THE present fasciculus almost completes the survey of historical literature in Persian, but not quite, since the next fasciculus, devoted primarily to biography, will contain also additions and corrections to the Qur’ānic and historical sections as well as a provisional index.

A few words must be said about points of transliteration. The sign ̣ having been used to represent the Arabic ١, it has been found necessary to use a different sign (٢) for the palatal ٢ which occurs in Urdu and other Indian languages. In previous fasciculi ٢٢٢, ٢٢٢, and ٢٢٢ have been represented by ٢٢٢, ٢٢٢, and ٢٢٢, while ٢٢٢, ٢٢٢, ٢٢٢, ٢٢٢ and ٢٢٢ (without the underlining) have stood for the combinations ٢, ٢, ٢, ٢, and ٢. It seems, however, that a clearer distinction is desirable, and therefore, in this fasciculus ٢, ٢, ٢, ٢, and ٢ have been transliterated ٢٢٢, ٢٢٢, ٢٢٢, ٢٢٢ and ٢٢٢ in accordance with the practice adopted sporadically by Rieu in his British Museum catalogues and regularly by Ivanow in the catalogues prepared by him for the Asiatic Society of Bengal. In transliterating the proper names of Indians I have allowed myself to represent certain vowel sounds in accordance with the Indian pronunciation and to write Aurangzēb, Firōz-Shāh and the like, but I have not been rigidly consistent in this matter and I have not, for example, thought it necessary to change the title Ṣafīnāh i Khwushgō into Ṣafīnāh i Khwushgō (or Khwāsh-gō), though “ Ḥkwushgō” was an Indian. Such inconsistencies as there are will probably cause no trouble.

It remains for me to express my grateful acknowledgments to Dr. A. J. Arberry, who has provided me with information concerning India Office accessions as well as other matters, and to Mr. A. F. L. Beeston, who has informed me about manuscripts in the Bodleian library and the Indian Institute at Oxford. I am indebted also to several reviewers, who have suggested additions and corrections, Professor V. Minorsky (BSOS. viii (1935–7), pp. 255–7, ix/1 (1937), pp. 253–4), Dr. W. Hinz (ZDMG. 91 (1937), pp. 755–8), Dr. C. N. Seddon (JRAS. 1938, pp. 568–9), Professor J. Rypka (Archiv Orientální x, 1–2 (1938), pp. 368–9), Mr. R. Lescot (Bulletin d’études orientales de l’Institut Français de Damas, vii–viii, pp. 281–3), Professor G. Morgenstierne (Acta Orientalia, xvii, pp. 238–9), and others.

May, 1939.

C. A. STOREY.
LIST OF
AUTHORITIES AND ABBREVIATIONS

[Supplementary to the lists printed on pp. ix–xxiii, xxix–xxxv, and [xliv] facing p. 237.]


Bānkīpūr Suppt. i, ii = Supplement to the Catalogue of the Persian manuscripts in the Oriental Public Library at Bankipore. Volume i (Volume ii). By Maulavi Abdul Muqtadir. Patna (Calcutta printed) 1932, 1933. [I regret that the existence of this supplement did not come to my knowledge until 1936.]


M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (a) GENERAL

[For the general histories of the Muḥammadan world, including India, see pp. 61–158 of this work.]

612. A certain “Iṣāmī” composed in 750/1349–50 and dedicated to ‘Alī al-Dunyā wa-l-Dīn Abū ‘l-Muẓaffar Bahman-Shāh Sulṭān, the first ruler of the Bahmani dynasty, his Futūh al-salāṭīn, an epic poem on the rulers of India from the Ghaznavids to the date of composition, one of the authorities of the Tabaqat i Akbarī: Ethé 895 (damaged. 16th cent.), Ḥaydarābād Maulawi M. Ghauth’s Library (see Oriental College Magazine, vol. xiv no. 1 (Nov. 1937) p. 901), possibly also Rehatsek p. 131 no. 16 (cf. p. 493 infra) and Āsafiyah I p. 226 no. 673 (cf. p. 493 infra).


613. Khwājah Nizām al-Dīn Ahmad b. M. Muqīm al-Harawi was appointed Bakhshī of Gujrāt in Akbar’s 29th regnal year and Bakhshī of the empire in the 37th year. He died at the age of 45 on 23 Safer 1003/1594, the 39th year.

Tabaqat i Akbarī, as it is usually called, or Tabaqat i Akbar-Shāhī, as the author himself called it, or Tārīkh i Nizāmī, as it is sometimes called, written a.h. 1001/1592–3 (but Akbar’s reign is brought down to the end of the 38th year a.h. 1002/1593–4), the earliest of the general histories of India and the basis of subsequent works like the Muntakhab al-tawārīkh and the Gulshan i Ibrāhīmī, divided into a muqaddimah (the Ghaznavids), nine tabaqat: (1) Delhi a.h. 574/1178-1002/1593 concluding with notices of celebrated men of Akbar’s time, (2) the Deccan a.h. 748/1347–1002/1593, (3) Gujrāt a.h. 793/1390–980/1572, (4) Mālwa a.h. 809/1406–977/1569, (5) Bengal a.h. 741/1340–984/1576, (6) Jaunpūr a.h. 784/1382–881/1476, (7) Kashmir a.h. 747/1346–995/1586, (8) Sind a.h. 86/705–1001/1592, (9) Multān a.h. 847/1443–923/1517 and a geographical khātimah (apparently never finished, since in the
MSS. it consists of only a few lines: *'Aligarh* Subh. MSS. p. 57 no. 954 (3) (A.H. 1003/1594–5); *Rieu* iii 906a (lacks circ. 40 foll. at beginning. Late 16th cent.), 906a (transcribed from the preceding. A.D. 1854), i 220a (17th cent.), 221b (A.H. 1049/1640), 221b (18th cent.), 222a (from Balban to Ibrahim Lodi. 17th cent.), 222a (Bābur and Humāyūn. 19th cent.); *Eton* 182 (A.H. 1020/1611–12), 183 (A.H. 1059/1649); *Ethé* 225 (A.H. 1031/1622), 226 (A.H. 1/1659), 227, 228, 229 (lacks *Tabaqah* ix. Collated A.H. 1079/1669), 230 (*Muqaddimah* and *Tabaqah* i. A.H. 1066/1656), 231 (*Muqaddimah* and part of *Tabaqah* i. A.H. 1103/1691), 232 (portion relating to Shēr Shāh. A.H. 1104/1636), ii 3014 (*Tabaqah* iii); *Bodleian* 184 (A.H. 1049/1639), 185 (A.H. 1088/1677), 186–191 (six undated copies, of which 190 is described as very good, 191 (*Muqaddimah* and most of *Tabaqah* i) as old, and 189 as differing in arrangement); *Oxford* Ind. Inst. MS. Pers. A. iv 54 (A.H. 1131/1719); *Vollers* 972 (A.H. 1063/1653), 973, *Blochet* i 530 (lacks *Tabaqah* ix and *Khūṭimah*. Mid 17th cent.), 531 (*Muqaddimah* and *Tabaqah* i. A.H. 1089/1678), 532 (*Muqaddimah* and *Tabaqah* i. Late 17th cent.), 533 (*Tabaqāt* ii, iii, v, vi (?), vii. 17th–18th cent.); *Aumer* 235 (collated A.H. 1081/1670–1), *Bānkīpur* vii 535 (lacks *Tabaqah* iv. 17th cent.); *Mehren* p. 21 no. 56 (Akbar’s reign from A.H. 969 to 1001. Copied A.H. 1114/1702–3); *Ivanow* 115 (early 12th cent. h.), 116 (12th cent. h.); *Curzon* 24 (defective. 18th cent.), 25 (defective. 18th cent.); *Lindesiana* p. 205 no. 934 (circ. A.D. 1750), no. 405 (circ. A.D. 1780–1830); *Bühār* 60 (23rd year of Shāh-‘Alam’s reign = 1195–6/1781–2); *Berlin* 485 (A.D. 1809); *Āṣafiyah* i p. 246 no. 732 (A.H. 1298/1881), p. 926 no. 720 (part relating to the Deccan); *Edinburgh* 77 (old); *Lahore* Panjab Univ. Lib. (one nearly complete copy and one of the Delhi *tabaqah* only. See *Oriental College Magazine*, vol. ii, no. 4 (Lahore, August 1926) pp. 45–6), *R.A.S.* P. 59 = Morley 46 (defective); *Rehatseck* p. 100 no. 54, *Salemanna-Rosen* p. 12 no. 269* ("jild i awwal az Tārikh i Akbar-Shāh?". Author not stated).

Editions: *Tabaqāt i Akbarī* [Lucknow], 1870°, 1292/1875*, Calcutta 1913– (edited by B. De. Bibliotheca Indica. The
three parts so far published (in 1913, 1927 and 1931) contain the Muqaddimah and the whole of Ṭabaqah i).


Translations of extracts: (1) Elliot Bibliographical index pp. 186–203. (2) Elliot and Dowson History of India v pp. 187–476 (translated by J. Dowson).


Anonymous epitome: (Muntakhab i Ṭabaqāt i Akbarī) I.O. D.P. 746.

Condensed extract relating to various dynasties of the Deccan (only?): Dīkr i aḥwāl i salāṭin i Hindūstān, Ivanow 117 (A.D. 1811).

[Muntakhab al-tawārīkh ii 397; Maʾāthir al-umaraʾ i 660–4 (English translation in Elliot and Dowson History of India v 178–80); Elliot Bibliographical Index i 180–5; Elliot and Dowson History of India v 178–83, vi 130; Rieu i 220; Khwājah Niẓām al-Dīn Ahmad (in Urdu) by S. Aḥmad Allāh Qādirī (in the Urdu periodical Maʾarif, Aʿzamgarh, August 1931, pp. 121–37); Ency. Isl. under Niẓām al-Dīn.]

614. ʿAbd al-Qādir “Qādirī” b. Mulūk-Shāh b. Ḥāmid Badāʿūnī 1 was born on 17 Rabīʿ ii A.H. 947/21 August 1540 2

1 According to H. Blochmann, JASE. 38 (1869) p. 119 n., “The word Badāʿūn [sic] has the accent on the penultima, and a final nasal n; hence badāwīn, with a short o or u, and the Shakl i Hamzah above the wāw, an inhabitant of Badāwūn. The transliteration Badāʿūnī, which I have seen in some works, is misleading; for ʿbadawīn has the wāw of ʿbadawīn. ——, معاملن, and Badāʿūnī would be be ʿbadawīn. ——, معاملن.” Blochmann’s pronunciation is probably based on the scansion of the niṣbah in M. al-i. iii pp. 14412 and 14914–13. The name of the town occurs in a verse on p. 130 of vol. ii, where the scansion is ——. The last word has not yet been said on this subject. Cf. JRAS. 1924 p. 272; 1925 pp. 517 and 715–16; 1926 pp. 103–5.

2 Muntakhab al-tawārīkh i p. 383 penult.
at Tōdah ¹ [i.e. apparently Toda Bhim, now in the state of Jaipur]. Soon afterwards he seems to have been taken to Basāwar,² evidently for a time at least the home of his family.³ At the age of twelve he was at Sambhal, where his father had taken him to pursue his studies under Shaikh Ḥātim Sanbhali (M. al-t. i p. 425, iii pp. 2, 66).⁴ In 966/1558–9 he went from Basāwar to study at Āgrah (M. al-t. ii p. 32) and for some years he was a pupil of Shaikh Mubārak Nāgauri (M. al-t. iii pp. 67, 74). In 969/1562 his father died at Āgrah (M. al-t. ii p. 53), and not long after he evidently removed to Badāʿūn. He was there, for example, in 971/1563–4 (M. al-t. ii p. 73), and it was there that he married for the second time in 975/1567–8 (M. al-t. ii p. 105). In 973/1565–6, however, leaving Badāʿūn, he entered the service of Ḥusain Khān, the Jāgīrdār of Ptīyālī, and remained with him for nearly nine years (M. al-t. ii pp. 86–7, 222), moving with him when his jāgīr was transferred to Lucknow and again to Kānt u Gōlah.

It was at the end of 981/1574 that ‘Abd al-Qādir, having severed his connexion with Ḥusain Khān, went from Badāʿūn to Āgrah and was presented to Akbar through the influence of Jalāl Khān Qūrchi and Ḥakīm ‘Ain al-Mulk (M. al-t. ii p. 172). In 982/1574–5 he was appointed an imām (M. al-t. ii p. 206)

¹ M. al-t. ii p. 236, l. 9: gaṣabah i Tōdah, kih maulid i faqīr ast u [sic] Basāwar kih nisbat i “wa-awwaḍu ardi massa jildi tūrānbhā” dārad. This appears to mean that he was born at Tōdah and learned to walk at Basāwar. It is, therefore, difficult to see why the Encyclopædia of Islam should say that ‘Abd al-Qādir was “born at Basāwar in the sarkār of Sambhal [sic]”. That Tōdah and Basāwar were west of Āgrah (and therefore not in the sarkār of Sambhal) seems clear from M. al-t. ii pp. 235–6, where ‘Abd al-Qādir records a journey from Gūrgīnah to Fathpur via Mōhānī, Bāq’haur [sic], Māndalgarh, Anbār, Tōdah, and Basāwar.

² i.e. Bhasāwar, now in the Bharatpur State, about 18 miles N.E. of Toda Bhim.

³ ‘Abd al-Qādir often mentions the place. His father was buried there (M. al-t. ii p. 53) and so was his maternal grandfather Makhdūm Ashraf (M. al-t. ii p. 64). ‘Abd al-Qādir was not the first of his family to be connected with Badāʿūn, since we learn from M. al-t. iii 75 that his father studied at Sambhal and Badāʿūn.

⁴ In the third volume of the Muntakhab al-tawārīkh there is a section (pp. 66 seq.) devoted to the author’s teachers.
and in 983/1575–6 he became one of the seven imāms and was instructed to lead the prayers on Wednesdays (M. al-t. ii p. 226). In the same year he was granted 1,000 big`hās of land as a madad i ma`āsh (originally at Basāwar, but in 997/1588–9 the grant was transferred to Badā’ūn. M. al-t. ii p. 368). From 982/1574 onwards he took a prominent part in the literary activities—mainly historiography and the translation of Hindu works into Persian—which Akbar promoted. His religious orthodoxy made him unsympathetic to Akbar’s free-thought and he regarded his master’s innovations with a disapproval which he does not conceal in the Muntakhab al-tawārīkh. It is stated in the Khizānah i `āmirah on the authority of a pupil of his that he died in 1004/1595–6. According to the Mir`āt i jahān-numā, however, he died in 1006/1597–8 and according to the Tabaqāt i Shāh-Jahānī in 1024/1615. According to Bakhtāwar Sing’h’s Urdu Tārikh i Badāyūn (quoted by Blochmann, J.A.S.B. 38, Pt. i (1869) p. 143) his grave is at ‘Atāpūr near Badā’ūn.

The works with which `Abd al-Qādir’s name is associated as author, epitomator, translator or collaborator are the following:

(1) Kitāb al-ahādīth (a chronogram = 978/1570–1), a collection of forty traditions on the merit of waging war. Presented to Akbar in 986/1578 (see M. al-t. ii p. 255), but now apparently lost. (2) Nāmah i khirad-afzā (a chronogram = 989/1581), a translation of the Sing’hāsan battīsī undertaken by Akbar’s order in 982/1574 and begun immediately with the help of a pandit designated by Akbar (M. al-t. ii pp. 183–4). The date indicated by the chronogram is puzzling and is not explained by ‘Abd al-Qādir’s further statement (M. al-t. i 67) that he translated this work first in 982 and again in 1003. Several Persian translations of this work are extant, but none of them seems to be definitely identifiable with ‘Abd al-Qādir’s. (3) Razm-nāmah, a translation of the Mahābhārata undertaken by Akbar’s order in 990/1582 (M. al-t. ii p. 319). In this enterprise ‘Abd al-Qādir had only a small share, being associated with Naqīb Khān (for whom see p. 118, n. 1, supra) for three or four months during which a translation of two of the eighteen parvās was produced. For manuscripts of this translation see Rieu i 57, Ethé 1928–46,
Bodleian 1306–12 etc. (4) Tarjamah i kitāb i Rāmāyan, a translation or abridgment of the Rāmāyaṇa undertaken by Akbar's order in 992/1584, completed in four years and submitted to Akbar in 997/1589 (M. al-t. ii 336, 366). (5) Tārīkh i alfī. The part taken by 'Abd al-Qādir in the compilation of this history has already been mentioned (pp. 119–20 supra). (6) Najāt al-raqīd (a chronogram = 999/1590–1), described by Blochmann as a polemical work and by Ivanow as "a Sufico-ethical treatise, richly interspersed with interesting historical anecdotes, controversial discussions, etc." It contains inter alia an account of the Mahdawī sect. 'Abd al-Qādir makes a passing reference to this work in M. al-t. ii p. 208. For a manuscript see Ivanow 1263. (7) Tarjamah i Tārīkh i Kashmīr. In 999/1590 by Akbar's order he re-wrote and abridged a translation made for Akbar by Mullā Shāh-Muḥammad Shāhābādī of a history of Kashmir [probably the Rāja-taraṅgīnī]. M. al-t. ii p. 374. (8) Tarjamah i Mu'jam al-buldān. In 999/1590 he was one of ten or twelve persons, both 'Irāqīs and Indians, who collaborated in a translation of Yāqūt's geographical dictionary. He completed his portion, one twentieth of the whole, in one month (M. al-t. ii p. 375). This translation does not seem to be preserved. (9) Intikhāb i Jāmi' i Rashīdī. In 1000/1591–2 he was instructed by Akbar to epitomise the Jāmi' al-tawārīkh, evidently the Arabic version (see p. 75 supra), since he speaks of translating from Arabic. The words in which he describes the result of his labours (M. al-t. ii p. 384) suggest that he epitomised only a part of the work. (10) Bahār al-asmār. In 1003/1595 he was ordered to complete the Bahār al-asmār, a fragmentary translation of a "Hindī" (i.e. no doubt Sanskrit) tale (afsānah) 1 made for the Sulṭān Zain al-Ābidīn of Kashmir (A.H. 820–872). In five months he translated the last volume (jīlāt i akhīr) of this work and then received instructions to modernise the old Persian of the earlier translation (jīlāt i awwāl). When he wrote about

1 Apparently the Kāthā-sarit-sūgara. The India Office manuscript Ethé 1987 seems to be a copy of 'Abd al-Qādir's translation. It is clear from the words of the Muntakhab al-tawārīkh that the title Bahār al-asmār belonged to the earlier translation and was not given by 'Abd al-Qādir, as stated in the Encyclopaedia of Islam.
this in the *Muntakhab al-tawārīkh* (ii pp. 401–2) he was hoping to finish the work in two or three months.

In 983/1575–6 he had taken part in the unsuccessful attempt to produce a translation of the *At'harva Vēdu* (*M. al-t.* ii p. 212).


Abridgment made in 1049/1639–40 by Ṭāhmāsp-Qulī: *Berlin* 470.


The passages relating to Akbar’s new religion were summarised by H. H. Wilson in an article entitled Account of the religious innovations attempted by Akbar, which he contributed to the Quarterly Oriental Magazine, Calcutta, 1824, vol. i, pt. i, pp. 49–62 and which was reprinted in Works by the late Horace Hayman Wilson, vol. ii, London 1862, pp. 379–400.


[Autobiographical statements in the Muntakhab al-tawārikh (some, not by any means all, of these are collected in the 16-page biography prefixed to vol. iii of the Calcutta edition and a few are translated in Elliot’s Bibliographical index and History of India); Ṭabaqāt i Akbarī ii p. 468; A’in i Akbarī tr. Blochmann i 104 (translation of the Mahābhārata), 104 n. 2 (a brief biography by Blochmann), 547 (merely his name in the list of scholars); Mir’at al-‘alam (quoted in M. al-t. iii, preface, p. 12 foll.); Khizānah i ‘āmirah p. 323, no. 79; H. Blochmann Badáoni and his works (in J.A.S.B. 38 (1869), pt. i, pp. 105–44); Rieu i 222, iii 1082b ad 222; Rahmān ‘Ali 130; Ency. Isl. under Badā’ūnī; Bānkīpur vii pp. 6–8.]

615. ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Dihlawī, who died in 1052/1642, has already been mentioned as the author of the Sharḥ Sufar al-sa’ādah (p. 181 supra), the Madārij al-nubuwah (p. 194 supra), the Ḍawāl i A’īmmah i Ithnā’-ashar (p. 214 supra) and the Jādīb al-qulūb ilā diyār al-maḥbūb (p. 427 supra).
Dhikr al-mulūk, or Tārīkh i Ḥaqqī, completed a.h. 1005/1596–7, a concise history of India from the time of Mu‘izz al-Dīn M. b. Sām to that of Akbar based on the Tabaqāt i Naṣīrī, the Tārīkh i Firōz-Shāhī (of Barani), the Tārīkh i Bahādur-Shāhī and, for the period from Buhārī Lōdī onwards, on oral tradition and personal observation: Bānkipūr vii 537 (a.h. 1023/1614), Bodleian 195 (with a continuation (little more than dates) to a.h. 1044/1634. Old), 196 (with the same continuation), 197 (n.d.), 198 (a.h. 1039/1629), Rieu ii 855b (a.h. 1066/1656), 823 (a.h. 1129/1717), i 223b (a later and enlarged recension. a.h. 1136/1724), Āsafiyah i p. 224 no. 612 (29th year of Aurangzēb), Browne Pers. Cat. 81 (a.h. 1221/1807), E.A.S. P. 60 = Morley 47.

Description, 5 pp. of extracts and translated extract of 1 1/2 pp.: Elliot Bibliographical index to the historians of Muhammedan India pp. 273–80, and (Arabic pagination) 60–4.

Description and translated extract of 2 pp.: Elliot and Dowson History of India vi pp. 175–81.

616. Nūr al-Ḥaqq al-Mashriqī al-Dihlawī al-Bukhārī was the son of ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Dihlawī, whose Dhikr al-mulūk or Tārīkh i Ḥaqqī has just been mentioned and whom he succeeded as a religious teacher at Delhi. In Shāh-Jahān’s time he became Qādī at Akbarābād (i.e. Āgrah). He died at Delhi in 1073/1662 at the age of ninety. Among his works were a Persian commentary on the Sahīh of al-Bukhārī entitled Taṣīr al-qārī fī sharḥ Sahīh al-Bukhārī (see Brockelmann 1st Suppt. p. 263 no. 31), a Persian commentary on the Sahīh of Muslim entitled Manba’ al-‘ilm fī sharḥ Sahīh Muslim revised and enlarged by his son Fakhr al-Dīn Muḥībb Allāh (see Brockelmann 1st Suppt. p. 266 no. 13) and a commentary on “Khusrau’s” Qirān al-sā‘dāin entitled Nūr al-tawārīkh, a general history of India from Mu‘izz al-Dīn M. b. Sām to the accession of Jahāngīr (a.h. 1014/1605), being a much enlarged edition and continuation of his father’s history: Blochet i 535 (a.h. 1068/1657–8), iv 2924 (a.h. 1104/
II. HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, ETC.


Extracts: Elliot Bibliographical index, Munatkhabat pp. 65–8.

Translations of extracts: (1) Elliot Bibliographical index pp. 283–96. (2) Elliot and Dowson History of India vi pp. 184–94.

Descriptions: (1) Elliot Bibliographical index pp. 281–97. (2) Elliot and Dowson History of India vi pp. 182–4.

["Amal i Schāh (B.M. MS. Add. 26,221 = Rieu i 263, fol. 692b, i.e. the 19th leaf from the end of the work); Mīrūt al-ālam (B.M. MS. Add. 7657 = Rieu i 125b, fol. 455a, i.e. the 43rd leaf from the end); Subḥat al-marjān 53; Farḥat al-nāẓirīn (passage quoted in Oriental College Magazine iv no. 4 (Aug. 1928) pp. 58–9); Khazīnat al-āsfiyya ii 356; Ithāf al-nubalā' 426; Rieu i 224b; Ḥadīth al-Ḥanafīyya 418; Raḥmān 'Ali 246; Ency. Isl. under Dīhlawi.]

617. M. Qāsim Hindū-Shāh¹ Astarābdī known as (al-mashhūr bi-) Firīstah, as he calls himself in the Gulshan i Ibrāhīmī, or M. Qāsim surnamed (al-mulaqqab bi-) Hindū-Shāh known as (al-mashhūr bi-) Firīstah, as he calls himself in the Dastūr al-ātībba', was the son of Ghulām-'Ali Hindū-Shāh [see Bombay ed. ii p. 449, [Lucknow] ed. ii p. 120]. Neither the date nor the place of his birth seems to be known.² On reaching years

¹ Not M. Qāsim ibn Hindū-Shāh.

² The two biographies of Firīstah by General Briggs contain a number of unsupported statements which are not easily verified from his own abridged and unindexed translation and from the equally unindexed editions of the Persian text, the sole source of information. [The Urdu translation published by the Osmania University has an index in the first volume but not in the other three!] Mohl is more scientific in giving references to the Persian text, but he, like several later writers, repeats unevienced statements from Briggs. Firīstah, says Mohl, following Briggs, "était né à Astarābad dans le Mazendaran," and he gives a reference to vol. i, p. 4, where the only reference to Astarābad is the nisbah Astarābdī appended to Firīstah's name. This, of course, does not prove that he was born at Astarābad. According to the Encyclopaedia of Islam Firīstah was "born 960 = 1552", but no evidence
of discretion Firishtah entered the service of Murtadā Niẓām-Shāh ¹ (ruler of Ahmād-nagar A.H. 972/1565-996/1588 ²), and it was at Ahmādnagar that, while still in the prime of youth,³ he conceived the idea of writing a history of the Islāmic kings and saints of India. At Ahmādnagar, however, he was unable to obtain all the historical works that he desired and so his project had to be deferred. When the Prime Minister Mirzā Khān ⁴ (Sultān Husain Sabzawārī) plotted with Dilāwar Khān, Regent of Bijāpur, to depose Murtadā Niẓām-Shāh in favour of his son Mirzā Husain and mobilised an army ostensibly to defend the kingdom of Ahmādnagar against the forces of Bijāpur, which by arrangement had assembled on the frontier, Firishtah was sent by the king to find out what was really happening.⁵ Mirzā Khān, knowing that Firishtah’s loyalty to the king would cause him to make a true report, intended, when

is produced, and no such statement is found in the authorities mentioned in the bibliography, though they do contain conjectural and approximate dates. Among the assertions of Briggs and his followers for which they cite no evidence are the following: (1) His father, “quitting his native country, travelled into India and eventually reached Ahmadnuggur in the Deccan, during the reign of Moortuza Nizam Shah” [acc. to Ency. Isl. Firishtah “was brought to Ahmādnagar as a child in the reign of Husain Niẓām Shāh I”], (2) Firishtah “states that he had only attained his twelfth year when he reached Ahmadnuggur”, (3) “Gholam Ally Hindoo Shah… was selected, on account of his erudition, to instruct the Prince Meeran Hoosein in the Persian language”, (4) “it seems probable that the former [i.e. Firishtah’s father] died at Ahmadnuggur not long after his arrival there. Firishta was [sic!] thus left an orphan in his youth”. Mohl’s statement that Firishtah was at one time in Badakhshān is based on a misconception. The reference to Badakhshān occurs in a quotation from the Tārīkh i Rashīdī. It was Mirzā Haidar, not Firishtah, who was at one time in Badakhshān.

² 994/1586 according to Ency. Isl. under Niẓām-Shāh, but Firishtah gives the date of his death as 18 Rajab 996.
³ dar ‘unfurān i jawānī, Bombay ed. i p. 4, ll. 5–6, Lucknow ed. i p. 3 penult., Briggs’s trans. i p. xlvi.
⁴ Mohl consistently calls this person Mihrāb Khān.
⁵ Bombay ed. ii p. 286, l. 9, Lucknow ed. ii p. 146, l. 15, Briggs’s translation iii p. 287, Journal des savants 1840, p. 214 (where Mohl gives a detailed account of these events).
he joined the army a little later, to arrest Firishtah, but the latter was warned by a friend and managed to escape on a dromedary. He disclosed the plot to the king and, on being asked for his advice, made certain recommendations. Yielding to the persuasion of a disloyal favourite, the king decided to remain in the palace, contrary to Firishtah’s advice. Hearing of this, the troops who had remained loyal lost heart and left Aḥmadnagar to join Mīrzā Khān. Firishtah, who was apparently captain of the palace guard 1 or something of that kind, and five or six others were all who remained in the palace with the king. Not long afterwards Mīrzā Khān and Mīrān Husain with thirty or forty ruffians entered the palace and Firishtah would have been killed if Mīrān Husain had not recognised him and, respecting his claims as a school-fellow, 2 spared his life.

The deposition and murder of Mīrān Husain Nizām-Shāh after a reign of only ten months led to xenophobic disturbances and a massacre from which few “foreigners” (gharībān, i.e. non-Dakani, and their descendants, gharīb-zādahā) escaped, and these, less than 300 in number, were expelled to Bījāpur on the “īd in Ramaḍān” 997/1589. Through the influence of Dilāwar Khān, Regent during the minority of Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil-Shāh II, they were given appointments, and on 19 Šafar 998/28 Dec. 1589 Firishtah was presented at court and entered the government service at Bījāpur. 3

1 Rāqim i huʁaf rā kīh ba-muḥāfażat i darbār ishtiqāḥul dāshīt ān-rāz ba-ḥudūr i aşdas ṣababīdah ba-mukālamah i šarīf sur-afhrāz sūkhā, Bombay ed. ii p. 287 ult., Lucknow ed. ii p. 147, l. 6, Briggs’s trans. iii p. 268.
2 Shāh-zādah bandah rā shinākhlah u nisbūt i ham-maktābī manzūr dāshīt mānī i kushān shud u mara ham-rāh i khwād bāšā-yi ‘Imārat i Baghdād būrdaḥ etc., Bombay ed. ii p. 288, ll. 9–10, Lucknow ed. ii p. 147, l. 13, Briggs’s translation iii p. 269. Firishtah tells us that Mīrān Husain on his accession was sixteen years old. Firishtah, to judge from the part played by him in these events, must have been at least several years older. The word ham-maktābī in this context seems to be the basis for General Briggs’s imaginative statement that “Gholam Ally Hindoo Shah, the father of Ferishta, was selected, on account of his erudition, to instruct the Prince Meeran Hooversein in the Persian language”.
3 u rāqim i huʁaf rāz dar nūzdaḥum i Šafar sanah i thamān wa-tis’in wa-tis’-mī’ah az Aḥmadnagar bah Bījāpur āmadah ba-wasṭat i Dilāwar Khān ba-sharaf i āstānah-būsi i śāh i ’adālāt-gustar musharraf gardid u dar silk i naukaran u
At the end of Rabî‘ al-Awwal 998/1590 Burhān Niẓām-Shāh, desiring to obtain the throne of Aḥmadnagar, then occupied by his son, Ismā‘īl, sent messengers to Firishtah with an autograph parwānāh asking him to place before the King of Bijāpur some letters appealing for support. Firishtah took the messengers to Dilāwar Khān, the Regent, who submitted the letters to the king and obtained his consent to a campaign. In a battle which ensued between Dilāwar Khān and Jamāl Khān, the dictator of Aḥmadnagar, Firishtah was wounded and after fleeing to Dārāsang fell into the hands of Jamāl Khān but escaped by a stratagem. In Rajab of the same year he was among those who accompanied the king on the night journey against Dilāwar Khān, which resulted in the latter’s fall and flight to Bidar.

In Ṣafar 1013/July 1604 Firishtah accompanied the palanquin of Bēgam Sultān, Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil-Shāh’s daughter, from Bijāpur to Paithan on the Gōḍāvarī, where she was married to Akbar’s son Dāniyāl, and thence to Burhānpūr, where Dāniyāl died a few months later. At the beginning of Jahāṅgīr’s reign (A.H. 1014/1605–1628) Firishtah was sent to Lahore by Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil-Shāh for a purpose which is not specified. In 1023/1614 he visited the fortress of Asīr, and he was still alive

mulāzimān i ā intiṣām yāftah tā yaum al-tahrīr az khāk-rūbān i ān ‘atabah i ‘alīyah ast, Bombay ed. ii p. 295, l. 8, Lucknow ed. ii p. 150 antepenult., Briggs’s trans. iii p. 277. Cf. Bombay ed. i p. 4, l. 11, ii p. 120, l. 5, Lucknow ed. i p. 4, l. 3, ii p. 62, l. 9, Briggs’s trans. i p. xlvii (the passage occurring in vol. ii p. 120, l. 5 of the Bombay edition is omitted by Briggs). In the last passage Firishtah says that he received his appointment on the 1st of Rabī‘ al-Awwal.

1 Bombay ed. ii p. 120, Lucknow ed. ii p. 62. Not in Briggs’s translation.
5 Bombay ed. i p. 230 antepenult.: Musawīd i ā in aurāq M.Q.F. chūn dar awā‘il i ‘aḥd i Nūr al-Dīn M. Jahāṅgīr Pūḏshāh az jāmīb i sū̄fīn i ‘aṣr Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil-Shāh ba-baldah i Lāhāvar rasūlū az ba‘d i mardum i ān-jū . . . istifsār i aṣl u nasab u dā’dmān i Tughluq-Shāhī numūd, Lucknow ed. i p. 130, ll. 6–8, Briggs’s trans. i p. 401.
in 1033/1623-4, if the record of the death of Bahādur Khān Fārūqī at Āgra in that year\(^1\) was not inserted in his history by a later hand.

As Firishtah tells us in two places,\(^2\) he was encouraged in the writing of his history by Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil-Shāh, who on an occasion when he was presented at court by Shāh-nawāz Khān (Khwājah Sa’d al-Dīn ‘Ināyat-Allāh Shīrāzī) gave him a copy of the Rauḍat al-ṣafā’ (for which see p. 92 supra) and instructed him to write a history of India which should be an improvement upon the very concise and, especially in matters relating to the Deccan, inadequate history of Nizām al-Dīn Almād Bakhshī. He also received much encouragement from Shāh-nawāz Khān.\(^3\) Firishtah wrote also an exposition of the Indian system of medicine, entitled Dastūr al-āṭibbā’ and often called Ikhtiyārāt i Qāsimī, which is extant in many manuscripts (e.g. Rieu Suppt. 160, Ethé 2318–24, cf. Fonahm Zur Quellenkunde der persischen Medizin pp. 22–3).

Gulshan i Ibrāhīmī, usually called Tārīkh i Firishtah, a general history of India dedicated to Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil-Shāh and existing in two slightly different recensions, the first dated (in the preface) 1015/1606-7, the second, with a new title, Tārīkh i Nawras-nāmah, 1018/1609-10 (both contain later insertions),\(^4\) both divided into a muqaddimah (on the beliefs of the Hindus, their early rājāhs and the coming of Islām to India), twelve maqālaḥs ((1) the Ghaznawids of Lahore, (2) the Sultāns of Delhi, (3) the Deccan in six rauḍāḥs ((i) Bahmanids, (ii) ‘Ādil-Shāhs, (iii) Nizām-Shāhs, (iv) Quṭb-Shāhs, (v) ‘Imād-Shāhs, (vi) Barīdīs), (4) Gujrāt, (5) Mālwa, (6) Burhānpūr, (7) Bengal (including the Sharqīs of Jaunpūr), (8) Sind, Tattah and Multān,


\(^2\) Bombay ed. i p. 4, ii p. 153 penult., Lucknow ed. i p. 4, ii p. 79, Briggs’s trans. i p. xlvi (the second passage is not translated by Briggs).

\(^3\) Bombay ed. ii p. 161, l. 6, Lucknow ed. ii p. 77, l. 23 (not translated by Briggs).

