḥmūd died in January, 1495, and some years later (Bābar 13) she was married to 'Ādil Sultān (Ers., Uzbek Sultān) and when 'Ādil died, to his brother, Qāsim Khān (the famous ruler of the Kirghises who defeated Shāibānī's troops, *T. R.*





Majesty hastily arose and saluted her (*ishān-rā daryāftand*). They arrested Muḥammad Ḥusain Mirzā and brought him in. His Majesty being a mine of kindness, gave him his life and gave him permission to go to Khurāsān. After that the Khānum (Mihr Nigār) brought in Khān Mirzā and said, "O life of your mother! I have brought

373). Ḥaidar Mirzā's account, from which A.F. has copied, may be seen in Ney Elias and Ross' trs. (200) but the word grandson is there a mistake for nephew. The MS. of Ḥaidar's Text has apparently not *nabīra* but *yugan* or "*yezneh*," nephew, as Erskine has written in the margin of his MS. trs. of T. R. B. M. Add. No. 26,162. Erskine has apparently written *yezneh* but the right word seems to be *yugan* which like the Latin *nepos*, means both a nephew and a grandchild. Perhaps *nabīra* has a similar double meaning. *yezneh* of Erskine is given by P. de Courteille as brother-in-law or son-in-law. A.F. calls Mihr Nigār the Khālazāda, i.e., cousin of Bābar and the same word appears in the T. R. Erskine in a marginal note (B. M. Add. No. 26, 612, 192) observes that this word which signifies cousin, seems an error. I am not sure that the original word is not *khālazāda* which perhaps might be held to mean a birth-aunt or full-aunt. Or perhaps it is *khānazāda*, home-born in allusion to her being his mother's full sister.

The discrepancies in the three accounts, viz., Bābar's (Ers. 217, etc.) Ḥaidar's and A.F.'s, are curious. Bābar is presumably most correct. For Ḥaidar was but a child at the time, but Ḥaidar's account, derived

presumably from his father, is the most graphic. He says that just after Bābar had laid his head in his grandmother's lap, the aunt Mihr Nigār Khānum came in. He saluted her and then she bade him go to the castle and see his family and that she would come there after him. He went and she followed, bringing with her, her nephew (Mirzā Khān) and Ḥaidar's father, Muḥammad Ḥusain. Bābar advanced to meet her and she said, "O life of your (dead) mother, I have brought your guilty nephew and your unfortunate cousin." (*Āi jān-i-mādar yezneh (or yugan)-i-gumāhgār ū bi-rādar-i-nāsākhār bar āvurdam.*) "What do you say to them?" A.F. has altered the words which Bābar used to his grandmother. Shāh Bēgum and Mihr Sultān afterwards went towards Badakhshān with Khān Mirzā but the ladies were caught on the road by Abū Bakr and taken to Kāshghar where they were imprisoned and eventually perished miserably. Evidently Mihr Nigār was strongly attached to her step-mother and her nephew and perhaps she was displeased with Bābar for having contributed to her divorce. Bābar expresses himself as vexed at her leaving him for Badakhshān. "It would have been better and more becoming for her to have remained with me." (Ers. 232).





"your guilty cousin (*birādar*), what is your pleasure?" His Majesty took him in his arms and spoke kindly to him. After that he left it to his option to go or stay. The *Khān* Mirzā was so ashamed that he could not make up his mind to remain. He took leave and went to Qandahār.<sup>1</sup> This happened in the same year.

Next year he (*Bābar*) proceeded to Qandahār<sup>2</sup> and fought a great battle with *Shāh Bēg*, son of *Zū-n-nūn Arghūn* and *Muhammad Muqīm* his younger brother. The *Khān* did good service here. His Majesty presented Qandahār to *Nāsir Mirzā*, the younger brother<sup>3</sup> of *Jahāngir Mirzā* and returned to *Kābul*. He permitted *Shāh Bēgum* and *Khān Mirzā* to proceed to *Badakhshān*. After many adventures *Khān Mirzā* put *Zabīr Raghī*<sup>4</sup> to death and became confirmed in the dominion of *Badakhshān*. He always retained his loyalty (to *Bābar*).

In 916 (early in December 1510) an express<sup>5</sup> brought the news that *Shaibānī Khān* was killed and that it was proper for *Bābar* to move in that direction. Accordingly in *Shawwāl*, he proceeded<sup>6</sup> there and fought great battles with the *Uzbēgs*. He was ever victorious and took *Samarqand* for the third time, in 917 (Oct. 1511). He ruled there for eight months but in *Ṣafar* 918 (April 1512) he had a great battle at *Kūl Malik* with '*Ubaidu-l-lāh Khān*. Though he had won the victory, suddenly by the jugglery of the heavens, he sustained a defeat and proceeded to *Hiṣār*.

<sup>1</sup> This is in accordance with *T. R.* 201, but *Bābar* says he got leave to go to *Khurāsān*. It would seem from *T. R.* that both *Mirzā Khān* and *Mahmūd Ḥasan* got leave to go to Qandahār but that the latter went as far then, while *Mirzā Khān* stayed. *Haidar* says his father went on because he wished to go to Mecca. He, however, accepted an invitation from *Shaibānī* and was killed by him.

<sup>2</sup> *T. R.* 357, *Bābar* besieged Qandahār for 5 years and 5 months.

<sup>3</sup> Half-brother only of *Jahāngir* and *Bābar*, his mother being a concubine. (*Bābar*, *Ers.* 10).

<sup>4</sup> Probably *Ragh* a hill-district in

*N.-W. Badakhshān* and not the *Rāg* which is the *Rhages* of *Tobit* and lies south of *Teheran*. See *T. R.* 203n.

<sup>5</sup> The express was sent by *Mirzā Khān* from *Badakhshān*. The courier had traversed the *Hindū Kush* in the snow and got frost-bitten. He arrived early in *Ramaṣān* which in that year began 3rd December. *Ers.* B. and H. I, 306 and *T. R.* 237).

<sup>6</sup> Lit. turned the reins of his world-traversing steed. *Ers.* B. and H. I, 322 and *T. R.* 260 for account of battle. '*Ubaidu-l-lāh*, called also *Sultān*, married *Mirzā Haidar's* sister and became king of *Bukhārā*. He was *Shaibānī's* nephew.





On another occasion,<sup>1</sup> he along with Najm Bēg, had a great battle below Fort Ghajdiwān with the Uzbēgs. Najm Bēg was killed and his Majesty went towards Kābul.<sup>2</sup> Moreover by secret inspiration, he was led to lay aside marching to Transoxiana and to press forward to the conquest of Hindustān. Four times did he turn towards this enterprise and as often did he, from stress of circumstances, retrace his steps. The first<sup>3</sup> time was in Shā'bān 910 (Jan. 1505) when he went by Bādām Cashma<sup>4</sup> (Almond Spring) and Jagdalik, passed through the Khaibar and halted at Jam (Jamrūd). In the Wāqī'at-i-bābari, a Turkī book written by his Majesty himself, it is stated that when in six marches, he went from Kābul to Ādinapūr,<sup>5</sup> he had never before seen the Garmsīr<sup>7</sup> (warm regions) nor the country of Hindustān. "Immediately on "reaching them, I beheld a new world. The grass was different, the "trees different, the wild animals of a different sort, the birds of a "different plumage, the manners and customs of the people (ایل والوس)<sup>6</sup> "ail ū ālūs) of a different kind. I was struck with astonishment, and "indeed there was room for wonder."<sup>8</sup> Nāsir Mirzā came to this stage from Ghaznīn to pay his respects. He (Bābar) halted at Jam-

<sup>1</sup> Ers. B. and H. I, 325 and T. R. 261. Ghajdiwān is north of Bu-khārā. The battle was apparently fought on 8 Ramāzān 918 (12th November, 1512). Najm means star and the real name of the general was Yār Muḥammad. He is said to have been Finance Minister. He seems to have been put to death in cold blood and in revenge for the massacre of Karshi.

<sup>2</sup> He did not go direct to Kābul but first to Hiṣār and was there nearly murdered by the mutinous Mughals. Thence to Kunduz and "at last, despairing altogether of "recovering Hiṣār, he returned to "Kābul." The date of his return does not seem known but probably it was in 920, (1514). Ers. B. and H. I, 32<sup>n</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Bābar, Ers. 156. Bābar (309) seems to reckon the expedition of 925 as the first of the five, and Firishṭa and Khāfi Khān take the same view. Ers. B. and H. I, 417<sup>n</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> Jarrett II, 399 and Bābar, Ers. 141<sup>n</sup>. Bādām Cashma is a pass S. of the Kābul River and between Little Kābul and Barik-āl.

<sup>5</sup> From Jamrūd, Bābar rode out to Bikram (Peshawar).

<sup>6</sup> Now Jalālābād. Ers. (B. and H. I, 233. Jarrett II, 405). But Ādināpūr lay about a mile south of the modern Jalālābād.

<sup>7</sup> Āin V. Jarrett II, 394.

<sup>8</sup> The change here described occurs at Gandamak. Bābar's Mem. 157 and Erskine's note.





and consulted about crossing the river Indus known as the Nilāb. Owing to the avarice of Bāqī<sup>1</sup> Caghānīānī the crossing of the Indus was postponed and he proceeded against Kohāt. After taking Kohāt, they attacked Bangash and Naghaz.<sup>2</sup> Then they went to the country of the 'Isā Khail and halted in the environs of Tarbila<sup>3</sup> which is a village on the Indus and in the country of Multān. Then he made several marches down the river. From thence he came to the borders of Dūki<sup>4</sup> and after some days to Ghaznīn. In the month Zī-hajja (May 1505) he returned to Kābul.

The second<sup>5</sup> time, the illustrious army proceeded in the month of Jamāda-l-awwal 913 (Sep. 1507) by way of Little Kābul (Khurd Kābul) to the conquest of Hindustān. They went first from Mandraur<sup>6</sup> by 'Atar and Shiweh and then returned owing to differences of opinion among the officers. They crossed by Kūner<sup>7</sup> and Nūrgil<sup>7</sup> and from Kūner he (Bābar) came on a raft (*jāla*)<sup>8</sup> to the camp and then by way of Bādij<sup>9</sup> to Kābul. By order of his Majesty, the date

<sup>1</sup> Text, "some Caghatāis." The Luck. ed. is right. (Bābar Ers. 156 and 256). The "avarice" refers to Bāqī's love of plunder. He was younger brother of Khusrū Shāh, Bābar's Memoirs, 128, Caghānīān was in Transoxiana. T. R. 177n.

<sup>2</sup> Text, Newar. Jarrett II, 389, 399 n. 6.

<sup>3</sup> The Belah of Ers. p. 163. Apparently the Darbelah of the Āin Jarrett II, 334. Caghānīān is a name given to Hīṣār. Bābar. Ers. Intro. XXXV.

<sup>4</sup> Jarrett, II, 397. Dūki means a hill or hill-country. Text, Ki. Luck. ed. دکی. See Bābar 164n. and 149 where the expedition is described.

<sup>5</sup> Bābar, Ers., 232.

<sup>6</sup> Jarrett II, 406.

<sup>7</sup> Bābar, Ers., 143. The two places are on opposite sides of the river of Caghānsērāi or Kameh, Jarrett II, 392n.

<sup>8</sup> Also 𐤎𐤁𐤏 *shāla*. (*Farhang-i-ra-*

*shūlī* s. v.). The *Burhān-i-qāṭi* describes a raft as a thing made of wood and grass on (? under) which inflated *massaks* are laid ~~and~~ which is used for crossing deep streams. Probably Bābar used one only for crossing the river. Raverty (Notes, 34) quotes a description of a raft from Jahāngīr's Memoirs. This kind of raft is still in use. "From Jalālābād we embarked on rafts of inflated skins and dropped down with the stream to Peshawur." (Journey to the source of the Oxus. Wood, 280). See too "At the Court of the Amīr," Gray, 12.

<sup>9</sup> This name does not seem known now. Ers. (Bābar, 142n.) suggests Bādpāsh. Price remarks (173n.) that he has not been able to find in the maps any of the places mentioned in this expedition. I have altered the names of the Text so as to agree with Erskine.





of his crossing was engraved on a stone above Badīj. This wonderful writing still exists. Till this time, the noble descendants of the Lord of Conjunction were called Mīrzās. His Majesty ordered that in this inscription,<sup>1</sup> he should be styled Pādshāh.

On Tuesday, 4 Zi-l-qa'da of this auspicious year (6th March, 1508), occurred, in the citadel of Kābul, the fortunate birth of his Majesty Jahānbānī Jannat-āshīyānī (Humāyūn). Of this an account will be given hereafter.

The third time, on Monday,<sup>2</sup> 1 Muḥarram 925 (3rd Jan., 1519), while the army was marching against Bajaur, there was a great earthquake which lasted for half a sidereal hour. Sultān 'Alā'u-d-dīn Siwādī (of Swat) arrived as an envoy on the part of Sultān Vais Siwādī. In a short time, the fort of Bajaur was captured and was presented to Khwāja<sup>3</sup> Kilān Bēg, son of Maulānā Muḥammad Ṣadr, who had been one of the great officers under Mīrzā 'Umar Shāikh. This Khwāja was related to his Majesty in a singular manner for his six brothers had given their lives in his service. He himself was a special *protégé* of his Majesty on account of his wisdom and sagacity. When his Majesty was contemplating the Siwād (Swat) expedition and the conquest of the Yūsufzāis, Tāūs Khān, the younger brother

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has "This writing has not yet disappeared."

The pass was east of Kābul and near the Lamghan (Laghman) district. (Bābar, Ers., 142). According to Raverty, (Notes, 100) the proper spelling is بادپاج Bādpaj;—*bād* meaning wind and *paj* or *fajj* Ar. for pass. "Thus Bādpaj means the Windy Pass, the name being given on account of the strong wind generally blowing there and which at times, renders its passage impracticable." Probably then this is the pass described by a friend (? Alexander Burnes, Erskine Hist. I, 517) of Mr. Erskine as Bādpāsh. (Bābar, Ers., 142.) "Bādpāsh is a steep (pass) half a day's journey to the east of Andrār on the Kābul

River and about 16 or 18 miles west of Targārī where the streams of Alingār and Alishaug join." (l. c. 142n.)

<sup>2</sup> Bābar merely says that the change took place at this period but, by the word *tārīkh*, A.F. seems to mean that the title was adopted in the inscription. It would be interesting to know if it still exists. Bābar complains that it was not well cut.

<sup>3</sup> Text, Saturday but Monday, MSS. and Bābar's Memoirs? de Courteille II. 36 note.

<sup>4</sup> T. R., 468. According to Bābar's Mem. Bajaur was taken before Sultān 'Alā'u-d-dīn's arrival and not after, as A. F.'s account implies.





of Shāh Manṣūr, who was chieftain of the Yūsufzāi tribe, brought the latter's daughter<sup>1</sup> and uttered words of humility and submission. There was also a difficulty about supplies of corn in that country of wild beasts. His (Bābar's) fixed determination too was to undertake the expedition to Hindustān. He turned his rein from Siwād. Although the preparations for the march to India had not been made and the officers were not in favour of it, he lighted the torch of courage and set forth for the tenebrous regions<sup>2</sup> of Hindustān. On the morning of Thursday, 16 Muḥarram, he crossed the river (Indus) with horses, camels and baggage,<sup>3</sup> while the camp (*urdu*) bāzār was floated across on rafts. They encamped at Kacākōt.

Seven kos from Bhīra,<sup>4</sup> towards the north, there is a mountain, 93 called in the *Zafarnāma* and other books, the hill of Jūd and there they encamped. His Majesty writes in his Memoirs (Erskine, 254), "At first I was ignorant of the origin of its name, but afterwards "discovered that in this hill there were two races of men descended "of the same father. One tribe is called Jūd, the other Jenjūheh." He sent 'Abdu-r-raḥim Shaghāwāl to Bhīra in order to reassure the people and prevent anyone from committing violence. At the end of the day, he halted east of Bhīra, on the bank of the river Bihat

<sup>1</sup> Bābar married her. (Ers., 250n.) Her name was Bibī Mubārak according to Raverty. (Notes, 234). Erskine, Bābar's Memoirs, 251n. calls her Bibī Macherikah.

<sup>2</sup> Siwād means also blackness.

<sup>3</sup> Text, *partāl* but the word is Hindustānī and spelt *partial*.

<sup>4</sup> Perhaps there are two Bhīras. (Bābar, Ers., 253n.) Bābar speaks (253) of Jūd as 7 kos from Bhīra and (255) of the middle of Jūd's being 10 kos from Bhīra. Jūd evidently belonged to the Salt Range. Erskine remarks that Bābar's account of it is not very exact and that he considered all the rough and mountainous country between the Khaibar and Salt Ranges to be one hill.

Erskine or rather Leyden (for the latter's translation comes down to this point) says (254) "This hill got the name of Jūd from a supposed resemblance to the celebrated hill of Jūd (Ararat)." This makes Bābar and A.F. more intelligible but the passage is not in the Turkish (P. de C. II, 54) and has the air of being a marginal note which has slipped into the text. Moreover Ararat is Jādī or Jūda and not Jūd. Nor does it seem likely that there is any resemblance between the lofty isolated Ararat and a spur of the Salt Range. *Jūd* is probably Sanscrit *yuddha* 'war.' The reference to the Kūh-i-Jūd in the *Zafarnāma* is at II, 48, 1. 1.