\(^4\) The Bombay and Lucknow editions have the date 1015 and the title Gulshan i Ibrāhīmī in the preface, but they contain the later dates 1018 (described as the current year Bombay ed. i p. 104, l. 12, Lucknow ed. i p. 60, l. 4, ii p. 177), 1023 (Bombay ed. i p. 693, l. 16, p. 724, l. 2, ii p. 77, ante penult., p. 507, l. 7, Lucknow ed. i p. 358, l. 5, p. 373, l. 11, ii p. 41, l. 17, p. 260, l. 20) and 1033 (Bombay ed. ii p. 568, l. 7, Lucknow ed. ii p. 291 ult.).
iii apparently). A.H. 1243/1827, Bombay Univ. 17 (vol. i. A.H. 1256/1841), Āṣafīyah i p. 228 no. 704 (A.H. 1257/1841), iii p. 96 nos. 998, 1074, 1233 (the last dated A.H. 1160/1747), Bānkīpur v, 538-9 (19th cent.), Bodleian 217 (Muqaddimah and Maqālahs i–ii), Caetani 71, Dresden 376 (vol. i).

Editions: Tāriskh-i-Firīshthā, Bombay (and Poonah) 1831–2, by Major-General J. Briggs and Mir Khairāt 'Ali Khān "Mushtāq". Some of the copies have also an English title-page: Tāriskh-i-Firīshthā, or History of the rise of the Mahomedan power in India, till the year A.D. 1612, by Mahomed Kasim Ferishta . . . edited and collated from various manuscript copies . . . by Major-General J. Briggs . . . assisted by Mir Kheirat Ali Khan Mushtak), [Lucknow], Nawal Kishore, 1281/1864-5°, Cawnpore 1290/1874*, 1884*.

Extracts: (1) [Maqālah xi (Malabar) with English translation by Anderson] The Asiatick Miscellany, vol. ii (Calcutta 1786) pp. 278–.2 (2) Elliot Bibliographical index, Muntakhabāt, pp. 76-84.


Urdu translation by M. Fidā-'Alī "Ṭālib" (with a few brief notes by S. Hāshimī Faridābādī): Ḥaḍarābād 1926–32* (Osmania University Press. 4 vols., containing apparently the whole work except the lives of the saints. Only vol. i contains an index).

Translations of extract: (1) [Maqālahs i and ii only] The history of Hindostan, from the earliest account of time to the death

---

1 1831 is the date given on the English title-page. In the Persian colophon the date of completion is said to be the last day of December 1832 [sic] corresponding to the 27th of Rajab 1247. The 27th of Rajab 1247 was the 1st of January 1832.

2 The I.O. copy of vol. ii is defective, ending with p. 124.
of Akbar; translated from the Persian of Mahummud Casim Ferishta... together with a dissertation concerning the religion and philosophy of the Brahmins. With an appendix containing the history of the Mogul Empire from its decline in the reign of Mahummud Shau to the present time. By A. Dow. 2 vols. London 1768*, 1770–2** (2nd ed., enlarged. With a third volume containing The history of Hindostan from the death of Akbar to the... settlement of the empire under Aurungzebe [compiled from various writers]... A dissertation on the origin and nature of despotism in Hindostan... An enquiry into the state of Bengal... By A. Dow), 1792 (3rd ed. See Morley, p. 67, n. 4), 1803 (4th ed. See Morley ibid.), 1812* ("New edition"). (2) [Maqālah xi (Malabar)] see above under Extracts (1). (3) [Maqālah iii (the Deccan)] Ferishta's History of Dekkan, from the first Mahummedan conquests: with a continuation from other native writers [or rather, from Bhīm Sīn's Dīl-kus̱hā in abridged translation] of the events in that part of India to the reduction of its last monarchs by the Emperor Aulumgeer Aurungzebe; also, the reigns of his successors in the empire of Hindostan to the present day [translated from the Memoirs of Irādat Khān and other works]: and the history of Bengal, from the accession of Aliverdee Khan to the year 1780 [translated as far as the death of 'Ali-Wirdī Khān "from a Persian manuscript" (see p. 717 infra) and thereafter from the Siyar al-muta'akkhirīn of Ghulām-Ḥusain Khān]. Comprised in six parts. [Translated] By Jonathan Scott. Shrewsbury 1794°*, London 1800 (2nd ed. See Morley p. 67, n. 6), London n.d. [?]. (3 vols. 8vo. See Morley ibid.). (4) [Extracts from Briggs's translation] Elliot Bibliographical index pp. 322–36. (5) [The same extracts] Elliot and Dowson History of India vi pp. 218–36. (6) [The Muqaddimah] Elliot and Dowson History of India vi pp. 532–69.


[Autobiographical statements in the Gulshan i Ibrāhīmī;
Briggs's translation, 1829 ed., vol. i pp. xxxix-xlvi (unsatisfactory, since there are no precise references to the translation, which, moreover, omits some of the author's allusions to himself); J. Briggs Essay on the life and writings of Ferishta (in Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. ii (1830) pp. 341-61); J. Mohl in Journal des savants 1840 pp. 212-20 (contains references to the Bombay text); Elliot Bibliographical index pp. 310-13 (based on Briggs and Mohl); Elliot and Dowson History of India vi pp. 207-9 (a repetition of the preceding); Morley pp. 63-4; Rieu i 225; Bānkipūr vii 538; Ency. Isl. under Fīrishtā (some conjectures are stated here as facts. No precise references).]

618. An anonymous author ¹ compiled from Fīrishtā and other histories a

Tārikh i rājahā (or ḥākimān) i Hind (beg. Dar mu‘taqadāt i ahl i Hind), a sketch of Indian history in twelve maqālahs corresponding to those of Fīrishtā: Eṭhē 303 (A.H. 1149/1736), 304 (n.d.).

619. M. Sharīf al-Najafī (Ḥanafī acc. to Elliot and Dowson) was born in the Deccan. In an official capacity he visited Gujrat, Mālwa, Ajmēr, Delhi, Agra, the Panjāb, Sind, and Kashmir, the last in 1031/1621-2 in the train of Jahāngīr and under the command of Qāsim Khān.

Majālis al-salāṭīn, a brief history of the kings of Delhi, the Deccan and Kashmir, completed A.H. 1038/1628-9: Rieu iii 906b (circ. A.D. 1850).

Extracts (chiefly on Kashmir) translated by a munshi: B.M. MS. Add. 30,779, foll. 92-102.

Description and 4 ¹/₂ pp. of translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson History of India vii 134-140.

620. Banwālī or Banwālī-Ḍās "Wālī", who is sometimes

¹ Ethē gives 1018/1609-10 as the date of compilation, but presumably the passage where 1018 is mentioned as the current year is a quotation from Fīrishtā.
called Wali Rām, a munshī under Shāh-Jahān’s eldest son Dārā-Shukoh and received instruction in Šūfism from Dārā-Shukoh’s pīr, Mullā Shāh Badakhshī (for whom see p. 18 supra). His Mathnawī in six ważns (beginning Qādirā az man manī bi-stat u bas. See Ivanow Curzon 270, 462 (27), Sprenger no. 564) was written, in part at least, in 1054–5/1644–5, and his Gulzār i ḥāl, a translation of the Sanskrit drama Prabodha Chandrodaja, in 1073/1662–3 (for MSS. see Rieu iii 1043, Ethé 1995–6, Ross and Browne 195, Eton 187. Editions: Bombay 1862*, Lucknow 1877*, 1887°). According to the editor’s preface to the 1868 edition of his dīwān he died in 1085/1674–5.

An incomplete manuscript of his dīwān, containing ghazals, couplets, rubā‘īs and part of the above-mentioned Mathnawī, is preserved at Calcutta (Ivanow Curzon 270). The Dīwān i Wali published at Lahore in 1868* contains only ghazals (beginning, as in Ivanow Curzon 270, Ganjī kīh būd makhfī akūn shud āshkārā) and two pages of rubā‘īs. According to the preface to that edition “Wali” wrote many works such as the Muḥīṭ i ma‘rifat (a mathnawī), the Gulzār i ḥāl, a Hindi dīwān and a Persian dīwān entitled Ganj i ‘irfān. The Mathnawī i Wali Rām published at Lahore in 1867* by the same press as the afore-mentioned Dīwān i Wali and at Siyāl-kot (though printed apparently at Gujranwālah) in [1876°] seems to differ considerably from the mathnawī described by Ivanow. It is divided into six jīlās and begins Mā zi-kufū u dīn hamah bi-gdhashtah īm. The third jīlā opens with the words given by Ivanow as the beginning of the third ważn. The King’s College MS. no. 14 (Browne Suppt. 1446) is described as “A collection of five Persian tracts on Hindu religion, etc., viz. (1) Kayān top-hī in verse; (2) Rām Gūd; (3) Miṣbāh’l-Hudū; (4) Arjūn Gūd;

1 In the colophon of the Tūp-khānah MS. of the Mathnawī i Wali Rām (Sprenger no. 564) he is called Swāmī Wali Rām ‘urf Bābā Banwāl-Dās. Other forms in which his names and designations occur are Banwāl-Das al-mutakhallīs bi-Wali munshī i Sūltān Dārā-Shukoh (colophon of B.M. MS. Rieu ii 855a), Banwālī Rām mutakhallīs ba-Wali (editor’s preface to the 1868 edition of the dīwān), Wali Rām Gūsā’īn Dārā-Shukohī (Āṣaffiyah i p. 240), etc. A rubā‘ī which is quoted in the editor’s preface but which does not occur in the body of the 1868 edition of the dīwān contains the words Iem i badan-am nist ba-juz Banwālī Dar shīr takhallus-am Wali, ai Wali.
(5) Discussion between Darā Shukūh and Bábā Lāl, all by Wali Rām, except No. 4, which is by Abu’l-faḍl’.

The Mathnawī i Wali Rām ma’rūf bah Chashmah i ‘irfān published at [Lucknow] in 1875* and at Rāwalpindi in [1890†] begins Ai shudah mahfī ba-kanāl i zuhūr and consists of only a few pages (ten in the Lucknow edition).

Rājāwāli,1 a short account of the Hindu rājāh of Delhi from Jud’hishtir to the invasion of Shihāb (Mu’izz) al-Dīn M. b. Sām followed by a tabulated list of the subsequent Muslim rulers to Shāh-Jahān (usually with continuations to later rulers such as Muḥammad Shāh and ‘Ālamgīr II): Berlin 14 (80) (earlier than A.H. 1154/1741–2),2 Éthé 205 (n.d.), 206 (?) (late 18th cent.), Blochet i 551 (18th cent.), 552 (1) and (2) (two slightly different recensions. Late 18th cent.), Rieu ii 855a (A.H. 1208/1793), 916b (circ. A.D. 1850), 925a (A.D. 1849), Lindesiana p. 127 no. 451 (circ. A.D. 1840), Āṣafiyah i in p. 240 nos. 519, 778, Bodleian 170 (n.d.), Browne Suppt. 644 (King’s 193), 1458 [?], (Corpus 115°), Leyden iv in p. 223 no. 1968, Mehren p. 18 no. 47.

[Gul i ra’nā (Bānkīpūr viii p. 133); other sources mentioned above.]

621. Rāy Bindrāban,3 son of Rāy Bihārā-Mal,4 was Diwān to Shāh-‘Ālam Bahādur-Shāh for a time before his accession.5

1 This is a Sanskrit word meaning “a line of kings”, “a royal dynasty or genealogy”. Rieu mentions (vol. iii, p. 916b) that according to Sūfān Rāy [Khulāsat al-tawārīkh, p. 7, ll. 1–2] the Rājāwāli was written originally in Hindi by Miṣr Bidyād’har and was translated into Persian by Sāhū Rām [Rieu writes Nabān Rām], a disciple of Wali Rām (Nuṣkhā i Rājāwāli kih Miṣr Bidyād’har asāmī i rājāhā ba-khāfī i Hinduwī naqīshlah u ān rā Sāhū Rām khulāgah i murūdān i Gusā’in Wali-Rām ba-ibārat i mughābāh ba-Fārisī dar-āvardāh).

2 Pertsch ascribes the work to M. Khalil Allāh.

3 Bindrāban Dās Bahādur-Shāhī is what Khāfī Khān calls him (vol. ii, p. 211 ult.).

4 According to the Tadākhirat al-umāra’ (B.M. MS. Add. 16,703, fol. 134, cited by Rieu i p. 228b) Bihārā-Mal, Diwān to Darā-Shukoh, received the title of Rāy in Shāh-Jahān’s 20th regnal year and died in the 26th year.

5 This is stated by a former owner of the B.M. MS. Add. 25,788 (Lubb al-tawārīkh i Hind = Rieu i 229b) in a note dated A.H. 1149/1736–7. Cf. Khāfī Khān ii p. 211 ult.–2121, where the word Mutāṣaddī is used, not Diwān.
An inscription found at Elgandali Fort (in the Haiderabad State) seems to show that he was at one time Governor of that fort, "an important outpost on the north-east frontier of the Quṭb-Shāhī kingdom" (see Annual report of the Director-General of Archaeology in India, 1920–1, p. 39). During the siege of Bijāpur in 1095/1684 he was dismissed from the army by Aurangzeb on the ground that he was implicated in Shāh-‘Ālam’s secret communication with the enemy (see Khāfi Khān ii p. 321).


Description and 2 ½ pp. of translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson _History of India_ vii 168–73.

622. Munshi¹ Sujān² Rāy Bhandārī,³ or Sujān Sing’h D’hīr,⁴

¹ _Munshi al-manāši_ [sic] is the title prefixed to Sujān Rāy’s name in the colophon of the I.O. M8. D.P. 637a. This is evidently the title which _Rieu_ quotes in a corrupt form.

² Sujān, a Hindi word of Sanskrit origin meaning “well-informed, wise, intelligent”, is probably the correct form of this author’s name, though the _Ency. Isl._ appears, for some unexplained reason, to prefer the form Sanjān, which occurs in some of the colophons. _Rieu_ points out that no less than three Sujān Sing’h’s are mentioned in the _Tadhkīvat al-umara’_ (cf. _Ma’āthīr al-umara’_ ii pp. 291, 452).

³ For notes 3 and 4 see p. 454.
whose name is mentioned in the text of some MSS. of the *Khulāsat al-tawārīkh* and in some of the copyists' colophons, tells us that he was born at Baṭālah (Kh. al-t. p. 71) and that from his youth up he had been a munshi in the employ of officials (Kh. al-t., preface). In the colophons of the B.M. MS. Add. 5559 (cf. Rieu i p. 230a) and the I.O. MS. 637a it is said that he was well-versed in the Hindi, Persian and Sanskrit ‘ulūm. The latter colophon (perhaps also the former) says that he was nādir al-‘asr wa-l-dawrān in calligraphy, munshi-yari and ba-hamah šifat ('). Another work of his, the *Khulāsat al-inshā*, was completed, according to Rieu, in ‘Ālāmghir’s 35th year, A.H. 1102–3 (cf. n. 4 on this page, where the date is given as 1103, perhaps by a misprint). Extracts from it are preserved in the British Museum (see Rieu iii p. 1017a). The *Khulāsat al-makālib*, “a rich collection of specimens of refined prose-style intermixed with verses, on all possible topics, by Sujān Singh or Sujān Rāy Munshi of Patyāla [sic]” (Ethé 2109), was written in ‘Ālāmghir’s 42nd year, A.H. 1110 (see *Oriental College Magazine*, vol. x no. 4 (Lahore, August 1934) pp. 66–7).

*Khulāsat al-tawārīkh*, written in two years and completed in 1107/1695–6, Aurangzēb’s fortieth regnal year, a history of India from the earliest times to Aurangzēb’s

3 This caste-title is a Hindi word meaning “store-keeper, steward, treasurer”. In the corrupt colophon quoted from by Rieu it appears as “bhzārī”.

4 Cf. *JRAS*. 1895, p. 211, where the following statements are made in a letter from Qādī Taṣadduq Ḥusayn, of Baṭālah: “... Sujān Singh, was a dhīr khatri ... Among his writings there is also a book called *Khulāsat [sic] al-Inshā*, in which he describes the art of polite writing. This was written in 1105 Hijri. Some people also call him Sujān Rāy, but in both books he signs himself [sic] Sujān Singh Dhīr ... The above information is derived from his books, for the inhabitants of Batāla of the dhīr caste know nothing about him.”

1 According to Rieu he “designates himself as Sujān Singh Dhīr” in the preface as given in the B.M. MS. Or. 1924 (Rieu iii p. 908a). Cf. Ivanov Curzon 32.

2 The largest town in the Gūrdāspūr District of the Panjāb. Several of the colophons describe Sujān Rāy as a resident of Baṭālah.

1 The first volume of the Siyār al-muta’ākhkhirīn is little more than a verbal transcript of the Khulāṣat al-tawārīkh. According to ‘Abd al-Muqtadīr the Kh. al-t. contains little that is not found in Firishtah (sc. to the death of Akbar). It enters into minute details concerning the contest between Aurangzēb and his brothers.
Madras 128, Rosen Institut 16 (breaks off in Humāyūn’s reign), Upsala Zetterstēen 401.

Edition: The Khulasatu-t-Tawarikh by Sujan Rai Bhandari edited by M. Zafar Hasan . . ., Delhi 1918* (540 pp.). The editions of the Mugaddimah to the Siyar al-muta’akhkhirin (for which see p. 638 infra) can also be regarded as editions of the Khulasat al-tawārīkh.

Translation of the topographical and statistical account of the sūbahs (omitting the last, Kābul): The India of Aurangzib (topography, statistics, and roads) compared with the India of Akbar with extracts from the Khulasatu-t-Tawarikh and the Chahar Gulshan translated and annotated by Jadunath Sarkar, Calcutta 1901**, pp. 1–122 [corresponding to pp. 23–83 in Zafar Hasan’s edition].

Descriptions: (1) Elliot and Dowson History of India viii pp. 5–12 (including a translation of the account of Delhi, 1 1⁄2 pp.), (2) The Khalāsāt [sic]-at-Tawārīkh, or Essence of History; being the description and history of India as told by a Hindu two hundred years ago. By H. Beveridge (in JRAS. 1894 pp. 733–68), (3) The India of Aurangzib . . . by Jadunath Sarkar, Calcutta 1901, pp. xi–xv.

Free Urdu translation (or, in places, adaptation 1) of the earlier part (less than one-third of the whole), which deals mainly with the geography of India and the Hindu Rājahs of Delhi 2: Ārāyish i mahfil begun in 1219/1804 and completed in 1220/1805 by Mīr Shēr ‘Alī “Afsōs” Ja’fārī b. S. ‘Alī Muqaffār Khān, an Urdu poet, who was Head Munṣẖi in the Hindustani department at the College of Fort William, and who died at Calcutta in 1809 (see Sprenger p. 198, Sakṣena History of Urdu literature pp. 244–5): I.O. 2048 = Blumhardt 39 (a MS. from the College of Fort William which does not contain “Afsōs’s” preface and introduction).

1 The translator has both added and subtracted, especially in the accounts of the sūbahs.

2 In his preface the translator expressed his intention of translating the part relating to the Muḥammadan rulers, but there seems to be no evidence that he ever carried out this intention.
Editions of the Ārāyish i mahfil: Calcutta 1808°*, 1848°*, 1863°, Lahore 1867°*, Lucknow 1870°.

English translation: The Araish-i-Mahfil; or, The ornament of the assembly, literally translated from the Oordoo by Major 1 Henry Court... Allahabad 1871°*, Calcutta 1882°*.

Extracts from the Ārāyish i mahfil: (1) [The general description of India, its spring and rainy season, fruits, flowers, animals, Hindu learning, ascetics, army, women] Muntakhabat-i-Hindi, or Selections in Hindustani... By John Shakespear... vol. i (London 1817°*) pp. 79–134, (2) [The description of the sūbahs] ibid. vol. ii (London 1818°*) pp. 3–188.


1 Major is a Christian name of the translator’s, not a military title. At the date of publication M. H. Court was a lieutenant in the Bengal Cavalry.


[Khilāṣat al-tawārīkh pp. 611–12 (for many years munshī to officials), 7120 (Batālah his birthplace), 86 penult. (saw certain women in the neighbourhood of Kābul), 3516 (visit to the gardens at Pinjaur); colophons of certain MSS.; H. Beveridge The Khilāṣat-[sic] al-Tawārīkh . . . (in JRAS. 1894) pp. 737, 763–4; Jadunath Sarkar The India of Aurangzib, Calcutta 1901, p. xi; Ency. Isl. under Sandjān [sic] Rāy (M. Shafi').]

623. Jagiwan Dās, son of Manōhar Dās, Gujrāti entered the Imperial service as harkārah in 1105/1693–4 and from that time kept a record of current events. In 1119/1707–8 he received a khil‘at from Bahādur Shāh at Lahore, where he had been for two years in the Intelligence Department.

Muntakhab al-tawārīkh, a sketch of Indian history written in 1120/1708–9 and, apart from the chapter dealing with Bahādur Shāh, based apparently on the Lubb al-tawārīkh of Bindrāban (see p. 453 supra): Rieu i 232a (A.H. 1144/1731),

1 Muntakhab i tawārīkh in I.O. 4517.

[Muntakhab al-tawārīkh, preface (cf. Rieu i pp. 231b–232a).]

624. The year 1118/1706–7 is twice mentioned as the current year in a

Dastūr al-‘amal beginning Fihrist i tawārīkh i Rājahā i Dihlī wa-qhāirah and containing chronological records down to Farrukhsiyar’s 2nd year, A.H. 1126/1714, with lists of Shāh-Jahān’s and Aurangzēb’s amīrs, their titles etc.: Ivanov 381 (A.H. 1271/1854–5), Rieu iii 989b (transcribed from the preceding MS.).

625. M. Hādi, a convert from Hinduism, entered the imperial service in Aurangzēb’s time. In the second year of Bahādur Shāh’s reign he received the title of Kāmwar Khān at the recommendation of Prince Rafī’ al-Shān, Bahādur Shāh’s second son, and was appointed Mīr-Sāmān to Rafī’ al-Shān’s third son, M. Ibrāhīm. He is the author of a history of the Indian Timūrids brought down to A.H. 1137/1724–5 and entitled Tadhkīrat al-salāṭīn i Chaghātā (see p. 517 infra).

Haft gulshan i Muḥammad-Shāhī (or Haft gulshan i Iḥā, as the author calls the work in the preface to his Tadhkīrat al-salāṭīn i Chaghātā), a general history of India to A.H. 1132/1719–20 divided into seven gulshans ((1) Delhi to the time of Bābur, Jaunpūr, Mālwah, (2) Gujrāt, Khāndēsh, (3) Bengal, (4) the Deccan, (5) Sind, Multān, (6) Kāshmīr, (7) Indian saints) and based mainly on Firīshṭah and Bindrāban’s Lubb al-tawārīkh (see p. 453 supra): Ethē 394 (a later edition finished in 1136/1723. Autograph), Lindesiana p. 169 no. 871 (A.H. 1207–6/1792–1 (so)), Berlin 494 (A.H. 1209/1794), Edinburgh 202 (lacks Gulshan vii. Late 18th cent.), Rieu iii 908a (18th cent.), Bānkīpur vii 541 (19th cent.).

Description: Elliot and Dowson *History of India* viii pp. 13–16 (with a translated extract of 1 page).

[*Haft gulshan*, preface (see Rieu iii 908a, Elliot and Dowson viii pp. 13–14), *Tādhkīrat al-salāfīn i Chaghātā*, vol. ii (in the account of Bahādur Shāh’s reign. See Bānkīpūr vii p. 15, where the words are quoted): M. Bahshāh “Āshōb” *Life of Muḥammad Shāh* (Rieu iii 943–5) fol. 44 (cf. Rieu iii 945a), where Kāmwar Khān is said to have been originally a Hindu named Chandīdās.]

626. ‘Abd Allāh “Yaqīn”, a descendant of Mir Shāh Mansūr Barlās, and consequently described in the *Safīnah i Khwushqū* as a Mughul of Tūrānī origin, is said to have lived the life of a darwāsh and to have spent his time in the coffee-shops of Shāh-jahānābād (see the Bānkīpūr catalogue viii p. 106). According to the same authority he wrote a dīwān.

*Tārikh i Thābit*, a metrical history of the Muḥammadan dynasties of India written in 1133/1720–1, in the reign of Muḥammad Shāh, at the suggestion of Thābit-Qadam Khān: *Blochot* iii 1928 (12th regnal year [of M. Shāh? A.H. 1142/1729–30]), *I.O.* D.P. 614 (18th year of M. Shāh [A.H. 1149/1736]), *Rieu* ii 824b (28th year of M. Shāh [A.H. 1158/1745]).

[Autobiographical statements at the end of the *Tārikh i Thābit*: *Hamīshah bahār* (Sprenger p. 130); *Safīnah i Khwushqū* (Bānkīpūr viii p. 106).]

627. M. Ḥāshim Khāfī (M. al-l. iii p. 23) entitled (*mukhātab bi-*)

 Ḥāshim ‘Alī Khān (M. al-l. i p. 21) and afterwards Khāfī Khān

1 So spelt in the printed text, but Khwāfī according to Rieu iii p. 235b (cf. *Ma’āthir al-unwār* iii p. 680 and note 1 on p. 461 infra). However spelt, this *nisbah* doubtless indicates a family connexion with Khwāf or Khāf, a town and district in Khurāsān. The idea (stated by Morley, R.A.S. Cat. p. 100, without mention of any authority but evidently of earlier origin, since Elliot refers to it) that the title Khāfī Khān contains an allusion to the “clandestine” composition of the *Muntakhab al-lubāb* in the period when historical writing was forbidden by Aurangzēb is contrary to Khāfī Khān’s own statements concerning the composition of his work and has long been discredited, having been disputed by Sir H. Elliot, who died in 1853, and still more emphatically by W. Nassau Lees in the *JRAS.* for 1868.
Nizam-al-Mulk (M. al-l. i p. 24, iii p. 23-4) was the son of an official 1 in the service of Prince Murad-Bakhsh, Shâh-Jahân's youngest son. 2

He makes no precise statement concerning the date of his birth, but in one passage (M. al-l. i p. 739) he mentions that at the time of writing (li-ghâyat i hâl) seventy-four years had passed since the death of Sa'd Allâh Khân (Jumâdâ ii A.H. 1066/April 1656) and fifty-two since he himself had reached the age of discretion (hadd i tamîz). 3 H. Beveridge in the Enyc. Isl. assumes (with a query) that the age of discretion was fourteen years and infers, doubtless with substantial correctness, that Khâfi Khân was born about A.H. 1074 (i.e. 1140 - 66).

The place of his birth is unknown, but his connexion with the Deccan dates at least from an early period in his life. Thus he tells us (M. al-l. ii p. 55518-19) that he attended the funeral of the

---

1 By name Khwâjah Mîr Khwâfi according to Elliot History of India vii p. 207 ("His father, Khwâja Mîr, also a historian [? C.A.S.], was an officer of high rank in the service of Murâd Bakhsh") and p. 208, where it is stated that "not only does Ghulâm 'Ali Shâh style our author Muhammad Hâshim the son of Khwâja Mîr Khwâfi, but he himself gives his father's name as Mîr Khwâfi". Unfortunately Elliot does not say where Khêfi Khân mentions his father by name nor does he even specify the work in which "Ghulâm 'Ali Shâh" (= Ghulâm-'Ali "Azâd" ?) speaks of him. Neither Mîr Khwâfi nor Khwâjah Mîr Khwâfi seems to occur in the indexes to the Calcutta edition of the Munâtkhâb al-lubâb. P.S. At the beginning of the anonymous history Bânkipûr vii no. 590 (cf. p. 642 infra) Khêfi Khân is called Muhammad Hâshim ibn Khwâjah Mîr muhâzirîn in târikh kih Khwâfi al-aşî az zumráh i nâmâk-parpurân i Shâhâb-Qirân i Thâni Shâh-Jâhân Bâdshâh u â u pidarâsh râfîq i Sulîân Murâd-Bâkhsh bûdând. The words are quoted in Bânkipûr vii p. 102 4. 2... wâlid i marûbûm kih az naukarân i mu'tamad i râ-shînâs i Murâd-Bâkhsh u tâ rûz i farâgh i muqaddamâh dar pây i qalâh nishastah dar fikr i mansûbah i kamaï bâstân u fîrûd âwârdan i Âqâ-yi khowâd ba-sar bûdâh bûd u fa-fikr i naukari i 'Âlamgîr-i na-pardâkhî (M. al-l. ii 155 = E. & D. vii p. 266). He was with Murâd-Bâkhsh at the Battle of Samâgir and was severely wounded (M. al-l. ii 27 7-9 = E. & D. vii p. 223). He subsequently asked for and eventually obtained a mansûb from Shâh-'Âlam (M. al-l. ii pp. 554-5). 3 Az-ân ast kih az zamân i qâlin li-ghâyat i hâl az rûy i tawârikh ân-rikh ba-muâlûthah dar âmadah u dar muddat i panjâb u dû sâl kih mubâvâd i awrâq ba-hadd i tamiz âmad mushâhâdah mi numâyad hich gâlîm khowâd 'agibat bâkhair na-postâh u nada u 'Sa'd Allâh Khân li-ghâyat i hâl kih hâstâd u châhâr sâl az zamân i wafât i ûst hamak 'agibat-mahmûd ...
saint Sh. Burhān ¹ [Burhānpūrī], who died according to him ² in the 22nd year of Aurangzēb’s reign [i.e. A.H. 1089/1678]. With another saint of Burhānpūr, Mir Naṣīr al-Dīn Harawī, he was in close relation as a disciple (M. al-l. ii p. 558 penult.). His teacher (ustād) was a certain Mir Sayyid Muḥammad, whom he describes as a well-known scholar and an incomparable mathematician (riyāḍi-dān) contemporary with Jahāngīr (M. al-l. i p. 308), but it is not clear who this person was or where he lived.

He was attached ³ to the unsuccessful expedition sent by Aurangzēb [in 1093/1682] under the command of Shihāb al-Dīn Khān against the fort of Rāmsēj ⁴ (M. al-l. ii p. 282¹¹). In the days when Aurangzēb was resident in the Deccan,⁵ Khāfī Khān noticed that from the year 1097/1685–6 onwards the Deccan was free from any sign of pestilence (wabā. M. al-l. i p. 287¹⁸–¹⁹).

For a time he was residing with ‘Abd al-Razzāq Khān Lāri ⁶

¹ For Sh. Burhān see Ţithé 1897, Ivanow 1278, etc.
² Rieu (iii 1091b) gives an earlier date, A.H. 1083/1672–3, for the death of this saint on the authority either of the Mir'at al-‘ulam or the Riyāḍ al-auliya’ or both.
³ Muḥarrir i sawānih az jumlah i muta’āyiinah i an fauq bād.
⁴ Mentioned by Tiefenthaler, who spells the name Rām Śedj, in his list of forts in the province of Aurangābād (see his Géographie de l’Indostan, Berlin 1786 (forming Tome i of Bernoulli’s Description historique et géographique de l’Inde) p. 479 and Sarkar The India of Aurangzēb p. lxxxvii no. 114 (misprinted 144) and p. 163 no. 114.
⁵ Aurangzēb was in the Deccan from 1092/1681 to the end of his reign (1118/1707).
⁶ ‘Abd al-Razzāq Lāri was in the service of Abū ʻl-Ḥasan Qutb-Shāh and fought bravely against Aurangzēb’s troops at the time of the final attack on Golconda in 1687, when he was severely wounded. After resisting Aurangzēb’s overtures for a time he entered the Imperial service in the 38th regnal year [A.H. 1103/1691–2], received the title of Khān and was appointed Faujdar of the ‘Ādil-Shāhī Kōnkan (in the neighbourhood of Goa), from which he was subsequently transferred to the Faujdarī of Rāhīrī. Khāfī Khān chronicles these appointments under the year 1103/1691–2. Shāh-Nawāz Khān, who in this matter is less likely to be correct than Khāfī Khān, places the appointment to Rāhīrī in the 38th year and that to the ‘Ādil-Shāhī Kōnkan in the 40th. See Elliot and Dowson History of India vii pp. 330–5 (= M. al-l. ii pp. 360–2), etc., Ma’āthir al-umārā’ ii pp. 818–21, Beveridge’s trans. pp. 70–71, etc.
in a house adjacent to the fort built by Shivaji at Rakhiri (M. al-l. ii p. 390-9 = E. & D. vii p. 341). This must have been within the period 1103-6/1691-5 (or thereabouts), since ‘Abd al-Razzaq Khan was appointed Faujdar of Rakhiri in (or soon after) the former year (M. al-l. ii p. 405) and removed from that post in the latter (M. al-l. ii p. 449).

In 1105/1693-4 Khafi Khan went to Surat as ‘Abd al-Razzaq Khan Laris authorised agent in order to convey from that port to Rakhiri property worth nearly two lakhs of rupees. On his way back he received and accepted an invitation to visit an English acquaintance of Abd al-Razzaq Khan’s at Bombay. His interesting account of that visit to Bombay (M. al-l. ii pp. 424-7) is one of the passages translated by Dowson (E. & D. vii pp. 351-4).

This was not his only visit to Surat. At the time when he wrote his history he had been there repeatedly (mukarrar, M. al-l. i p. 469. Cf. ii p. 441), and once (in 1106/1694-5 apparently) he was present at a banquet given by Amunat Khan Khwafi, the Mutasaddi of the town, to Sh. ‘Abd al-Rahman Mufti on his return from a pilgrimage to the Hijaz (M. al-l. ii p. 444). Another place with which he was connected was Baglanah, in which he spent two years at some unspecified time (M. al-l. i p. 562).

A few days after Aurangzeb’s death he was in the company

---

1 “The name was afterwards changed to Rāi-garh. It lies due east of Jinjera.—See Grant Duff, vol. i, p. 190” (Elliot and Dowson vii p. 288 n.).

2 i.e. Amunat Khan i Thānī (Mir Husain) the third son of Amunat Khan Mirak Mu’in al-Din Ahmad. For his life see Ma‘āthir al-umara’ i pp. 287-90, Beveridge’s trans. pp. 230-2.

3 “Between Surat and Nandurbar is an inhabited hilly region called Baglana. The country is cultivated and has a good climate... It has seven famous forts, of which Saler and Mulher* [Footnote *In the Nosari district of the Gaekwar’s dominions are [the most] celebrated. The chiefs are of the clan of Rathor” (Sarkar The India of Aurangzeb p. 63, the above passage being a translation from Sujan Ray’s Khulāsat al-tawārīkh). See also Ma‘āthir al-umara’ i pp. 413-15, Beveridge’s trans. pp. 352-4, where a much fuller account is given.
of M. Murād Khān (see p. 467 infra), who at that time was Wāqī’ah-Nigār and Sawānīkh-Nigār of the province of Aḥmadābād and also Faujdār of the sarkār of Thāsrah \(^1\) and Gōdrah.\(^2\) It must have been about this time that he was brought into contact with the leader of an Ismā’īlī sect at Aḥmadābād in connexion with the release of some prominent members of the sect who had been imprisoned by order of Aurangzēb.\(^3\) It was than that he obtained some Ismā’īlī law-books with a view to investigating the names Ismā’īliyah and Chirāgh-kush, by which the sect was known.

He was present on the battle-field near Ḥaidarābād where Prince Kām-Bakhs was defeated on the 3rd of Dhū ’l-Qa’dah 1120/13 January 1709 \(^4\) by Bahādur Shāh’s forces (M. al-l. ii p. 624\(^10\)). In the early part of that Emperor’s reign he was Qal’ah-dār at Chānpānēr \(^5\) in Gujrat (M. al-l. i p. 77).

\(^1\) So Ma’āthir al-umara’i iii 686\(^5\). The printed text of Khāfī Khān has the corrupt reading T’hānēsar \([\!]\).

\(^2\) Dar ān aiyām muḥarrir i aurāq dar rafiqat i M. Murād Khān kih waqī’ah-nigar i sawānīkh-nigar i tamān sūbah i Aḥmadābād u Faujdāri i sarkār i Thāsrah u Gōdrah dāštah būd (M. al-l. ii p. 567 = E. & D. vii p. 388).

\(^3\) M. al-l. iii p. 177\(^14\) seq. (Chunānhī dar awākh i ‘ahd i khardat i Khuld-Makān i.e. Aurangzēb) kih haqiqat i ān-hā ba’-arda rasid chand muqaddar par phēwā-yi ān-hā rā hukm i habs farmādah būdand. Dar ‘amal i sūbah i Ibrahim Khān muqadda-yi ān jamā’ah rā bah muharrir i aurāq dar Aḥmadābād sūrah i khalāṣi i ān-hā uflād. u kutub i fikhi i ān-hā rā barā-yi tahqiq i lafz i Ismā’īliyah u Chirāgh-kush ba-dost āwardah mujūla’ah numūd).

Ibrahim Khān was appointed Governor of Aḥmadābād in succession to Prince M. A’zam (in the last year of Aurangzēb’s reign according to Khāfī Khān ii 541\(^14\), but the Ma’āthir al-umara’i 298 places this event in the 46th year, at least according to the printed text). He was superseded by Iḥāzī al-Dīn Khān Firōz-Jang not long after Bahādur Shāh’s accession (see M. al-l. ii p. 616\(^4\), Ma’āthir al-umara’i ii p. 878\(^8\), Beveridge’s trans. p. 591). It is not clear whether the Ismā’īlī leader referred to here is identical with Mullā Jiwan, an Ismā’īlī mujahid, whom Khāfī Khān met on one occasion at Aḥmadābād and questioned concerning the Ismā’īlīs (M. al-l. i p. 593).

\(^4\) See Ency. Isl. under Bahādur Shāh. Khāfī Khān places this battle in the year 1119.

\(^5\) Kāthb i huruf dar awā’il i ‘ahd i Khuld-Manzil Shāh-i Alam Bahādur dar ān-jā ta’alluqah i mālit u qal’adārī dāṣt.
In 1121/1709–10 (having recently arrived in Aḥmadābād ¹) he was appointed by Ghāzī al-Dīn Khwān Fīrōz-Jang, the Governor (Ṣūbah-dār) of the province of Aḥmadābād, to be Dīwān and Mīhmāndār ² to a distinguished visitor, Mīrzā M. Ḥāshim,³ who had come, presumably from Persia, via Sūrat [to Aḥmadābād] on his way to Bahādur Shāh’s court at Delhi.

At the beginning of Farrukh-siyyar’s reign (A.H. 1124 or 1125/1713) Qilīkh Khwān received the title of Niẓām al-Mulk Bahādur Fath-Jang and the Governorship (ṣūbah-dārī) of the Deccan. Apparently at this time he appointed Khāfī Khwān to be his Dīwān.⁴ In the following year, however, S. Ḥusain ‘Alī Khwān became Governor of the Deccan, and Niẓām al-Mulk returned to Delhi. Khāfī Khwān next tells us (M. al-Ⅳ. ii p. 798) in his account of the year 1311/1718–19 that after three distressful years he was appointed Amīn and Faujdār of the estates (maḥāll) of Muṣṭafā-ābād,⁵ which belonged to the Royal domains. From this new appointment he was dismissed after only a very

¹ Musawwir i aurāq dar ān ayyām tāzah wārid i Aḥmadābād gardādah būd (M. al-Ⅳ. ii p. 664¹²). We have seen that he was in Aḥmadābād in the governorship of Ibrāhīm Khwān.

² u muḥarrir i savāniḥ rā dīwān u mīhmāndār az ṭarf i khwūd sāḥbat ba-
ubāb kih bā muḥarrir i in aurāq maḥabbat i tanām dāshīt i ittifāqīn Khwān i Fīrōz-Jang az Aḥmadābād az ṭarf i khwūd u-rā mīhmāndār i shāh-zādah mugarrar kardah būd u shāh-zādah dar rāh kār-hā-yi dīwānī i khwūd rā ba-ū farrūdāh.

³ A great-grandson (nabīrah) of the Persian Prime Minister Khalīfah Sultān (Khālīfah S. ‘Alī b. Mīr Raṣī al-Dīn. See Maʿāthīr al-umārā’ iii pp. 109–10) and at three removes (ba-sīh wāsiṭah) a navāsah (daughter’s child) of Shāh ʿAbbās. For a biography of this person see Maʿāthīr al-umārā’ iii pp. 677–83.

⁴ Dar ayyāmī kih in ḍajīz rā ba-kamāl i nā-dānī az ṭākh i lutf u qudr-dānī dīwānī i sarkār i khwūd dar ṣūbah-dārī i Dakan mugarrar numūdah būd (M. al-Ⅳ. ii p. 748¹⁴–¹⁵).

⁵ Az ān-jumlaḥ muḥarrir i savāniḥ kih ba-ḍ i kasālah u taṣdī’ i shī sāl kih az Dakan ba-hudār rafīfah dar rikāb būdah ba-khīdmat i amānāt u fauḍārī i māhāl i Muṣṭafā-ābād, kih ba-khīlīsah i pāndhā-ṣīhī toʿallug dāshī, maʿmūr gardūdah (M. al-Ⅳ. ii p. 798 ⁴–⁶). Muṣṭafā-ābād is evidently “Muṣṭafā-ābād ʿurf Chōprah” (M. al-Ⅳ. i p. 717¹³, ii p. 274 i.l.), which was in Khāndēsh.
short time by S. Husain 'Ali Khān, who took him with him on his march to Delhi [in 1131/1719].

In Ramaḍān 1132/1720 he rode through Delhi to see the damage caused by an earthquake (M. al-l. ii p. 883<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> <sup>1</sup> ). According to Beveridge (Ency. Isl. under Kh<sup>2</sup> wafi Khān) it was Muḥammad Shāh who conferred upon him the title Khāfi Khān. No statement to this effect seems to occur in the printed text of the Muntakḥab al-lubāb.

In a Persian note at the end of the British Museum MS. Add. 26,224 (a copy of vol. ii) it is stated (according to Rieu i p. 232<sup>b</sup>) that the author had written four or five leaves further when he died (probably therefore in, or not long after, 1144/1731-2).

More than once in the Muntakḥab al-lubāb he takes occasion to reflect on the evil consequences of oppression (ẓilm, mardum-āzārī) not only to the oppressor but to his descendants (the sins of the fathers being visited upon the children), and in one passage (ii pp. 676-7) he claims that he himself never stooped to such conduct. Even at a time when peculation was rife in the Deccan of Aurangzēb’s days he took care that matters should not go so far as to cause accusations of oppression. In or soon after Aurangzēb’s 32nd year there did indeed occur a regrettable incident, of which he declines to give particulars, but thereafter he strove whole-heartedly—but with incomplete success—to avoid imputations of financial irregularity.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> u mażūlān rā mażūlāb numūdah muḥtāj ba-nān i shāh gardūndah bā-khwud girift. Az ʾān-jumlaʾ muharrir i sawānīh ... (M. al-l. ii p. 798<sup>3</sup>). Cf. M. al-l. ii p. 811<sup>5</sup>-<sup>6</sup>, where Khāfi Khān mentions that he watched the flight of the Marāthā troops [at Delhi].

<sup>2</sup> Al-hamdu li-l-lāh kih musawwīd i anāʾig ... hargiz rādī ba-mardum-āzārī kih dar zābūn-hā ba-ẓilm munjarr gardad na-gardūndah. Khudā rā ... ba-ʾazamat yād numūdah ʿinrār mi numūyad kih tā san[n] sī u dā-yīʾ. Alangīr dar labāʾiyat i nafs i kāfīr-kīsh khvud rā muʿāf na-mī dāšīt u mīl i hadrat i Khud-Makān kih dar šūbajāt i Dukān khvūn i yaqīnā kā biṣyār khvurdaḥ shudah ammā dar-dān aiyaṃ ham šāhīyat i tamām dāšīt kih lār ba-ʾān-jā na-rasād kih dar zābūn-hā gush-gūy ba-ẓilm munjarr gardad. Baʾdahu ba-sabāb i rūy dūdūn i baʾāli muqaddamāt kih ba-tahīrī i tafsīl i ʾān pardākhtan pardah i rā-niyāḥī i khvud rā az miyān bar-dāšīt ast ba-Khudāy i khvud ʿahd numūdah u tā maqūl ba-dīl u jān kāshīdaḥ kih dar akt u taṣṣrīf u talaf numūdah i māl i Musulmānān tabāʾiyat i nafs i shūm-na-numūdah ammā har shāhī khvāstä kih az bad-nāmī i zāhīrī i
He was on friendly terms with his much younger\(^1\) contemporary and fellow-Khwāfī, Sāmsām al-Daulah Shāh-Nawāẓ Khān, the author of the *Ma'āthīr al-umara\(^{2}\)*. Another friend and at one time a colleague of his was his kinsman (*bīrādar*) M. Murād Khān (for a time entitled Sa'ādat Khān), who for two or three years was Aurangzēb's Ḥājīb at Haidarābād,\(^3\) and who died in 1120 (according to *M. al-l.* ii p. 661) or in 1122 (according to the *Ma'āthīr al-umara* iii 687).

In a preamble which occurs in the B.M. MS. Or. 176 (latter part of vol. ii, Aurangzēb and his successors) but not in the printed text and which is summarised by Rieu (p. 234b), Khāfī Khān describes himself as having been successively attached to the train of three or four sovereigns and says that he had spent sixteen or seventeen years of his life on the composition of the *Muntakhab al-lubāb*, especially on the last forty years of Aurangzēb’s reign. Of that period, owing to Aurangzēb’s prohibition of historical writing, he had found no previous record\(^4\) except

\(^1\) Sāmsām al-Daulah was born in 1111/1700.

\(^2\) See *Ma'āthīr al-umara* iii p. 680 (*Khwāfī Khān sāhib i tārīkh i Muntakhab al-lubāb* kih bā muḥarrir ī in aurrāq maḥabbat i tamām dāshī).

\(^3\) See *M. al-l.* iii p. 412 (*Az án-kīh muḥarrir ī aurrāg dar khidmat i M. Murād Khān kih birūdar i kalān i Mīrzā Muḥammad mī bāksh az muddat i maqād rafqāt i ta’āyunātī bah ‘aqidat u bandagi u irādat i khāṣṣ dāshī u M. Murād Khān rā kih dar án aiyām muḥkāfā bah Sa‘ādat Khān numūdāh būdand muddat i dū sīh sīl hijābāt i Haidarābād dāshī u in ‘ażīz rā ziyādāh az farzandān i khwūd mī khwāst...*) Cf. *M. al-l.* ii p. 290 = E. & D. vii p. 313 (*Ammā án-chīh az zabān i rāwīyān i thiqāt masmū‘ gardādah u ba-sabbāb i ta’āyunāt būdān i birūdarī i khufūn-pandāh M. Murād Khān kih az tarbiyāt-yāftahā-yī kūfūr būd u bar awqāw ī ī tīmād ī kullī dāshī u khwūd dar safar i Rām-darāh u hijābāt i Haidarābād muḥkāfāhām numūdāh ba‘d ī taḥqīq i ikhtilāf ī awqāw az bīsh u kan ba-zabān i gālam mī dīhad. M. Murād Khān was the son of Muḥṣīd-Quḷī Khān M. Ḥusain and was not a brother of Khāfī Khān (as Dowson’s translation suggests). For a biography of him see *Ma'āthīr al-umara* iii pp. 682–92.

\(^4\) This statement must be regarded as untruthful, if Prof. Sri Ram Sharma is correct in his belief (published in the *JRAS*, 1936 pp. 279–83) that Khāfī Khān’s account of Aurangzēb’s reign is largely borrowed from a history of that reign "by Abū ‘l-Faqīl Ma‘mūrī". See pp. 594–5 infra.
Musta‘idd Khān’s account of the Deccan conquests, but he had tried to compile a truthful narrative from the official records, the reports of trustworthy persons and his personal experiences.

*Muntakhab al-lubāb*, a history of India from the Muḥammadan conquest “to the beginning of Muḥammad Shāh’s 14th year”, A.H. 1144/1731,\(^1\) divided into three volumes ((1) perhaps never completed except in the rough,\(^2\) from the Muḥammadan conquest to the end of the Lōdī dynasty, (2) the Timūrids to Muḥammad Shāh,\(^3\) the detailed narrative closing with A.H. 1137/1724 \(^4\) and being followed by a chapter on events, especially in Persia, from the eighth to the thirteenth year of Muḥammad Shāh, (3) the local dynasties ("the kings of the various sūbahs of India, with the exception of those of Delhi and Akbarābād") abridged from Firishtah, Nūr al-Ḥaqq and others but perhaps never continued beyond the Deccan dynasties \(^5\) : Ivanow 173 (very defective, but apparently old.

\(^1\) li-ḥāyāt i shurāʾ i sanaḥ i ḥahārdah bāhtahār i mujamalt az sawānih i ‘ahd i Muhammad Shāh Bādshāh pardākhlaḥ . . . (M. al-l. ii p. 978). According to Nassau Lees (JRAS. 1898 p. 468) the MSS. differ considerably. " . . . no two copies that I have met with—and I have compared five apparently very good MSS.—are exactly alike, while some present such dissimilarities as almost to warrant the supposition that they are distinct works, some passages being quite accurate, and others again entirely dissimilar."

\(^2\) In a preamble preserved in the B.M. MS. Or. 176 (the latter part of vol. ii: see Rieu i 234b) the author says that vol. i had been completed in the rough but not yet in a fair copy. The only recorded manuscript of this volume is the fragment dealing with the Lōdis which Rieu has described (i p. 235a).

\(^3\) According to the preamble already referred to the author spent sixteen or seventeen years of his life on the composition of his work, especially on the last forty years of Aurangzēb’s reign. Of that period, an account of that sovereign’s prohibition, he had found no previous record except Musta‘idd Khān’s account of the Deccan conquests. According to Prof. Sri Ram Sharma, however, the account of Aurangzēb’s reign is copied almost word for word from a history of that reign “by Abū ʿI-Faḍl Maʾmūrī” (see JRAS. 1936 pp. 279–83 and pp. 594-5 infra).

\(^4\) At the beginning of vol. ii the year 1133/1720-1 (in the printed text erroneously A.H. 1130) is referred to as the date of composition (see Rieu i 233a ult.).

\(^5\) The author did not intend to confine himself to the Deccan, as is clear from the words “shurā’ az shurāʾi sūbah i Dakān numādah” (iii p. 27), but only Deccan history is contained in such of the few recorded MSS. of this volume as have been adequately described.
A.H. 1146/1733-4 (?), 169 (vol. ii only. A.H. 1191/1777), 170
(vol. ii, defective. Late 18th cent.), 171 (vol. ii. Late 18th cent.),
172 (vol. ii, pt. 2 (from Aurangzêb's 32nd year). A.H. 1194/1780),
1st Suppt. 763 (Vol. III (not vol. i as stated in the catalogue).
Deccan dynasties only. Urdu bhishâmit 1313 Ilâhî (sic, but the Ilâhî
era, which starts in 963/1556, has not yet reached 1313), Rieu
i 232b (vol. ii. A.H. 1196/1782), 234a (vol. ii. A.D. 1821), 234a
(vol. ii, part = Calcutta ed. i p. 1–ii p. 177. 18th cent.),
234a (vol. ii, part = Calcutta ed. i p. 2–ii p. 127. 18th cent.), 234a
234b (vol. ii, part = pt. ii of the Calcutta ed. A.D. 1823), 234b
(Vol. I, part (the Lôdûs) and vol. ii, part (Bâbur to Aurangzêb's
tenth year, but lacking the later part of Akbar's reign and the
whole of Jahânûr's). 18th cent.), 235b (Vol. III, first part (the
Deccan dynasties). A.H. 1237/1822), iii 1049b (extracts only.
Circ. A.D. 1850), Lindesiana p. 175 no. 822 (circ. A.D. 1780),
Ethè 396 (vol. ii. Late 18th cent.), 397 (vol. ii. A.H. 1225/1810),
398 (vol. ii. A.H. 1239/1823), 399 (vol. ii. Modern), 400–1 (vol. ii.
N.d.), 402 (vol. ii, part of 2nd half (Aurangzêb's 4th year to
accession of Farrukh-siyar). N.d.), 403 (vol. ii, part (Farrukh-
siyar to M. Shâh)), 404 (vol. ii, extracts from 1st half. A.D. 1806),
405 (vol. ii, selections), 406 (vol. ii, extracts), 407 (Vol. III,
small portion (86 folis. Bahmanís to Nigâm Shâh (d. 867/1463)),
ii 3013 (vol. ii, defective), L.O. 3936 (A'zam Shâh to the end),
Blochet i 549 (vol. ii. 18th cent.), Caetani 2 (belonged to
Jonathan Scott), Asâfíyâh i p. 254 no. 216 (Vol. III), no. 403
(Vol. III. A.H. 1204/1789–90), iii p. 92 nos. 1367 (an abridgment
of Vol. III ?), 1172 (an abridgment of Vol. III. A.H.
1269/1851–3), Rehatsek p. 91 no. 37 ("all the four volumes"
[sic]. A.H. 1207/1793), no. 38 (an abridgment ?. N.d.), Brelvi &
Dhabhar p. 63 no. 4 (Vol. III. A.H. 1214/1799–1800), Bodleian
259 (vol. ii, extending to M. Shâh's 3rd year = 1133/1720–1),
A. i 24–7 ("recent"), R.A.S. P. 102–3 = Morley 98–9 (vol. ii,
to Aurangzêb's death), Browne Suppt. 1253 (vol. ii, part
(Aurangzêb's reign. N.d.), 1254 (vol. ii, part (from Aurangzêb's
11th year). A.H. 1237/1821–2, copied from an original dated
(105 foll. only)), Bānkīpur vii 592 (vol. ii. 19th cent.), Berlin 435 (vol. ii, extending to M. Shāh’s 3rd year, A.H. 1133/1720–1), Majīs 275.


Descriptions: (1) W. Nassau Lees Materials for the history of India for the six hundred years of Mohammadan rule (in JRAS. 1868 pp. 414–77) pp. 465–9, (2) Elliot and Dowson History of India vii pp. 207–10.

[Autobiographical statements (nearly all of these are referred to above); Elliot and Dowson History of India vii pp. 207–9: Rieu i 232b, 234b, 235b; Ency. Isl. under Khāfi Khān (Beveridge).]

628. Lāl Rām, son of Rāy Dūlah Rām b. Rāy Kunjaman Khuld-Makānī, once held Māngī Patan, in the Deccan, as a jāgīr (T. al-H. fol. 22a). He was in the service of Muḥammad Shāh and wrote his Tuhfat al-Hind in the 18th year of that sovereign’s reign, A.H. 1148/1735–6.

1 This printed edition ignores the existence of vol. i and, dividing vol. ii into two parts (hīsāh), calls them part i and part ii of the Muntahkāb al-lubāb.
Tuḥfat al-Hind, a history and topography of India to the time of Farrukh-siyar (reigned 1124/1713–1131/1719) in four sections (fāṣl), the third containing an account of the early kings of Persia and the Greek philosophers, the fourth miscellaneous historical anecdotes, and a Khātimah: Edinburgh 203 (A.H. 1182/1768), Rieu i 236 (lacking Khātimah. 18th cent.).

629. Yaḥyā Khān was Mir Munšā to the Emperor Farrukh-siyar (reigned 1124/1713–1131/1719).

Tādhkirat al-mulūk, a general history of India to A.H. 1149/1736–7, based chiefly on the Ţabaqāt i Akbarī (see p. 433 supra): Ethé 409 (A.H. 1212/1797).

630. Rūstām ‘Ali b. M. Khālī Shāhābādī was serving in the army of Bājī Rāō at the taking of Māłwah in 1150/1737–8. He then went to Bhopāl and lived under the patronage of the Nawwāb Yār-Muḥammad Khān.

Tārikh i Hindī, a general history of India to A.H. 1153/1740–1, completed in 1154/1741–2, and divided into a mugaddimah, ten tabaqāhs and a khātimah (on contemporary or nearly contempor. shaikhs, ‘ulamā’ and poets), much space being devoted to Muḥammad Shāh1: Rieu iii 909a (A.H. 1264/1848), 1057b (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850).

Translated extracts: B.M. MS. Add. 30,780 foll. 118–160.

Description and 27 pp. of translated extracts (on M. Shāh’s reign): Elliot and Dowson History of India viii 40–69.

631. Rāy Chaturman2 Kāyat’h3 Saksēnāh,4 surnamed

1 “Altogether a useful compilation, as it is not copied verbatim from known authors, and in the latter part of it the author writes of many matters which came under his own observation or those of his friends” (Elliot and Dowson viii p. 41).

2 This name has been variously written by different cataloguers—Chaturman (Rieu and others), Čāturman (Ethé in the Bodleian catalogue, where the long vowel in the first syllable is evidently a slip or a misprint), Chaturman (Edinburgh catalogue (Ethé ?)), Chhatar Mān [sic] (Edwards, following Sarkar in respect of the (incorrect) long vowel in the last syllable).

3 = Kāyat’h, the name of the writer caste among the Hindus.

4 The name of a subdivision of the Kāyat’h caste.
Rāy-zādah, (Rāy Chaturman, qaum Kāyat’h Saksēnah, laqab Rāy-zādah, as he calls himself in the preface) completed his Chahār gulshan in 1173/1759–60, a date which he indicates by a metrical chronogram.\footnote{Quoted in the Bodleian catalogue as follows: \textit{Zi-dil gulsam bi-gū tārikh raushan * Nīdā āmad Chaturman nik gulshan Buwad nām i tu dar tārikh dāshīl * Ham az majmū’ah ehud tārikh āhūl.}} According to the colophon of his grandson (nabīrah), the redactor, which occurs in most of the manuscripts, the author died one week after finishing the work.


English translation of the topographical and statistical portions, i.e. parts of Gulshan i, most of Gulshan ii and all of Gulshan iii: \textit{The India of Aurangzib} (topography, statistics, and roads) compared with the India of Akbar with extracts from the Khulasatu-t-Tawarikh and the Chahar Gulshan translated and annotated by Jadunath Sarkar, \textbf{Calcutta} 1901*, pp. 123–78.

Descriptions: (1) Elliot and Dowson \textit{History of India} viii pp. 255–6, (2) J. Sarkar \textit{The India of Aurangzib}, Calcutta 1901, pp. xv–xxv.

\begin{flushright}
632. \textit{Dastūr al-‘amal} (?) (beg. Ba-mūjab i tawārikh i}
\end{flushright}
Hinduwí), a history of India from the earliest times to A.H. 1179/1765 with chronological, statistical etc. notices largely in tabular form: Berlin 473 (A.H. 1179/1766), 474 (transcript of the preceding MS.).

633. Anand-rūp, a Brāhman born at Chāngulnāt'h¹ near Nārmaul, spent some years in the service of Jānōjī ² Bhōns ślā and Sītā-Rām. Having gone from Nāgpūr in the suite of Nāṣir al-Mulk Nāṣir-Jang, he wrote his Mīzān i dānish at Ilāhābād (Allahabad) in 1182/1768-9.

Mīzān i dānish, a brief sketch of Indian history: Rieu iii 910 (A.D. 1851).

634. For the Farhat al-nāẓirīn, a history, mainly of India, completed in 1184/1770-1 by M. Aslam Pararsūrī, see pp. 140-1 supra, and for the Ḥadīqat al-ṣafā‘ completed in the same year by Yūsuf ‘Alī Khān see p. 140 supra.

635. Nawwāb³ Maḥabbat Khān ⁴ b. Faiḍ-‘Atā Khān was a descendant of Dilīr Khān Dāwūd-zāy (d. 1094/1683), a Rohilla general in Aurangzēb’s service, whose elder brother, Bahādur Khān, founded Shāhjahānpūr.

Akbār i Maḥabbat, a general history of India to A.H. 1186/1772, giving special attention to the author’s ancestors and to Shāhjahānpūr and Bengal⁵: Rieu iii 911a (A.D. 1850), 1052b (extracts only), I.O. 3926 (probably A.D. 1878).

¹ So Rieu.
² Rieu writes Khālūjī Bhons ślā, but presumably Jānōjī, the second Mahā-rājah of Nāgpūr (1749-72), is meant.
³ So Elliot.
⁴ This Nawwāb Maḥabbat Khān is to be distinguished from Ḥāfīz Rahmat Khān’s eldest son Nawwāb Maḥabbat Khān “Maḥabbat”, who died in 1232/1818 and is the author of an Urdu dīwān (see I.O. Catalogue of Hindustani MSS. nos. 161-2) and a Pushtu grammar and vocabulary written in Persian and entitled Riyāḍ al-maḥabbat (see Ethé 2452-4).
⁵ “In too abridged a form to be much use, except towards the end, where the author expands the narrative, giving an unusually minute account of the Durrānī invasions, and some of the transactions of Shāh ’Ālam’s reign” (Elliot and Dowson viii 376-7). In earlier reigns also he gives special attention to Afghan exploits.

Description and 14 pp. of translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson *History of India* viii 376-393.

636. Jugal Kishor compiled for Sir Elijah Impey (Chief Justice of the Supreme Court at Calcutta 1774-83, d. 1 Oct. 1809 1)

(*Tarikh i Jugal Kishor*), an unimportant 2 history of India from the death of ‘Adli to the date of composition: Rieu iii 1029b (foll. 38b-42. Extracts only), 1051b (extracts only).

Description: Elliot and Dowson *History of India* viii p. 300.

637. A resident of the district of Sanbhal and Badaiyn in Rohilkhand wrote in 1194/1780, when Najaf Khan 3 was master of Delhi and the Jat territories and Faid Allah Khan was the reigning Rohilla chief,

A sketch of Indian history from Akbar to A.H. 1194/1780 written as a supplement to ‘Abd al-Haqq Dihlawi’s *Dhikr al-muluk* (see p. 441 supra), with special attention to the Rohillas: Rieu iii 1007a (19th cent.).

638. For the *Siyar al-muta’akhkhirin* of S. Ghulam-Husain Khan Tabatabai, which is a history of India from Aurangzeb’s death in 1118/1707 to A.H. 1195/1780-1, but to which the author subsequently added a Muqaddimah consisting of Sujan Ray’s *Khulasat al-tawarikh* with slight alterations and which thus became in effect a general history of India, see pp. 635-9 infra.

639. Ghulam-Basit Amet’hawi, 4 having lost his estate in

---

1 See Buckland *Dictionary of Indian biography* p. 215 and the histories of India dealing with the British period.
2 "It is of no value, at least in the passages which I have examined" (Elliot and Dowson viii p. 300).
3 Nawwab Dhū ’l-Faqār al-Daulah Mirzā Najaf Khān, a Persian who rose to be Sābah-dār of Allahabad and subsequently Wakil i Muflat to Shāh ʿĀlam, died in 1196/1782.
4 Amet’hī is a small place in the Sulţānpūr District of Oudh.
Oudh and tried unsuccessfully to enter the service of the Timūrids, became munši to General Giles Stibbert (Commander-in-Chief of the Bengal Army 1777–9 and 1783–5), who took him to Calcutta. At the latter’s request he wrote the Tārīkh i mamālik i Hind.

(Tārīkh i mamālik i Hind), a short history of India to A.H. 1196/1781–2 (the date of composition) based mainly on Firishtah: Rieu i 237 (18th cent.), ii 798a (history of Malabar only. A.H. 1197/1783), iii 1051b (extracts only), Suppt. 83 ii (chapter on Gujrat only. 19th cent.), Rehatsek p. 76 no. 15 (A.H. 12401 /1824–5), Ethé 2835 (only the preface and the latter half of the history. Transcribed from the preceding MS. A.H. 1296/1879).

Description and a short translated extract: Elliot and Dowson History of India viii pp. 200–3.

640. Har-Charan-Dās b. Ūdai Rāy b. Mukund Rāy b. Sāgar-Mal, a native of Meerut, went to Delhi soon after Nādir Shāh’s invasion [A.H. 1151/1739] and some years later entered the service of Nawwāb Qāsim ‘Alī Khān b. Qāsim Khān, who was father-in-law and Khān-sāmān to Najm al-Daulah M. Ishāq Khān.2 In 1167/1753–4 Qāsim ‘Alī Khān moved from Delhi to Faiḍabād (Fyzabad) but died immediately afterwards, and Har-Charan-Dās, who had accompanied him, remained there in the service of his late master’s descendants. For many years he received an allowance from Nawwāb Shujāʿ al-Daulah of Oudh. In 1199/1784–5, when he wrote the preface of the Chahār gulzār i Shujāʿī, he had reached an advanced age.3

1 Kahmān Singh, whom Rehatsek gives as the author, was presumably the copyist and A.H. 1240 the date of transcription not, as Rehatsek supposed, the date of completion by the author.
2 i.e. Mu’tamān al-Daulah M. Ishāq Khān, who was Bakhsī i Chahārūm in the reigns of M. Shāh and Aḥmad Shāh and who died in 1163/1750. A sister of his was married to Shujāʿ al-Daulah of Oudh. See Ma’āthir al-umāra’ i ii pp. 774–6.
3 Eighty years according to his own statement, but this seems to be only a rough approximation, since he was in his twentieth year in 1143/1730–1, when his grandfather, Diwān Mukund Rāy, died at Meerut (see Rieu i p. 912a).
Chahār gulzār i Shujā'ī, a history of India to A.H. 1201/1786-7, dedicated to Shujā' al-Daulah and divided into five chamans ((1) Brahmov, Mahēs etc., (2) the Satya Yuga,[^1] (3) the Trētā Yuga, (4) the Dwāpar Yuga, (5) the Kālī Yuga, this fifth chaman being subdivided into two safāhās, of which the first treats, in twelve qism, of the Hindu Rājahs from Jud'hīshā'īr to the Muslim conquest, and the second, in nine qism, of the Muslim sovereigns, the ninth qism containing the history of the Timūrids from Humāyūn to Shāh-'Ālam and including a discursive but valuable account of the author's own times): Lahore Panjāb Univ. Lib. (autograph? See Oriental College Magazine vol. ii no. 4 (Lahore, August 1926) p. 48), Rieu iii 912a (preface and chapters from the latter part of the last qism only. 19th cent.).

Extracts translated by Munshī Sadāsuk'h Lāl: B.M. MS. Add. 30,782, foll. 113-205.

Description and 23 pp. of translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson History of India viii pp. 204-31.

[Autobiographical statements in the preface and elsewhere (see Elliot and Dowson viii pp. 204-6, Rieu iii 92).]

641. Lachhmi Narāyān "Shafiq" Aurangabādī was born at Aurangābād in 1158/1745. His father, Rāy Mansā-Rām, for many years held high office in the Nizām's dominions and in 1204/1789-90 was (had perhaps long been) Dīwān.² Lachhmi Narāyān entered the service of 'Āli-Jāh, son of Nizām-'Āli Khan³ (Rieu i p. 326a, iii p. 1083a, apparently from the Natā'īj

---

[^1]: The Yugas are the four ages into which the Hindus divide the history of the world. The first three are legendary, the fourth, the Kālī Yuga, is that now in progress.

[^2]: In the Ḥaqīqat-hā-yi Hindustān, written in 1204/1789-90, Lachhmi Narāyān describes his father as Dīwān. According to the Natā'īj al-afkār, as quoted by Rieu (iii 1083a), Mansā-Rām held for nearly forty years "the office of Sadr of the six Sābahs of the Deccan." It is apparently on the same authority that Rieu says in another place (i p. 327a) that he "filled for nearly forty years the office of Pishkār of the Deccan".

[^3]: Nizām-'Āli Khan was Nizām from A.H. 1175/1761 to A.H. 1218/1803.

(1) Haqiqat-hā-yi Hindūstān³ (a chronogram = 1204/1789–90), a historical and topographical account of India written for the benefit of the author’s munificent patron, Captain William Patrick (so Rieu, but perhaps Kirkpatrick⁴ should be read) and divided into four maqālaḥs ((1) revenue returns based on some drawn up by the author’s grandfather, brought down from various dates to the Faṣīlī year 1139, and signed by Nizām al-Mulk, (2) account of the sūbahs of Hindūstān, (3) account of the sūbahs of the Deccan, (4) sketch of the Muslim rulers of

¹ The Nātā‘ij al-afkār (as quoted by Rieu iii 1083a) says merely that he died in the early part of the 13th century.
² According to T. Grahame Bailey (B.S.O.S. v/4 (1930) p. 927) he used the takhllus “Shafig” in his Persian and “Şāhib” in his Rāḥtah (i.e. Urdu) poetry.
³ Hindūstān, not Hindūstān, which would give the wrong date.
⁴ For William Kirkpatrick, who translated a selection of Tīpū’s letters, see Buckland’s Dictionary of Indian biography.
India from Mu'izz al-Dîn b. Sâm to 'Âli-Gauhar (Shâh-'Âlam): Rieu i 238b (A.H. 1224/1809), 238a (A.H. 1283/1866), iii 913a (A.D. 1851), Ivanow 179 (A.H. 1288/1871), Bânkîpûr vii 543 (19th cent.), Ethé 426.

(2) Khulāsât al-Hind: Āṣafîyah i p. 238 no. 705 (where the precise subject is not stated).

[Gul i ra'nā (Bânkîpûr viii p. 131); Nishtir i 'ishq ("Shafiq's", biography summarised in Sprenger p. 645); Naṭâ'i ĵ al-aflâr (information summarised in Rieu iii 1083a); Rieu i 327a, iii 1083a; Niẓâmî Badâyûnî Qâmûs al-masâkîhîr (in Urdu) ii p. 167.]

642. Munshî Hirâm [?] or Hanîrâm [?], son of D'hanîrâm, son of D'hanîrâj, was Qânînîgî of the parganah of Unâm (i.e. Unao in Oudh). It was after 1207/1792 that he compiled from various Sanskrit and Persian sources his

Râj-sohâwâli, a history of the Hindû Râjahs and the Muḥammadan rulers of India to A.H. 1194/1780 in Shâh-Âlam's reign together with statistical tables of the săbanhs of Hindûstân: Ethé 208.

643. Sarûp Chand Khâtiri compiled in 1209/1794-5 for Sir John Shore (afterwards Baron Teignmouth, Governor-General 1793-8)

Ṣâhîh al-akhbâr, a general history of India to the author's time: Rieu iii 1031a (extracts only).

Description and a translated extract (1½ p.): Elliot and Dowson History of India viii pp. 313-5.

644. A'azz al-Dîn Muḥammad wrote in 1218/1803-4 for Major William Yule (the father of Sir Henry Yule) his

Mukhtâsâr i Yûl, a sketch of the Delhi Sultâns and the Timûrîds, said by Rieu to be merely a transcript of the Târikh i Haqqî (see p. 441 supra) with a meagre continuation: Rieu i 238b (early 19th cent.).
645. Mirzā Masītā,¹ a descendant of Ilāh-wirdī Khān Jahāngīrī, wrote in the time of Shāh-‘Ālam (reigned A.H. 1173/1759–1221/1806) for the instruction of his son Karīm Allāh Khān, called Mirzā Kullū, his

**Intikhāb al-tawārikh**, a mere sketch of Indian history in an introduction, two books (1) Northern India, (2) the Deccan) and a conclusion: Rieu iii 1052a (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850).

Description: Elliot and Dowson History of India viii 334–5 (the only MS. known to Elliot was in one of the Royal Libraries at Lucknow).

646. Ḥarnām Sing’ḥ “Nāmī” b. Gūrdās Sing’ḥ, a Sāraswat Brāhman, of Brāhmanābād in the province of Lahore, resided near Lucknow. His father was Nā’ūb to ‘Ain al-Dīn Khān, Governor of Barālī A.H. 1195/1781–1199/1784–5 and afterwards of Gōrak’hpur, and Harnām Sing’ḥ himself was in his service from childhood.

**Tārikh i sa‘ādat i jāwid**, a general history of India to A.H. 1220/1805–6, written in 1221/1806–7, dedicated to Sa‘ādat ‘Alī Khān, the Nawwāb Wazīr of Oudh, and divided into four faṣls (1) Early Rājahs, (2) Kings of Delhi to Shāh-‘Ālam, (3) Amūrs and Rājahs of Aṣaf al-Daulah’s time, etc., (4) the Seven Climates, etc.), useful for biographical details of Indian nobles: Rieu iii 913a (defective at end. Circ. A.D. 1850).

Extracts translated by Munshī Sadāsuk’h: B.M. MS. Add. 30,786, foll. 1–81.

Description and 14 pp. of translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson History of India viii 336–354.