(Jhelam, the ancient Hydaspes). He levied 400,000 *shāhrukhīs*<sup>1</sup> from Bhīra as the price of protection, and presented the country to Hindū Bēg, assigning the revenues of it to him as a maintenance. *Khushāb* he made over to *Shāh Hasan*<sup>2</sup> and arranged that he should assist Hindū Bēg. He sent *Mullā Murshid*<sup>3</sup> on an embassy to *Sultān Ibrāhīm*, son of *Sultān Sikandar Lōdī*, who had succeeded his father five or six months previously<sup>4</sup> in the kingdom of Hindustān, in order to convey to him salutary counsels. *Daulat Khān*, the governor of *Lāhōr*, detained the ambassador and with utter folly, sent him back without having fulfilled his mission. On Friday, 2 *Rabī'u-l-awwal* (4th March, 1519), the news came of the birth of an auspicious son. As the expedition against Hindustān was then in progress, he was by secret inspiration and augury, named *Hindāl*.<sup>5</sup> On Monday,<sup>6</sup> 5 *Rabī'u-l-awwal* the administration of Bhīra was given to Hindū Bēg and he

<sup>1</sup> About ten or eleven pence each, (*Bābar*, Ers., 254n. and 335) so that the sum levied was some £20,000. The Text might read that this money was given to Hindū Bēg and has been so understood by Price (*Ret.* IV, 674), but if so, A.F. seems to have mistaken his authority (*Bābar*, 256, 258 and 309) where *Bābar* says he divided the money among his troops. P. de C. (II, 64) does not mention the sum 400,000 *shs.* but represents *Bābar* as stating that he assembled the headmen of Bhīra and fixed their ransom at a thousand *shāhrukhīs* apiece. A.F.'s Text has *cahār šad shāhrukhī māl* and which is unintelligible. The MSS. give the correct *māl-i-amān*, price of peace.

<sup>2</sup> Incorrect. *Bābar* says (Ers., 260) that he bestowed *Khushāb* on *Lenger Khān* who was the prime cause and adviser of the expedition and that he left him behind to support Hindū Bēg. *Khushāb* is on the right bank of the Jhelam while Bhīra is on the left.

<sup>3</sup> P. de C. II, 62 gives Thursday 1 *Rabī'u-l-awwal* (3rd March, 1519). Apparently the ambassador was sent partly to claim some portions of the Panjāb which had been held by the Turks from the days of *Timūr*.

<sup>4</sup> *Erskine* considers the date of *Sikandar's* death uncertain but would put it in 1518 (B. and H. I, 407n.) but there does not seem sufficient reason for doubting *Firishā's* statement that he died in November 1517. *Bābar's* statement (Ers., 257) is too loosely expressed to be relied on.

<sup>5</sup> The affix *āl* is Turkish and means 'to take,' so that *Hindāl* would mean 'taken of India.' According to *Bābar*, P. de Courteille II, 46 (the passage is not in *Erskine*) the name was given by *Māhim* the wife of *Bābar* and adopting mother of *Hindāl*.

<sup>6</sup> Text, Sunday, 15th, but *vide Bābar*, 259. One MS. has 11 (eleventh) which is the right day of the month for Sunday.





(Bābar) for state reasons, proceeded to return to Kābul. On Thursday, the last day of Rabi'ū-l-awwal (31st March) he arrived at Kābul. On 25 Rabi'ū-l-ākhar (April 25th) Hindū Bēg who, out of carelessness,<sup>1</sup> had left Bhira, came to Kābul.

The date of the setting out of the fourth expedition has not come to light but it appears that he (Bābar) returned after the taking of Lāhōr and from the chronogram<sup>2</sup> of the taking of Dīpālpūr, which will be stated hereafter, it appears that the expedition was in 930 (1524). As every event has its special time, this splendid project (of conquering India) was postponed. The ostensible cause of this was the sluggishness of the officers and the non-co-operation of his brothers. At last, on the fifth time, by the guidance of God and the leadership of Fortune, on Friday, 1st Šafar 932 (17th Nov., 1525), when the Sun was in Sagittarius, the standards of light were unfurled, such as might disperse the darkness of an universe, and placing the foot of resolve in the stirrup of reliance on God and of abstention from sin,<sup>3</sup> he proceeded towards the conquest of India. Mirzā Kāmran was left in Qandahār and the care of Kābul was also entrusted to him. When this expedition was made, victory followed on victory and fortune upon fortune. Lāhōr and some other large cities of India were taken and on 17 Šafar (3rd Dec.) his Majesty Jahānbanī, Jannat-āshiyānī, Našīru-d-dīn Muḥammad Humāyūn arrived from Badakhshān with his army, at the camp which was in the Bāgh-i-wafā<sup>4</sup>

94

<sup>1</sup> Bābar does not blame him but says he was left without sufficient means. (267).

<sup>2</sup> This is explained by Bābar (Ers., 368) where *Wāsiṭ shahr Rabi'ū-l-awwal* is given as the chronogram of the taking of Dīpālpūr. These words yield "Middle of Rabi'ū-l-awwal 930" and so the conquest occurred about 22nd Jan., 1524. See *Akbarnāma* I, 110 where the reading is *Wasat*. This seems the more correct as *Wāsiṭ* would yield 931. Bābar thus alludes to this expedition (Ers., 141). "In the year in which I defeated Bahar Khān and conquered Lāhōr and Dībālpūr,

I brought plantains and planted them here," (in the Bāgh-i-wafā, near Jalālābād). Dīpālpūr is in the Montgomery District, Panjāb, and formerly on the Beas. It is now in a state of decay owing to its distance from the river. Text, Dībālpūr and according to Raverty, this is correct. (J.A.S.B. 1892, Part I. 375n. 380) Khāfi Khān (I, 47) has a good deal to say about this expedition.

<sup>3</sup> For Bābar's vows of penitence, see *Memoirs*, Ers., 292.

<sup>4</sup> Bābar made this garden in 914, (1508). It was opposite Ādināpūr which was south of the Kābul River



Garden of Fidelity). Khawāja Kilān Bēg also came at this time from Ghaznī.

On 1st Rabi'ū-l-awwal (16th Dec.) he crossed the Indus near Kacakōt<sup>1</sup> and held a muster<sup>2</sup> of the army. Twelve thousand<sup>3</sup> cavalry, Turks, Tajiks, merchants,<sup>4</sup> etc., were reckoned up. Then they crossed the Bihat (Jhelam) above<sup>5</sup> Jilum (Jhelam). Near Buhlūlpūr they crossed the Cināb and encamped.

On Friday, 14 Rabi'ū-l-awwal (29th Dec.) they encamped at Siālkōt and his Majesty formed the plan of transferring its population to Buhlūlpūr. At this time news came that the enemy was assembling and when his Majesty reached Kalānūr, Muḥammad Sultān Mirzā, 'Adil Sultān and the other officers who had been appointed to defend Lāhōr, arrived and paid their respects.

On Saturday, 22 (Text 24) Rabi'ū-l-awwal, the fort of Milwat<sup>6</sup> was taken. Booty was obtained and the books of Ghāzī Khān which were in the fort were got possession of. Some of them were given to his Majesty Jahānbānī and some were sent as a present to Kāmran in Qandahār. As it was reported that Hamid Khān, governor<sup>7</sup> of Hiṣār-firūza<sup>8</sup> had advanced two or three stages, on Sunday, 13 Jumāda-l-awwal the army marched from Ambāla and halted on the bank of a tank (*kūl*) and Humāyūn was sent against him (Hamid Khān). Amīr Khawāja Kilān Bēg, Amīr Sultān Muḥammad Dūldāi, Amīr Walī Khāzīn, Amīr 'Abdu-l-'azīz, Amīr Muḥibb 'Alī, Khawāja Khālifa and some of the officers who had stayed in Hindustān such as Hindū Bēg, 'Abdu-l-'azīz, Muḥammad 'Alī Jang-jang were appointed to accompany

and about a mile south of Jalālābād. (Bābar, Ers., 141 and 278 and Raverty, Notes, 49).—Eleven years later, he made the Bāgh-i-ṣafā at the lake of Keldeh-Kehār, in the Salt Range. (Ers., 255).

<sup>1</sup> Bābar (293) says they crossed the river of Kacakōt, i.e., the Haroh (Jarrett, II, 324).

<sup>2</sup> Text *shān* but I prefer the variant *sān*, viz., a review or counting of an army. It would seem from P. de C.'s version (II, 36) and from Erskine (Bābar, 293) that advantage was

taken of the crossing to count the troops while they were embarking or disembarking.

<sup>3</sup> "Great and small, good and bad, servants and no servants, they amounted to 12,000 persons." (Bābar, 293).

<sup>4</sup> *Saudāgar*. So too, Bābar (Ers., 310) but the meaning here seems doubtful, perhaps mercenaries.

<sup>5</sup> Bābar, below.

<sup>6</sup> The Malot of the Imp. Gaz.

<sup>7</sup> Text, *hakim*. Bābar, *shikdār*.

<sup>8</sup> (Hiṣār, Jarrett II, 105, 293).





Babam, who was one of the nobles of Hindūsān, came in on this day and did homage. His Majesty Jahānbānī gained an easy victory.