647. Rāy Amar Sing’ḥ “Khwush-dīl” tells us in the prose preface ² to his Razmīstān that he was born and bred at Ghāzīpūr but had been resident for some years at Benares. In the poem itself he speaks of his being appointed Munshī to Alexander

---

¹ Elliot writes Māsitā, but see Rieu iii 1052a and Kulliyāt i Ghulīb, Lucknow 1924–5, p. 437–8.
² This preface occurs in I.O. 4019 but not in I.O. 3975.
Duncan. The Qāmūs al-mashāhīr states on unspecified authority that he was the son of Jīwan Rām Kāyast’h, that his [his father’s?] original home (aštī waṣṭan) was Kārīrah Mānikpūr, that in the time of Shujā’ al-Daulah [A.H. 1169/1756–1189/1775] he [his father?] was Nāẓīm and Ḥākim i al-lā of Ghāzīpūr, that on completing his education he entered the service of Mahā-rājah Chait 3 Sing’h of Benares (reigned A.H. 1185–95), that subsequently he was appointed Nāẓīm 4 of ‘Alīgarh by the East India Company, that he wrote a Tūrīkh i farmān-ravāyān i Hind, and that he died in 1225/1810.5

(1) Zubdat al-akhbār, an abridgment of Sujān Rāy’s Khulāṣat al-tawārīkh (see p. 454 supra) continued to A.H. 1221/1806–7: Rieu iii 1052a foll. 170–94 (extracts only).

Translated extracts: B.M. MS. Add. 30,781 foll. 60–69.

Description: Elliot and Dowson History of India viii pp. 374–5.

(2) Razmīstān (or Bāzm i khayāl 6 ?), a versified sketch

---

1 A. Duncan died at sea in 1210/1795–6. He was a brother of the better known Jonathan Duncan, Resident and Superintendent at Benares 1783, Governor of Bombay 1785–1811 (see Buckland’s Dictionary of Indian biography).

2 These statements concerning the aštī waṣṭan and the appointment at Ghāzīpūr seem to have been accidentally transferred from the father to the son.

3 The Qāmūs al-mashāhīr writes Ajīt.

4 It may be doubted whether this is the correct technical term. According to Elliot and Dowson “He seems to have been employed by the British Government in the Revenue Department”.

5 In view of the similarity of names and the connexion with Benares and ‘Alīgarh it seems likely that he is the same person as “Khūshgū [sic], Munshiyy Anmar [sic] Singh Banārsy [sic]”, of whom there is a notice in the Riyād al-wifāq (Sprenger p. 167) as well as in Beale’s Oriental biographical dictionary, p. 70, and the Qāmūs al-mashāhīr (the Riyād al-wifāq being apparently the original source). “Khūshgū, Munshiyy Anmar Singh Banārsy held a government appointment in the Coo [i.e. Kūl-=‘Alīgarh] district. He compiled a short history of Akbar’s palace and of the Tāj of Agra and put the Bahārā Dānīsh into verse and called it Tarjamah i Bahār i dānīsh... [Sprenger p. 167, where the last title is printed in the Arabic character].

6 Razmīstān is the title given to the work in the author’s prose dīvān (in I.O. 4019), but Rieu in describing extracts evidently from the same work calls it Bāzm i khayāl. The extracts described by Rieu seem to include the dīvān (since it is in the dīvān that the author says that he was born at Ghāzīpūr, a fact mentioned by Rieu), and it seems possible that the author changed the title. On the title-page of I.O. 3975 it is called Shāh-nāmah i Hind,
of Indian history, chiefly the British period, to A.H. 1210/1795-6, dedicated to Jonathan Duncan, Resident at Benares 1788-95, and completed in 1211/1796-7: I.O. 3975 (A.D. 1896), 4019 (A.D. 1892). Rieu iii 1017b foll. 34-46, 52-57 (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850).

[Razmistan, preface etc. : Nizamî Badayûnî Qāmūs al-mashâhîr (in Urdu) i p. 104; probably also Rīyād al-wifâq (Sprenger p. 167) and Beale Oriental biographical dictionary p. 70.]

648. A certain Kânji-Mal wrote

*A chronological list* of the Hindu Rājahs from Judh’ishtir to Pīth’ôrā and of the Muhammadan rulers from Shihâb al-Dîn Ghôrî to the accession of Akbar Shâh in 1221/1806: Rieu iii 917b (A.H. 1225/1810).

649. Daulat Rây Kâyat’h Saksânah composed in 1225/1810

Chahâr (Châr) chaman, a general history of India: Rieu iii 1058b (description only).

650. Munshî Sadâsuk’h “Niyâz” Dihlawî was employed at the close of the 18th century in some official capacity under Government at Chunâr. At the age of 65 he left Delhi for Ilâhâbâd, where after ten years spent in literary work, including the composition of Persian, Urdu and Bhâkâ verse, he began his history. In addition to this work he wrote also the Tâmbîh al-qasâfîn (cf. Rieu iii 918a), on Hindu tribes and sects, and the ‘Ajâ’îb al-Hindî (cf. ibiâ. 1030b) on remarkable places etc. in India.

*Muntakhab al-tawârîkh*, composed in 1234/1818-19, a general history of India to 1233/1817-18, valuable for the reign of Shâh-‘Alam and later times: Rieu iii 914a (complete. A.D. 1849), 1021b (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850), 1052b (extracts only).

1 In order to console himself for the death of his patron, A. Duncan, the author read ancient and modern histories and then conceived the idea of telling in verse the story of some events in the ancient and modern history of India. He wrote an account of the war of Lord Cornwallis against Tipû Sultân, prefixed to it some account of the suljâns of Hindûstân and called the poem Razmistan.
Extracts translated by Munšhī Sadāsuk’h Lāl: B.M. MS. Add. 30,786, foll. 82–291.

Description and 4 pp. of translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson History of India viii 403–411.

[Elliot and Dowson viii 403–5; Rieu iii 914a.]


Sirāj al-tawārīkh, a vast general history with special reference to India: Ethé ii 3009 (autograph brouillon).

652. A large work on the political and natural history of India projected by ‘Azīm-Jāh, Nawwāb of the Carnatic (i.e. M. ‘Alī Khān Bahādūr Sirāj al-Umārā’, who was installed on 3 Feb. 1820 and died on 12 Nov. 1825), was entrusted by him to the superintendence of Maulawī M. Šībghat Allāh entitled ‘Azīm-Nawāz Khān Bahādūr Muʿtamad-Jang ‘Umdat al-‘Ulamā’ Muftā Badr al-Daulah, who has already been mentioned (pp. 222–3 supra) as the author of a Dāstān i ghaf written in 1250/1834–5. Of the collaborators selected by Maulawī Šībghat Allāh for the various parts the most prominent was Rīḍā Şāhīb known as Ḥakīm Bāqir Ḥusain Khān Bahādūr, who devoted himself particularly to the history of the Carnatic from the time of Saʿīd Allāh Khān to that of Wālā-Jāh (this portion of the history does not occur in the only recorded manuscript). After Rīḍā Şāhīb’s death S. Murtaḍā (i.e. no doubt “Bīnīsh”, author of the tadḥīkirah, Ishārāt i Bīnīsh, mentioned below in the subsection Biography: Poets) undertook to supply other portions of the political history, but the work was interrupted by the Nawwāb’s death and remained unfinished. Both Maulawī Šībghat Allāh and S. Murtaḍā were still alive in 1859, the latter as teacher in the Madrasah [at Arcot presumably].

‘Azīm al-tawārīkh, a history, mainly of India, planned to

1 An English note on a fly-leaf ascribes to the work the general title of Sirāj al-tawārīkh (cf. § 651 supra), but, according to Ethé, no such title is mentioned in the Persian text.
consist of seven maqālahs and five muqaddimahs, but differently divided in the only recorded manuscript, which is evidently incomplete, lacking, for example, the Carnatic and Mysore history (which was to be the subject of Maqālah vii): Ethé 430 (consisting of (1) a general introduction on the value of historiography, the sources for the Hindu period and an outline of pre-Muḥammadan Indian history, (2) history of the Creation, the Patriarchs, the Hindu rājahs and the rise of Islām in India, (3) [called Maqālah iii] the Ghaznavids, (4) [called Maqālah iv] the Delhi Sultāns to ‘Alā’ al-Dīn [Khalji], (5) [called Maqālah v] the Delhi Sultāns from Buhlūl Lūḍī, (6) [called Maqālah vi] the Indian Timūrids to Muḥammad Shāh. These are followed by a portion called Jāmi‘ al-ashyā‘ or Hashti chaman on natural history).

653. Kishan-Dayāl K’hatri, of Delhi, completed in 1826 his Aṣhrāf al-tawārīkh, which he wrote for presentation to Rājah Chandū Lāl “Shādān”,1 Peshkār at Ḥaidarābād.

Aṣhrāf al-tawārīkh, an enormous compilation in seven books ((1) epitome of the Śiva-Purāṇa etc., (2) translation of the Rāmāyaṇa, (3) translation of the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa, (4) Hindu saints, (5) epitome of the Mahābhārata, history of the Hindū Rājahs, the Muḥammadan kings of Ghaznī and Delhi to Akbar II, (6) the revenues of Hindūstān and Persia, (7) account of the seven climates etc.): Rieu iii 1026b (foll. 48–70. Extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850), 1042b (foll. 147–152. Account of the K’hatri caste only. Circ. A.D. 1850), cf. 1052b. [Elliot knew of only two MSS., both in the possession of the author’s family.]

Description: Elliot and Dowson History of India viii 411–2.

654. S. Ahmad Khān b. S. Muttaqi Khān, or Sir2 Saiyid,3

1 He was the author of diwāns both in Persian and Urdu. The former will be mentioned in the section of this book devoted to Poetry. He died on 19 April 1845 (see Garcin de Tassy iii 90–92, Buckland Dictionary of Indian biography, and the authorities mentioned on p. 252, n. 1, supra).

2 This is the English title prefixed to the name of a knight. Sir Saiyid was created a Knight Commander of the Order of the Star of India in 1882.

3 An old transliteration “Syed” still survives in India side by side with other transliterations.
as he is commonly called by the Muḥammadans of India, was born at Delhi on 17 October, 1817. His maternal grandfather, Khwājah Farīd al-Dīn Aḥmad, was Prime Minister to Akbar II. Entering the East India Co.'s service, he was appointed Surishṭah-dār (Record-keeper) of the Ṣadr Amin's Court at Delhi in 1837, Nāʾib Munshī "or deputy reader" in the office of the Commissioner of Āgra in 1839, Munṣif or Sub-Judge at Mainpūrī in 1841, at Fathpūr-Sīkri in 1842 and at Delhi in 1846. Subsequently he was Ṣadr Amin at Rohtak (1850) and Bijnaur (1855), Principal Ṣadr Amin at Murādabād (1858), Ghāzīpur (1862), and ‘Alīgārh (1864), and Judge of the Small Cause Court at Benares (1867). He retired in 1876, settled at ‘Alīgārh, died there on 27 March 1898 and is buried at the side of the mosque of the ‘Alīgārh Muslim University. He was a Member of the Legislative Council of the North-West Provinces and from 1878 to 1882 a Member of the Viceroy’s Council. In 1882 he was made a K.C.S.I.

Sir Saiyid Aḥmad’s fame, however, rests not on his official career but on the distinguished services which he rendered to education and the spread of enlightenment among the Muḥammadans of India. Unlike his bitter opponents among the orthodox, who regarded modern knowledge as useless and dangerous to faith, he believed education of the European type to be the only means of raising the status of India’s Muḥammadans and enabling them to play their part worthily in the history of their country. In 1858 he opened a school at Murādabād for the study of modern history, in 1864 he founded the Translation Society of Ghāzīpur (which afterwards became the Scientific

---

1 See Qāmūs al-maṣḥāḥir i pp. 236-7.
2 "A subordinate judge (lower than ṣadr-aʿlā; — the office has been abolished)" (Platts). Sudder Ameen was the old spelling.
3 The dates given by the different authorities are not in all cases quite the same.
4 The vernacular equivalent seems to be Ṣadr Aʿlā or Ṣadr al-Ṣudūr.
5 An interesting account of the campaign of vituperation, menace and slander directed against him will be found in “Ḥulī’s” Ḥayāt i jāwīd, pt. ii pp. 266-312. A series of fatwās denouncing him is given at the end of Maulawi Imdād al-ʿAli’s Imdād al-ʿaʃāq, Cawnpore 1873*. 
Society of ‘Alīgārh) for the translation of English books into Urdu, in 1870 he started a monthly periodical entitled Tahdīb al-akhlāq (English title: The Mohammedan social reformer) and formed a “Committee for the better diffusion and advancement of learning among the Mohammedans of India”. Finally in 1875 came the opening of the Muḥammadan Anglo-Oriental College at ‘Alīgārh (now the ‘Alīgārh Muslim University), of which he was the chief promoter and which is the most widely known of the memorials which he left behind him.

Sir Saiyid’s labours had lasting effects in several different directions. They profoundly influenced Indian Muslim education. They stimulated the growth of a modernist or liberalising school of religious thought among educated Indian Muḥammadans. They contributed to the promotion of friendly relations between Europeans and Indians.\(^1\) They changed the course of Urdu prose style. According to T. Grāhame Bailey Sir S. Aḥmad “exercised more influence upon Urdu than perhaps any other single man in the nineteenth century... He wrote good, flowing and simple Urdu, discarding the florid style of his predecessors in journalism... Ultimately, so far as prose went, he won a complete victory, and no one now thinks of writing in the style of Surūr when he has before him as a model the forceful and straightforward writing of Sir Sayyid”.

In the latter part of his life S. Aḥmad was the leading personality among the Muḥammadans of India. He was undoubtedly the greatest man produced by Indian Islām in the nineteenth century.

Sir Saiyid’s numerous works\(^2\) were nearly all in Urdu. Among them were Āthār al-ṣanā‘id (on the archaeology of Delhi. Delhi 1847\(^*\), Delhi 1853–4\(^*\), Lucknow 1876\(^*\). French translation: Description des monuments de Dehli en 1852, d’après le texte hindoustani de Saiyid Ahmad Khan, par M. [J. H.] Garcein de Tassy (in, and offprinted from, the Journal asiatique 1860–1),

\(^1\) It may be mentioned in this connexion that at the time of the Mutiny S. Aḥmad showed much courage and resource in saving the lives of Europeans and that he defied the prejudice against eating with Christians and defended the practice in his Risālah i ʿaʿām i ahl i kūṭb published in 1285/1869–9.

\(^2\) For a list of these works see “Ḥālī’s” Ḥayāt i jāwīd, pt. 2, appendix 2.
II. HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, ETC.

Tabyín al-kalám fī tafsīr al-Taurāḥ wa-ʾl-Injīl ʿalā millat al-Islām (The Mohammedan commentary on the Holy Bible. Urdu and English. Pts. i (Introduction) and ii (Genesis), Ghāzīpūr 1862°. Pt. iii (St. Matthew) is described by Graham (p. 71) as "now in the press")¹, Tafsīr al-Qurʾān (an Urdu translation and commentary. Vols. i and ii, ‘Alīgārh 1880°. Vol. vi 1309/1891-2.² Part of the series entitled Taṣānīf i Ahmadiyāh. Six volumes (to the end of Sūrah xvii) were published and a seventh (to Sūrah xxii, completing about half of the work) was ready for the press when Sir Saiyid died), Iḥtīlāl i ḡulāmī, on the evils of the slave trade, Āgra 1893.* Sirāt i Fārisāyāh, a life of his maternal grandfather, Āgra 1896*.

Among the works of which English translations ³ have appeared are The loyal Mohammedans of India (on the Muhammadans who remained loyal to the Government, saved the lives of Europeans and rendered other services at the time of the Mutiny), 1860-1 (see Graham pp. 58-69, where some extracts are given but where the place of publication is not mentioned, and Oriental College Magazine xiii no. 2 p. 13, where it is said that this publication was issued in parts as a sort of periodical in Urdu and English), A series of essays on the life of Mohammed and subjects subsidiary thereto, vol. i, London 1870* ⁴, Review on Dr. Hunter’s Indian Musalmans,⁵ Benares 1872*, The causes of the Indian revolt. Written [in 1858]... in Urdu... and translated... by his two European friends [Auckland Colvin and G. F. I. Graham], Benares 1873*, On the present state of Indian politics, Allahabad 1888*.

¹ According to the B.M. catalogue only pts. i and ii were published.
² See Ḥayāt i jāwīd, pt. 2, appendix 2, p. 3, where 1296-1309 is given as the date of the publication of the Tafsīr.
³ It is not necessarily to be assumed that these works were ever published in the original Urdu.
⁴ Only one volume seems to have been published. The Urdu title seems to have been Khujābāt i Ahmadiyāh : see S. M. ‘Abd Allāh’s article in the Oriental College Magazine vol. xiii no. 2 p. 15, where no date or place of publication is mentioned and where it is not stated whether the work appeared in Urdu as well as in English.
⁵ A reply to W. W. Hunter’s The Indian Musalmans : are they bound in conscience to rebel against the Queen? (London 1871*).
Collections of his lectures and speeches were published under the titles \textit{Lak̇harōn kā majmū'ah} (Lahore 1890*), \textit{Majmū'ah i lak̇har-hā} (Sād'haurah 1892*) and \textit{Tahdhib al-akhḷāq} (speeches delivered from 1287/1870 to 1293/1876. Vol. II published at Lahore in 1896*). A collection of his letters compiled by his grandson, S. Ross Masood, has been published under the title \textit{Khuṭūt ī Sar Saiyyid} (2nd ed., Bādāyūn [1931]).

He was editor of the \textit{Tārīkh ī Fīrōz-Shāhī} (of Barānī) published at Calcutta (Bibliotheca Indica) in 1860–2, of the \textit{Tūzuk ī Jahānghiri} printed at his own presses at Ghāzīpūr and 'Aligarh in 1863–4 and of the \textit{Ā'īn ī Akbarī} published by Nawal Kisḥūr at Lucknow in 1869.

\textit{Jām ī Jam}, written for R. N. C. (afterwards Sir Robert) Hamilton, Commissioner of Āgra,\textsuperscript{1} and completed in Šafar 1255/1839, tabulated information (viz. title, father’s name, mother’s name, race (Lōd’hī, Chaghatāy etc.), date of birth, place of accession, date of accession, poetical chronogram, if any, for that date, length of reign, length of life, date of death, poetical chronogram, if any, for that date, posthumous title, if any, place of burial, observations) concerning the Muḥammadan sovereigns of Delhi from the time of Timūr, who comes first followed by Nuṣrat Shāh, to that of the last Timūrid, Bahādur Shāh: \textit{Rieu ī 284b} (A.D. 1839), \textit{Lindesiana} p. 111 no. 416 (A.H. 1258/1842), \textit{Bānkīpur} vii 595 (A.H. 1266/1849–50), 596, \textit{Lahore} Panjāb Univ. Lib. (Dībāchāh only. See \textit{Oriental College Magazine}, vol. iii/1 (Nov. 1926) p. 66), \textit{I.O.} 4030 (transcribed apparently from a Delhi edition of 1263).

Editions: \textit{Akharābād} [i.e. Āgra, not Delhi, as stated in the B.M. Catalogue] 1840\textsuperscript{2}, \textit{Delhi} 1268/1851–2 (from which the I.O. MS. mentioned above was apparently transcribed).

Description: Elliot and Dowson \textit{History of India} viii pp. 430–1.

[His genealogy in the preface to the \textit{Jām ī Jam} and in the \textit{Khuṭabāt ī Āhmadīyāh} (and also in \textit{Hayāt ī jāwwīd} Pt. 2, appendix 1); Garcin de Tassy \textit{Histoire de la littérature hindouie et hindoustanie}, seconde éd., tome iii (Paris 1871), pp. 37–41; Beale

\textsuperscript{1} See Buckland’s \textit{Dictionary of Indian biography}.\textsuperscript{2}

655. In 1262/1846 was composed

Tārikh-i Hindūstān: 'Alīgarh Subh. MSS. p. 58 no. 11 (defective at end).

656. It was in 1264/1848 that M. Riḍā "Najm" Ṭabāṭabā ¹ (for whom see p. 148 supra) completed his

Akhbārāt-i Hind (chronogram), a general history of India to a.h. 1264/1848 dedicated to Sir H. Elliot, forming vol. v of the author's historical encyclopaedia Bahr al-zakhkhār and consisting largely of matter abridged from vol. iii (Majma' al-mulūk, see p. 148 supra) and vol. iv (Mafātīh al-rīāsah, see p. 523 infra) but with considerable additions ²: Rieu iii 914b (circ. A.D.

¹ Ṭabāṭabā, not Ṭabāṭabā't, seems to be the form used by the author himself.
² It "includes a full and minute account of the period of dissolution of the Moghul empire" and "is chiefly based, for the last sixty years, on oral information received by the author from his father and uncle, and on his personal recollections. The copious details it contains on the rise, progress, and decline of the native states of India, down to the latest period, are nowhere else to be found in a connected form" (Rieu).
1848), 1014b ii (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850), 1018b v (extracts only. A.D. 1849).

Account of the work by the author with full statement of contents: Rieu iii 1053a.

Description with 3½ pp. of translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson History of India viii 436-440.

657. Mir Khwursheid 'Ali "Khwursheed", commonly called Saiyid Shâh 'Alî, b. S. Dastgîr "Dastgîr" translated into Persian under the title Târikh i Hind (the first part only (?) of) an English work entitled apparently Epitome of the History of Hindoostan, in which according to the preface the author proposed to give the history of India from the time of Mahmûd Ghaznavî to the British conquest.

**Târikh i Hind.** Edition: Madras 1267/1851°* (extending to the year A.D. 1289).

658. Ḥakîm Jawâhir La’l Akbarabâdî, a physician by profession, was editor of the Urdu newspaper Akhbâr al-nawâh, wa-nuzhat al-arwâḥ which was published at Ágra and which, according to Garcin de Tassy, at first contained good literary and scientific articles but after 1851 became less interesting and more exclusively devoted to the news of the day. He edited also the Etawah newspaper published in English, Hindi and Urdu editions entitled respectively People’s Friend, Prâjahit and Muhîb ib ra’îyâ.

His works include (1) Makhzan al-tawârîkh, an Urdu translation of the Zubdat al-tawârîkh (an abridgment of the Siyar al-muta’akhkhirin), Ágra 1853*, (2) Muntakhab al-tawârîkh, an abridgment of the Makhzan al-tawârîkh, Ágra 1855*, (3) Mu’dirîyât (in Urdu) on minerals and their uses, Ágra 1855*, (4) Šâkuntalâ nãtaka, an Urdu translation from the Sanskrit of Kâlidâsa, Ágra 1873*, (5) a Persian translation of Môti La’l’s Urdu Pand-nâmâh i kâshikàrân, Ágra 1854°.

**Târikh i Hind**, a history of India from the earliest times to the Second Burmese War in 1852, translated by Jawâhir La’l from an Urdu original (also by J. L. ?). Edition: Ágra 1855°*.
659. **Ghauth Muḥammad Khān** succeeded his father ʿAbd al-Ghafūr Khān as Nawwāb of Jāōrah (a state of 568 square miles in Mālwa, Central India) in 1825 at the age of two. During the Mutiny of 1857 he rendered important services to the Government of India. He established kōtwālis in the tahsils, where criminal cases were heard, and opened a hospital and a court of Muḥammadan law. He died in 1865.

**Majmaʿ al-salāṭin,** “tabulated lists of the emperors of Hindustan and the sovereigns of England, with statistical accounts of the provinces of India” (pp. 69). Editions: Jāōrah 1272/1856°, place ? 1279/1862-3 (Āṣafiyah i p. 252 no. 257), place ? 1286/1869-70 (Āṣafiyah i p. 252 no. 872).


660. Mīrzā Naṣr Allāh Khān “Fidāʾī” 2 entitled Nawwāb Daulat-Yār-Jang Bahādur, was the son of M. Ḥusain Khwushnawīs Iṣfahānī. A year or two after leaving Persia for the purpose of travel he conceived the desire of doing some work which should be both a present to his countrymen and a service to the language of his ancestors. He decided, therefore, to write a history of India. For some years he hesitated to undertake unaided so difficult a task and he was moreover occupied with the duties of tutor to Mīr Maḥbūb ʿAlī Khān 3 (bāhāmūzqārī u ham-nishīnī i Bandāqān i wālā Nawwāb Fath-Jang Nīzām al-Daulah Nīzām al-Mulk Āṣaf-Jāh Mīr Maḥbūb ʿAlī Khān Bahādur nām-zad būdam).

---

1 The Āṣafiyah catalogue gives the author as Muḥtasham al-Daulah ʿAbd al-Ghafūr Khān, but this seems to be an error.
2 For his Divān i qhazalīyāt (Bombay 1310) and his Divān i qasāʾid (Bombay 1310 likewise) see Harrassowitz’s Bücher-Katalog 430 (1931) nos. 499 and 500 and Āṣafiyah i p. 730 no. 133.
3 Nīzām of Ḥaidarābād, born 1866, succeeded 1869, invested with full powers 4 Feb. 1884, died 1911.
Early in 1301/1883 he began the Dāstān i turk-tāzān i Hind and he completed it towards the end of 1303/1886. According to the Āṣafiyah catalogue, i p. 730 no. 133, he died in 1314/1896-7.

Dāstān i turk-tāzān i Hind, a history of the Muḥammadan rulers of India from M. b. Qāsim's invasion to the death of Bahādur Shāh in 1862, based mainly on English sources and written in "pure Persian". Edition: Bombay 3 1309/1892* 4 (5 vols.).

661. Kunwar Durgā-Parshād “Mihr” Sandīla, the son of Rājah D'hanpat Rāy, was born in 1846. In 1867 he succeeded his father as ra'īs, and in 1884 he was appointed an Honorary Magistrate of Sandīlah. He was still living in 1897. In addition to the Gulistān i Hind he wrote a history of Oudh, Būstān i Awad'h, which was published at Lucknow in 1892°*, and a tadḥkirah of poetesses, Hadīqah i 'ishrat, published at Sandīlah in [1894°*].

Gulistān i Hind (alternatively, in the 1889 edition, The Universal History of India in commemoration of the Queen's Jubilee 1887) in four daftars (((i) Hindu Rājahs, (ii) the Muḥammadan period, (iii) the British period to 1877, (iv) the author and his ancestors) written in 6 months after the Jubilee darbār at Hardoi. Editions: Lucknow 1889°, Sandīlah 1897°*.

[Gulistān i Hind (Sandīlah 1897) pp. 23 etc. (portrait at beginning of book); Būstān i Awad'h pp. 213 etc. ; Hardoi

1 This is stated on the unnumbered leaf prefixed to the author's portrait in the 1309 edition.
2 The fifth volume is consequently a glossary.
3 According to a statement on the leaf prefixed to the author's portrait the work was published by Messrs. Jehangier B. Marzban & Co., Bombay. In the Bombay quarterly catalogue for the 1st quarter of 1893 the Dattaprasad Press, Bombay, is given as the place of printing. According to the title-page the work was printed dar chāp-khānah i khānagī i Nawwāb i nāmah-nigār u ba-nigārānī i khūndaehān.
4 This is the date of publication by Messrs. J. B. Marzban according to the statement mentioned in the previous note.
662. Mīrzā Muḥammad b. M. Rafiʿ, entitled Malik al-kuttāb, Shīrāzī was born at Shīrāz in 1269/1852-3. In 1285 he settled in Bombay and there he founded the bookselling and publishing business in connexion with which he was best known. In 1300/1882-3 the title of Malik al-kuttāb was conferred on him by the Persian Government and in 1317/1899-1900 that of Khān Şāhīb by the Government of India.

His works include (1) Iksīr al-tawārīkh wa-Siyar al-aʾimmah (see p. 210 supra), (2) Mīrāt al-zamān (see p. 432 supra), (3) Tārīkh i Inglīstān (see p. 429 supra), (4) Tārīkh i qadīm Yūnān (see p. 429 supra), (5) Alī fāhār, "anecdotes and reflections on various subjects" (Edwards), Bombay 1313/1896°, (6) Ayyāt al-wilāyāh, a defence of the claims of 'Alī and the 12 Imāms to the Caliphate, Bombay [1898°], (7) Miftāḥ al-rizq, on the mutual relations of employers and employed, Bombay 1315/1898°, (8) Kashf al-sināʿah, or Muntakhabāt i Muḥammadī, an account of various arts, Bombay 1311/1894°, (9) Tadhkirat al-khawātīn, notices of Islāmic poetesses, Bombay 1306/1889°, (10) Tuhfat al-khawātīn, on the hygiene of married women, Bombay 1325/1907°.

Among the books published by him was the Tadhkirah of Daulat-Shāh (Bombay 1887°).


[Prag Narāyan Bhārgava Saḥīfa e zarrīn (in Urdu), Lucknow 1902, Bombay section p. 97.]

1 The Āṣafiyah catalogue gives no particulars which would show whether this work deals with the history of India in general or with a special period.
663. Appendix


(2) Nasab al-ansāb, a general history of India: Lindesiana p. 201 no. 881 (A.H. 1210/1795).

(3) Tadhkīrat al-mulūk, a brief review of Indian dynasties to 1208/1793–4, apparently different from Ethé 409: Ivanow 180 (mid 19th cent.).


(5) Tārīkh i Kār-nāmah [?], metrical narratives relating inter alia to M. b. Sām, Quṭb al-Dīn Aibak and İltutmış 2: Rehatsek p. 131 no. 16 (inadequately described).

(6) Tārīkh i salātīn i Dīlī, manzūm (? identical with the preceding): Aṣafiyyah i p. 226 no. 673.

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (b) SULTĀNS OF DELHI

(See also § 663 nos. (5) and (6))

664. In consequence of the disturbed state of Khūrāsān Ḥasan Niẓāmī 3 left his native place Nīshāpūr and went first to Ghaznī and then to Delhi. Encouraged by the Ṣadr Sharaf al-Mulk and other friends to produce a literary work he obeyed a royal command recently issued and began in 602/1205–6 to

---

1 Apparently different from the Kanz al-mahfūz of which the second volume, a history of India to 1150/1737–8, is described in Elliot and Dowson viii pp. 37–9 (the only MS. known to Elliot belonged to Saʿīd al-Dīn Aḥmad Khān of Muḥādābād and lacked the first volume. Cf. Rieu iii 1050b ix).

2 Possibly this and no. 6 may be copies, or parts, of ‘‘Iṣ̄āmī’s’’ Futūḥ al-salātīn (see p. 433 supra).

3 In the Raudat al-safa’ i p. 7 and in Ḥ. Kh. ii p. 92 he is called Ṣadr al-Dīn M. b. Ḥasan al-Niẓāmī. On the title-page of the B.M. MS. Add. 24,951 his name is written Tāj al-Dīn Ḥasan b. Niẓāmī. In the preface he calls himself Ḥasan i Niẓāmī (cf. the extract quoted in JRAS. 1868 p. 435).
write a record of the glorious deeds of Sultan Mu’izz al-Din M. b. Sām (assassinated at Ghaznī in Ḡaṣbān 602).

(Tāj al-maʿāthir), a verbose, rhetorical and uninformative account, in prose and verse, of the Indian wars of Mu’izz al-Din, Quṭb al-Dīn Aibak (who reigned a.h. 602/1206–607/1210 and to whom the work is chiefly devoted) and Īltutmish, extending (in most copies) from Mu’izz al-Dīn’s conquest of Ajmēr in 587/1191 to Nāṣir al-Dīn Maḥmūd’s appointment as Governor of Lahore in 614/1217. H. Kh. ii p. 92 no. 2051, Faid Allah Efendi 1402 = Tauer 536 (a.h. 694/1295), Rieu i 239a (a.h. 711/1312), 240a (a.h. 818/1416), 240a (16th cent.), 240b (a.h. 1034/1625), iii 1014a (extracts only). Circ. a.d. 1850), 1045a (extracts with a summary of the work), Āyā Ṣūfiyah 2847b = Tauer 537 (a.h. 716/1316–17), 2991 = Tauer 539 (a.h. 750/1349), 2847a = Tauer 540 (a.h. 795/1392–3), Lālā Ismā‘il 299 = Tauer 538 (a.h. 740/1340), Berlin 478 (defective, about 2/3 of the work. a.h. 755/1354), Blochet i 554 (a.h. 781/1379), 555 (defective at end. Early 15th cent.), 556 (a.h. 870/1465), Flügel ii 951 (a.h. 859/1455), Fātiḥ 4204 = Tauer 541 (a.h. 867/1462–3), Gotha 29 (a.h. 915/1510), 30 (n.d.), Dorn 307 (a.h. 980/1572–3), Muṣṭafā Efendi 601 = Tauer 542 (10th/16th cent.), Bodleian MS. Pers. e. 29 (a.h. 1034/1624–5), Majlis 220 (a.h. 1041/1631–2), Ivanow 110 (18th cent.), Ahmad Thalith 2637 = Tauer 543, Browne Suppt. 224 (King’s 68), Ethé 209 (tolerably old), 210 (n.d.), Āṣafiyah i p. 220 no. 283, Salemann-Rosen p. 12 no. 578.

Translation of extracts (“all that is of the remotest historical interest in the work”): Elliot and Dowson History of India ii pp. 204–43.

Descriptions: (1) Hammer-Purgstall Gemälde sam der Lebensbeschreibungen grosser moslemischer Herrscher iv pp. 172–82.

1 At this point the author concludes by saying that, if his life is spared, he will continue the work in the same manner. That he actually did so seems probable from the fact that according to H. M. Elliot (History of India ii p. 210) Nāwab Diya’ al-Dīn of Delhi possessed a MS. dated 779/1377–8, in which, though imperfect at the end, the narrative was carried down to a.h. 626/1228–9. The MS. was used by Elliot, whose extracts extend to that year.
665. Amir 1 Khusrau 2 Dihlawi was born in 651/1253 3 at Patiyali, 4 an old town now in the Etah District of the United Provinces. His father, whom he calls Saif i Shamsi and whom Firishtah calls Amir Saif al-Din Mahmud, was a Turk 5 in the employ of Shams al-Din Ilutmish 6 (reigned A.H. 607/1210-633/1235) and his successors: his mother was a daughter of Imad al-Mulk, a high official in Balban’s reign (see Barani pp. 114–17, Waheed Mirza pp. 29–31).

Even at the age of eight, he tells us, he was already composing poetry (Dibaghah i Tuhfat al-sighar, Waheed Mirza p. 21). He was still a mere boy when Balban came to the throne in 664/1265. In this reign he attached himself successively to three high officials, namely (1) ‘Ala’ al-Din Kishlu Khân, Balban’s nephew and Bör-bak or Chamberlain (Dibaghah i Ghurrat al-kamal, Waheid Mirza p. 38), (2) Nasir al-Din Bughra Khân,

1 According to Firishtah (Lucknow 1865) ii p. 402 penult., it was in Jalal al-Din Khaaji’s reign that Khusrau became an amir (manand i biradar u pidar az umar第二天). Daulat-Shah implies that it was in ‘Ala’ al-Din’s reign.
2 According to Firishtah his original name (nami i ashli) was Abii l-Hasan.
3 This date seems to have been inferred from several statements made by Khusrau concerning his age at different times. Thus it appears from the preface to the Ghurrat al-kamal that he was 34 years old in 685 and 43 in 693. Towards the end of the Qiran al-sa’dain (Lucknow 1885, p. 174 penult.) he says that he was 36 in Ramadhan 688.
4 Khusrau describes India as his maulid (in the Nuh sipih; see Waheed Mirza p. 17 n. 3) but does not specify the actual place of his birth. Badau’ini, however, in one of the places where he mentions Patiyali (Muntakhab al-taawirikh ii p. 4314–15) describes it as a qasabah on the bank of the Ganges and the maulid u mansha’ i Mir Khusrau. (Badau’ini himself had a connexion with Patiyali, since he was at one time in the service of Husain Khan, Jagirdar of that place.) Cf. Safinat al-aulyiyah’ p. 98.
5 Khusrau calls himself an Indian Turk (Turk i Hindustani) in the Dibaghah i Ghurrat al-kamal (cf. Waheed Mirza p. 34).
6 Jahangir ba-qanwar i a mi-girift Ilutmish kih bat-kashidah Khudayash ziqabdaah i qudrat (Dibaghah i Ghurrat al-kamal, quoted by Waheed Mirza).
Balban’s younger son, who was Governor of Sāmānah and whom he accompanied on Balban’s expedition against Lak’hnautī in the 14th year of the reign (Wahīd Mirzā pp. 41–3), (3) Nuṣrat al-Dīn Sulṭān Muḥammad, Balban’s elder son, the Governor of Multān, with whom he remained for five years until 683/1284–5, when he was killed in battle against the Mongols (Khusrau himself was taken prisoner but escaped). In 685/1286 or 686/1287 Balban was succeeded by Mu’izz al-Dīn Kai-Qubād, the son of Nāṣir al-Dīn Bughrā Khān. Khusrau was invited to court, but, fearing the hostility of the powerful Malik Nizām al-Dīn, he declined and became a protégé of Hātim Khān, whom he accompanied to Oudh when Kai-Qubād went to meet his father Bughrā Khān. Hātim Khān was then appointed Governor of Oudh and Khusrau remained with him there unwillingly for a time. On his return to Delhi he wrote the Qirān al-sa’dain (completed in Ramadan 688/1289) at the king’s request to commemorate his meeting with his father in Oudh. Khusrau’s Asp-nāmah, a matnāwī included in the Ghurrat al-kamāl, was dedicated to Hātim Khān (cf. Baranī p. 118a, Wahīd Mirzā p. 162).

In the reign of Jalāl al-Dīn Firūz Shāh Khaljī (A.H. 689/1290–695/1295) Khusrau was appointed Mushaf-dār and was given an annual stipend of 1200 tankahs (Baranī pp. 197–8). Baranī calls him Malik al-nudamā i majlis i sulṭān (p. 2001), mentions him second in his list of nine nadīmān i majlis i sulṭān (p. 199a) and says that every day he produced new ghazals in the sulṭān’s majlis and that he received many presents (in’am) from the sulṭān, who was enamoured (shīftah) of his ghazals (p. 199a–b). Four victories of this king are described in the Miftāh al-futūḥ, which was completed in Jumādā ii 690/1291.

‘Alā’ al-Dīn M. Shāh Khaljī reigned from 695/1295 to 715/1315. Khusrau accompanied him on his expedition against Chittaur (in 702 or 703) and narrated his victories from 695 to 711 in

---

1 According to Firūsštah (Lucknow 1885), ii p. 40215 he held the office of Mushaf-dār, his friend Amir Hasan Dihlawi being Dawlat-dār.

2 Dībārīh in Ghurrat al-kamāl, Baranī p. 67, Wahīd Mirzā p. 50.

the prose work *Kharā'in al-futūḥ* completed in the latter year. The *mathnawi* *Duwal Rānī Khādir Khān* belongs also to this reign, since it was originally completed in 715 and ended with Khādir Khān’s marriage. All the five poems of Khusrau’s *Khamsah* are dedicated to ‘Alā’ al-Dīn. According to Baranī (p. 36617-18) Khusrau received from ‘Alā’ al-Dīn a stipend (*mawājib*) of only 1000 *tankahs* and was not honoured at court as his merits deserved.

The early part of the reign of Quṭb al-Dīn Mubārak Shāh Khaljī (a.h. 716/1316-720/1320) is the subject of the *Nuh sipihr* completed in Jumādā i 718/1318.

The accession of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluq (reigned 720/1320-725/1325) and the events which led to it were celebrated by Khusrau in the *Tughluq-nāmah*. When the king led his expedition into Bengal (in 724/1324 according to Firishtah) Khusrau accompanied him and so was absent from Delhi when his pēr Niẓām al-Dīn Auliya’ died. A few months later, in 725/1325, Khusrau himself died and was buried in a tomb adjacent to that of Niẓām al-Dīn Auliya’. He had lived to see the first few months of the reign of Sultān Muḥammad Tughluq, whose entrance into Delhi after his accession is the subject of a poem in the *Niḥāyat al-kamāl*.

Khusrau is considered the greatest of India’s Persian poets. He is also counted as a saint. Tradition credits him with original contributions to the art of music, and it is said that even today he is recognised by Indian *qawwāls* as their master (see Wahīd Mīrzā p. 239).

According to Firishtah Khusrau wrote 92 books (nawād u dū

---

1 In Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluq’s reign Khusrau added a continuation telling of Khādir Khān’s estrangement from his father ‘Alā’ al-Dīn, his confinement in the fortress of Gwalior, his blinding by Malik Kāfūr and finally his murder at the hands of his brother Mubārak Shāh.

2 *u Sultān ‘Alā’ al-Dīn in-chumīn nādārah i ṣawārā u fuḍalā-yi salaf u khālafl rā ḫamīn yak hazār tankah mawājib dādī u dar pīsh i khwādī muhabbā jīl u mubarram na-gardānīdī.*

3 The day and month are variously given, e.g. 29 Dhū ’l-Qa’dah (Firishtah), 18 Shawwāl (*Ṣafīnāt al-auliya’*), 18 Rabi’ ii (Sprenger p. 466, from the *Adāb al-tālibīn*).
kitāb dar silk i naẓm kashidah). If this is correct, a large part of his work has perished, but what remains is of considerable extent. Still preserved are

(1) five dīwāns, viz. (a) Tuḥfat al-ṣīghar, poems of adolescence (from the age of fifteen, or sixteen,¹ to nineteen), (b) Wasat al-hayāt, poems of middle life (from the age of nineteen, twenty, or twenty-four,¹ to thirty-two, or thirty-four ¹), (c) Ghurrat al-kamāl, poems of maturity (from the age of thirty-four to forty-three) collected (originally) in 693 but poems of a later date are included, (d) Bagāyih i naqīyah, completed not earlier than 715, since it contains an elegy on Sultān ‘Alā’ al-Dīn, (e) Nihayat al-kamāl, which includes at least one poem written in 725 (Edition: Delhi 1332/1914*).

There are in existence a number of MSS. bearing the title Dīwān i Khusrav and containing several different selections, mainly ghazals, from the first four of these dīwāns (e.g. Rieu ii 610b, 614b–615a). One such selection, ostensibly made by the poet himself, has been published under the title Kulliyāt i ‘anāṣir ² i dawāwān i Khusrav by Nawal Kishōr ([Cawnpore 1871*, 1874°, 1886°] Cawnpore 1916‡ (4th ed.)). It contains 21 qaṣā‘īd (pp. 6–37), 923 ghazals alphabetically arranged (pp. 37–456), a few muqatta‘āt etc. (pp. 456–60) and rubā‘īyāt (pp. 460–6). These 923 ghazals may be all, or nearly all, that occur in the four dīwāns, but it is incorrect to say, as Rieu, Edwards and Arberry have done, that this volume contains the four dīwāns collected into a single dīwān. The qaṣā‘īd included in this selection are, for example, fewer than those in the Tuḥfat al-ṣīghar, which contains 35, or in the Wasat al-hayāt, which contains 58.

(2) a Khamsah modelled on “Nizāmi’s” and comprising

¹ The ages mentioned in the different MSS. are not always the same.
² The use of this word is due to a fanciful comparison of the four dīwāns to the four elements, earth (Tuḥfat al-ṣīghar), water (Wasat al-hayāt), air (Ghurrat al-kamāl) and fire (Bagāyih i naqīyah), in respect of a progress from coarseness to fineness, from lowness to highness etc.
(a) *Maṭla' al-anwār*, completed in 698 (Editions: Delhi 1293/1876*, Lucknow 1303/1884*)

(b) *Shirin u Khusrau*, completed in Rajab 698*

(c) *Majnūn Lailā*, completed likewise in 698 (Editions: Calcutta 1811*, Calcutta 1828* (in *Classic selections from some of the most esteemed Persian writers*, vol. i), Lucknow 1286/1869*, 1870*, [1899*], ‘Aligarh 1335/1917*).

(d) *Aţnah i Sihandarī*, completed in 699 (Edition: ‘Aligarh 1918† (?1917)).

(e) *Hasht bihisht*, completed in 701 (Editions: Lucknow 1290/1873*, ‘Aligarh 1336/1918*).

(3) *Rasā'il al-i'jāz*, or, as it is often called, *I'jāz i Khusrawī*, a treatise on elegant prose composition in five *risālahs*, the first four completed in 682, the last in 719, with numerous specimen documents and letters, mainly of Khusrau’s own writing (MSS. Ethé 1219 etc. Editions: Lucknow 1865° (vol. i only), 1876° (5 vols., of which I.O. has the first two only).

In addition to these may be mentioned the *Afḍāl al-fawā'id*, a collection of Nizām al-Dīn Auliya’s sayings in four parts, of which the first was presented to the saint in 719 (Edition: Delhi 1887°).

Popularly ascribed to Khusrau are (1) the *Qiṣṣah i chahār darwīsh*, best known through Mir Amman’s Urdu translation *Bāgh u bahār* (see Rieu ii 762 etc.), (2) a metrical Persian-Hindi glossary known from its opening words as *Khāliaq-Bārī*, (3) a number of Hindi verses and conundrums. For further information concerning these see Wahīd Mīrzā, pp. 149–50, 227–32.

(1) *Qirān al-sa'dain*, written in 3 months and completed in Ramadān 688/1289, a *matk nawī* on the meeting of Sultān Mu‘izz al-Dīn Kai-Qubād and his father Nāṣir al-Dīn Bughrā Khān in 688/1289 on the banks of the Sarjū in Oudh: H. Kh. iv p. 510 no. 9399, Sprenger 329, Ethé 1186 (5) (A.H. 866–7/1462

---

1 The statement of Wahīd Mīrzā (op. cit. p. 195) that an edition (date unspecified) was lithographed at ‘Aligarh seems to be without foundation.

2 The statement of Wahīd Mīrzā (op. cit. p. 197) that “The poem has been lithographed in Aligarh” seems to be without foundation.

Editions: [Lucknow,] 1261/1845×* (with a marginal commentary by Qudrat Ahmad), Cawnpore 1871†, 1302/1885†‡ (on the title-page, evidently unaltered from that of the previous edition, are the dates 1287/1870), [Tihrān, 1886"], ‘Aligarh 1918† (ed. S. Ḥasan Barnī. Silsilah i Kulliyāt i Khusrau).

Abstracts: (1) The Kirān-us-Sa’dain of Mir Khusrau.—By E. B. Cowell (in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,


Edition: Oriental College Magazine vol. xii no. 3 (Lahore,

1 Ivanow Curzon 221 claims to be the transcript of an autograph dated 1135 (a date (or a statement) which Ivanow regards as “rather suspicious”).

Abstract: Elliot and Dowson History of India iii pp. 536-44.

Description: Wahīd Mīrzā The life and works of Amir Khusrau pp. 176-7.

(3) Khażā'in al-futūḥ, as the author calls it, or Tārīkh i 'Alāʾī, as it is sometimes called, an ornate prose account of the victories of 'Alā' al-Dīn Khaljī completed in 711/1311-12: Āṣafīyah i p. 122 no. 178 (Aurangzēb's 3rd year = A.H. 1070/1659-60), Breilvi and Dhabbar p. 76 no. 4 (1) (? Author not stated. A.H. 1147/1734-5), Rieu i 240b (18th cent.), iii 919a (A.H. 1253/1838), 1045b (abstract only. Circ. A.D. 1850), Browne Suppt. 427 (A.H. 1200/1785-6. King's 158), Madras.


Translation (with omissions): The campaigns of 'Alā'u'd-Dīn Khaljī being the Khażā'inul [sic] Futūḥ [sic]... of Hazrat Amīr Khusrau... translated... by Muhammad Habib, Bombay (Madras printed) 1931† (For numerous corrections of this translation see a series of articles (in Urdu) entitled Angrēzi tarjama i Khażā'in al-futūḥ i Amīr Khusrau by Ḥāfiz M. Maḥmūd Shērānī in the Oriental College Magazine, vol. xii no. 1 (Lahore, Nov. 1935) pp. 81-96, no. 2 (Feb. 1936) pp. 3-80, no. 3 (May 1936) pp. 3-51, no. 4 (Aug. 1936) pp. 3-15).

Description and abstract: Elliot and Dowson History of India iii pp. 67-92.

Description: Wahīd Mīrzā The life and works of Amir Khusrau pp. 222-5.

(4) Duwal Rānī Khādir ¹ Khān, or Manshār i shāhī, or 'Ashiqah, or 'Ishqiyah or Khādir-Khānī, a mynthwāvī completed

¹ The spelling Khādir does not suit the metre of this poem.
in Dhū 'l-Qa'dah 715/1316 on the love-story of Khīḍr Khān, Sultān 'Alā' al-Dīn Khaljī's son, and the daughter of Rājāh Karn of Nahrwālāh, with a continuation of 319 lines written at some time subsequent to Mubārak Shāh's death and telling of Khīḍr Khān's estrangement from his father, his confinement in the fortress of Gwalior, his blinding by Malik Kāfūr and his murder: H.Kh. iii p. 142 no. 4723 (Khādir Khān Duwal-Rānī), Sprenger 328, Hākim-oghlu 'Alī Pāshā 661 (a.h. 903/1497. See H. W. Duda Ferhād und Schīrīn p. 187), Ayyā Šūfiyāh 3912 (a.h. 917/1511. See Duda op. cit. p. 187), Lahore Panjāb Univ. Lib. (3 copies, one dated a.h. 917/1511. See Oriental College Magazine vol. iii no. 3 (May 1927) p. 73), Rieu ii 612a (a.h. 923/1517), 617b (a.h. 982/1574. 3 Pictures), 617b (early 16th cent. 6 Pictures), 618a (17th cent.), 817a (a.h. 1004/1596. Pictures), iii 1045b (analysis only. Circ. a.d. 1850), Dorn 386 (a.h. 923–4/1517–18), 387, 393 (superb copy), 398 (a.h. 983/1575), 397 (a.h. 987/1579–80), Éthé 1188 (12) (a.h. 933/1527–7), 1187 (11) (a.h. 1008/1599), 1215 (17th cent.), 1216 (a.h. 1220/1806), 1217 (fragment. 17th and 18th cent.), Blochet iii 1520 (circ. a.d. 1560), 1530 (late 16th cent.), 1531 (a.h. 1010/1602), 1532 (mid 17th cent.), 1533 (mid 18th cent.), 1537 (late 17th cent.), Lindesiana p. 180 no. 49 (a.h. 989/1581. Pictures), Yıldız Köşkü 473 (2nd half of 16th cent. See Edhem and Stchoukine pp. 38–9), Aumer 65 (a.h. 995/1587), Bānkipūr i 131 (a.h. 995/1587), Aṣafīyāh ii p. 1488 no. 141 (not later than a.h. 999/1590–1), p. 1486 no. 156 (a.h. 1065/1654–5), 236 (Aurangzēb's 23rd year), Bodleian 777 (a.h. 1012/1604), 778 (a.h. 1064/1654), 779 (n.d. Pictures), Būhār 315 (a.h. 1030/1621), Ivanow 567 (a.h. 1100/1688–9), 568 (early 17th cent.), Browne Suppt. 965 (n.d.), 966 (a.h. 1112/1700–1), 967 (transcribed from an A.S.B. MS.), 968 (n.d.), Madras, R.A.S. P. 282, Rehatsek p. 155 no. 101.


Abstract: Elliot and Dowson *History of India* iii pp. 557–66.


Edition: Haidarābād (Aurangābād printed) 1352/1933+ (Silsilah i nakhlušt i fārisiyah, 1. Edited by S. Ḥashimī Fāridābādī).


666. **Diyā‘ al-Dīn Barani** must have been born in, or about, 684/1285, since his age when he wrote a passage towards the end of the *Tārīkh i Firōz-Shāhī* (p. 5737-8) was 74 and he tells us in the preface that he completed the work in 758/1357. He belonged to a distinguished family. His father, Mu‘aiyid al-Mulk (*T. i F.* pp. 1278, 20510), was in Jalāl al-Dīn Firōz-Shāh Khalji’s reign deputy (*nā‘īb*) to Arkli 1 Khān (*T. i F.* p. 2098), and in the first year of ‘Alā‘ al-Dīn Khaljī’s reign [A.H. 695-6] he was given the *Niyābat* and *Khwājagī* of Baran 2 (*T. i F.* p. 2488-9). His paternal uncle, Malik ‘Alā‘ al-Mulk (*T. i F.* pp. 2228, 249 ult.,

1 Vocalisation unconfirmed. Arkli Khān, the Sultan’s second son, succeeded his elder brother in 691 as his father’s vicegerent (*nā‘īb i qhaibat*) at Kilok’ārī (*T. i F.* p. 2138-9, Arabic history of Gujarāt p. 7607-8).

2 Baran is now absorbed in the modern town of Bulandshahr.
336\(^{15}\)) was Kōtwāl of Delhi in ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Khaljī’s reign (T. i F. pp. 240\(^{14-15}\), 250\(^{3}\), 255\(^{8-9}\)) and was one of the king’s friends and counsellors (az mukhtassān u rāy-zanān i Sultān ‘Alā’ al-Dīn būd, T. i F. p. 255\(^{8-9}\)). His maternal grandfather, Sipah-sālār Ḥusām al-Dīn (T. i F. p. 119\(^{13}\)), Wakīl i Dar to Malik Bārbak, was appointed by Balban to the Shāhnagī of Lak’hnautī (T. i F. p. 87).

Ḍiyā’ al-Dīn Barānī found a patron in Sultān Muḥammād b. Tughluq \(^{1}\) (reigned 725/1325–752/1351) and spent 17 years and 3 months (T. i F. p. 504\(^{17}\)) at his court (mulāzīm i dargāh, T. i F. p. 504\(^{17}\), muqarrab i dargāh, T. i F. p. 497\(^{17}\)), basking in his favour and munificence (az in’āmāt i waṭirah u șadaqāt i mu’ta-wātirah i  ámb zar-hā yāstah, T. i F. p. 504\(^{18}\)). He does not say that he held any official position, and it seems that he was a nadīm (cf. Siyar al-auliyyā’ p. 313\(^{5}\)) rather than an official. According to the Siyar al-auliyyā’ 312 penult., he was an entertaining conversationalist and raconteur (á majmū’ al-laṭī’īf wa-jawāmī’ al-ḥikāyāt būd).

In the reign of Fīrūz-Shāh (752/1351–790/1388) he suffered a change of fortune. His enemies procured his banishment from court (Dushkmanān-am az haḍrat u az qurb i  ámb marā dūr andākītah and, T. i F. p. 125\(^{4-5}\). Cf. p. 557\(^{11}\) seq.: ba’ād i nāq i sulṭān i mağfīr dar mahālīk i gūnāgūn uftūdām etc.), he was unable to submit his history to the king, a lover of history (T. i F. p. 125\(^{5-6}\)), and he was in a state of misery and poverty (T. i F. pp. 69\(^{10-12}\), 114\(^{16-17}\), 125, 204 ult.–205\(^{12}\), 466\(^{21-22}\), 548\(^{18}\) seq.). His last years were spent in devout retirement, during which he composed several literary works (Siyar al-auliyyā’ p. 313\(^{8-10}\)). He was buried \(^{2}\) near to the grave of Nizām al-Dīn Auliyyā’ (Siyar al-auliyyā’ p. 313\(^{17-18}\)), having been a murīd and a devoted adherent of that saint.

According to the Siyar al-auliyyā’ (p. 313\(^{10-12}\)) he was much

\(^{1}\) Cf. T. i F. p. 467\(^{2-4}\): Man dar dūnīyā parwardah u bar-ūwardah i Sultān Muḥammād am u án-ḵīh az ikram u in’ām i á yāstah būdām nah pīš azān didah būdām nah ba’ād azū ba-khwāb mi bīnam.

\(^{2}\) The date of his death is not mentioned in the Siyar al-auliyyā’. The Khāzināt al-asfiyā’ gives the impossible date 738.
in the society of the poets Khusrau (for whom see pp. 495–505 supra) and Ḥasan Dihlawī. From both of them he received oral information which he utilised in the Tārikḥ i Fīrūz-Shāhī (see, e.g., pp. 6711, 6819, 1834).

In addition to the Tārikḥ i Fīrūz-Shāhī five works of his are mentioned in the Siyar al-auliya’, namely (1) Thanā-yi Muhammada sl’m, (2) Sālāt i kabīr, (3) ‘Ināyat-nāmah i ilāhī, (4) Ma’āthir i sādāt, (5) Ḥasrat-nāmah (dar taṣawwuf, according to Raḥmān ‘Ali). Another work, the Akhbar i Barmakiyān, translated from an Arabic original, completed in 755/1354 and dedicated to Fīrūz-Shāh, is extant in several MSS. (e.g. Rieu i 333b, Ethé 569, Bodleian 308).

Tārikḥ i Fīrūz-Shāhī, a history of the Sultāns of Delhi from Balban A.H. 662/1263-4 (or rather 664/1265) to Fīrūz-Shāh’s sixth year, A.H. 758/1357, forming a continuation of the Tabaqāt i Naṣīrī: Blochet i 557 (defective at both ends. Mid 15th cent.), iv 2327 (17th cent.), Rieu iii 919 (defective at end and elsewhere. 15th cent.), 1014a (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850), 1021a (similar extracts), 1023a (similar extracts), 1045b (similar extracts), Būhār 61 (16th cent.), Bānkipūr vii 546 (from Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluq to Fīrūz-Shāh. 16th cent.), Ethé 211 (A.H. 1007/1599), Bodleian 173 (defective. A.H. 1009/1600), 172 (A.H. 1197/1733), 174 (A.H. 1196/1782), Ivanov Curzon 23 (early 18th cent.), Browne Pers. Cat. 85 (defective and bad copy. Seal dated A.H. 1128/1716), Lindesiana p. 235 no. 823 (A.H. 1230/1815), Āṣāfiyah i p. 228 no. 259, Berlin 477 (defective).

Edition: The Tārikh-i Feroz-shahi of Ziaa al-Din Barni . . .
Edited by Saiyid Ahmad Khân under the superintendence of Captain W. Nassau Lees . . . and Mawlawi Kabir al-Din, Calcutta 1860–2* (Bibliotheca Indica).

Translations of extracts: (1) Elliot and Dowson History of India iii pp. 97–268 (by J. Dowson), (2) Translations from the Tārikh i Fīrūz Shāhī, by the late Major A. R. Fuller . . . The

1 According to the Bodleian catalogue. The date is not mentioned by Rieu or in the I.O. catalogue.

Descriptions: (1) Materials for the history of India . . . By Major W. Nassau Lees (in the JRAS. 1868) pp. 441-5, (2) Elliot and Dowson History of India iii pp. 93-97.


667. Fírúz b. Rajab, better known as Fírúz Sháh Tughluq, succeeded his cousin, M. b. Tughluq, on 24 Muḥarram 752/20 March 1351. The wars of his reign were expeditions to Bengal, Orissa, Nagarkot and Tattah. His passion for building expressed itself in the foundation of a new Delhi named Fírúzābād, in the refounding of Hīsār Fírūzah [i.e. Hīsār, N.W. of Delhi] and Jaumāpur [N.W. of Benares] and in the erection of towns, forts, mosques, colleges and other edifices. His rule was mild and he
prided himself on the abolition of torture and various imposts. He died more than eighty years old in Ramadān 790/September 1388.

_Futūḥat i Fīrūz-Shāhī_, a brief account by Fīrūz Shāh of his own edicts and ordinances, the abuses and evil practices abolished by him, the buildings erected and the works of public utility carried out in his reign: _Rieu_ iii 920 (A.D. 1853).

Edition: _Delhi_ 1885†.

Translation: Elliot and Dowson _History of India_ iii pp. 374–88 (translated by J. Dowson from “a unique copy belonging to Mr. E. Thomas”).

[Barānī _Tārīkh i Fīrūz-Shāhī_ pp. 527–602 = Elliot and Dowson iii pp. 265–8; _Shams i Sirāj Tārīkh i Fīrūz-Shāhī_ = E. & D. iii pp. 269–373; other histories of India; _Ency. Isl._ under Fīrūz Shāh Taghlak.]

668. In 772/1370–1, the twentieth year of Fīrūz-Shāh’s reign, an anonymous author completed his

_Sirāt i Fīrūz-Shāhī_, a florid and eulogistic account of Fīrūz-Shāh in four bābs (182 foll.): _Bānkīpur_ vii 547 (A.H. 1002/1593–4).


669. _Shams i Sirāj_ [i.e. Shams al-Dīn b. Sirāj al-Dīn] ‘Affīf

---

1 This record was inscribed by Fīrūz-Shāh’s order on an octagonal cupola erected by him on the mosque of Fīrūzābād (see _Tabaqāt i Aḥkārī_ i p. 239).

2 It appears that ‘Affīf was a hereditary surname in his family, since he appends it to the names of his grandfather, Shams i Shīhāb ‘Affīf (T. i F. p. 391), and his great-grandfather, Malik Sa‘d al-Mulk Shīhāb ‘Affīf (p. 377–8).
says (T. i F. p. 31014-16) that he was twelve years old when Firöz-Shâh after his return from Tattah (T. i F. p. 30514-15) had two ancient stone columns (manârahâ-yi sangîn, i.e. Asoka pillars) removed from Töprâh and Meerut to Delhi. Rieu, placing the return from Tattah in the year 763/1361–2,1 infers that Shams i Sirâj was born in 751/1350–1, but the words used by Shams i Sirâj do not necessarily imply that the columns were removed immediately after the return from Tattah. His great-grandfather, Malik Sa’d al-Mulk Shihâb ‘Afif, was appointed ‘Amâldâr of Abûbar [in the Firûzpur District] by Sultan Ghiyâth al-Dîn Tughluq (T. i F. p. 377-8).

His father was in the service of Firöz-Shâh (cf. T. i F. pp. 130 penult.–13112, 14510-10, 19611-12), at one time as Shub-nawis i Khavâssân (T. i F. p. 12716), at another time in the Wazîr’s office (dar mahall i diwân i wizârat, p. 19711-13), and he was in the Sultan’s suite on the expeditions to Jâñagar (pp. 16314, 17215) and Nagarkot (p. 18612).

Shams i Sirâj thus grew up at the court of Firöz-Shâh and for many years used to accompany the officials of the Wazîr’s office to the audience chamber (T. i F. p. 10512-15: i mû’arrîkh i qâ’if..., kîh dar mu’dad i cîkid sîlân-hadrat râ didah u bâshâr sanawâth pîsh i takht-gâh i ahl i barakât barâbar i ašhâb i diwân i wizârat dar mahall i salâm raftah. Cf. p. 28111-11: dar-ân aiyâm i mû’arrîkh i qâ’if..., bar [âbar] i ašhâb i diwân i ‘âli i wizârat ba-hukm i farnâmân i hadrat i jahân-dar dar mahall i salâm mû-raft; 28512-13: andar-ân aiyâm kîh i n mû’arrîkh... dar mahall i salâm pîsh i takht mû-raft). He used to accompany the Sultan on his hunting expeditions (T. i F. p. 321 ult.-3221). His Târikh i Firöz-Shâhî was written subsequently to Timûr’s invasion of 801/1398.

The Târikh i Firöz-Shâhî (a title which does not seem to occur in the work itself) was not the whole of the author’s historical writing. He wrote also about the manâqib i Sultan [Ghiyâth al-Dîn] Tughluq (T. i F. p. 3611-12 = E. & D. iii p. 271), the manâqib i Sultan Muhammad [ibn Tughluq] (T. i F. pp. 4211-13, 5116-6 =

1 This date does not seem to have the authority of the Târikh i Firöz-Shâhî.
E. & D. iii pp. 274, 279), the manāqib i Sultān Muḥammad [ibn Fīrūz] (T. i F. pp. 148 ult.–1491, 4284 = E. & D. iii pp. 307, 371) and about the khārābī i Dihlī owing to Mongol incursions after Fīrūz-Shāh’s time (T. i F. p. 1856 = E. & D. iii p. 317). These do not seem to be the titles of other works by the author. It is probable that they indicate parts of a large work now lost apart from the fragment known as the Tāriḥ i Fīrūz-Shāhī.

(Tāriḥ i Fīrūz-Shāhī), a life of Fīrūz-Shāh Tughluq (reigned A.H. 752/1351–760/1358) written subsequently to Tīmūr’s invasion of 801/1398 (which is mentioned on p. 314) and divided into five qisms each subdivided into eighteen muqaddimahs:


Translation of extracts: Elliot and Dowson History of India iii pp. 271–373 (the translator was J. Dowson).

Description: Elliot and Dowson History of India iii pp. 269–71.


670. Yahyā b. Ahmad b. 'Abd Allāh Sīhrindī ¹ dedicated his Tārīkh i Mubārak-Shāhī to Mu‘izz al-Dīn Abū ‘l-Fāth Mubārak Shāh (of the Saiyid dynasty), who reigned from 824/1421 to 837/1433.

_Tārīkh i Mubārak-Shāhī_, a history of the Sultāns of Delhi from Mu‘izz al-Dīn M. b. Sām to Shābūn 831/1428 with a later continuation ending abruptly in Rabī‘ ii 838/1434, the first year of M. Shāh b. Farīd Shāh (who reigned a.h. 837/1433-847/1443) : Bodleian 175 (A.H. 957/1550), Rieu iii 1010a (19th cent.).

Edition: _Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī of Yahyā... as-Sīhrindī... edited by... M. Hidayat Hosain..._. Calcutta 1931* (Bibliotheca Indica).

English translation: _The Tārīkh-i-Mubārakshāhī by Yāhiyā [sic] bin Ahmad... Sirhindi translated... by K. K. Basu..._. Baroda 1932* (Gaekwad’s Oriental Series).

Description and 81 pp. of translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson History of India iv pp. 6–88 (the translator was J. Dowson).

671. Shaikh Rizq Allāh “Mushtāqī” b. Sa‘d Allāh Dihlawī, a paternal uncle of ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Dihlawī (for whom see pp. 194–5 supra), was born in 897/1491-2. wandered about as a _faqīr_ meeting innumerable shaikhs and died on 20 Rabī‘ i A.H. 989/1581.

¹ So spelt in the B.M. MS. (Sīhrindī in the Bodleian MS., according to Ethé) with _yā’_ after the _sīn_.


He wrote poetry both in Hindi and Persian. As a Hindi poet he used the pen-name "Rājan".

Waqqiāt i Mushtaqi, a disorderly collection of narratives and anecdotes relating to the times of the Lōdīs, of Bābur, Humāyūn and Akbar, of the Sūrs, of Ghīyāth al-Dīn Khaljī (of Mālwah), of Naṣir al-Dīn Khaljī and of Muẓaffar Shāh of Gujrāt: Rieu ii 820b (lacking circ. 12 foll. at end. 17th cent.), iii 921b (defective. Circ. A.D. 1850).


Description and 20 pp. of translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson History of India iv pp. 534–57.

[Dhikr al-mulūk; Nūr al-Ḥaqq Zubdat al-tawwārikh; Tārīkh i Khān-i-Jahānī (Rieu p. 210) fol. 4a; Makhzan i Aqfānī (Dorn History of the Afghans p. 3); Kalimāt al-sādīqīn no. 111 (see Bānkipūr viii p. 44); Ḥākbōr al-akhkār p. 174; ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Dīlawī Taḥkīrah i muṣannifīn i Dīlī p. 20 (translated in Elliot and Dowson vi p. 489); Tabaqat i Shāh-Jahānī; Rīyāḍ al-aṭlīyā‘; Sawāṭi‘ al-anwār (Ethé col. 331 ult.); Elliot and Dowson History of India iv 534–7; Rieu ii 821a; Beale Oriental biographical dictionary, 2nd ed. p. 333; Rāhmān ‘Alī 63.]

672. ‘Abbās Khān b. Shaikh ‘Alī Sarwānī was descended from a certain ‘Abbās Khān, whose son, Ḥasnū Khān, married a sister of Shēr Shāh’s. He himself received a command of 500 horse from Akbar, but, having soon lost it through the intrigues of his enemies, he resolved to "return to the country of his fathers". The Khān i Khānān, however, "procured for him a clear 200 rupees a month, which he appears to have lost soon afterwards" (Elliot and Dowson iv pp. 301–2).

Tuhfah i Akbar-Shāhī, better known by the description Tārīkh i Shēr-Shāhī, written by order of Akbar probably soon after 987/1579, a valuable though prolix and tedious biography of Shēr Shāh and his descendants extant apparently in three
recensions (1) beginning Ḥamād i ān Qādir i bī-ḵān and containing only the life of Shīr Shāh, (2) beginning Ḥar jins i ḥamād and divided into three bābs ((a) Shīr Khān, (b) Islām Khān, (c) relatives of Shīr Khān who claimed sovereignty after Islām Khān), (3) beginning Baʿd az ḥamād i Īzādī, an edition revised and enlarged by Ibrāhīm Bātānī, who brought the history down to a.h. 1021/1612: Ethé 219 (shorter recension, divided into three bābs and beginning [Har?] Jins i ḥamād wāthānuṭyāh (?) Khāliq i barīyāh rā sazād. A.H. 1030/1621), Browne Suppt. 240 (A.H. 1097/1686), Bodleian 176 (ending, “as usual,” with Shīr Shāh’s death. A.H. 1191/1777), 177 (beginning Baʿd az ḥamād i Īzādī. Revised and enlarged by Ibrāhīm Bātānī, who brought the history down to a.h. 1021/1612. Ends with a third daftar on shaikhās and sūfīs), 178 (same recension. A.H. 1227/1812), Rieu i 242b (ending with Shīr Shāh’s death. 18th cent.), ii 827b (shorter recension, beginning Ḥar jins i ḥamād. A.H. 1215/1801), iii 921a (ending with Shīr Shāh’s death. A.H. 1239/1824), 921a (extracts. Circ. a.d. 1850), 921a (shorter recension, beginning Ḥar jins i ḥamād. Circ. a.d. 1850).

Description and 129 pp. of translated extracts (virtually an abridged translation of the whole work): Elliot and Dowson History of India iv pp. 301–433 (the translator was E. C. Bayley).


---

1 According to Elliot and Dowson iv p. 302 “Copies of the work vary very much, and, in some, long passages are omitted”. In some copies (apparently those beginning Ḥar jins i ḥamād) the initial doxology is followed by the rubric Tābāqāt i šīwān dar ḍhārīr i aḥwāl i saṭṭanat i Shīr Shāh Sār, which would suggest that the work is only part of a larger work.

2 Cf. Rieu i p. 212.

3 No daftars or other divisions are marked in the history which precedes.
673. The Tārīkh i Dā‘ūdī was written in the time of Jahāngīr, who is mentioned (see Elliot and Dowson History of India iv p. 462) as the reigning sovereign, by an author whose name does not occur in the preface, but who incidentally [on fol. 176 in the B.M. MS. Or. 1701 (Rieu 922a)] calls himself ‘Abd Allāh.


Description and 78 pp. of translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson History of India iv 434–513 (the translator was C. F. Mackenzie).

674. Ahmad Yādgār, who describes himself ¹ as an old servant of the Sūr kings and who mentions ² that his father was Wazīr to Mīrzā ‘Askari (Bābur’s third son) in the Gujrat campaign (i.e. in 942–3/1536–7), wrote his Tārīkh i salāfīn i Afāqīnāh at the suggestion of Abū ‘l-Muẓaffar Dā‘ūd Shāh [i.e. presumably Dā‘ūd Shāh b. Sulaimān, the last of the Afghān kings of Bengal, who reigned from 980/1572 to 984/1576]. It was not, however, until much later that the Tārīkh i salāfīn i Afāqīnāh was completed in its present form, since the Ma‘dīn al-akhbār i Ahmadī, which was written circ. 1023/1614–15 (see p. 124 supra), is several times mentioned as one of the sources. A still later date (A.H. 1095/1684) seems to be indicated by another passage ("p. 89b of MS.") where, according to Beveridge, a village in the

¹ In his preface.
² "At p. 99 of the MS." (i.e. the A.S.B. MS.) according to Beveridge, who in the article cited below quotes the passage (In da‘īf az pidar i khwud kh dar-ān vaqt wazīr i Mīrzā ‘Askari hūd shanidah būdam).
parganah of Kait‘hal is said to have remained a desert for 160 years since a punitive expedition against the Mundahars in 935), but this, if the text is not corrupt, must certainly have been added by a later writer than Ahmad Yādgār.

Tārikh i salātīn i Afghīnīnā, a history of the Lōdī and Sūr dynasties ending with the death of Hīmū and agreeing largely with the Tārikh i Dā‘ūdī and in the reign of Humāyūn verbatim with the Tabaqāt i Akbarī: Būhār 62 (19th cent.), Ivanov 114 (late 19th cent.), Rieu iii 922 (extract only, Humāyūn’s reign to a.h. 949. Transcribed circ. a.d. 1850 from Ivanov 114).