On Monday, the 21st of the same month, he returned to the camp. His Majesty bestowed on him, Hīṣār-firūza with its dependencies and subordinate districts (*lawāḥiq*) which were worth a *kror* and also a *kror* in money as a guerdon for this victory which was the first of countless ones. The army continued its march. News repeatedly came that Sultān Ibrāhīm was advancing with 100,000 cavalry and 1,000 elephants. The army encamped near Sirsāwah (Sirsa). Here Haidar Qulī (Text, 'Alī) a servant of Khwāja Kilān Bēg who had been sent to procure information brought the news that Dāūd Khān and Haitim Khān (Text, Hātim) had advanced in front of Sultān Ibrāhīm's camp with five or six thousand horse. Accordingly on Sunday, 18 Jumāda-l-ākhar (1st April) Cīn Timūr Sultān, Muḥammad Sultān Mīrzā, Mahdī Khwāja, 'Adil Sultān, with the whole left wing commanded by Sultān Junaid, Shāh Mīr Husain and Qutlaq Qadam, as well as part of the centre under Yūnus 'Alī, 'Abdu-l-lāh Aḥmadī, Kita Bēg and others, were appointed to operate against this body. And these heroes proceeding swiftly to the field of battle, were victorious over the enemy and slew a great number of them with the lightning of the sword and the rain of the arrow. Haitim Khān with 70 others were made prisoners and sent alive to the exalted camp where they suffered capital punishment. Orders<sup>1</sup> were issued that wheeled carriages should be collected and Ustād 'Alī Qulī was directed to yoke them together in the Ottoman<sup>2</sup> (Rūm) manner with chains<sup>3</sup> and cow-hides of which they made ropes. Between every two car-

95

<sup>1</sup> The corresponding passage about collection of carts, is not in Erskine (Bābar, 304, l. 1) but in P. de Courteille, (II, 161) we read, "I ordered all the soldiers to bring carriages, each according to his means. They collected in this manner 700."

<sup>2</sup> Elliot (VI, 468) observes that the reference is doubtless to the victory obtained by Sultān Salīm the Grim (Yāwaz) over Shāh Isma'īl in 1514,

in which this method had been found very effective. The battle was fought on 23rd Aug. at Caldīrān near Tabriz. (His. of Persia, Malcolm I, 504 and Hist. of Ottoman Empire, Hammer-Purgstall II, 412). Probably Ustād 'Alī had been present in it.

<sup>3</sup> A.F.'s rendering does not seem quite correct. The twisted cow-hides were in lieu of chains.





carriages there were placed six or seven gabions<sup>1</sup> so that the matchlock men might fire their pieces from behind them in security. In a few days these arrangements were completed.

At length on Thursday, the last day of Jumāda-l-ākhar (12th April) the phoenix (humā) of victory made a shade with his wings at the city of Pānīpat. The ranks of the army were arranged in an excellent manner. The right wing rested on the city and environs, and the carriages and gabions were placed in front of the centre. The left wing was defended by trees and ditches. Sultān Ibrāhīm, with a large army was drawn up six *kōs* from the city and for a week the young men and the veterans daily engaged numerous bodies of the enemy on the borders of the hostile camp and were always victorious. At length on Friday, 8 Rajab (20th April) Sultān Ibrāhīm marched against the camp with a mighty army and an array of elephants. His Majesty Gīti-sitānī also drew up his forces and adorned the battle-field in the following manner.<sup>2</sup>

BATTLE BETWEEN HIS MAJESTY GĪTĪ-SITĀNĪ FIRDŪS-MAKĀNĪ  
AND SULTĀN IBRĀHĪM AND ACCOUNT OF THE ARRAY.

As the Protector and Doer desired to repair old defeats and to convert past afflictions into felicities, He arranged the preliminaries for this, and set things in order. Among such arrangements were the advancing of Sultān Ibrāhīm for the purpose of giving battle and the drawing up of the army of his Majesty Gīti-sitānī. As the Divine aid was accompanying the latter, and ever-increasing fortune was in his van, he, in spite of a plenitude of difficulties and a paucity of favouring circumstances, had recourse with a tranquil mind and firm soul to the inalterable Arbiter and addressed himself to the marshalling of his troops.

The centre was adorned by the presence of his Majesty in person. In the right centre which the Turks call *ūnk-ghūl*,<sup>3</sup> Timūr Sultān, Sulaimān Mīrzā, Amīr Muḥammadī Kōkultāsh, Amīr Shāh Maṣṣūr Barlas, Amīr Yūnus 'Alī, Amīr Darwāsh Muḥammad Sārbān, Amīr

<sup>1</sup> *Turā*, (Vullers s. v. and Quatremère, Hist. of the Mongols, 337n. 130). The latter quotes the passage from the *Akbarnāma*.

<sup>2</sup> Text, اگرچه which may be in-

tended for cuirasses but the true word seems *āncunān*, as follows.

<sup>3</sup> Text, *ūn*. Erskine *ung*. See Bābar, Ers., 227 where this and other terms are explained.





Abdu-l-lāh Kitābdār were stationed. On the left centre which the Turks call *sūl-ghūl*, Amīr Khalifa, Khwāja Mir Mirān Sadr, Amīr Aḥmadī Parwāncī, Amīr Tardī Bēg, brother of Kūc Bēg, Muḥibb 'Alī Khalifa, Mirzā Bēg Tarkhān were stationed. The right wing was in charge of his Majesty Jahānbānī Jannat-ashīyānī; Amīr Khwāja Kalān Bēg, Sultān Muḥammad Duldāī, Amīr Hindū Bēg, Walī Khāzin, Pīr Qulī Sīstānī were in attendance on him. On the left wing were stationed Muḥammad Sultān Mirzā, Sayyid Mahdī Khwāja, 'Adil Sultān, Sultān Junaid Barlās, Khwāja Shāh, Mir Ḥusain, Amīr Qutlaq Qadam, Amīr Jān (text, Khān) Bēg, Amīr Muḥammad Bakhshī and other heroes. In the vanguard were Khusrū Kōkultāsh and Muḥammad 'Alī Jang-jang;<sup>1</sup> Amīr 'Abdu-l-'azīz had charge of the reserve. At the flank of the right wing, Walī Kazil,<sup>2</sup> Malik Qāsim, Bābā Qashqa with their Mughals, were appointed as a flanking-party (*tūlghāma*). At the extremity of the left wing, were stationed Qarāqūzī, Abū-l-Muḥammad Nizabāz (lance-player), Shaikh 'Alī, Shaikh Jamāl, Tengri Qulī Mughal, as a flanking-party. Accordingly the brave swordsmen stood with firm foot on the battle-field and with life-taking arrows (*sahām*) and blood-drinking scimitars (*ṣamṣām*) displayed bravery and daring.

*Verse.*

The brave stood with firm foot,  
Trees learned from them how to stand.

At length after great contest, the heavenly aids accompanied the centre and wings of the army and by the Divine aid, there ensued victory and the defeat of the enemy. A great victory for the servants always taking refuge in God became manifest. Sultān Ibrāhīm was slain unrecognised and in a corner, and numerous Afghāns were the harvest of the royal sword, and the caravans of the city of destruction were conducted to the rest-house of annihilation by the escort of victorious soldiers and the flambeaux of world-opening swords. Near the body of Sultān Ibrāhīm, there lay

<sup>1</sup> (Ers. 305) states that this officer was wounded on the day before and unable to take his place in the battle. But in S. Zain's recension we are

told that though wounded he contrived to take part in the great battle.

<sup>2</sup> Text, Sharmal.





on one spot five or six thousand dead. The sun had mounted spear-high when the onset of battle began and at noon there blew the breeze of victory, and the north wind of vernal conquest.

How can this great victory, which was the masterpiece of fortune, be explained? And how can language describe what is beyond the bounds of comprehension? When Sultān Maḥmūd<sup>1</sup> Ghaznavī came to Hindūstān, he was in possession of Khurāsān; the kings of Samarqand and Dāru-l-Marz<sup>2</sup> and of Khawārizm were subject to him and he  
 97 had an army of over 100,000 men. Nor was Hindūstān subject to one monarch. Rāis and Rājas were stationed here and there and were not on terms with one another. Sultān Shihābu-d-dīn<sup>3</sup> Ghōri came to the conquest of India with 120,000 cuirassiers, mounted on mail-clad<sup>4</sup> horses. Then too, there was no ruler in all that vast territory. And though his brother Ghiyāsu-d-dīn held Khurāsān, yet he was not outside his influence. His Majesty,<sup>5</sup> the Lord of Conjunction (Timūr), at the time of his conquest of Hindūstān, gave orders for a muster of his troops in the plain of Samānah,<sup>6</sup> and Maulānā Sharafu-d-dīn 'Alī Yazdī states (*Zafarnāma* II, 83) that the line of the army (*tūl-i-yesāl*) occupied a space of six *farsakhs* in length, and persons experienced in military matters have calculated that a *farsakh* represents 12,000 horse, consequently, exclusive of the servants of servants (*naukar-i-naukar*<sup>7</sup>) there were 72,000 horsemen. The servants of servants occupied two *kos*.<sup>8</sup> His opponent, Mallū

<sup>1</sup> Jarrett, III, 340. A.F. bewails there Sultān Maḥmūd's bigotry but was it worse than Bābar's?

<sup>2</sup> *Lit.*, Land of the marches. Red-house, Turkish Dict. explains that it means the whole country under the chain of the Persian Caucasus, bordering on the Caspian Sea.

<sup>3</sup> Called also Mu'izzu-d-dīn. Jarrett, III, 342 and Bābar, Ers., 148.