Description and 64 pp. of translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson History of India v pp. 1–66 (the translator of nearly all the passages was C. F. Mackenzie).


675. M. Kabīr b. Shaikh Ismā‘īl Ḥaziyā (? ) was the son of a daughter of Shaikh Khalil Allāh Ῥaqqānī, an Afghān saint of Rājgīr (Rājagriha in the Patna District) who died in the Panjāb in Akbar’s time.*

Afsānah i shāhān, 140 narratives and anecdotes concerning the Afghān (Lōdī and Sūr) Sulṭāns of Delhi: Rieu i 243b (18th cent.).

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (c) THE TIMŪRIDS (1) GENERAL

676. For the (Tārikh i khānadān i Timūriyāh), a history of Timūr (foll. 7–134), his successors to Sulṭān Ḥusain Mīrzā (foll. 136–234), Bābūr (foll. 238–73), Humāyūn (foll. 273–95) and Akbar to the 22nd year of his reign, see pp. 298–9 supra.
677. In the reign of Shāh-Jahān (A.H. 1037/1628-1068/1658) was written

A short (78 foll.) history of Bābur, Akbar and Shāh-Jahān, preceded by an account of Timūr (beg. Mahāmīd i jamālah): Bānkīpur vii 571 (ends abruptly in Shāh Jahān's eighth regnal year. 17th cent.).

678. M. Bakhtāwar Khān has already been mentioned (p. 132 supra) as the ostensible author of the Mirāt al-‘alām composed in 1078/1667.

Tārīkh i Hindi,¹ a history of India from Bābur to Aurangzēb: Princeton 468.

679. For the Jawāhir al-tawārīkh of Salmān Qazwīnī, a history of the Mughuls from Adam to A.H. 1037/1627 written in the reign of Aurangzēb (A.H. 1068/1658-1118/1707), see p. 298 supra.

680. Saiyid Muḥaddal Khān has already been mentioned (p. 135 supra) as the author of a general history entitled Tārīkh i Muḥaddalī.

(Timūr-nāmahi Muḥaddalī), a short history of the Timūrids to the reign of Farrukh-siyar (A.H. 1124/1713-1131/1719): Rieu iii 923b (ends abruptly in F.’s reign. Circ. A.D. 1850), 1054b (extracts only).

681. M. Hādī entitled Kāmwar Khān has already been mentioned (pp. 459-60 supra) as the author of the Haft gulshan i Muḥammad-Shāhī completed in, or soon after, 1132/1719-20

Tadhkirat al-salāṭīn i Chaghata, a history of the house of Timūr, especially its Indian branch, written after the Haft gulshan (see p. 459) ² and divided into two volumes ((1) from the

¹ According to Martinovitch this work “is not to be confused with Marāt al-‘Alām [sic] ‘The Mirror of the World’, a general history by the same author”.

² According to the preface of the later edition of the Haft gulshan (Rethé 394) the Tadhkirat al-salāṭīn i Chaghata was begun in 1135/1722-3.
origin of the Turks to the death of Jahāṅgīr, (2) from Shāh-Jahān’s accession to the sixth or (in one or two MSS.) the seventh year of Muhammad Shāh, A.H. 1137–8/1724–5) ¹: Rieu iii 924 (vol. i only. Autograph, A.H. 1135/1723), i 274b (vol. i, lacking Jahāṅgīr’s reign. 18th cent.), 275a (vol. i. 18th cent.), 275a (extracts from vol. i. 19th cent.), iii 1022a (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850), Glasgow (see J.R.A.S. 1906, p. 596, no. 5) (A.H. 1140/1727), Bānkīpūr vii 591 (vol. i–ii, ending with 6th year of Md. Shāh. Vol. i dated A.H. 1154/1741), Ethé 395 (large portion of vol. ii, extending from A.H. 1039/1630 to 1132/1719–20, but with lacunae. Not later than A.H. 1197/1783), L.O. D.P. 591 (vol. i. A.H. 1255/1839), L.O. 3918 (vol. ii, extending to end of Jumādā i A.H. 1136/1724, the second month of M. Shāh’s sixth regnal year. A.D. 1883), 4010 (extract from vol. ii, viz. Bahādur Shāh’s reign to 1 Sha‘bān 1123/14 Sept. 1711 in the fifth and penultimate year. Probably A.D. 1897 or 1898), 4074 (vol. ii, extending to beginning of M. Shāh’s seventh year, but damaged and lacking the whole of Aurangzēb’s reign and most of Bahādur Shāh’s. 18th cent.), Blochet i 605–6 (complete apparently. 18th cent.), 607 (end of vol. i and beginning of vol. ii, from Akbar to 29th year of Aurangzēb. Late 18th cent.), 608 (vol. ii, lacking end of Aurangzēb’s reign and nearly all of Md. Shāh’s. 18th cent.), 609 (part of vol. ii, from Bahādur Shāh to beginning of Farrukh-siyar’s reign. Late 18th cent.), 610 (part of vol. ii, from death of Aurangzēb to 6th year of Md. Shāh. 18th cent.), 611 (part of vol. ii, from death of Aurangzēb to 5th year of Md. Shāh. 18th cent.), Majlis 244 (vol. i. A.H. 1234/1818–19), Būhār 77 (vol. i. 19th cent.), 78 (vol. ii, to 6th year of Md. Shāh. A.D. 1870), R.A.S. P. 100 = Morley 96 (vol. i), P. 101 = Morley 97 (vol. ii, to 7th year of Md. Shāh), Ivanow 168 (vol. i–ii).

Descriptions: (1) W. Nassau Lees Materials for the history of India (J.R.A.S. 1868) pp. 469–70, (2) Elliot and Dowson History of India viii 17–20 (with an extract of 1 p.).

¹ “In the later years of the work it is little more than a record of appointments and promotions, with the concomitant presents and offerings” (Elliot and Dowson viii p. 18).
682. For Ḥājjī Mīr M. Salīm's *Silsilat al-salāfūn* [?], of which the first part is a history of the Mughul race from Adam onwards, Chingiz Khān, Timūr etc., and especially of the Indian Timūrīs to Muḥammad Shāh (reigned A.H. 1131/1719–1161/1748) see p. 381 supra.


684. Dalpat Rāy entitled (mukhātab) Rāo Dalpat Sing’h was born at Ahmadābād, where his father, Gulāb Rāy, was Mutaṣaddār. He made himself well acquainted with Arabic, Persian, Sanskrit, Prākrit and Bhaṭk’hā (i.e. Hindi). For eight years he was in the service of Mahārājā Jagat Sing’h of Udaipur (reigned 1147/1734–1165/1751), for whom he prepared a Hindi translation of the *Diwān* of Ḥāfīz. The invasion of Ahmad Shāh Abdālī in 1173 (or rather 1174/1760) compelled him to leave Delhi, where he was staying, for Jaipur. Here at the age of 57 years he undertook by order of Mahārājā Mād’hau Sing’h (d. 1181/1767–8) his *Malāḥāt i magāl*, completed after the Mahārājā’s death, a collection of historical anecdotes, the first part relating to the Timūrīs and their amīrs in chronological order with some account of Jagat Sing’h and Mād’hau Sing’h, the second part miscellaneous under subject headings: *Ivanov* Curzon 119 (A.H. 1235/1819–20), *Rieu* iii 1005b (circ. A.D. 1850).

1 Ethé’s identification of this person with the author of the *Tārīkh i Nādirī* (for which see p. 322 supra) is of course incorrect.
685. Sultān ‘Ali Ḥusainī Mūsawī Ṣafawī Ardabīlī travelled eastward from Ardabil, his native place, and settled at Lucknow in the time of Shuja‘ al-Daulah. In the second year of the reign of Sa‘ādat-‘Ali, A.H. 1213/1798, he decided to write a history of India from the time of Timūr to the death of Muḥammad Shāh.


English translation of the preface and table of contents: B.M. MS. Add. 30,781 foll. 30-56.

Description: Elliot and Dowson History of India viii p. 354. [Ma‘dīn al-sa‘ādat, preface (see Elliot and Dowson loc. cit.).]

686. Sūfī Ṣan‘ān b. Mirzā Bābā wrote the

Tārikh al-salāṭīn, a short (34 foll.) and negligible chronicle of Timūr’s successors and the Indian Mughuls to Shāh-‘Ālam: Ethish 428 (A.H. 1220/1806. Autograph?).

687. Maulawī Khair al-Dīn Muḥammad Ṯāḥābādī was born at Allahabad on 12 Ẓafar 1165/31 Dec. 1751. Educated at Allahabad and Jaunpūr, he became a teacher in a madrasah of his own (madrasah i khwud) at Allahabad, but when the province of Allahabad was transferred by the E.I.Co. to Nawwāb Shujā‘ al-Daulah [after the Treaty of Benares in 1773¹], the Nawwāb confiscated the stipends of the teachers of Allahabad, and Khair al-Dīn M. sought employment with officials of the E.I.Co. He was attached to the staff of Captain W. Bruce in the operations which led to the capture of Gwalior in 1780. Subsequently he assisted James Anderson, British Resident in Sindhiyāḥ’s camp, in his negotiations with the Marāṭhās, but

¹ The printed text of the Taḥkīr al-‘ulamā’ (p. 63²) gives the date 1176, probably an error or misprint for 1186, though the correct date is 1187.
left his service in 1200/1785 on account of illness and returned to Allahabad. After a short period in the service of the Shāh-zādah Jahāndār Shāh, he went from his birthplace to Lucknow in 1202/1788 (Rieu iii 946a) or 1206/1791–2 (Rieu iii 1028b) at the request of Āṣaf al-Daulah. Then for some years he taught at Allahabad and Benares. In 1209/1794–5 the practice of appointing British judges and registrars was introduced, and he served under two successive judges at Jaunpūr, the second being A. Welland. It was at Jaunpūr that he spent the years of his retirement. He died about 1827.

At the end of his Tadhkira al-‘ulamā’, on the scholars of Jaunpūr, written in 1216/1801 (Edition: Calcutta 1934), he mentions numerous works of his own. These include (1) ‘Ibrat-nāmah, on the reign of Shāh-‘Ālam (see p. 641 infra), (2) Jaunpūr-nāmah (see p. 698 infra), (3) Tuhfah i tāzah, on the history of Benares (see p. 702 infra), (4) Guvvaliyār-nāmah (see p. 736 infra), (5) ‘Ālam-āshūb, a history of India from Nādir Shāh’s invasion to the death of Najaf Khān (this work he describes as unfinished), (6) Gulsār i asrār, anecdotes of Indian saints, (7) Sarābistān, anecdotes of Indian kings, (8) Khair al-majālis, an abridgment of Nūr Allāh Shūshtari’s Majālis al-mu‘minin, (9) Burhān i imāmat, written by order of Āṣaf al-Daulah, (10) Khvāvārig i Qādirīyah, written at the request of Shāh-‘Ālam, as well as works on such subjects as dogmatic theology, law, logic, philosophy, rhetoric and grammar. A work entitled Tawallā-yi ‘Azīz, in which he seeks to show that the author of the Tuhfah i Ithnā-‘Ashārīyah [i.e. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Dihlawi, for whom see pp. 24–5 supra] was secretly a Shi’ite, is preserved in the India Office (D.P. 273 (a)). For his account of a short period in the history of Oudh (Rieu iii 948a) see p. 704 infra.

Sketch of Timurid history from Bābur to Shāh-‘Ālam with a chronological abstract of the latter’s reign to his death in 1221/1806: Rieu iii 948a (circ. A.D. 1850).

[Autobiography in the Tadhkira al-‘ulamā’, khūtānimah (Calcutta edition pp. 67–75, trans. pp. 74–82); autobiographical statements in the Jaunpūr-nāmah (see Rieu i 311a), the Tuhfah i tāzah (see Rieu iii pp. 964b, 965a), the ‘Ibrat-nāmah (see Rieu iii
946) and the Gwāliyār-nāmah (see Rieu iii 1028b); Elliot and Dowson History of India viii p. 237; Rieu iii 946, 964, 1028b, i 311; Bānkīpūr vii pp. 97, 140; Buckland Dictionary of Indian biography p. 235.

688. M. ‘Ali Khān Anṣāri has already been mentioned (p. 144 supra) as the author of the general history Bahr al-mawwāj completed according to the preface in 1209/1794-5 but in fact extending to 1211/1796. The part of that history relating to the Indian Timūrids is for all practical purposes a reproduction of the Tārikh i Muẓaffari, which was composed originally in 1202/1787-8 for the purpose of obtaining the patronage of Muʿīn al-Daulah Mubāriz al-Mulk Khān i Khānān S. M. Riḍā Khān Bahādur Muẓaffar-Jang (Nāʿīb-Nāẓim of Bengal and Bihār), then resident at Mursīhīdābād, where he died in Ṣafar 1206/1791.


1 These MSS., if they had been identified sooner, would have appeared on p. 144 supra, but this place is almost equally appropriate, since the part of the Bahr al-mawwāj dealing with the Indian Timūrids is practically identical with the Tārikh i Muẓaffari.
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Shāh-‘Ālam’s reign, the last date being 1202/1788. 19th cent.), possibly also vii 545 (Shāh-‘Ālam’s reign to A.H. 1200/1785. 19th cent.), ‘Alīgārī Subhān Allāh MSS. p. 58 no. 954 (8), Āṣafiyah i p. 230 nos. 450 and 722.

Extracts translated by Dīn Muḥammad: B.M. MS. Add. 30782 foll. 206–32.

Extracts translated by J. Dowson: Elliot and Dowson History of India viii pp. 317–30.

689. Mahārājāh Kalyān Sing’h b. Shitāb Rāy (see p. 719 infra).

Khulāsat al-tawārikh, a history in two bābs of which the first deals with the Indian Timūrids to A.H. 1227/1812 and the second, which has in some MSS. the independent title Wāridāt i Qāsimī and is the longer and by far the more important, with the Nāzims of Bengal. For further information see p. 721 below.


(Mukhtāsar dar ahwāl i Timūriyāh), an untitled sketch of Indian history under the Timūrids to the year 1228/1813 (more than half of the work being devoted to Shāh-‘Ālam II) written in 1245/1829–30 at the request of Mahā-rājāh Kirat Chand: I.O. 4429 (circ. A.D. 1850).

691. M. Riḍā “Najm” Ṭabāṭabā 1 has already been mentioned (pp. 148, 488 supra) as the author of the Zubdat al-gharā‘ib, the Majma‘ al-mulūk and the Akhbārāt i Hind.


1 Ṭabāṭabā, not Ṭabāṭabā’ī, seems to be the form used by M. Riḍā himself in his prefaces etc.
692. Rājah Apūrva Krishna “Kunwar”, or Apūrva Krishna Dēva, born in 1815 (see Proceedings of the A.S.B., 1925 p. xxxi), was the son of Rājah Rāj Krishna (d. A.D. 1823, aged 42 1) and the grandson of Rājah Nava Krishna, the “Nob Kissen” who rendered important services to the British in Clive’s time and whose name is repeatedly mentioned in the histories of that period. 2 He was thus a brother of Mahārājah Sir Narendra Krishna, K.C.I.E., and of Rājah Kāli Krishna. On the title-page of the Shāh-nāmah i Hind (Calcutta 1848) he is described as “Honorary Poet to His Majesty the King of Delhi, and Member of the Hamburg Academy, &c., &c., &c.” According to Loke Nath Ghose he died in 1867. He seems to have lived a simple and uneventful life at Sovabazar, Calcutta. For his diwān see Sprenger p. 474.

Shāh-nāmah i Hind (on the English title-page The History of the Conquerors of Hind from the most early period to the present time: containing an account of the religion, government, usages and character of the inhabitants of that kingdom), a poem of which the two chapters published in 1848 extend to the time of Bābur but are concerned mainly with Timūr and Shāh-Rukh: Lindesiana p. 114 no. 774 (vol. (chapter?) iv (reigns of Bābur and Humāyūn). A.H. 1257/1841).

Editions: Calcutta 1848* (chapters i and ii (only ?), extending to the time of Bābur but dealing mainly with Timūr and Shāh-Rukh. The B.M. has chapter i), Lahore [1899*], chapters i and ii only].

[Taiyib Allāh Lives of Maha Raja Apurva Krishna Bahadur . . . his father and grandfather (Mathnawi i Taiyib Allāh), Calcutta 1847°; Sprenger p. 474; Garcin de Tassy i pp. 217–18; Loke Nath Ghose The modern history of the Indian chiefs, rajas, zamindars, etc., pt. ii, Calcutta 1881, p. 121.]

1 See Genealogical and other accounts of Maha-Raja Kali-Krishna Bahadur, Calcutta 1841*, p. 5.

693. For the Tārīkh i Farah-bakhsh of M. Faid-Bakhsh Kākōrī which begins with a history of the Timūrids see p. 706 below.

694. Mīrzā Asad Allāh Khān "Ghālib" b. ʿAbd Allāh Bēg Khān was born at Āgra on 8 Rajab 1212/27 Dec. 1797. His grandfather was a Turk of Samarqand who had migrated to India in Shāh-ʿĀlam’s reign and had been given a mansāb by Najaf Khān. "Ghālib" was only five years old when his father, at that time a military officer in the service of Rājah Bakhtāwar Sing’h of Alwar, was killed in battle. He and his younger brother were adopted by their uncle, Naṣr Allāh Bēg Khān, a commander of 400 horse in Lord Lake’s army, but, when "Ghālib" was nine years old, his uncle died, and his jāgīr, consisting of two parganahs in the neighbourhood of Āgra, reverted to the government. In compensation "Ghālib" was granted a small government pension, which for the greater part of his life seems to have been almost his only regular income.

In 1266/1850 Bahādur Shāh conferred upon him the titles of Najm al-Daulah Dabīr al-Mulk Niẓām-Jang and appointed him to write a history of the Timūrids at a salary of Rs. 50 a month. The Mihr i nūm-rūz published in 1852 represents the first half of this task, but "Ghālib", who was evidently in no hurry to complete the undertaking, had not written the second half when the Mutiny of 1857 led to the deposition of Bahādur Shāh. Wājīd ʿAli Shāh, King of Oudh (A.H. 1263/1847-1272/1856), granted "Ghālib" a stipend of Rs. 500 a year, but only two years afterwards, in 1856, Oudh was annexed by the E.I.Co. and that stipend ceased. Two years after the Mutiny Nawwāb Yūsuf ʿAli Khān of Rāmpūr assigned to him a pension of Rs. 100 a month, and this was continued by Nawwāb Kalb-ʿAli Khān to the end of "Ghālib's" life. He died at Delhi on 2 Dhū 'l-Qa'dah 1285/14 Feb. 1869¹ at the age of 73.

It is chiefly as an Urdu poet—one of the greatest, if not actually the greatest—that "Ghālib" is still remembered. His

¹ 15 Feb. 1869 according to the Yādgār i Ghālib, p. 108, but, as 15 Feb. was 3 Dhū 'l-Qa'dah, either the Muḥammadan or the Christian date must be incorrect.
Urdu diwān has often been published (e.g. Cawnpore 1278/1861°, Lucknow 1873*, 1881°, Cawnpore 1887*, Delhi 1889*) and under the title Muraqqa’ i Chughtāy [sic] (with illustrations by M. ‘Abd al-Rahmān Chughtāy) at Lahore in [1928]. Other Urdu works well known in India are Urdu i mu’allā, a collection of letters, and ‘Urū i Hindī, a collection of letters and reviews.

His Persian poetical works have been published under the title Kulliyāt i Ghālib at Lucknow in 1872° and 1924–5° (3rd ed.). A Persian diwān, doubtless for the most part identical with the Kulliyāt, was published at Delhi in 1261/1845 (506 pp. See Sprenger p. 410), and there is a MS. at Bānkīpūr (Catalogue, vol. iii no. 441). The Abr i guhar-bār, an unfinished māthnawī on the life of Muḥammad, was published separately at Delhi in 1280/1863° and is included in the Lucknow Kulliyāt (p. 111). The Qasīdāh i bar-guzīdah, an ode to Queen Victoria, of which there is a manuscript in the Bibliotheca Lindesiana (Catalogue p. 202 no. 613), is also in the Kulliyāt (p. 241).

Of his Persian prose works in addition to the Mihr i nīm-rūz the following have been published: (1) Panj āhang, a collection of letters, prose compositions, lists of words and other material useful to a student of inshāʾ,1 Delhi 1853* and in the Kulliyāt i nakhir i Ghālib, [Lucknow], 1871°*, pp. 2–254. Cawnpore 1884*, 1888*. (2) Qāṭi’i burkhān, criticisms of the Persian dictionary Burkhān i qāṭi’, [Lucknow], 1278/1862°. (3) Dirafsh i Kāvāyānī, an enlarged edition of the preceding, Delhi 1865°. (4) Dastanbūy, reminiscences of the Mutiny at Delhi, Bareilly 1871* and in the

1 The Panj āhang, described inexacty in the India Office catalogue as “a treatise on grammar and lexicography”, contains (1) Alyāb u ādāb u nūmātib i mutu’ālīqah i ān, i.e. complimentary formulae for use at the beginning and end of letters, pp. 4–21, (2) (a) rules for forming tenses etc. of the verb from the principal parts, pp. 21–26, (b) a list of verbs with their principal parts, pp. 26–33, (c) a list of idiomatic phrases, pp. 33–5, (d) a short glossary of more or less uncommon words, pp. 35–9, (3) a collection of verses by “Ghālib” suitable for quotation in letters, pp. 39–47, (4) a collection of prefaces, laudatory notices of books (taqārīz), and other prose pieces pp. 47–96, (5) letters to friends of the author, pp. 96–254. The pagination given above is that of the Kulliyāt i nakhir i Ghālib, in which the Panj āhang occupies pp. 2–254, the Mihr i nīm-rūz pp. 255–376 and the Dastanbūy pp. 377–410.
Kulliyāt i nathr i Ghālib, [Lucknow], 1871°*, pp. 377–416, Cawnpore 1884†, 1888*.

Mihr i nīm-rūz, a short history of the Timurid line from the Creation to the reign of Humāyūn undertaken by the author on receiving the titles of Najm al-Daulah, Dābir al-Mulk and Nizām-Jang from Bahādur Shāh on 23 Sha‘bān 1266/4 June 1850 and intended to form the first half of a work entitled Partawistān and to be followed by a second half entitled Māh i nīm-māh dealing with the period from Akbar to Bahādur Shāh 1: I.O. D.P. 583 (a.h. 1270/1854).

Editions: Fakhr al-maṭābi’ [Delhi?] 1268/1852*, 1271/1854–5, 2 and in the Kulliyāt i nathr i Ghālib, Nawal Kishr, [Lucknow], 1871°*, pp. 255–376, Cawnpore 1884†, 1888*.

[Autobiographical statements in Dastanbūy, esp. pp. 392–5, Mihr i nīm-rūz, preface, and various passages in his poems; Gulshan i bī-khār (cf. Sprenger p. 228); Riyāḍ al-afkār (Bānkīpūr Suppt. i p. 57); Sprenger pp. 204, 228, 410; Haft āsmān pp. 166–7; Garcin de Tassy i pp. 475–82 (where will be found an abridged French translation of the obituary notice in the Awad’h akhbar of 16.3.1869); M. Ḥusain “Āzād” Ab i ḫayāt (in Urdu. Originally published circa. 1880), Lahore 1899, pp. 466–99; Bānkīpūr iii pp. 269–70; Ency. Isl. under Ghālib (Blumhardt); Alğāf Ḥusain “Ḥāli” Yādgār i Ghālib (in Urdu), Lucknow 1924; Saksēna A history of Urdu literature pp. 158–68, 263–5; T. Grahame Bailey A history of Urdu literature pp. 71–2, 84; an Urdu biography, Ghālib, by Ghulām-Rasūl “Mihr” (Lahore, date not stated) was reviewed at some length by S. M. ’Abd Allāh in the Oriental College Magazine Vol. xiii no. 1 (Nov. 1936) pp. 71–84; Portraits facing p. 376 and Hisṣah i nathr p. 28 in the Urdu translation of Saksēna’s work (Tārikh i adab i Urdu, Lucknow 1929).]

695. By desire of Bahādur Shāh, the last Emperor of Delhi

1 The second half was never written (see Yādgār i Ghālib p. 35).
2 The chronogrammatic colophon of an edition lithographed at the Fakhr al-maṭābi’ in this year is reprinted in the [Lucknow] edition of 1871.
(1253/1837–1275/1857), Muḥammad Fakhr al-Dīn Ḥusain with the assistance of Ḥākim M. Aḥsan Allāh Khān and the painters Ghulām ‘Alī Khān and Bābur ‘Alī Khān began in 1266/1849–50 and completed in the following year.

*Mīrāt al-ashbāḥ i salāṭīn i āsmān-jāh,* chronological tables of the Indian Timūrids with their portraits and pictures of their tombs: *Lindesiana* p. 137 no. 775 (circa 1850. Possibly this may be a copy of the lithograph mentioned below).

Edition: [Delhi ?] 1267/1851° (see Rieu i 285a).


*Awīmāq [sic 5°] i Mughul,* 6 completed in August 1900 apart from a (second) *khāṭimah* added in November 1901, an account

---

1 Not Khān.

2 A genealogical tree of the author’s family (*Shajarah i Qājāriyah i Barkīs*) is given on p. 54 of the A. i M.

3 This Sōngarḥ is to be distinguished from better known places of the same name in Baroda and Kathiawar.

4 The precise title of his office is not stated. On the title-page the author is described merely as a resident (*sikīn*) of Sōngarḥ.

5 This word is so vocalised on the title-page and in some chronomrammetric verses (not by the author) at the end, one line being *Wā-lam wynqam bi-hādhā l-Jarzi qaṭ’an,* *kitāban fi Awīmāq i Mughūl [sic]. For the word see Ency. Isl. under Aimāk (Barthold) and Redhouse’s Turkish dictionary, where the pronunciation is given as Öymāq.

6 So on the title-page, but Mughūl where the title occurs at the end of the preface. The author uses the two spellings interchangeably.
of the Mughul tribes (Bāb i awwal dar bayān i aqwām i Mughul, pp. 7–100) and a history of the Mughul dynasties (Bāb i dūyum dar tafsīl i ijmāl i salāṭin i Mughul, pp. 101–832), Timūr (Timūr) and the Timūrids occupying pp. 271–695 (Bābur and the Indian Timūrids from p. 389). Edition: Amritsar 1319/1902*.

697. Miscellaneous works relating to the Timūrids:

(1) Fihrist i Timūriyyah, a sketch of Timūrid history to A.H. 1185/1771, written in 1203/1788: Bānkipur Suppt. 1771 (A.H. 1233/1817–18).


(3) Tārikh i Timūriyyān, a sketch (foll. 13) of Timūrid history to A.H. 1221/1806: Bānkipur Suppt. i 1772 (19th cent.).

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (c) THE TIMŪRIDS (2) BĀBUR

698. Zahīr al-Dīn M. Bābur b. ‘Umar Shāikh Mīrzā b. Sultān Abū Sa‘īd Mīrzā b. Sultān-Muḥammad Mīrzā b. Mirān-Shāh b. Timūr was born on 6 Muḥarram 888/14 Feb. 1483, and succeeded his father as ruler of Farghānā in Ramadān 899/June 1494, being then in his twelfth year. In 906/1501 a defeat at the hands of Shābānī Khān deprived him of his principedom, but in 910/1504 he occupied Kābul and made it the seat of his government. In 932/1526 he defeated Ibrāhīm Lōdī at Pānīpat, made Agra his capital and founded the Timūrid dynasty of Hindūstān. He died on 6 Jumādā i 937/26 December 1530 in his 48th year.

In addition to his Memoirs, which alone concern us here,

1 The author laments that the works dealing specially with the Mughul tribes, like the Tārikh i Rashīdī (see p. 274 supra) and the Mugaddāmah i Zafar-nāmah (see p. 284 supra), were unobtainable in India and therefore inaccessible to him.

2 The author uses the spelling GWRKĀN for Timūr’s title, not Gūrgān, as seems to be usual in India.
Bābur was the author of some poetical works in Turki (for which see The Babur-nāma in English pp. 437–8 and appendices pp. lviii–lxxii, Akbar-nāmah i pp. 118–19, F. Teufel Bābur und Abūl-faṣıl (in ZDMG. 37 (1883)) pp. 179–84, Dīvān-i-Bābur Pādishāh edited with facsimile by E. D. Ross in JASB. 1910, extra number).

(Bābur-nāmah), or (Wāqi‘āt i Bābur), Bābur’s personal memoirs in Chaghātāy Turki, extant only in a mutilated form, since the existing MSS., as well as ‘Abd al-Raḥīm’s translation, are marred by numerous lacunae: Edinburgh Scottish National Library (‘may have been copied during Akbar’s first decade (1556–67)’). See Mrs. Beveridge’s description in JRAS. 1907, pp. 131–44 (cf. 1900 pp. 451–3), and her brief account in The Bābur-nāma in English p. xliii. Formerly belonged to Elphinstone and Erskine), Rieu B.M. Turkish Cat. p. 280 (detached fragments only. A.H. 1039/1630. Cf. Mrs. Beveridge in JRAS. 1900 pp. 453–4, 470), Lindesiana p. 244 no. 151 (fragment only (71 foll.) from the beginning. Written, according to Mrs. Beveridge, by Nūr M., nephew of Abū ’l-Faḍl, who was living in 1625. See JRAS. 1900 pp. 465–6, 470, and The Bābur-nāma in English p. xli). Ḥaḍārābād Sālah-Jang Library (circ. A.D. 1700. See JRAS. 1902 p. 655, 1905 pp. 741–62, 1906 pp. 79–93, 1908 pp. 73–6, The Bābur-nāma in English pp. xlvi–xlvii).

In addition to the above MSS., which are regarded by Mrs. Beveridge as representing the genuine Turki text of the Bābur-nāmah, there exist a number of others, which, according to her, resemble the text published by Ilminski from Kehr’s transcript

1 This title is used, e.g., by ‘Abd al-Qādir Badā‘ūnī, Muntakhab al-tawārīkh i p. 341. Bābur refers to the work as the Waqā‘i‘


Facsimile of the Turki text: The Bābar-nāma, being the autobiography of the Emperor Babar... written in Chaghatai Turkish; now reproduced in facsimile from a manuscript belonging to the late Sir Salar Jang of Hyderabad, and edited with a preface and indexes by A. S. Beveridge. Leyden and London 1905* (Gibb Memorial Series, 1).


¹ It has been shown by F. Teufel (Bābur und ‘Abd al-Ja‘īl, ZDMG. 37 (1883) pp. 141-87) that one portion is a translation from the Aḵbar-nāmah. For the passage discussed by Mrs. Beveridge in the JRAS. 1911 pp. 65-74 see also H. Beveridge’s article A passage in the Turki text of the Bābanīnāmah in the ASB. N.S. vi no. 4 (April 1910) pp. 221-6.
English translation from the Turki: *The Babur-nama in English (Memoirs of Babur)* by Zahiru’-d-din Muhammad Babur Padshah Ghazi. Translated from the original Turki text by A. S. Beveridge. **London** 1921*.

Edition of most 1 of the extracts preserved in Kehr’s manuscript of the garbled recension: *Baber-namè ili Zapiski Sultana Babera* [these words in the Russian character]. *Baber-Nameh Djaqataice ad fidem codicis Petrogradae edidit N. Ilminski. Kazan* 1857* (cf. Zenker ii p. 64 no. 814).

French translation of Ilminski’s text: *Mémoires de Baber (Zahir-ud-din Mohammed) traduites ... sur le texte djagatai par A. Pavet de Courteille*. **Paris** 1871*.

Persian translations of these memoirs, or parts of them, were made by the following persons:

1) **Shaikh Zain** [al-Din] “Wafā’ī” **Khwāfī**, a poet who was Ṣadr in Bābur’s reign, who wrote a fath-nāmah describing the Battle of Kanwah (cf. Rieu iii p. 1046b vii), which is quoted in the Memoirs, and who died in 940/1533–4 and was buried at Āgra. [See *The Bāburnāma in English* pp. 448, 476, 532, 553 (bis), 559, 565, 575, 662, 683, *Akbar-nāmah* i p. 119, Beveridge’s trans. i p. 280; ‘Abd al-Qādir Muntakhab al-tawārikh i pp. 341, 471–2; Tabagāt i *Shaikh-Jahānī*; Safinah i *Khushgū* no. 68; *Makhdum al-qurūb* no. 2933; Elliot and Dowson *History of India* iv pp. 288–9.]

---

1 For a list of the contents of Kehr’s transcript and a specification of the parts published by Ilminski see *The Bābur-nāma in English* pp. lii–liii and the *J.R.A.S.* 1923 pp. 75–8. One of the extracts (the “Hindustan Section”, as Mrs. Beveridge calls it) is actually a part of Bābur’s Turki text, others appear to be retranslations from ‘Abd al-Rahim’s Persian, others are spurious and one is “a continuous passage translated from the *Akbar-nama* winding up Bābur’s story to his death and Court”. Mrs. Beveridge argued from the colophon of Senkovski’s transcript (Turki text quoted in *J.R.A.S.* 1900 p. 474) that the garbled recension was a compilation “planned to contain the histories of Bābur and Humayun” and entitled *Waqī‘ī*-nāmah i pādshāhī by Mullā ‘Abd al-Wahhāb Akhund Ghujdawānī, who completed it on 31 Aug. 1709/5 Rajab 1121. It seems probable, however, that, since *Waqī‘ī* is the term used by Bābur in speaking of his Memoirs, *Waqī‘ī*-nāmah i pādshāhī is merely equivalent to *Waqī‘ī* i Bāburī, Bābur-nāmah and the other quasi-titles given to the Memoirs.
An ornate paraphrase of the Memoirs, or perhaps only of a portion relating to the Indian period of Bābur’s life: Rieu iii 926b (events of AH. 932 and the early part of 933. 102 foll. A.H. 998/1590), i 246a (Ṣafar 932–Muḥarram 933. 17th cent.), Blochet iv 2154 (from the beginning of 932 to the end of the description of Hindūstān. Early 17th cent.).

Description and 3 pp. of translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson History of India iv pp. 288–92.

(2) Mirzā Pāyandah Ḥasan Ghaznawi and Muḥammad-Qulī Mughūl Ḥisārī, the former of whom began his translation in 994/1586 at the command of Bihrūz Khān (afterwards Naurang Khān, who died as Governor of Jūnāgārh A.H. 1002; see Rieu ii 799b) and dealt with the first six years and part of the seventh, while the latter continued the work to A.H. 935: Browne Suppt. 1351 (n.d., but presented to King’s Coll. in 1788. King’s 96), Rieu ii 799b (A.H. 1203/1789), Eté 215 (n.d.), Bodleian 179 (modern).

(3) Mirzā ‘Abd al-Raḥīm Khān i Khānān b. Bairam Khān Khān i Khānān, who made his translation by order of Akbar and completed it in 998/1589–90: Rieu Suppt. 75 (late 16th cent. Fine Pictures), Rieu i 244a (late 16th cent.), 244b (16th cent. 4 Pictures), 245a (A.H. 1048/1638. 26 Pictures), 245a (A.H. 1148/1735), 245b (18th cent.), 245b

1 The inappropriate title Ṭabagāt i Bāburī, which Dowson gives to the work, is ignored by Rieu in his description of the Elliot MS. and may be presumed to have no satisfactory authority.

2 According to ‘Abd al-Qādir Badā‘uni (i p. 4725–6) a tārīkhī nawishṭāh mukhtamīl bar ahwāl i fatḥ i Hindūstān u gharb i gharā‘ib i ān u dād i sukhkumwarī dar-ān dādah. An earlier passage in the Munštahkhab al-tawārīkh (i p. 341 17–18) says that Sh. Zain Wāqī‘at i Bāburī rā kih ān pāshāh i maghfīr nawishṭah ba-‘ibārdā bālīgh tarjamah kard.

3 Cf. ZDMG. 37 (1883) p. 177 n.

4 This celebrated general, governor and man of letters was born at Lahore in Ṣafar 964/1556 and died at Delhi in 1036/1627. He is the subject of ‘Abd al-Bāqī Nihāwandi’s Ma‘āthīr i Raḥīmī (see p. 553 infra). For other accounts of him see ‘Ā’in i Akbarī tr. Blochmann in pp. 334–9, Igbūl-nāmah i Jahāngīrī iii pp. 287–8; Ma‘āthīr al-unmārā’ i pp. 693–713, Beveridge’s trans. pp. 50–65; Safināh i Khwāshedgū no. 619; Ency. Isl. under ‘Abd al-Raḥīm Khān (A. S. Beveridge), etc.


English translation of ‘Abd al-Rahīm’s Persian version: Memoirs of Zehir-ed-Din Muhammed Baber, Emperor of Hindustan, written by himself, in the Jaghatai Turkī, and translated [mainly from the Persian version] partly by the late John Leyden, partly by William Erskine..., London 1826* (Zenker i no. 956), Life of Baber, Emperor of Hindostan, written by himself and
translated from the Jaghatai Toorki [or rather, from the Persian version], by J. Leyden and W. Erskine. 2nd ed. London 1844 (Zenker ii no. 813), Memoirs of Zehir-ed-din Muhammed Bâbur, ... written by himself, in the Chaghatai Turki and translated by J. Leyden ... and W. Erskine ... Annotated and revised by Sir Lucas King. Oxford 1921*.

Abridgments of Leyden and Erskine's translation: (1) Life of Baber, abridged from the Memoirs of Zehir-eddin Muhammed Baber ... by R. M. Caldecott. London 1844* (Zenker ii no. 812), (2) Memoirs of Baber Emperor of India, first of the Great Moghuls; being an abridgment with an introduction, supplementary notes, and some account of his successors, by Lieut.-Colonel F. G. Talbot. London 1909*.


Description and 57 pp. of extracts from Leyden and Erskine's translation: Elliot and Dowson History of India iv pp. 218–87.

699. Mirzâ Barkhwurâd Turkmân completed in 937/1530–1 and dedicated to Shâh Ismā'īl a work entitled Aḥsan al-siyar, which is one of the authorities used by L. F. Rushbrook Williams for An empire builder of the sixteenth century (London 1918), and which according to him (op. cit. p. viii) "recounts in great detail the relations between Babur and Shah Ismael [sic]" and is "noteworthy because the author, a Shiâ [sic], who wrote with the professed object of correcting the Habib-us-Siyar, confirms it in all important respects".

Aḥsan al-siyar, a history, of which the fourth and last volume (the only part known to be extant) is a detailed account of Shâh Ismā'īl's reign: Râmpūr Nawwâb 'Abd al-Salâm Khân's library (Vol. iv (last) only).

1 This work would have been mentioned among the histories of Shâh Ismâ'īl's reign, if Rushbrook Williams's article in the J.A.S.B. had come to notice earlier.

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (c) THE TĪMŪRIDS

(3) HUMĀYŪN.

(See also pp. 299, 543, 561, etc.)

700. Khwānd-Amir was instructed to write the Humāyūn-nāmah on being presented to Humāyūn (b. 913/1508, acc. 937/1530, d. 963/1556) at Gwalior about the beginning of A.H. 941/1534. He died probably in the next year (see p. 101 supra).

Humāyūn-nāmah, an account of Humāyūn’s rules and ordinances and of some buildings erected by him: Rosen Institut 23 (1) (10th/16th or 11th/17th cent.), Rieu iii 1024a (circ. A.D. 1850).


Description with some translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson History of India v pp. 116–26.

701. Mihtar 1 Jauhar, for some years Āfībēchī, or ever-bearer, to Humāyūn, says towards the end of his Tadhkīrat al-waqqi‘āt (on fol. 132 in the B.M. MS. Add. 16711, which has 146 foll.) that in 962/1554–5 Humāyūn appointed him Collector of Haibatpūr and subsequently of Tatār Khān Lōdī’s villages. Further on (fol. 135b in the same MS.) he calls himself Treasurer (Khizānchī) of the government of the Panjāb and Multān. In the Akbar-nāmah (i p. 34611–12, Beveridge’s trans. i p. 627) his appointment to the office of Treasurer (Khazīnah-dār) of the province (sūbah) is mentioned among the events of 962/1554–5.

Tadhkīrat al-waqqi‘āt, memoirs of Humāyūn’s reign, written,

1 This title is prefixed to Jauhar’s name in the Akbar-nāmah i p. 34611, and, evidently, in Ilāh-dād “Faidī’s” epilogue to the Humāyūn-Shāhī (see Rieu iii 927a).

English translation (bad): The Tezkereh al Vakiāt, or Private memoirs of ... Humāyūn, written ... by Jouher ...; translated by Major C. Stewart. London 1832 (Oriental Translation Fund), Calcutta 1904 (with index).

MS. corrections of Stewart’s translation by W. Erskine: B.M. MSS. Add. 26608 and 26620.

Description and 11 pp. of extracts from Stewart’s translation: Elliot and Dowson History of India v pp. 136–49.

Later recension divided into five bābs (the last dealing with Akbar’s accession) subdivided into fussūl: Jawāhir i shāhī,1 I.O. 3946 (A.H. 1060/1650), Ėthē 221.

Later recension in ornate prose written at Jauhar’s request by Ilāh-dād “Faiḍī” Sirhindī (see p. 551 infra) for presentation to Akbar and divided into the same five chapters as the Jawāhir i shāhī but having a new preface (with a dedication to Akbar) and an editor’s epilogue, in which Ilāh-dād “Faiḍī” speaks of his contribution to the work: Humāyūn-Shāhī, Blochēt i 563 (A.H. 1187/1773), Rieu iii 927a (A.H. 1264/1848), Ėthē 222.

702. Bāyazīd Bayāt 2 was the younger brother of Shāh-Bīrdī

1 The difference, if any, between the Jawāhir i shāhī and the Humāyūn-Shāhī remains to be investigated.

2 This is a Turkish tribal name. Cf. Ā‘īn i Akbārī tr. Blochmann p. 581, note: The Bayāt tribe is a Turkish tribe scattered over Azerbāijān, Erivan, Tāhrān, Fārs, and Nishāpūr; C. E. Yate Khurasan and Sistan pp 365–9: The district [i.e. the “Sar-i-Valayat” district, headquarters “Chakana”] contained 62 villages, big and little, all inhabited by Bayāt Turks, a tribe numbering some 15,000 families ... These Bayāt Turks said that they had been brought to this district by Nadīr Shāh from Irāk, or somewhere in the neighbourhood of Ţeherān; Babinger Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen p. 31: 15. Bejātī Āqā Mahmūd. Er ist türkmenischer Herkunft; der Name Bejātī deutet auf der Stamm der Bejāt (um Kerkuk).
Bayāt, afterwards known as Bahrām "Saqqā", the poet, whom he joined at Gardēz in the service of Mīrzhā Kāmrān, Humāyūn’s half-brother. When Humāyūn entered Kābul in Ramaḍān 952/1545, all Kāmrān’s officers, including Shāh-Birdī, deserted to Humāyūn, and Bāyazīd went with his brother. At the time of the festivities connected with Akbar’s circumcision at Qandahār in 953/1546 Shāh-Birdī under the influence of ecstasy (jadhbah) gave up the profession of soldiering and became a saqqā’, or water-carrier, under the name of Bahrām i Saqqā. Subsequently at Āgra he erected a saqqā-khānah under a nān-tree on ground belonging to his brother. Considerably later than this Bāyazīd was chosen by Abū ʿl-Faḍl at Akbar’s request for the purpose of writing the Tārīkh i Humāyūn, which he began in 999/1591 at Lahore and completed in 1000/1591-2 [?].

Tārīkh i Humāyūn, a history of the reigns of Humāyūn and Akbar, with accounts of the persons closely connected with them, opening with the year 949/1542 (when Humāyūn was forced to leave India) and ending with 999/1591: Ethé 223.


[Autobiographical statements (for which see H. Beveridge’s article in the JASB. for 1898 and the summary given by Maulawi ʿAbd al-Walī in the JASB. N.S. xx (1924) no. 7 p. 490); Gulbadan Bēgam Humāyūn-nāmah, ed. and tr. A. S. Beveridge, introduction, pp. 38, 64, 74.]

703. Gulbadan Bēgam, a daughter of the Emperor Bābur by his wife Dildār Bēgam and consequently a half-sister of Humāyūn, was eight years old when her father died in 937/1530. She had left Kābul and joined him at Āgra in the preceding year.

1 For the dīwān of "Saqqā" see Sprenger no. 499, de Jong 173, Āṣafiyyah i p. 724 nos. 23, 304, 432, Ethé 1436, Bānkīpūr ii 241–2, Lindeiana p. 214 no. 290b, Ivanow 669–70.
She married Khıdır Khwājah Chaghatāy, who was Amīr al-umārā' under Humāyūn.¹ In 982/1576 she performed the pilgrimage to Mecca. She died at Ágrah on 6 Dhū 'l-Ḥijjah 1011/7 May 1603 at the age of 82 lunar years.

(Humāyūn-nāmah), or (Ahwāl i Humāyūn Pādshāh), personal memoirs written at Akbar’s request as material for Abū ’l-Faḍl’s Akbar-nāmah: Rieu i 247a (defective, breaking off after the blinding of Kāmrān (at the end of 960/1553 according to the Akbar-nāmah i 328). 17th cent.).

Editions: (1) The history of Humāyūn (Humāyūn-nāma). By Gul-badan Begam...Translated...and reproduced in the Persian from the only known MS....By A. S. Beveridge. London 1902** (Oriental Translation Fund, N.S. 1), (2) Humāyūn-nāmah i Gul-badan Bēgam, Lucknow [1925**].

English translation: see above Editions: (1).

[Tabaqāt i Akbarī ii 312ˢ = Elliot and Dowson v p. 391; Akbar-nāmah iii 568ˢ, 815ᵗ, 7, 817¹⁴ etc. (see the index to Beveridge’s translation, when published); Iqbāl-nāmah i Jahāngīrī (mentioned by Rieu, iii p. 1083ᵃ, without precise reference, as authority for the date of Gul-badan’s death. The occurrence would fall in vol. ii, and therefore not in the Bibliotheca Indica text); Tārīkh i Muḥammadī (presumably under the year 1011); Rieu i 247ᵃ, iii 1083ᵃ; Mrs. Beveridge’s introduction to the Humāyūn-nāmah; Ency. Isl. under Gulbadan (H. Beveridge).]

704. In the time of Akbar was written

Humāyūn-nāmah (?), an epic poem on the life of Humāyūn: Rieu iii 1000ᵇ (defective at both ends and elsewhere. 17th cent.).

705. In the catalogue of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana no. 431 on p. 136 (dated A.D. 1826) is described as

Iqbāl-nāmah. Tārīkh i Humāyūn Pādshāh and is ascribed to “Faidī” b. Mubārak, the well-known poet of Akbar’s reign.

¹ For further information about him see Ā’īn i Akbarī tr. Blochmann p. 365 n.
M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (c) THE TĪMŪRIDS (4) AKBAR.

706. Sh. Abū 'l-Faḍl "Faidī" afterwards "Faiyādī" b. Mubārak, the elder brother of Abū 'l-Faḍl (for whom see p. 541 infra), was born at Āgra in 954/1547, became Malik al-shu'arā' in Akbar's reign and died at his birthplace on 10 Şafar 1004/15 Oct. 1595. He began an Akbar-nāmah, which was to be, like "Nizāmī's" Sikandar-nāmah, the fifth poem of a khamsah, but, like the other four poems except the Markaz i adwār and Nal Daman, it was never finished. No copies of the unfinished poem seem to be extant. For further information concerning him and his works see the section on POETRY.

(Zafar-nāmah i Ahmadābād),¹ a makhnavī on the conquest of Ahmadābād by Akbar and the death of the Sipahdār M. Ḥusain Mirzā, who was defeated and put to death in 981/1573: Lahore Panjāb Univ. Lib. (see Oriental College Magazine, vol. iv no. 2 (Feb. 1928) p. 13), Rieu iii 1001a (a.d. 1850).

[Khulāṣat al-ash'ār (Sprenger p. 37 no. 485); Tabaqāt i Akbarī i pp. 486-8; Muntakhab al-tawārīkh ii pp. 405-6 = Elliot and Dowson v pp. 544-9; Fi ṣin i Akbarī pp. 235-42, Blochmann's translation pp. 490-1, 548-63; Mir'āt al-khayāl pp. 79-81 (Bodl. 374 no. 65); Hamīshah bahār (Sprenger p. 127); Safīnah i Khwūshgūz no. 317; Ma'āthir al-umarā' ii pp. 581-90, Beveridge's trans. pp. 513-18; Khulāṣat al-kalām (Bānkīptür viii p. 144); Khulāṣat al-afkār no. 196; Sprenger pp. 401-2; Haft āsmān pp. 115-26; Browne Lit. Hist. iv 242-5; Ency. Isl. under Faizī [,] Shāilk; Brockelmann ii 417, Supptbd ii p. 610; For other authorities see the section POETRY.]

¹ This title has been invented as more appropriate than Dāstān i Akbar Bādshah, which is that given in the Oriental College Magazine. No title is mentioned by Rieu.
707. **M. ‘Ārif Qandahārī** was Steward (*Mīr-Sāmān*) to Bairam Khān Khān i Khānān,¹ the celebrated general of Humāyūn and Akbar’s reigns, and was present at his deathbed in Gujrāt. After his death he made a pilgrimage to Mecca and on his return to India lived for a time in Bihār. In 985/1577–8 he came from Bihār and was presented to Akbar.

*Tārīkh i Akbarī* ² or (*Tārīkh i Muḥammad ‘Ārif i Qandahārī*), a history of Akbar’s reign to the year 987/1579, being apparently only the last part of a larger work, since, according to Sri Ram Sharma, “there are cross-references to a history of the reign of Humāyūn, which, however, is missing”: Browne Pers. Cat. 86 (i) (ending abruptly with Akbar’s return from Ajmēr to Fatḥpūr-Sikīrī towards the end of Rajab 981/1573. Autograph ?), Rāmpūr State Library (see Sri Ram Sharma in *JRAI*. 1933 pp. 807–11).


[Autobiographical statements (for which see Sri Ram Sharma’s article); *Ma’āthir i Raḥīmī* ii pp. 1–5, 70–17.]

708. For the *Tārīkh i Humāyūn*, a history of the reigns of Humāyūn and Akbar ending with the year 999/1591, see p. 538 supra.

For the *Tārīkh i khānadān i Tīmūrīyāh*, a history of Tīmūr (foll. 7–134), his successors to Sultān Ḥusain Mīrzā (foll. 136–234), Bābur (foll. 238–73), Humāyūn (foll. 273–95) and Akbar to the 22nd year of his reign (foll. 295–338), see pp. 298–9 supra.

709. Sh. Abū ‘l-Faḍl “‘Allāmī” was the second son of the

---

¹ For accounts of Bairam Khān see *Ā’in i Akbarī* tr. Blochmann pp. 315–17; *Ma’āthir i Raḥīmī* ii pp. 1–102 (where much of the information is quoted from M. ‘Ārif’s history); *Ma’āthir al-umarāʾ* i pp. 371–84, Beveridge’s translation pp. 368–78; *Ency. Isl.* under Bairam Khān (H. Beveridge), etc.

² This is the title by which the work is cited in the *Ma’āthir i Raḥīmī* ii p. 1 (M. ‘Ārif i Qandahārī kih Mīr-Sāmān u mulażim i Khān i Khānān i marhūm i muḥār ilaih ast dar Tārīkh i Akbarī kih ba-nām i nāmī i khalīfah i ilāhī nawāhidh āwardah kih etc.).
scholar and Şûfî, Shaikh Mubâarak Nâgaurî (for whom see Ḍ'in i Akbarî tr. Blochmann pp. i-xx; Ma'âthîr al-umarâ' ii 584-5, Beveridge's trans. pp. 513-14; ṭāḥmān 'Ali 174 etc.), and the younger brother of the poet, Abû ʾl-Faḍl "Faiḍî". He was born at Āgra on 6 Muḥarram 958/14 Jan. 1551, was presented to Akbar in the 19th year of the reign (a.h. 981/1573-4) by "Faiḍî", and soon became a close friend of the Emperor's. He is said to have been mainly responsible for destroying Akbar's faith in Islâm. After distinguishing himself as a military commander in the Deccan he was returning to court, when on 4 Rabî i 1011/22 Aug. 1602 he was assassinated at the instigation of Prince Salîm (afterwards the Emperor Jahâṅgîr) by a Bûndelâh chief, Bir-Sîngh Dēv, who sent his head to Salîm at Allahabâd. His body was taken to Ṭârî near Gwalior and buried there.

He is the author of the 'Iyār i dânish, a modernised version of the Anwâr i Suhaîlî, and he wrote prefaces for the Persian translation of the Mahâbhârata and the Târikh i alîfî.*

Two collections of letters composed by him are extant. The best known, properly entitled Mukâtabât i ʿAllâmî (a chronogram = 1015/1606-7, the date of completion) but often called Inshâ i Abû ʾl-Faḍl or Mukâtabât i Abû ʾl-Faḍl, was begun soon after his death in 1011/1602 by his sister's son ʿAbd al-Šâmad b. Afḍal Muḥammad and is divided into four daftars (viz. (1) letters written in Akbar's name to kings and amîrs, (2) letters written by Abû ʾl-Faḍl to kings and amîrs, (3) exordia and conclusions of letters, select extracts and detached pieces in prose, (4) fifty-two letters of which the first is written in Akbar's name to ʿAbd Allâh Khân Ùzbek and the rest in Abû ʾl-Faḍl's name to various persons). The fourth daftar is very rare (for MSS. see Bânkîpur ix 869 and apparently Voller's 964), but manuscripts of the first three daftars are common and numerous editions have been published. The second collection is usually called Ruqâʿât i Abû ʾl-Faḍl. It consists of private letters and was compiled by his nephew Nûr [al-Dîn] Muḥammad. Editions

---

* See p. 540 supra.

* The latter preface is not to be found in the MSS. of the Târikh i alîfî.
have been published at Calcutta in 1238/1822-3* and at Cawnpore in 1872.* For MSS. see Rieu ii 838b, Ethé 287 etc.

(1) (Akbar-nāmah), a detailed history of Akbar's reign with an account of his predecessors, commonly said to be divided into three daftars,\(^1\) of which the first, completed in Ša'bān 1004/1596, the 41st regnal year, is subdivided into two parts ((1) Akbar's birth, genealogy of the Timūrids, reigns of Bābur and Humāyūn, (2) Akbar's reign from the first to the middle of the 17th year \(^2\)), the second continues the narrative from the middle of the 17th year to the end of the 46th,\(^3\) while the third, known by the independent title Ā'īn i Ākbarī, deals with the administration and statistics of the empire\(^4\): London Victoria and Albert Museum

\(^1\) According to the author's own statement in the preface to Daftar ii (Bibliotheca Indica edition, vol. iii p. 3, ll. 14-16) his plan was to devote a separate daftar to each period of thirty years in Akbar's life (chawān bahr kihāfīr i sāfī partau andākh kih har sī-sālah sawānaḥ i kishwar-khudaŋ rā jūdākatūn daftarī nigāštah sa'dādat-nāmah i khud rā tāzāk furūḡī baḵshād), but, although divisions are indicated in the text by bombastic exordia and epilogues, these latter do not state clearly that such and such a daftar, or such and such a part, is there beginning or ending. In accordance with the author's apparent intention it is customary to regard the portion extending from Akbar's birth to the middle (or to the end, as the case may be) of the 17th regnal year as Daftar i and to regard this as consisting of two "parts", there being a division of the kind indicated above, though the two "parts" are not formally so designated. The rest of the Akbar-nāmah is treated as Daftar ii. The Ā'īn i Ākbarī is sometimes, in manuscripts (e.g. Mehren 54) and elsewhere, called Daftar iii, though the author's text seems to give no warrant for calling it so.

\(^2\) i.e. to the birth of Dāniyāl, or rather to Akbar's encamping at Nāgaur a few days later (9 Jumādā i A.H. 980/17 September 1572). In many, apparently in most, of the manuscripts, however, the first daftar ends with a full account of the 17th year. In such copies Daftar ii begins with the 18th year, and Rieu in fact describes Vol. i [i.e. Daftar i] Part 2 as containing "History of Akbar from his accession to the end of the 17th year of his reign" and Vol. ii [i.e. Daftar ii] as containing "Continuation of Akbar's reign from the beginning of the 18th to the end of the 46th year" (see Rieu i p. 248a).

\(^3\) Continuations of the narrative to Akbar's death in the 50th year by 'Ināyat Allāh [b.] Muḥibb 'Ali and Muhammad Šāliḥ [Kanbū?] are in existence. According to Beveridge (trans. vol. iii p. 1204) they are more or less reproductions of the Igbāl-nāmah i Jahāngīrī. The Bibliotheca Indica edition contains one which the editor ascribes to Muḥibb 'Ali Khān (no doubt identical with that of 'Ināyat Allāh [b.] Muḥibb 'Ali).

\(^4\) It is treated separately on pp. 549-51 below.

1 See H. Beveridge Note on an illuminated Persian manuscript (in the JRAS. 1905 pp. 365–6). A MS. of Daftar i belonging to S. ‘Ali Bilgānī, “containing passages which do not occur in the printed editions” and believed by H. Beveridge to show the original condition, was described in the JRAS. 1903 pp. 115–22. For another old MS. (Chester Beatty) see BSOS. iv p. 721.
Ethé 235 (Daftar i. A.H. 1065/1655, Daftar ii. A.H. 1106/1695), 236 (Daftars i–ii), 237 (Daftars i–ii. A.H. 1111/1699–1700 and 1132/1719–20), 238 (Daftars i–ii, breaking off in 19th year), 239 (Daftar i. A.H. 1073–4/1663), 240 (Daftar i. A.H. 1101/1689), 241 (Daftar i. A.H. 1111/1699), 242 (Daftar i), 243 (Daftar i), 244 (Daftar i), 245 (Daftar i, pt. 1. A.H. 1094/1683), 246 (Daftar i, pt. 1), 247 (Daftar i, pt. 1), 248 (Daftar i, pt. 1. A.H. 1223/1808), 249 (Daftar i, pt. 1), 250 (Daftar i, pt. 1), 251 (Daftar i, pt. 1 and fragment of pt. 2), 252 (Daftar i, pt. 2. A.H. 1098/1686), 253 (Daftar i, pt. 2), 254 (Daftar i, pt. 2), 255 (Daftar i, pt. 2, and Daftar ii. A.H. 1101/1690 (?)), 256 (Daftar ii. A.H. 1048/1639), 257 (Daftar ii. A.H. 1159/1747), 258 (Daftar ii), 259 (Daftar ii), 260 (Daftar ii with M. Şāliḥ’s continuation. A.H. 1225/1810), 261 (Daftar ii with M. Şāliḥ’s continuation, defective at end), 262 (large fragment of Daftar ii), 263 (fragment of Daftar ii), 3010 (Daftar i), I.O. 3917 (Daftar ii, defective), 3919 (Daftar i, defective and disarranged), 3963 (Daftar i, pt. 2), Vollers 974 (part i [i.e. presumably Daftar i]. A.H. 1053/1643–4), 975 (nearly complete), Bānkipūr vii 552 (Daftar i. A.H. 1242/1827), 553 (Daftar ii. A.H. 1059/1649), Suppt. 1764 (from the latter part of the 30th to the 46th year. Dated 38th year of Aurangzēb), Bodleian 200 (Daftars i–ii with M. Şāliḥ’s continuation. A.D. 1831), 201–4 (four copies of Daftar i), 205–7 (three copies of Daftar i, pt. 1), 208 (Daftar i, pt. 2 with M. Şāliḥ’s continuation), 209 (Daftar i, pt. 2, and Daftar ii. A.H. 1133/1721), 210 (Daftar i, pt. 2 and fragment of Daftar ii), 211 (Daftar ii. A.H. 1064/1654), 212 (an abridgment of Daftar ii), MS. Pers. c. 25 (Daftar i. A.D. 1812–14), Leyden iii p. 9 no. 920 (Daftar ii. A.H. 1072/1661–2), v p. 230 no. 2638 (part of Daftar ii (end of 27th year to 47th)), Āyā Şūfiyah 3017 = Tauer 546 (vol. i. A.H. 1073/1662), Rieu 2 47 (Daftars i–ii (the latter defective) with part of iii. Text differs in places considerably from the Lucknow ed. A.H. 1080/1670), 248b (Daftar i. A.H. 1097/1686), 249a (Daftar i. 17th cent.), 249a (Daftar i. 17th cent.), 249b (Daftar i. A.H. 1114/1702), 249b (Daftar i. A.H. 1119/1707), 249b (Daftar i. 18th cent.), 250a (Daftar i, pt. 1. 17th cent.), 250a (Daftar i, pt. 1. 18th cent.), 250a (Daftar i, pt. 1. 18th cent.), 250a (Daftar i, pt. 2. 17th cent.), 250b (Daftar i, pt. 2. A.H. 1151/1738), 250b (Daftar i,
pt. 2. 18th cent.), 250b (Daftar i, pt. 2. A.H. 1113/1701), 250b (Daftar i, pt. 2 and Daftar ii. 18th cent.), 251a (Daftar i, pt. 2, and part of Daftar iii. A.H. 1166/1753), 251a (Daftar ii. Early 17th cent.), 251b (Daftar ii. A.H. 1183/1770), 251b (Daftars i–ii. 76 Pictures. A.H. 1232/1817), iii 928a (Daftar i, pt. 1, defective. 17th cent.), 928a (fragment. Circ. A.D. 1850), 928a (fragment. 2 Pictures. 17th cent.), 1047a (extracts. Circ. A.D. 1850), Mehren 51 (Daftar i), 52 (Daftar i, pt. 2 and Daftar ii. A.H. 1099/1687–8), 53 (Daftar i, pt. 2 to end of 12th year. A.H. 1180/1766–7), Nür i ‘Uthmāniyah 3081 = Tauer 544 (Daftar i. 11th/17th cent.), 3154 = Tauer 547 (Daftar i. 11th/17th cent.), As’ad 2201 = Tauer 545 (Daftar i. 11th/17th cent.), Adabiyāt Kutubkhānah-si 788 = Tauer 548 (Daftar i, pt. 1. 11th/17th cent.), 783 = Tauer 549 (Daftar i, pt. 2. A.H. 1002/1593 (? ?)), Berlin 482 (Daftar i, pt. 1. A.H. 1105/1694), 481 (Daftar i), 483 (Daftar i, pt. 1), Aumer 248 (Daftars i–ii. A.H. 1107–8/1696), 249 (Daftar i, pt. 2), 250 (Daftar i, pt. 2), 251 (Daftar ii with M. Şālih’s continuation. A.H. 1100/1688–9), Calcutta Madrasah 129 (Daftar i. Late 17th cent.), 130 (Daftar i, pt. 2 and Daftar ii. A.H. 1107/1695–6), 131 (Daftar ii, defective, 18th year to 40th year. 19th cent.), Rehatsek p. 76 no. 14 (Daftar i. A.H. 1151/1738–9), p. 92 no. 39 (Daftar i), p. 93 nos. 40 (Daftar i, defective, ending in Bābur’s reign), 41 (Daftar ii, slightly defective. Ornate copy), Oxford Ind. Inst. MS. Pers. A. I. 10 (Daftar i, pt. 2. A.H. 1154/1742), Būhār 63 (Daftar i, pt. 1. 17th cent.), 64 (Daftar i, pt. 2, defective at end), Ivanow 122 (Daftars i–ii with M. Şālih’s continuation. A.H. 1206/1791–2), 123 (Daftar i, defective at end. 18th cent.), 124 (Daftar i. 18th cent.), 125 (Daftar i, defective at end. 18th cent.), 126 (Daftar i. 19th cent.), Curzon 26 (Daftar i, pt. 2. 17th cent.), Edinburgh 78 (Daftars i–ii. Old), Lahore Panjāb Univ. Lib. (one old copy of “vol. i,” one defective copy, two copies (one defective) of “vol. ii.” See Oriental College Magazine, vol. ii, No. 4 (Lahore; August 1926) p. 50), ‘Aligarh Subhān Allāh MSS. p. 61 no. 28 (Daftar i), Bukhāra Semenov 12 (?), Dorn Asiat. Mus. (defective, ending with A.H. 979/1572), Eton 181, Madras (3 (complete ?) copies and 1 of Daftar iii), Mashhad iii p. 73, T.C.D. 1580.

English translation: The Akbarnāma of Abu-l-Fazl, translated... by H. Beveridge..., Calcutta 1897-1921°* (Bibliotheca Indica).*

Abridged English translations: (1) [the whole work] by Lieut. Chalmers: R.A.S. MS. (2) [Bābur and Humāyūn] Chronological retrospect, or memoirs of the principal events of Mahommedan history... By Major David Price, vol. iii, part 2 (London 1821*) pp. 658-950. (3) [Humāyūn’s reign and that of Akbar to his 29th regnal year] B.M. MSS. Add. 26607, 26620-1.


Continuation [or continuations]: Takmilah i Akbar-nāmah, a detailed account of Akbar’s reign from the 47th year to his

¹ “A lithograph edition of the Akbar-nāma, in three quarto volumes, was printed at Lucknow in 1867, at the expense of the Rāja of Pattiālā. It is a handsome and costly work, and it is greatly to be regretted that its literary value is by no means commensurate with the money expended upon it. Gross and obvious errors abound in it, and there are many passages wanting. In one instance the annals of six months of one of the most important years of the reign (the 17th) are altogether omitted.” (Elliot and Dowson History of India vi pp. 8-9.)

² Only the index to vol. iii remains to be published.


1 Rieu states in his Additions and Corrections p. 1096a ad 929a that in the Tārikh i Muḥammad, fol. 131b, the author is called ‘Ināyat Allāh b. Muḥibb ‘Alī.

2 ”The circumstance that the author of the continuation is sometimes called ‘Ināyat Ullah and sometimes Muḥibb ‘Alī [and sometimes M. Ṣāliḥ] may be due to the fact that there are more than one continuation” (Beveridge, Akbar-nāmah trans. iii p. 1204, where some information is given about the continuation). The continuation seems to have been written in Shāh-Jahān’s time, and the two authors referred to are presumably the brothers ‘Ināyat Allāh Kanbā, author of the Bahār i dānish, and M. Ṣāliḥ Kanbā, author of the ‘Amal i ṣāliḥ. According to Beveridge the continuation [or the one examined by him] is copied from the Iqbal-nāmah i Jahāngīrī.

3 According to Rieu the Takmilah i Akbar-nāmah described by him (vol. iii p. 929), “is quite distinct from the Takmilah i Akbar Nāmah described in Elliot’s History of India, vol. vi, pp. 103–115, and appears, from a comparison with the extracts there given, to be much fuller”. Similarly Beveridge observes (Akbar-nāmah trans. iii p. 1204) “The continuation as given by Chalmers differs considerably from that in the Bib. Ind. ed. and the continuation in Nos. 260 and 261 of the I.O. differs from both of them. But evidently all the continuations are more or less reproductions of the Iqbālnāma”.
Description of the Takmilah and 12 pp. of extracts from Chalmers’s abridged translation: Elliot and Dowson History of India vi pp. 103–15.

(2) (A’in i Akbari), a detailed account of the administration and statistics of Akbar’s empire divided into five daftars ((1) on Akbar’s household and court,¹ (2) on the state service,² lists of scholars, notices of poets etc., (3) on the Ilahi era, the revenue,³ the statistics of the provinces etc., (4) on the Hindus, their literature, institutions etc., foreign invaders of India, distinguished travellers, Muhammedan saints etc., (5) sayings of Akbar collected by Abū Ḭal-Faḍl) : Browne Suppt. 82 (a.h. 1007/1598–9 [sic ?]. King’s 31), 144 (n.d. King’s 5), Pers. Cat. 92 (year 1785 of some Hindu era), Lindesiana p. 108 no. 170 (a.h. 1036/1626–7), 171 (a.h. 1115/1703–4), 172 (cirec. a.d. 1700–10), p. 107 no. 800 (a.h. 1044/1634–5), Leyden iii p. 10 no. 921 (a.h. 1037/1627–8 (?)), R.A.S. P. 121 = Morley 116 (a.h. 1066/1655), Rieu i 248b (from the beginning to the chapter on the Arsenal. a.h. 1080/1670), 251a (from the beginning to the chapter on the Mansabdars. a.h. 1166/1817), 251b (17th cent.), 252a (17th cent.), 252a (a.h. 1130/1718), 252a (18th cent.), 252b (defective. 18th cent.), 252b (a.h. 1196/1782), 252b (account of the sūbahs only. 18th cent.), 252b (account of the Hindus only. 18th cent.), iii 928b (account of the sūbahs. Cirec. a.d. 1850), 928b (topographical tables only. a.d. 1847), 1019b (extracts only. Cirec. a.d. 1850), 1020b (extracts only. Cirec. a.d. 1850), 1070a (early 17th cent.), Ethé 264, 265 (a.h. 1119/1707), 266–9 (four undated copies), Eton 184, 185 (a.h. 1133/1720–1), Aumer

¹ For the elucidation of A’in 27 (A’in i nirkh i ajnas) see W. H. Moreland’s articles Prices and wages under Akbar (J.R.A.S. 1917 pp. 817–25) and The value of money at the court of Akbar (J.R.A.S. 1918 pp. 375–85).


Extracts: Selections from the A’in-i-Akbari... by Maulawi M. Rāfi Siddiqī (Intikhāb i A’īn i Akbarī), Allahabad 1931°.

English translations: (1) Ayeen Akbery; or, The institutes of the Emperor Akber, translated... by Francis Gladwin, Calcutta 1783-6°* (an abridged and inaccurate paraphrase of Daftars i-iii), London 1800°*, Calcutta 1898° (vols. i and ii only. Edited by Jagadis Mukhopadhyaya), (2) The A’in i Akbari by Abul Fazl ‘Allami, translated... by H. Blochmann (vols. ii and iii by H. S. Jarrett.) Calcutta 1868-1894°* (Bibliotheca Indica).

Index: A supplementary index of the place names on pages 89 to 414 of the ‘A’in [sic]-i-Akbarī, Vol. ii (Translated by Colonel H. S. Jarrett.) Compiled by W. Irvine and L. M. Anstey, Calcutta 1910° (Bibliotheca Indica).

¹ Vol. ii, delayed for further consideration of the matter relating to the revenue, was destroyed at the time of the Mutiny, when it was in the press (see Ḥayāt i jāwīd (in Urdu) i p. 65).
Annotations to Gladwin’s translation: *Supplement to the first volume of Gladwin’s Ayeen Akberi,* prepared for the use of students by L. F. Rushbrook Williams... together with a chronological table of the reign of Akbar compiled by Ram Prasad Tripathi... assisted by Harish Chandra Misra, *London* (Beccles printed) 1918°* (Publications of the Department of Modern Indian History, Allahabad University, No. 2).

Translated extract: *The Ayn Akbari, or the institutes of the Emperor Akbar.* Translated... [by F. Gladwin], *London* 1777° (81 pp. only, published as a specimen of the translation published at Calcutta in 1783–6).


Abridgments: (1) Muntakhab i A’in i Akbari, *Étché* 270, (2) Dastūr al-‘amal, *Lindesiana* p. 108 no. 765 (A.H. 1103/1691) and p. 131 no. 765 [?], *Bānkīpur* xi 1098 xxx (18th cent.).


¹ “Shaikh Ilahdād [sic] was a native of Sirhind, and held a madad-ma’āsh village in that district.” (Elliot and Dowson vi p. 116).

Humāyūn-Shāhī, has already been mentioned (p. 537 supra). He was in his 36th year when he began his Akbar-nāmah, having previously been greatly devoted to social pleasures.

(Akbar-nāmah), a plain history of Akbar to A.H. 1010/1601, compiled apparently from the Tabaqāt i Akbar-Shāhī (see p. 433 supra) and the Akbar-nāmah of Abū ’l-Faḍl (see p. 543 supra) but with additions, especially concerning Shaikh Farîd, at whose suggestion it was written ¹: Rieu i 253a (17th cent.), iii 929b (A.H. 1264/1848), Ethé 289 (A.H. 1104/1693), Caetani 68 (A.D. 1826).