<sup>4</sup> "Cataphract horse" (Bābar, Ers., 310). Minhāju-d-dīn is the authority referred to by Bābar. See his *Ṭabaqāt-i-nāsiri*. Raverty, 465.

<sup>5</sup> It is singular that Bābar (Ers., 309) takes no account of the conquest

of India or at least, of Delhi, by his ancestor Timūr. He mentions the expeditions of Maḥmūd of Ghazni. Shihābu-d-dīn and then says his own was the third. Evidently he did not count Timūr's because it was not followed by any permanent settlement in the country. He has a reference to Timūr's expedition at p. 255.

<sup>6</sup> W. of Thaneshwar and cir. lat. 29°55 and lat. 76°6. (Bābar, Ers., 301n. See also Jarrett, II, 296).

<sup>7</sup> The Text is incorrect here.

<sup>8</sup> Sharafu-d-dīn says 2 miles (*mīl*). A.F.'s description is not clear neither is Sharafu-d-dīn's account (*Zafar-*





had 10,000<sup>1</sup> horse and 120 elephants. Yet with all this, many of those in the Lord of Conjunction's camp were frightened and his Majesty observed the alarm of his soldiers and heard improper remarks from them. And in order to reassure them, he commanded that a palisade should be made of branches of trees, in front of his troops, and that in front of this, a ditch should be dug and that behind that bullocks and buffaloes should be placed opposite each other, and fastened by their necks and feet with leathern thongs. Also many triangular (caltrops) iron prongs<sup>2</sup> were made and it was arranged that foot soldiers should take these and throw them in the way at the time of the onset and when the elephants came on. His Majesty Gīti-sitānī Firdūs-makānī who was the fourth world-soother (*gīti-nawāz*) of India, in that great victory, which was one of the glorious gifts of God, had not with him more than 12,000 men, both soldiers and others. More astonishing still, his territories consisted of Badakhshān, Qandahār and Kābul. Nor did he get assistance from these countries for his armies; on the contrary, the expenditure, in order to protect some of the borders from the enemy and for other state purposes, was such as to exceed the receipts. And the contest was with Sultān Ibrāhīm who had nearly 100,000 cavalry and 1,000 war-elephants and who ruled from Bhīra to Bihār without an opponent. It was solely by the Divine aid and the assistance of heaven that that glorious work was

*nāma* II, 83) from which A.F.'s is taken, easy, to understand. Apparently the length of the line of the army was 20 *kos* or 6 *farsakhs* (about 40 miles) (Sic *Sharafu-d-dīn* but according to A.F. (Jarrett II, 415), 6 *farsakhs* would be 18 *kos*.) Perhaps, however, A.F. is justified in regarding a *mīl* which he says was the third of a *farsakh*, as equal to one *kos*. (Jarrett II, 415 and 417). The breadth according to *Sharafu-d-dīn* was two miles (*dū mīl*) and not two *kos* as A.F. puts it.

The cavalry are called *naukar* and their servants *naukar-i-naukar*. The

latter would probably be on foot. See trs. of these passages in Retr., Price, III, 250 and IV, 681. Major Price considers that the horse were arranged two deep.

Gibbon, quoting the Institutes, says Tīmūr had 92 squadrons of each 1,000, corresponding to the 92 names of Muḥammad.

<sup>1</sup> Text, two, but MSS. and Retr., Price, show this a mistake. 10,000 also is named in *Zafarnāma* (II, 100). Mallū Khān was Prime Minister of Maḥmūd Tughlaq, the young king of India.

<sup>2</sup> *Zafarnāma* II, 102.



98 accomplished. Men of judgment and experience feel powerless to panegyryze properly this masterpiece of the Ages. Hail, Holy One, carrier of the world illuminating light of his Majesty, the king of kings, what marvel if such feats were wrought by Thee! In short, his Majesty Giti-sitānī Firdūs-makānī, on the rising of the lights of victory glorified his forehead-mirror with the dust of thanksgiving prostration. He proclaimed presents to all mankind and sent his servants to all countries and regions.

But a deed fit to surpass the lofty designs of those world-opening princes who conquered Hindūstān, was the victory of his Majesty Jahānbānī Jannat-āshīyānī which by the blessing of the existence of his Majesty, the king of kings (Akbar) took place in the plain of Sihrind.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly an account will hereafter be given of how with 3,000 men, he delivered India from Sikandar Sūr who had more than 80,000 men. Still stranger is the masterpiece of fortune of the Shadow of God (Akbar) who by the Divine aid so rescued India with a few men from the hands of many rebellious<sup>2</sup> chiefs that the tongue of the Age becomes dumb before it. An abridged account will be given in its proper place.

*Verse.*

Should Fortune grant me hope,  
Heaven, leisure and opportunity,  
By the kindling society of the truthful,  
I shall embroider tale upon tale.<sup>3</sup>  
On this tablet of immortals,  
I'll draw a picture for posterity's behoof.

On the very day of the victory, his Majesty Jahānbānī Jannat-āshīyānī, Amīr Khwāja Kalān Bēg, Amīr Muḥammad Kōkultāsh, Amīr Yūnus 'Alī, Amīr Shāh Maṇṣūr Barlās, Amīr 'Abdul-l-lāh Kitābdār, Amīr 'Alī Khāzin were by orders of the king sent with a force to Agra, the capital, the seat of Sultān Ibrāhīm's government, to take possession of the treasure. They gave confidence to the inhabitants—

<sup>1</sup> 22nd June, 1555. (B. and H. Ers. II, 518).

<sup>2</sup> Referring apparently to the rebellion of 'Alī Qulī and others against Akbar which is known as

the Rebellion of Jaunpūr. (Emperor Akbar, Von Noer, A. S. Beveridge, I, 106 *et seq.*)

<sup>3</sup> Text *dāstān dāstān*. One MS. has *dāstān darastān*.





who are trusts from God—by diffusing the lights of justice. Sayyid Maḥdī Khwāja, Muḥammad Sulṭān Mirzā, ‘Adil Sulṭān, Amīr Junaid Barlās, Amīr Qatlaq Qadam were sent to Delhi, to preserve the treasures and secret stores of that place and to acquaint the subjects and inhabitants with the royal graciousness. On the same day proclamations of victory were written and sent by couriers to Kābul, Badakhshān and Qandahār. And he himself, on Wednesday, 12 Rajab, (25th April, 1526), alighted at Delhi. On Friday, 21<sup>st</sup> (4th May) he unfolded the umbrella of fortune in Agra and dispelled the darkness of the land.

Everyone,<sup>2</sup> small and great, in Hindūstān experienced the royal kindness and balminess. Out of his comprehensive kindness, the mother, children and dependants of Sulṭān Ibrāhīm were made partakers of his bounty and special stipends were assigned to them. An allowance of a property worth seven lakhs of tankas was made to Ibrāhīm’s mother. Similarly pensions were bestowed on his other relatives. The distracted world was soothed. His Majesty Jahān-bānī Jannat-ashīyānī who had previously arrived at Agra, presented a diamond eight *misqāls*<sup>3</sup> in weight and which was valued by jewelers at one-half of the daily expenditure of the inhabited world. They said that this diamond had belonged to the treasury of Sulṭān ‘Alā’u-d-dīn (Khiljī). He<sup>4</sup> (Humāyūn) got it from the family of

<sup>1</sup> Bābar, 22, but if Wed., 12 Rajab, be right, Friday was the 21st.

<sup>2</sup> Mirzā Ḥaidar remarks that all the world, from Turkey to China, benefited by the expedition, for the treasures obtained by the army, enabled them to buy the goods of these countries. An interesting allusion to the effects of commerce!

<sup>3</sup> 320 *ratīs* = 27<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> carats. (Bābar, Ers., 308) Erskine and H. I., 438) inclines to identify this diamond with the one shewn by Langzēb to Tavernier and valued by him at £888,000. By some it is regarded as identical with the Kōh-i-nūr. For a discussion of the question, see

Tavernier’s Travels trs. Valentine Ball, II, 431 *et seq.*

I have treated of this subject in the *Calcutta Review*, &c., and my conclusion is that the Bābar diamond is the Kōh-i-nūr. Humāyūn carried the diamond away with him and gave it to Shāh Tahmāsp who sent it to the king of Ahmadnagar.

<sup>4</sup> The text seems to say that ‘Alā’u-d-dīn got it from Vikramāditya’s heirs and has been so understood by Price. But both Ers. and P. de C. make it Bābar’s statement that Humāyūn got it from Vikramāditya’s heirs. How ‘Alā’u-d-dīn got it is not explained. Khāfi Khān says ‘Alā’u-d-dīn got it in the Deccan.





Bikramājī, the Rāja of Gwālār. His Majesty, from the nobility of his nature, first accepted it and then returned it to him (Humāyūn) as a present.

On Saturday,<sup>1</sup> 29th Rajab, he began to examine and distribute the treasures and hoards, the collections of many kings. He gave his Majesty Jahānbānī, 70 lakhs of Sikandari tankas and a treasure-house of which no account or inventory had been taken. To the Amīrs, he gave in accordance with their rank from five to ten lakhs of tankas and to every soldier and servant he gave presents superior to their position. All the men of learning, small and great, were made happy by gifts. No one, either in the camp or the cantonment (*urdū-bazār*) went without a share in the good fortune. The scions<sup>2</sup> of the royal family in Badakhshān, Kābul and Qandahār also received presents, viz., Kāmran Mirzā, 17 lakhs of tankas; Muḥammad Zamān<sup>3</sup> according to their rank 15 lakhs and similarly 'Askari Mirzā, Hindāl Mirzā and all the ladies of the harem and shining stars<sup>4</sup> of the *Khilāfat* and all the officers and servants who were absent from the dais received in accordance with their degree, jewels and rich varieties and also gold and silver money. Also to all the relatives and dependants, of his Majesty in Samargand, Khurāsān, Kāshghar and Trāq, there were sent valuable gifts. Presents too were despatched to the holy sepulchres (*maṣhāhid*) and blessed shrines in Khurāsān, Samargand, etc. And an order was issued that to every inhabitant of Kābul, Saddara,<sup>5</sup> Warask, Khūst, and Badakhshān, male and female,

<sup>1</sup> Saturday, Erskine (Bābar, 334) says the date is wrong, for 29th Rajab was a Friday and suggests that the distribution of treasure on a Friday might have interfered with Bābar's religious duties. P. de C., Monday, 29th Rajab. Price, "30th of the month."

<sup>2</sup> Lit. trees of the garden of success. The reference is to the presents sent to Kāmran and others (Bābar, Ers. 335).

<sup>3</sup> Son of Badī'uz-zamān Mirzā, son of Sultān Ḥusain Mirzā of Herāt, the gift was probably made to

him as being the emperor's son-in-law. He served under Bābar and Humāyūn and was drowned in the Ganges at Causa in 1539. (Elliot, V. 203).

<sup>4</sup> *Darrārī*, pl. of Ar. *durri*, a sparkling star or gem.

<sup>5</sup> There are some unintelligible words here. P. de C. (II, 233) has "Dans la circonscription de 'versek et en principauté de Kābul, 'il n'y eut pas une âme vivante, 'maître ou dame, esclave ou homme 'libre, adulte ou non adulte 'reçut un *bābari* de grati."





small and great, a *shāhrukhī* should be sent. Thus all and sundry, the elite as well as the commonalty, were fed from the table of his Majesty's bounty.

and adds in a note to "circonscription," "Le mot que je traduis ainsi "par conjecture est *sada* que la "version persane se contente de "réproduire sans l'interpréter." To "bāberi," he has the note, "Un "*chuhrokhi* suivant la version persane et la traduction anglaise." Erskine (Bābar, 335) seems to have considered that *sada ū rasak* should be read *ba sadur rashk*, (for producing emulation), for he translates, "To the country of Kābul, as an "incentive to emulation, to every "soul, man and woman, slave or free, "of age or not, I sent one *shāhrukhī* "as a gift!" I have examined the passage in the two B.M. MSS. Add. Per. of Bābar's Memoirs, *viz.*, No. 24,416, p. 269b, and No. 26,200, p. 285a. The latter was used by Erskine and the passage is as follows:—

بولايت کابل و مدۀ و ارسک براهر  
جان داري از مرد وزن از بنده و ازاد بالغ  
و نا بالغ یکم شارهخي انعام شد \*

There is nothing in either MS. about Badakhshān or Khūst.

The explanation of their mention in the A.N. however seems to be that A.F. used *Shaiikh* Zain's trs. of Bābar's Memoirs. This was made much earlier than 'Abdu-r-raḥīm's for *Shaiikh* Zain was one of Bābar's courtiers and wrote for him the pompous *firmāns* given by Bābar. (Ers., 355 and 359). He is also mentioned in the *Akbar-nāma* (I, 119) as *Shaiikh* Zain, the *Ṣadr* and grandson of *Shaiikh* Zainu-d-dīn Khwāfi

(Blochmann, 592n). There are two fragments of this translation in the B.M., *viz.*, Add. No. 26,202 (Rieu, I, 246) and Or. No. 1999 (l. c. III, 926) *Shaiikh* Zain's version is written in an ornate and rhetorical style and in the third person. Both fragments contain the transactions of 932 and both speak of *Khūst* or *Khwāst* Badakhshān in describing the sending of the *shāhrukhīs*. The passage in Add. No. 26,202 occurs at 70a, and in Or. No. 1999 at 70b. It runs thus,

و فرمان صدر یافت که تمامی مقوطنان  
دار الملک و ساکنان صدۀ درسک و از  
خوست بدخشان که اهالي آن بزهد و  
واخ اعتیاذ تمام دارد هو مرد را از مرد  
وزن —

"And an order was passed that all "the inhabitants of the capital (? Kābul) and the dwellers in *Sada* Darask (or Warask) and *Khūst* Badakhshān, who were distinguished for religion and piety, should each get a *shāhrūkhi*." Apparently then, *Sada* Darask is some hamlet of *Khūst* in Badakhshān. All the other B.M. MSS. of 'Abdu-r-raḥīm's trs. agree with the two already named in omitting any mention of Badakhshān.

The *Ṣaddara* of the Text might mean the hundred valleys and according to Steingass *Dara* is a district in Badakhshān. *Ṣada* is given by Vullers, on the authority of *Notices et Extraits*, (XIV, 771) as meaning a company of 100 men and possibly it may be the title of a divi-





## Verse.

From the showering of the jewel-shedding hand,  
 Joy burst out afresh in the world.  
 Pleasant is the gift that cometh from afar,  
 As the Moon sheds light on earth from her sphere.

sion of a country, e.g., the English hundred. I can find no such district as Warsak or Versak but possibly Wakhsh or Vakhsh is meant. (T. R. N. E. & R. 263, and Bābar, Ers. Intro. XXX).

"Khūst or Khost is a district on the northern slope of the Hindū Kūsh, between south and south-east of Kunduz and lies very near the hill tracts known on our time as Kāfiristān." (T. R., trs. 103n.). Khūst is given in Raverty's Pushtū Dictionary, as a province in Afghānistān. (See Bābar, Ers. 151, 263 and 270.) It lay in the west of Badakhshān. Mr. Ney Elias' map marks it as north of Cārikār and west-north-west of Citrāl.

On the whole it appears that Erskine's rendering "to excite emulation" cannot be correct though he adheres to it in his Bābar and Humāyūn (I, 440) adding that perhaps Bābar's object was to assist in recruiting his army, but Mr. Erskine had not then probably examined Shaikh Zain's translation. It appears to me that Bābar's motive was rather to enable the people of Afghānistān to defend themselves against the Uzbēgs and to strengthen their loyalty. It is probably to these presents that he alludes when he says (Ers. 310) that Badakhshān, Kunduz, Kābul and Qandahār were dependent on him, but that instead of being a help, he had to send extensive supplies to some of them, on

account of their being near the enemy. This enemy can only mean the Uzbēgs. I should note that the last of the Text, viz. that between Khūst, and Badakhshān does not occur in all the MSS. Price (Retr. IV, 684) has "at Kābul and the neighbourhood." Firishṭa too has nothing about Badakhshān and merely speaks of the inhabitants of the city of Kābul, adding that Bābar received, on account of his improvidence, the title of Qalandar. Nor does Khāfi Khān (Bib. Ind. I, 53) speak of Badakhshān. Bābar sought afterwards to recoup his extravagance by adding 30 per cent. to the taxes (Memoirs, 387).

There is still another trs. of Bābar's Memoirs, that by Mirzā Pāyānda Ḥasan Ghaznavī and Muḥd. Qulī Mughal Ḥisārī. Rien, II, 799b.

Since writing the above note I have seen Wood's Journey to the Source of the Oxus (Lond. 1872) and am now inclined to think that Ṣada is a mistake for the Arabic ṣadda, a gate or pass. Ṣad or Ṣadda seems a common name of places in Badakhshān and in one of Wood's maps (p. XC) there is a pass marked Sad-ish-tragh or Ishtārk which may be the Ṣada or Ṣaddara rasak of the Text. It is north of Citrāl and perhaps recent expeditions to that neighbourhood, have thrown or will throw light on the locality mentioned in the Text. Ṣad seems to be used in Badakhshān as equivalent to dara.





It is a fixed law that when the world-adorning Creator designs to reveal a unique jewel from its casings, he brings strange things to pass so that a man being tried in such ways by word and deed may become glorious in the minds of all for firmness and foreseeing. Among these, there was this strange circumstance that with all this victory and largesse, there was a defect of similitude (*qillat-i-mujānasat*) which worked a want of intimacy (*'illat-i-'adam-i-muwā-nasat*) with the people of India.

The soldiery and the peasantry (of India) abstained from intercourse (with the invaders). Although Delhi and Agra had come into possession, opponents held the country. Many of the neighbouring forts were held by rebels. Qāsim Sanbalī held Sanbal (Rohilkhand) and in the fort of Bīāna (Bhartpūr) Nizām Khān was beating the drum of opposition. Ḥasan Khān Mewātī had established himself in Mewāt (south of Delhi) and raised the standard of revolt. Muḥammad Zaitūn had established himself in Dhōlpūr (Rājputānā) and was breathing opposition. Tātār Khān Sārangkhānī (Firishta, son of Sārang Khān) was holding Gwālīār; Ḥusain Khān Lōhānī, Rāpri (on the Jumna); Quṭb Khān, Etāwa, 'Alām Khān, Kālpī. Marghūb, a slave of Sulṭān Ibrāhīm, held Mahāwan (Mathurā) which is near Agra. Qanauj and the other cities beyond the Ganges, were in the hands of the Afghāns, under the headship of Nāṣir Khān Lōhānī and Ma'rūf Farmulī who had contended also with Sulṭān Ibrāhīm. After his death, they had acquired many other countries and having advanced some stages, had made Bahār Khān, son of Daryā Khān, king and styled him Sulṭān Muḥammad.<sup>1</sup>

During this year, while his Majesty had his head-quarters in Agra, the hot winds were very oppressive. An impure *samūm* and sickness were added to the pusillanimity of the camp. A large number absconded out of senseless imaginations. Owing to the rebels, the inclement weather, the impassableness of the roads, the delay of coming by merchants, there was distress for food and a want of necessary articles. The condition of the people became bad. Many officers resolved to leave Hindūstān for Kābul and its neighbourhood, and many soldiers deserted. Though many old officers and veteran soldiers used improper language in the Presence, and also secretly

<sup>1</sup> B. and H., Ers. I, 412.





Hazārca<sup>1</sup> were given to him in fief. In Hindūstān too the *pargana* of Ghurām<sup>2</sup> was given to him. Mīr Mirān also got leave to go to Kābul.

The Khwāja got leave to depart (to Kābul) on Thursday,<sup>3</sup> 20 *Zi-hijja* (28th August). It is manifest that every right-minded, fortunate one who conducts business with subtle prudence, is more and more successful in proportion as he arrives at high positions. A mirror of this is the grand story of his Majesty Giti-sitānī Firdūs-makānī who in such a commotion of the soldiery and in presence of much opposition, had recourse to world-conquering courage, and who, relying on the Divine protection, set his face to accomplish his work and achieve his desires and made the city of Agra, which is the centre of Hindūstān, his fixed residence and with strength of counsel and courage and abundant liberality and justice, composed the distractions of the country. Accordingly many of the officers of Hindūstān and rulers of the country gradually entered his service. Among them was Shaikh Ghūrān<sup>4</sup> who brought with him as many as 3,000 men of mark.<sup>5</sup> Everyone of them received favours above his condition. 102

There were also Firūz Khān, Shaikh Bāyazīd, Maḥmūd Khān Lōḥānī, Qāzī Jīā, who were amongst the famous *sirdārs*, and who entered the service and obtained their desires. Firūz Khān received a *jāgīr* from Jaunpūr of one *kror* odd<sup>6</sup> of *tankas*. Shaikh Bāyazīd one *kror*<sup>7</sup> from Oudh; Maḥmūd Khān 90<sup>8</sup> *lakhs* from Ghāzīpūr. Qāzī Jīā had an assignment of 20 *lakhs* from Jaunpūr. In a short time, there was peace and comfort and joy and pleasure and such prosperity as belongs to a permanent government. Some<sup>9</sup> days

<sup>1</sup> Bābar, Ers., 151 and 156. Jarrett, 401n.

<sup>2</sup> Guhrām, Jarrett II, 296. As my friend Mr. Beames has pointed out to me, this is Ghurām in Sihrind. It is now in the native State of Patiala and on the Ghaghar (the old and famous Saraswatī), about 25 miles south-west of Ambāla and 24 miles due west of Shāhābād.

<sup>3</sup> Bābar, Ers., 341.

<sup>4</sup> Ers. and P. de C., Kāren. Badāonī

I, 337, Khūrān. Badāonī speaks of him as unrivalled in his knowledge of music.

<sup>5</sup> Bābar calls them bowmen (*tur-kashband*) from the Dnāb.

<sup>6</sup> 1 kr., 46 lakhs, 5,000, P. de C.

<sup>7</sup> 1 kr., 48 lakhs, 50,000, P. de C.

<sup>8</sup> 90 lakhs, 35,000 P. de C. See also Ers. B. and H. I, 446n., correcting trs. of Mem.

<sup>9</sup> About 11th July, 1526.





after the 'Id of Shawwāl, there was a great feast at Agra, in the palace of Sultān Ibrāhīm when a treasury of gifts was showered into the lap of the public. Sambal was assigned to Jahānbānī, in addition to Sarkār Hiṣār-firūza which formerly had been given him as the reward of valour. Amīr Hindū Bēg was appointed as his deputy to preside over that district. As Biban had besieged the fort of Sambal, the aforesaid Amīr, Kita Bēg, Malik Qāsim, Bābā Qashqa with his brothers and Mallā Āpūq, Shaikh Ghūran and his soldiers from the middle Dūāb were rapidly sent there. Biban engaged them and was defeated and as that seditious and disloyal one (*ḥarām-nimāk*) after having experienced the sweets of service, had out of evil nature turned his back, never again did he behold fortune's face.

---



CHAPTER XVIII.<sup>1</sup>DELIBERATIONS OF HIS MAJESTY GĪTĪ-SITĀNĪ (BĀBAR) AND UNDERTAKING  
BY HUMĀYŪN OF THE EXPEDITION TO THE EASTWARD.

As his Majesty Gīti-sitānī Firdūs-makānī was now victoriously established in Agra, the capital of the kingdom, and as the rainy season,—which is the spring of India and the period of freshness and verdure, of enjoyment with one's friends, and of garden delights,—had passed away and the time for expeditions had arrived, he consulted with his ministers as to whether he should proceed to the east to quell the Lōhānīs who had advanced with nearly 50,000 cavalry beyond Qanauj and were meditating hostilities, or should march westward against Rānā Sāngā<sup>2</sup> and subdue him, as he was very strong and had recently got possession of the fort of Khandār<sup>3</sup> and was cocking the cap of disobedience. After consultation, it was decided that as Rānā Sāngā had repeatedly sent representations to Kābul and had made protestations of loyalty, the facts of his not having done so since and of his having taken the fort of Khandār 103 from Ḥasan, the son of Makan, who had not yet done homage,—were not sufficient evidence of disloyalty, and that it was not advisable to proceed against him at present. The proper course was to send capable men to ascertain his dispositions and that until the truth about him was known, the first thing was to march eastwards and put down the Lōhānīs. The Emperor intimated that he would attend to this matter in person, but meantime his Highness Jahānānī,—the plant of whose greatness had grown tall in the garden of hope,—represented that if this weighty affair were committed to him, he would by the help of the royal fortune, bring it to a successful ter-

<sup>1</sup> Chalmers resumes his translation here after missing out from p. 112, p. 102 of the text.

<sup>2</sup> According to Tod, Sāngā is a contraction of Sangrām Singh, "the lion of battle."

<sup>3</sup> Kandār is a strong hill-fort a few miles east of Rantanbhur. Bābar, Ers., 339. Text and Jarrett II, 275, Khandār.





mination. The Emperor greatly approved of this request and gladly accepted the offer, and his Highness Jahānbānī girded himself for the task with energy and good fortune. Orders were issued that there should join themselves to Humāyūn, 'Adil Sultān, Muḥammad Kōkul-tāsh, Amīr Shāh Maṣṣūr Barlās, Amīr Qatlaq Qadam, Amīr 'Abdu-l-lāh, Amīr Walī, Amīr Jān Bēg, Pīr Qulī, Amīr Shāh Ḥusain,—who had been deputed to take Dhōlpūr and its neighbourhood from Muḥammad Zaitūn and to make it over to Sultān Junaīd Barlās and then to march against Biānā. For this purpose Kābulī Aḥmad Qāsim was despatched in all haste to direct these officers to meet Humāyūn at Candwār. Sayyid Maḥdī Khwāja, the *jāgīrdār* (fief-holder) of Etāwa, Muḥammad Sultān Mīrzā, Sultān Muḥammad Dūldī, Muḥammad 'Alī Jang Jang and 'Abdu-l-'azīz,<sup>1</sup> Master of the Horse, with the rest of the army which had been sent to subdue Quṭb Khān Afghān who had raised the standard of revolt in Etāwa,—were also appointed to serve his Highness (Humāyūn). On Thursday, 13 Zilq'ada (21st August, 1526) he came out from Agra at an auspicious moment and encamped at a distance of three *kos* from the city. He marched on from there, accompanied by the breeze of victory. Naṣīr Khān who had collected an army in Jājamū', fled while Humāyūn was 15 *kos* distant, and crossing the Ganges went to the territory of Khārīd.<sup>2</sup> Humāyūn also went in that direction, and having brought that region into order, partly by severity and partly by gentle measures, turned the reins of enterprise towards Jaunpūr. Having reduced Jaunpūr to order by justice and equity, he administered the country with the wisdom of age and the energy of youth. When near Dalman, Faṭḥ Khān Sarwānī, who was one of the great nobles of India and whose father had received from Sultān Ibrāhīm the title of A'zam Humāyūnī, 104 came and did homage to his Highness Jahānbānī. He (Jahānbānī) sent him to the imperial Court under the charge of Sayyid Maḥdī Khwāja and Muḥammad Sultān Mīrzā. There he was royally<sup>3</sup> treated and received a robe of honour. He received the allowances of his father and also a *kror* and six *lakhs* in addition. Though out of sim-

<sup>1</sup> Text, 'Alī, but this is wrong as Bābar's Mem. and A.S.B. MS. C. 27 and Text 107 and 108 show.

<sup>2</sup> Mentioned also in Bābar's *firmān*. Ers., 360. It is a large *pargana* in

the district of Balia, N.-W. P. Jarrett II, 163.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Bābar, Ers., 344. The total amount of the allowances is there stated as one *kror* and 60 *lakhs*.





licity he wished for the title which his father had possessed, he received that of Khān Jahān and was dismissed to his estates. His son Mahmūd Khān was exalted by obtaining permanent service. His Majesty Gīti-sitānī was both in appearance and in reality successful and munificent in the capital.

In Muharram 933 (Oct. 1526) the joyful news came from Kābul that Māham Bēgam, the mother of his Highness Jahānbānī, had given birth to a son. His Majesty Gīti-sitānī named him Muhammad Fārūq. His birth occurred on 23 Shawwāl, 932 (2nd Aug., 1526), and he died in 934 before his father had ever seen him.

DESCRIPTION OF VARIOUS AUSPICIOUS EVENTS IN THIS YEAR (933), OF THE NEWS OF THE REBELLION OF RĀNĀ SĀNGĀ AND OF THE MEETING OF HIS HIGHNESS JAHĀNBĀNĪ WITH HIS MAJESTY GĪTĪ-SITĀNĪ.

On Wednesday, 24 Ṣafar<sup>1</sup> (30th Nov., 1526), orders were issued to his Highness Jahānbānī that he should make over Jaunpūr to some officers and himself return with all speed, as Rānā Sāngā was advancing with a large army of Hindūs and Muhammadans. The conveyance of this message was given to Muhammad 'Alī, son of Mihtar Haidar Rikābdār.

In this year Nizām Khān, the governor of Bīāna, did homage through the instrumentality of that fountain of blessings Rafī'u-d-dīn Ṣafavī,<sup>2</sup> and made over the fortress of Bīāna to the imperial officers. Tātār Khān also tendered Gwālīār and kissed the threshold; and Muhammad Zaitūn made over Dhōlpūr and submitted himself. Everyone received royal favours corresponding to his sincerity and loyalty and was secured against calamities.

On 16 Rabī'u-l-awwal (21st Dec.) of this year, the mother of Sultān Ibrāhīm formed a plot<sup>3</sup> by the means of the cooks which had a happy<sup>4</sup> issue,—the crude imaginings of evil-disposed persons coming to nothing and they themselves meeting with punishment.

<sup>1</sup> 24 Muharram, Ers. and P. de C. This is probably correct. A.F. has probably written Ṣafar because that month appears in a preceding entry in Bābar's Mem. 24 Muharram = 31st October.

<sup>2</sup> A native of Īj near the Persian

Gulf. He was a teacher of A.F.'s father and was buried opposite Agra. Blochmann, Preface ii and 523 and Jarrett II, 180 and III, 423.

<sup>3</sup> She attempted to have Bābar poisoned. Bābar, Ers., 347.

<sup>4</sup> Bakhair guzasht, qu. turned out





105

When the orders were received by his Highness Jahānbānī, he appointed Shāh Mir Ḥusain and Amīr Sulṭān Jumaid Barlās to the command of Jaunpūr, and leaving Qāzī Jīā who was one of those trained up by his Majesty Gīṭī-sitānī, to assist these two officers, he set out for the capital. He also appointed Shāikh Bāyazīd to Oudh and as 'Ālam Khān held Kālpi and it was necessary to dispose of him, either peaceably or by force, he led his victorious army thither. By working on his hopes and fears, he brought him into the path of obedience, and taking him in his train, presented him at the world-protecting Court. On Sunday, 3rd Rabī'ū-ṣ-ṣānī, he arrived at the Cārbāgh,<sup>1</sup> known later as the Hasht Bihisht (Eight Paradises) and which was by its verdure the spring of power and fortune, and presented himself before his Majesty Gīṭī-sitānī. On the same day Khawāja Dōst Khāwand arrived from Kābul, and was received with honour.

At this time representations were continually arriving from Mahdī Khawāja who was in Biāna, about the rebellion of Rānā Sāngā and his warlike preparations.

well. Price (IV. 691) seems to have read *bulghūr guzashī*, went into darkness, i.e., was killed. But it would seem from the Memoirs that she was only put into confinement. See too Firishṭa.

<sup>1</sup> Now called Rāmbāgh; A. F.'s birthplace and opposite Agra. Blochmann, ii and Jarrett II, 189 and 423.





## CHAPTER XIX.

OF HIS MAJESTY GĪTĪ-SITĀNĪ FIRDŪS-MAKĀNĪ'S DRAWING UP  
HIS FORCES AGAINST RĀNĀ SĀNGĀ, AND UPREARING  
THE STANDARDS OF VICTORY.

Whene'er a design takes root in the bosom of an auspicious one, on whose honoured head God, the world-arranger, hath placed the diadem of true sovereignty, and whose lofty intellect is set on obeying the behests of the Lord of Lords, his action rises above the petty views of the vulgar, and he achieves success in realm and religion (*dīn ū dunyā*). The wondrous deeds of his Majesty Gīṭī-sitānī Firdūs-makānī are an instance of this, for as his felicity increased so also did his wisdom, and in proportion as the causes of dizziness augmented, so also did his prudence become enhanced. He ever took refuge in the Divine Unity, and in the administration of justice and the management of State affairs, never deviated a hair's breadth from the highway of reason. And at this time when Rānā Sāngā, in the pride of his numbers and courage and with his brains full of boastful madness, began to act presumptuously, and to remove his foot from the circle of equanimity, and was drawing nigh with the stride of boldness, he (Bābar) made the favour of God his stronghold, and gave no admission to the attacks of dismay but proceeded to quell that ill-fated disturber of the Age.

On Monday, 9 Jumāda-l-awwal (11th February, 1527), he marched out from Agra to extirpate this sedition, and pitched his camp in the neighbourhood of the city. Reports were continually arriving that the ill-fated one (Rānā Sāngā) had attacked Bīāna with a large army, and that the troops who had come out of that town, had not been able to withstand him and had turned back. Sankar Khān Janjūha was killed on that occasion, and Amīr Kita Bēg<sup>1</sup> wounded. Having halted four days, he (Bābar) marched on the fifth and encamped in the plain of Mandhākar<sup>2</sup> which lies between Agra

<sup>1</sup> T.R. 313ff. He was brother of Mīr Aḥmad Qāsīm Kohbar.

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps the Mandāwar of the Āin. Jarrett II, 182.





and Sikrī. It occurred to him that there was no water-supply for the troops except in Sikrī—(which after returning thanks for his victory, his Majesty Gītī-sitānī, by giving diacritical points, named Shukrī (thanksgiving) and which is now by the auspicious felicity of the king of kings, known as Fathpūr, from its giving victory to hearts)—and it might happen that the hostile army by using despatch, would get possession of this. In consequence of this just thought, he proceeded next day towards Fathpūr and sent Amīr Darvēsh Muḥammad Sārbān in advance in order that he might find a proper ground for encampment. The said Amīr fixed on an eligible spot in the neighbourhood of Fathpūr Lake (*Kāl*) which is a broad sheet of water and an ocean-like reservoir, and that was made the pleasant ground of encampment. From thence messengers went to summon Mahdī Khwāja and the other officers who were in Bīāna. Bēg Mirak<sup>1</sup> who was a servant of Jahānbānī and a number of the Emperor's special attendants were sent to collect information. In the morning intelligence was brought that the opposing army had advanced one *kos* beyond Bisāwar and were eighteen *kos* distant. On the same day Mahdī Khwāja,<sup>2</sup> Muḥammad<sup>3</sup> Sultān Mirzā and the other officers who had been in Bīāna, arrived and did homage. During this time, daily skirmishes took place between the outposts in which gallant soldiers distinguished themselves and received the royal approbation.

At length on Saturday, 13 Jumāda-l-ākhar 933 (16th March, 1527), Rānā Sāngā advanced with a large army to a hill near the village of Khānwa<sup>4</sup> in the Sarkār of Bīāna and about two *kos* from the imperial camp.

His Majesty states in his Memoirs that according to the Indian calculation by which territory yielding one *lakh* of revenue furnishes 100 horse, and one of a *kror* of revenue, 10,000 horse, the dominions

<sup>1</sup> Possibly the grandfather of Nizāmu-d-dīn Aḥmad, the author of the *Tabaqāt*.

<sup>2</sup> Bābar's brother-in-law. The statement that he was a son-in-law is a mistake of Erskine. Khwāndamīr tells us near the end of the *Habibu-s-siyar* that Mahdī Khwāja

was married to Bābar's sister Khānzāda.

<sup>3</sup> A grandson of Sultān Husain of Herāt. Bābar made him governor of Kanauj, Mem. 181.

<sup>4</sup> 37 miles west of Agra, in the Bhartpur State.