Description and 30 pp. of translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson History of India vi 116–46.

[Autobiographical statements in the Akbar-nāmah (see Elliot and Dowson and Rieu) and in the preface to the Madār al-afādil; Makhdūm al-chārā’īb no. 1910; Elliot and Dowson History of India vi 116–17.]

711. Āqā ² or Khwājah ³ ‘Abd al-Bāqī “Bāqī” b. Khwājah Āqā Bābā Kurd ⁴ Nīhāwāndī was born at Jūlak near Nīhāwand in 978/1570. His father, a Kurd of Jūlak, was made a Wāzīr and Nāżir of Hamadān by Shāh ‘Abbās. ‘Abd al-Bāqī himself was for some time revenue officer of Kāshān, Raiy, Qazwin and Qumm, and eventually became a Wāzīr in place of his brother Āqā Khīdār. On incurring the King’s displeasure he decided to leave Persia and in 1023/1614 he reached Burhānpūr, where the Khān i Khānān, ‘Abd al-Raḥīm b. Bairam Khān,⁵ welcomed him and asked him to write the Ma’āthīr i Raḥīmū, which he completed in 1025/1616. Until 1029/1619 he served as Amīn of the Deccan and Barār. Subsequently Sultān Parwēz, Jahāṅgīr’s second son, made him Diwān of Bihār. The statement of the Tārīkh i Muḥammādī (see Rieu iii 1080b) that he died in 1042/ ¹ Sh. Farîd, having remarked that the Wāqīʿāt i Mughalī (see p. 513 supra) concluded with the period of Humāyūn and contained no notice of Akbar’s reign, desired the author to supply the deficiency (Rieu i 253a).

² So Rieu iii 1080b.

³ So Taqī Kāshī (Sprenger p. 39).

⁴ For a notice of Hájjī Āqā Bābā “Mudrīki” see Taqī Kāshī Khulāṣat Lash’ār (Sprenger p. 39 no. 527).

⁵ For this celebrated general and governor of Akbar’s time see p. 533 supra.
1632 seems to be incorrect, since a Calcutta MS. (Ivanow 140) contains a note saying that it was collated by the author himself in 1046/1637.

Ma'āthir i Rahimī, a life of 'Abd al-Rahim Khān i Khānān padded with a history of Islāmic India in his own and in previous times and divided into a Mughādimah (on his ancestors), four fasīls ((1) on his father (Bairam Khān) and his own youth together with a history of Hindūstān from the Ghaznavids to Jahāngīr and of Bengal, Jaunpūr, Mālwah, Kashmīr and Multān, (2) on his public career, campaigns etc. together with a history of the sultāns of Gujrāt, Sind, the Deccan, and Khāndēs, (3) on the mosques, colleges, baths etc. built or repaired at his expense, (4) on his children) and a khātimah (notices of contemporary celebrities): Browne Pers. Cat. 93 (apparently corrected (except the khātimah) by the author at Burhānpūr in 1030/1621), Ivanow 140 (apparently collated by the author in 1046/1637), 141 (khātimah only. Early 19th cent.), Bānkīpūr viii 722 (khātimah only, defective. Not later than 1046/1636), Rieu 131b (extracts only. 19th cent.), 970b (abstract of contents only).

Edition: Ma'āṣir-i-Rahimī (Memoirs of 'Abd ur-Rahîm Khân Khānān) by Mullâ 'Abd ul-Bâqî Nahâvandî. Edited by... M. Hidayet Husain... Calcutta 1910–31.* 1 (Bibliotheca Indica).

Description and a translated extract of 3 pp.: Elliot and Dowson History of India vi pp. 237–43.

[Taqī Kāshī Khulāṣat al-ash'ār, Khātimah, Ašl xi (Hamadān) (Sprenger p. 39 nos. 527 (Ḥājjī Āqā Bāqī “Mudrīki”), 528 (Khwājah 'Abd al-Bāqī); Ma'āthir i Rahimī iii pp. 1535–76 (see also the editor's introduction); Tadhkirah i Tahir i Naṣrābādī i p. 124; Safinah i Khwusghū (Bodleian 376) no. 650; Makhzan al-gharā'ib (Bodleian 395) no. 1562; Elliot and Dowson History of India vi pp. 239–40; Bānkīpūr viii p. 164.]

712. Asad Bēg “Asad” b. Khwājah Murād Qazwīnī, a native of Qazwīn, was for a time Dawātīdār to the Wazīr Khwājah

1 An index to the three volumes remains to be published.
Aftal at Harât. Settling in India he served Shalih Abû 'l-Fadîl b. Mubârak for seventeen years and after his death in 1011/1602 entered the service of Akbar, by whom he was sent on a mission to Bijâpur in connexion with the marriage of Prince Dâniyâl to Ibrâhîm 'Adîl-Shâh’s daughter. On his return Akbar appointed him chamberlain, an office which he held for a year. Then he was appointed envoy to the four provinces of the Deccan. Not long after his departure on this mission Akbar died and he was recalled by Jahângîr, who dismissed him. Subsequently he was received into favour and given the title Pesh-râu Khân. According to the Mir'ât i jahn-numâ (Rieu 890, fol. 302) he died in 1030/1620–1, leaving a diwân of 8000 lines and some mathnawîs, but according to a note at the end of a B.M. MS. of his memoirs (Rieu iii 979) he died in 1041/1631–2 under Shâh-Jahân.

(Âlalât i Asad Bîg) or (Ahwâl i Asad Bîg), memoirs of the author’s life from the murder of Abû 'l-Fadîl [in 1011/1602] to the death of Akbar and the accession of Jahângîr [in 1014/1605]: Rieu iii 979b (A.H. 1211/1796), 1029a (circ. A.D. 1850, apparently transcribed from the preceding MS.), probably also Âsafiyâh ii p. 848 no. 41 (“Sawânih i Asadi” by Asad Bîg Firdausi [sic, Firdausi being presumably a misprint for Qazwîni] composed in 1010, perhaps a misprint for 1015).


Description, summary and 19 pp. of extracts from Chapman’s translation: Elliot and Dowson History of India vi pp. 150–74.

[Haft iglîm no. 1271; ‘Abd al-Nabî Mai-khanah pp. 554–5; Hamîshah bahâr (Sprenger p. 118); Safînah i Khwushgû (Bodleian 376 no. 422 (and 685 “Asadbeg, with the takhallus Asad of Turân?”); Riyâd al-shû’ara’; Atash-kadah no. 514; Makhzan al-qarâ’ib no. 106; Mir’ât i aftâb-numâ; Sham i anyuman 67–8; Elliot and Dowson loc. cit.; Rieu iii 979b.]

713. Maulawî S. Amir Hâidar “Amîr” Hûsainî Wâsiţi Bilgrâmi, a grandson of Ghulâm-‘Ali “Azâd” Bilgrâmi (author of the tadkhîrah entitled Khizânah i ‘ámîrah and of other works),
was the author of (1) *Tahqiq al-ishilahat* (a chronogram = 1189/1775), a glossary of rare words (see Rieu iii 1070b), (2) *Muntakhab al-nahw*, a Persian syntax written A.H. 1214/1799–1800 (see Rieu ii 857b), (3) *Muntakhab al-sarf*, on the formation of Arabic words used in Persian (see Rieu ii 857b), extracts were published by M. J. Rowlandson in Part ii of *An analysis of Arabic quotations which occur in the Gulistan of肌ih-ul-deen Sheikh Sadi* (Madras 1828°), (4) a Persian work of which an English translation was published under the title *Dissertation concerning the Revenues of Government, and of landed Tenures according to the Mohammedan Law in The Oriental Miscellany* (Calcutta 1798°), (5) *Ruqa’at i Haider* (Asafiyah i p. 124 no. 129).

According to "Afsos" he was for some years a mufti in the service of the East India Company and died in 1217/1802–3, having fallen ill at Murshidabod when accompanying his family as far as Patna on a journey to Bilgram.

*Savanih i Akbari*, a biography, of which vol. i (apparently the only one extant) goes down to the end of the 24th regnal year, A.H. 987/1579–80, based mainly on the *Akbar-namah* but also on the four daftars of Abū 'l-Faḍl’s *Munshārāt* and other works and written by desire of William Kirkpatrick: *Bānpīpur vīi* 556 (A.D. 1854), *Rieu iii* 930a (19th cent.).


Description: Elliot and Dowson *History of India viii* 193.

["Afsos" *Ārāyish i mahfil*, in the account of Bilgram at the end of the description of Oudh; Garcin de Tassy 1st ed. ii p. 379, 2nd ed. i p. 259 (an extract from the *Ārāyish i mahfil.*]

714. **M. Ḥafiz**, a resident of Jaland’hur ("Jullundur"), left that town on account of Sik’h disturbances.

*Nafst al-talibin*, a life of Akbar written at the request of Ḥadrat Rūḥ al-Amīn Jiw, based on the *Akbar-nāmah*, the

---

1 The author’s autobiography, which, as stated at the end, was to form an appendix to the work, is missing from the BM. MS. (Rieu iii 1070b).

2 For whom see Buckland *Dictionary of Indian biography.*

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (c) THE TĪMŪRIDS

(5) JAHĀNGĪR

715. M. Salim, the eldest son of Akbar and Rājah Bihārī Mal’s daughter, was born at Fathpūr-Sīkri on 17 Rabī’ i 977/31 Aug. 1569. He succeeded his father on 20 Jumādā ii 1014/24 Oct. 1605 at the age of 38, and adopted the title of Abū ’l-Muẓaffar Nūr al-Dīn M. Jahāngīr Pādshāh. In 1020/1611 he married Mīhr al-Nisā’ (afterwards entitled Nūr-Mahall and later Nūr-Jahān), the daughter of Ghiyāth Bēg afterwards entitled I’timād al-Daulah. He died on 28 Șafar 1037/7 Nov. 1627 and was buried at Shāhdarah near Lahore.

Jahāngīr-nāmah¹ or (Tūzuk i Jahāngīrī), the Emperor’s memoirs, existing in three forms,² the first two apparently authentic and the third, which is confused, lacking in dates and marked by exaggerations and irrelevant digressions, more or less garbled (see de Sacy’s discussion in the Journal des savants, 1830, pp. 359 foll. and 430 foll.):

I The earliest version³ of the memoirs written in the 3rd year of the reign (beginning Ham d i bī-ghāyat u shukr i bī-nihāyat

¹ This is the title given to the work in the account of the 13th year (pp. 23518, 2397) and in the preface to the Ma’āthir i Jahāngīrī. Various other titles have been given to it, e.g. Tārīkh i Salīm-Shāhī, Tārīkh i Salīmī, Wāqī’āt i Jahāngīrī, etc.

² The classification given below is only provisional, since the manuscripts have not all been carefully examined or adequately described.

³ This “shorter redaction of the spurious memoirs”, as Ethé calls it, agrees generally, according to Rieu, with the earlier part of the “garbled” or “spurious” memoirs, which are apparently an amplification and extension of it.
mubdi'i rā ¹): Bānkīpur vii 557 (written at Haidarābād A.H. 1020/1611 (note this very early date), Aumer 259 (1) (?) (A.H. 1138/1726), Ethē 309 (A.H. 1194/1780), Berlin 486 (A.H. 1199/1784–5), Bodleian 222 (A.H. 1225/1810), Rieu iii 932a (A.H. 1239/1824).

The "authentic" memoirs (beg. Az 'ināyāt i bī-ghāyāt i ilāhi) written by the Emperor himself from his accession firstly to the end of the twelfth regnal year (after which copies were bound and distributed to relations and officials) then to the 17th year, after which they were continued, under his supervision, by Mu'tamad Khān (for whom see p. 560 infra) to the beginning of the 19th year, and finally re-edited in the time of Muhammad Shāh by M. Hādī, who added an introduction (beginning Hamd u thanā-yi bī mar u hadd) dealing with Jahāngīr's pre-regnal life and a continuation to the end of his reign: Lahore Panjāb Univ. Lib. (the first twelve years. A copy bearing the seals of Jahāngīr and Shāh-Jahān. See Oriental College Magazine, vol. ii, no. 4 (August 1926) pp. 51–2), Ross and Browne 9 (breaks off about half-way through the work. Bears a seal dated 1040/1630–1), Ethē 305 (to beginning of 19th year. N.d.), 306 (to beginning of 19th year. N.d.), 307 (defective, extending to beginning of 10th year. N.d.), 308 (ends as no. 307. A.D. 1835), 2833 (with M. Hādī's continuation. Written after collating different MSS. by S. M. Khān Dihlawī A.D. 1843. Ornate copy), Rieu i 253b (to end of 12th year. 17th cent.), Suppt. 77 (breaks off in middle of 13th year. 17th cent.), iii 930b (with M. Hādī's continuation. 1 Picture. A.H. 1241/1825), 931a (with M. Hādī's continuation. 18th cent.), 931a (with M. Hādī's continuation. 18th cent.), 931a (extracts. Circ. 1850), 931a i (Or. 1648 foll. 35–181. The first twelve years in a shorter recension. Early 19th cent.), 931a ii (Or. 1648 foll. 202–296. Passages from the fuller recension. Early 19th cent.), Lindesiana p. 159 no. 938 (with M. Hādī's continuation. Circ. A.D. 1700), Bodleian 219 (to 23 Rabi' i A.H. 1027/1618, the 14th year. A.H. 1118/1706), 220

¹ These are the opening words of the garbled memoirs also. For the opening and closing words of this earliest version see Elliot and Dowson History of India vi p. 264.
(ends at same point), 221 (with M. Hādī’s continuation. Completed A.D. 1846 by S. Ahmad Khān (for whom see p. 483 supra) on the basis of 10 good MSS. belonging to Bahādur Shāh’s libraries). Browne Pers. Cat. 94 (to end of 12th year. N.d.), 95 (to end of 12th year. A.H. 1139/1726), Spt. 333 (A.H. 1232/1816–17), 334 (King’s 88), Blochet 579 (to end of 12th year. A.H. 1196/1781), R.A.S. P. 124 = Morley 120 (with M. Hādī’s continuation. A.H. 1231/1815), Ivanov 142 (to the 19th year. A.H. 1253/1837), 144 (with M. Hādī’s continuation. 19th cent.), Curzon 27 (mid 19th cent.)

It is not clear from the catalogue whether the copies of the “Tuzuk-i Jahāngīrī” mentioned in Āṣafiyah i p. 234 nos. 234 and 632 are the authentic or the “spurious” memoirs. There is a Tārīkh-i Jahāngīr-Shāhī mentioned in Semenov’s catalogue of the historical MSS. in the Central Library at Bukhārā, p. 8 no. 14.

Editions: (1) Tūzuk-i-Jehangeeree [with M. Hādī’s continuation] ... Edited by Syed Ahmad [for whom see p. 483 supra], Ghāzipur and (preface etc.) ‘Aligarh 1863–4°*, (2) Lucknow 1914°*.

Extracts: Muntakhabat i Tūzuk i Jahāngīrī, Lahore 1884†.


Extracts with translation by F. Gladwin: Gladwin History of Hindostan, Calcutta 1788, i p. 96 foll.

English translations: (1) Tūzuk-i-Jahāngīrī translated ... by W. H. Lowe. [One fasciculus only], Calcutta 1889°* (Bibliotheca Indica), (2) The Tūzuk-i-Jahāngīrī, or Memoirs of Jahāngīr [without M. Hādī’s continuation]. Translated by A. Rogers ... Edited by H. Beveridge. 2 vols. London 1909–14°* (Oriental Translation Fund, N.S. xix, xxii), (3) by W. Erskine (first nine years only): B.M. MS. Add. 26,611.

Description and translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson History of India vi pp. 276–391.

Description and extracts from M. Hādī’s continuation: Elliot and Dowson vi pp. 392–9.
The "garbled" memoirs (beginning: Ḥamd i bī-ghāyat u shukr i bī-nihāyat mubādī'ī rā, to which some verses beginning Ai nām i tū sar-daftar i asrār i wujūd are normally prefixed), apparently an amplification and extension of the earliest version (no. 1 above) and possibly, as Rieu suggests, written in the early part of Shāh-Jahān's reign with a view to superseding the genuine memoirs, which contain many passages reflecting of Shāh-Jahān. (Most of the MSS. contain at the end a Pand-nāmah, or collection of moral precepts, ascribed to Jahāngīr with a prologue by I'timād al-Daulah): R.A.S. P. 122 = Morley 117 (ending with a number of letters, petitions etc. belonging to Jahāngīr's later years. A.H. 1040/1630), P. 123 = Morley 119, P. 114 (2) = Morley 118 (the MS. from which Price made his translation), Mashhad iii p. 89 (defective at beginning. Probably the "garbled" memoirs. A.H. 1046/1636–7), Rieu i 254b (with a continuation not found in Price's translation. Breaks off in prologue to the Pand-nāmah. 17th cent.), 255a (1. Picture. 19th cent.), iii 931b (circ. A.D. 1850), Lālā Ismā'īl 337 = Tauer 550 (11th/17th cent.), Edinburgh 211 (A.H. 1127/1716), 212 (about same date ?), Ethé 310 (A.H. 1154/1742), 311 (circ. A.D. 1802–3), I.O. D.P. 775 (19th cent.), Rīdā Pāshā 16 = Tauer 551 (12th/18th cent.), Ivanow 143 (A.H. 1202/1787–8), Aumer 258 (18th cent.), Blochet i 580 (late 18th cent.), Lahore Panjāb Univ. Lib. (one copy dated A.H. 1262/1846 and one of an abridgment dated A.H. 1242/1826), Bānkīpur vii 558 (with the continuation not found in Price's translation. 19th cent.), Būhār 67 (19th cent.), 68 (19th cent.), Browne Suppt. 366 (Trinity R. 13. 67).

For a separate copy of the Pand-nāmah i Jahāngīrī see Ross and Browne 150 (ii) (A.H. 1124/1712–13).


Description and a translated extract (in both Elliot's and Price's versions): Elliot and Dowson History of India vi pp. 256–75.
Translation of the \textit{Pand-nāmah}: Elliot and Dowson \textit{History of India} vi pp. 493–516.

716. \textbf{Wali Sirhindī}, called Khwājah-zādah, was in the service of Jahāngīr and was more than 46 years old in the fourteenth year of the reign when he wrote his \textit{Tawārīkh i Jahāngīr-Shāhī} and dedicated it to his sovereign.

\textit{Tawārīkh i Jahāngīr-Shāhī}, or \textit{Farhang i bādī' al-lughāt i Jahāngīrī (?)}, a brief chronicle of the first fourteen years of Jahāngīr’s reign: \textit{Bodleian} 231 (foll. 389b–421a. Autograph).

717. M. Sharīf, a member of an undistinguished Persian family, received the title of \textbf{Mu'tamad Khān} in the third year of Jahāngīr’s reign, and was for a time Bakhsū of the Ahadīs. Subsequently he was Bakhsū to Prince Khurram’s army in the Deccan. In the seventeenth year of the reign, a.h. 1031/1622, after returning from the Deccan, he was ordered by Jahāngīr, then in bad health, to continue his Memoirs (see the \textit{Memoirs of Jahāngīr} tr. Rogers and Beveridge vol. ii p. 246). In the second year of Shāh-Jahān’s reign he became Second Bakhsū and in the tenth Mir Bakhsū. In the thirteenth (a.h. 1049/1639–40) he died.

An account of Shāh-Jahān’s life until his accession, \textit{Ahwāl i shāh-zādāgī i Shāh-Jahān}, which is extant in three recorded MSS. (Bānkīpur vii 565 (1), Rieu Suppt. 76 ii, Būhār 74 i), is ascribed in “endorsements” to “Mu’tamad Khān”, by which title the author of the \textit{Iqbal-nāmah} is doubtless meant, but the correctness of this ascription is doubted by Rieu on the ground that, whereas in the \textit{Iqbal-nāmah} Mu’tamad Khān refers to himself by such phrases as “the present writer”, the author of this work speaks of Mu’tamad Khān by name in the corresponding passages.

\textsuperscript{1} He is to be distinguished from Sharīf Khān, who was \textit{Amīr al-umārā} in the early years of Jahāngīr’s reign and who died in 1021/1612.

\textsuperscript{2} Ibn Dōst-M. M. Sharīf al-mughātab bi-Mu’tamad Khān, according to Berlin 430, fol. 4a, 1. 6 \textit{ab infra} (see Pertsch’s catalogue p. 470 n. 1). Bānkīpur vii p. 60 \textit{ult}.  

\textsuperscript{1} He is to be distinguished from Sharīf Khān, who was \textit{Amīr al-umārā} in the early years of Jahāngīr’s reign and who died in 1021/1612.
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Iqbal-namah i Jahangiri, completed, according to the preface, in Kashmir A.H. 1029/1619-20, the fifteenth regnal year (but the narrative is brought down to Jahangir's death), a history in three volumes ((1) Babur and Humayun, (2) Akbar, (3) Jahangir, of which the third is common, the first two rare), based mainly on the Akbar-namah, the Tabaqat i Akbari, Khwajah 'Ata [so Bankipur vii p. 61, but read Asad?] Beg Qazwini's history of [a small part of] Akbar's reign (see p. 554 supra), and Jahangir's own Memoirs: Bankipur vii 560-1 (vols. i-ii. A.H. 1045/1635-6. The preface of this copy contains no mention of a third volume), 559 (vols. i-iii, slightly defective. 18th cent.), 562 (vols. iii. A.H. 12—(?), Supp. 1765 (vols. i and iii. A.H. 1207/1792-3), 1766 (vols. iii. 18th cent.), Blochet i 581 (vols. i-iii, lacking last chapter. Mid 17th cent.), 582 (vol. i. Latter half of 17th cent.), 583 (vol. ii. A.H. 1049/1639), 584 (vol. iii. A.H. 1204/1789), 585 (vol. iii. A.H. 1160/1747), Browne Pers. Cat. 96 (vol. iii. A.H. 1143/1730-1), 97 (vol. iii, defective. N.d.), Supp. 75 (vol. iii. A.H. 1219/1804). Christ's Dd. 3. 17, 76 (vol. iii. A.H. 1231/1816. Corpus 207), 77 (vol. i. A.D. 1063/1653. Vol. ii. A.H. 1086/1675-6. King's 33), Ethé 312 (vols. i-ii. A.H. 1087/1676 (?)), 313 (vol. ii, pt. 2 (from middle of Akbar's 28th year to his death. A.H. 1064/1654), 314 (vol. iii. A.H. 1071/1660), 315-24 (ten copies of vol. iii, 324 being misdescribed by Ethé 2), I.O. D.P. 621 B (vol. iii, defective), 621 C (Vol. iii. A.H. 1228/1813), Mehren 57 (Vol. iii. A.H. 1071/1661), Rieu i 255a (vol. iii. A.H. 1074/1664), 255b (vol. iii. 17th cent.), 256a-256b (five 18th-century copies of vol. iii, one containing nine PICTURES), 256b (three 19th-century copies of vol. iii), ii 819b (A.D. 1819), iii 922b (vol. i. A.H. 1104-5/1693), 923a (vol. ii. 18th cent.), 923a (part of vol. ii (to Akbar's 17th year). 17th cent.), 923b (vol. iii. A.H. 1103/1692), iii 1030b (extracts), Philadelphia Lewis Coll. p. 56 (Vol. ii. 54 PICTURES, of which a list is given and three are reproduced in the catalogue), p. 63 (fragments of Vols. i and ii. Late 17th cent.), Bodleian 224 (vol. iii. A.H. 1095/1684), 225 (vol. iii. A.H. 1106/1695), 226-30 (five more copies of vol. iii),

1 Often called the Jahangir-namah.
2 According to Beveridge (see Memoirs of Jahangir, preface, p. xv, postscript):

Editions: CALCUTTA 1865°* (vol. iii only. Ed. ‘Abd al-Ḥaiy and Ahmad ‘Alī. Bibliotheca Indica), LUCKNOW 1870°* (vols. i–iii), 1890° (vol. iii only. Title: Jahāngīr-nāmah. Author’s name given in the publisher’s colophon as Khwājah Abū ʿl-Ḥasan1), ALLAHABAD 1931°* (vol. iii only).

Description and 37 pp. of translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson Hist. of India vi 400–38.

English translation by J. Macmurd (b. 1785, d. 1820): I.O. MSS. Eur. F. 26 (according to G. R. Kaye, "The extracts given by Elliot, possibly from a different work, differ considerably from our manuscript").

[Iqbāl-nāmah i Jahāngīr] iii pp. 917, 1041, 1871², and doubtless elsewhere; Memoirs of Jahāngīr tr. Rogers and Beveridge i 300, ii 1, 2, 100–1, 128, 129, 131–2, 158, 175, 193, 235, 246; ‘Abd al-Ḥamil Pādshāh-nāmah i 73 etc., ii p. 102 etc. (see the indexes to both volumes in the Bibliotheca Indica); Maʾāthir al-umārā’

1 In the B.M. catalogue consequently this edition is entered under Abū ʿl-Ḥasan, Khwājah.
iii 431–4 (two short extracts from this notice are translated in Elliot and Dowson viii p. 191); Tadhkirat al-umarā'; Elliot and Dowson vi p. 400; Ency. Isl. under Mu'tamad Khān.)

718. Khwājah Kāmgār Ḫusainī, originally in the service of Jahāngīr, took part in the campaign of his uncle 'Abd Allāh Khān Firōz-Jang against the rebel Khān-Jahān Lōdī (for whom see Ency. Isl. ii 898) and took the latter's head to Shāh-Jahān in the fourth year of his reign, A.H. 1040/1631, receiving as a reward the title of Ghairat Khān. In Shāh-Jahān's tenth year he was appointed Nāẓim of the Sūbah of Delhi, but in 1049/1639, when the new buildings of Shāhjahānābād were just rising from their foundations under his superintendence, he was transferred to the Sūbahdārī of Tattah, where he died in 1050/1640–1.


Description and two translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson History of India vi 439-45.

[Maʾāthir al-umarāʾ ii 363–5; Tadhkirat al-umarāʾ; Elliot and Dowson vi 439–41; Rieu i 257a.]

719. Mullā "Kāmi" Shirāzī.1

Waqāʾiʿ al-zamān, or Fath-nāmah i Nūr-Jahān Bēgam, a mathnawī on events towards the end of Jahāngīr's reign

---

1 It is not clear whether Blochet has good authority for ascribing the Waqāʾiʿ al-zamān to this poet, since, according to him, in both of the manuscripts the author's name has disappeared in a lacuna. "Kāmi" Shirāzī is not mentioned in the Iqbal-nāmah among the poets of Jahāngīr's reign, nor does he seem to be noticed in the tadhkirahs.
(especially "la lutte entre l'empereur timouride, Mohabat [sic] Khan, Asaf Khan, laquelle fut provoquée par les intrigues de sa femme, Nour Djihan Bégoum, qui avait fait choisir Khourram, son troisième fils, comme prince héréiti"r") composed at Kábul in 1035/1625-6 and dedicated to Jahângîr: Blochêt iii 1874 (circ. A.D. 1626), 1875 (late 17th cent.).

720. One of the Elliot MSS. of the Jahângîr-nâmâh (Or. 1648. Rieu iii p. 931a. Early 19th cent.) contains on foll. 181b-201b "detached notices and anecdotes relating to various periods of Jahângîr's reign" including some quotations from the Jahângîr-nâmâh and following no chronological order. They begin with the words "az intikhâb i Jahângîr-Shâhî nawishtah mi-shawad", and contain internal evidence that the author was a contemporary and companion of Jahângîr. That they belong to a larger work is clear from the fact that "the author speaks of his having related, in another part of the volume, a detailed account of the proceedings of Bikrámâjîf and of 'Usmân in Bengal; and neither of these passages occurs in these extracts".

**Intikhâb i Jahângîr-Shâhî (†):** see description above.

Description and 5½ pp. of translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson *History of India* vi pp. 446-52.

721. For the *Shâsh fat'h i Kângrah* of Jalâl al-Dîn Tabâfîbâ'î see p. 566 infra.

**M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (c) THE TIMURIDS**

(6) **SHÂH-JAHÂN**

722. The author of the *Ahwâl i shâh-zâdâgî i Shâh-Jahân* does not mention his name in the text, but "endorsements" (apparently on all the three recorded MSS.) ascribe the work to Mu'tamad Khân. The person intended is doubtless the author of the *Iqbal-nâmâh i Jahângîrî* (see p. 560 *infra*), but the correctness of the ascription is doubted by Rieu on the ground that, whereas in the *Iqbal-nâmâh* Mu'tamad Khân refers to himself by such phrases as "the present writer", the author of
the Alwāl i shāh-zādāgī i Shāh-Jahān speaks of Mu'tamad Khān by name in the corresponding passages.

(Alwāl i shāh-zādāgī i Shāh-Jahān), an account of Shāh-Jahān’s life until his accession in 1037/1628: Bānkipūr vii 565 (1) (44th year of ‘Ālamgīr), Rieu Suppt. 76 ii (18th cent.), Būḥār 74 i (A.H. 1235/1819–20).

723. Mīrza M. Jalāl [al-Dīn], or Jalālā, Tabātābā'i Zawārī 1 Iṣfahānī went to India in 1044/1634–5, and, having been appointed one of Shāh-Jahān’s court chroniclers, wrote an account of five 2 years of the reign, but owing to the envy of rivals he had to discontinue this work. In 1062/1652, according to his own statement, he began to translate from the Arabic for Prince Murād-Bakhsh the work known as Tauqī'āt i Kismawī, or, chronogrammatically, Dastūr-nāmah i Kismawī, a collection of answers alleged to have been given by Khusraw Anūshirwān to ministers of his who questioned him concerning matters of administration or other subjects [Arabic text unknown (?). MSS. of Persian translation: Bodleian 1470, Browne Suppt. 335–7, 488. Editions: Khudā'ī Press [Lucknow] 1261/1845*, Nawal Kishōr [Lucknow] 1287/1870*, Nawal Kishōr [Cawnpore] 1874*, Cawnpore 1886°, Lucknow 1892* (The Wisdom of Naushirwan “the Just”... commonly called Tauqiyat i Kismawīya. With transliteration and English translation by W. Young). According to the Tahhkira h i Tāhir i Naṣrābādī he died some years (chand sāl) before the composition of that work (which was begun in 1083/1672–3, but added to in 1089/1678–9 and 1092/1681). He was regarded as the master of a new style of Persian composition. 3 For collections of letters and other pieces by him see Rieu iii 933a, Āṣafiyah i p. 132 no. 20, and Lindesiana p. 161 no. 425.

(1) (Pādshāh-nāmah or Shāh-Jahān-nāmah), a prolix account of the 5th–8th solar years of Shāh-Jahān’s reign (i.e. 28

---

1 For the meaning of this nisbah see p. 14 supra, n. 2.
2 It will be seen below that the B.M. MS. at any rate does not contain five full years.
3 Cf. the statement of Diwā' al-Dīn Khān, cited by Rieu (iii 933b), that none but Sh. Abū 'l-Faḍl ever wrote history with equal elegance.
Sha'ban 1041/20 March 1632 to 11 Shawwal 1045/19 March 1636): Aṣafiyyah i p. 244 no. 359 (A.H. 1187/1773–4), Lindesiana p. 161 no. 410 (circ. A.D. 1800), Rieu iii 933a (A.H. 1216/1801), 1035b (a notice of the work with extracts). Circ. A.D. 1850), 1048b (a notice of the work), I.O. D.P. 684 (early 19th cent. This is the MS. referred to by W. N. Lees in JRAS. 1868 p. 463).


Descriptions and partial translations: (1) Elliot and Dowson History of India vi pp. 517–31 (the whole of the first account is translated and the beginnings of the other five), (2) The Zafarnāma-i-Kāngra, or an account of the conquest of Kangrah during the reign of Jahāngīr. By Raza Husain (in the Journal of the United Provinces Historical Society, vol. ii (1919) pp. 56–62).

[‘Amal i Ṣāliḥ, near the end; Tadhkirah i Tāhir i Naṣrābādī i pp. 102–3; Rieu i 258a.]

724. Mīrzhā M. Amīn b. Abī ʻl-Ḥusain Qazwīnī, usually called Aminā i Qazwīnī, a Persian by birth, entered the service of Shāh-Jahān as a munsīri in the fifth year of his reign, and in the eighth year (A.H. 1045/1635–6) was appointed Historiographer with orders to prepare a history of the first ten years of the reign. According to the Mirʿāt al-ʻalam (Rieu i, 125b, fol. 462b) he was an eminent calligraphist, but he does not seem to be mentioned in the Tadhkirah i khwush-nawīsān of Ghulām-Muhammad Dihlawī.
Pādshāh-nāmah, a history of the first ten years of Shāh-Jahān's reign, with a muqaddimah on his life before accession and a khātimah on the contemporary shaikhs, scholars, physicians and poets: Edinburgh 409 (autograph ?), Rieu i 258b (17th cent.), 259b (18th cent. 9 good Pictures), 259b (A.H. 1251/1835), iii 933b (A.H. 1240/1824), 935 (extracts only), R.A.S. P. 126 = Morley 122 (A.H. 1173/1759), Bānkīpūr vii 566 (1) (18th cent. Good Pictures), Būhār 69 (A.H. 1228/1813), I.O. D.P. 683 (A.H. 1248/1832–3), Ivanow 151 (A.H. 1253/1842), Bodleian 236 (? ?), Windsor Castle (see Journal of Indian Art, vol. v (London 1894), plate 69), possibly also Biochet i 590 (18th cent.).

[Amal i Ṣāliḥ (quoted Bānkīpūr vii p. 72].]

725. Muḥammad-Qulī "Salīm" Ṭihrānī was for a time attached to Mīrzā ʿAbd Allāh, Governor of Lāhijān, but subsequently went to India and found a patron in Islām Khān Māshhādī.¹ He died in Kashmir in 1057/1647. (For further information see the section Poetry.)

(Fang i Islām Khān²), a māthnawī on the victories of Islām Khān in Kūch Hājī and Assam ³: Ivanow 748 (6) (early 18th cent.), 749 (18th cent.), 750 (18th cent.), Bānkīpūr iii 311 fol. 21b (described as "A Maṣnawī in praise of Spring". 18th cent.), Rieu iii 1032a (circ. A.D. 1850), and doubtless in other MSS. of the Dīwān (for which see the section Poetry).

[Tadhkira i Ṭahir i Naṣrābādī; Safinah i Khwusqū no. 731; Haft āsmān pp. 144–5; Bānkīpūr iii pp. 88–9 and the authorities cited there. See also the section Poetry.]

726. M. Šādiq Dihlawi is probably identical with M. Šādiq Kashmirī Hamadānī, the author of the Tabaqāt i Shāh-Jahānī

¹ For Islām Khān see Maʿāthīr al-umarāʾ i pp. 162–7. In Shāh-Jahān's eighth year he was appointed Governor of Bengal.
² This, according to Ethē, is the title given to the poem in the Khulāṣat al-kālām (see Ethē col. 851º). In some of the MSS. it seems to be headed [Māthnawī ?] dar fath i Bangālāh.
³ In 1047/1637 (see 'Abd al-Ḥamīd Pādshāh-nāmah ii 68–90, 'Amal i Ṣāliḥ ii 286–8).
(written in 1046/1636-7) and the Kalimāt al-ṣādiqīn (completed in 1023/1614. See Bānkīpūr viii no. 671).

Āthār i Shāh-Jahānī or AKBār i Jahāngīrī, dedicated to Shāh-Jahān, and divided into a muqaddimah (on kingship), a maqta (on Shāh-Jahān’s ancestors), a maqṣad (anecdotes of prophets, caliphs and kings), and a khātimah (probably on Shāh-Jahān): Bānkīpūr vii 564 (lacking khātimah. 18th century), Browne Suppt. 23 (King’s).

727. Ḥājjī M. Jān 1 “Qudsi” Mashḥadī was born at Mashḥad. Coming to India in 1041/1631 he was patronised by ‘Abd Allāh Khān Firōz-Jang and in 1042/1632 presented by him to Shāh-Jahān. He received liberal rewards from Shāh-Jahān, but did not become Malik al-shu‘arā, having been forestalled by “Kalim”, who received the title before “Qudsi’s” arrival at Shāh-Jahān’s court. He died A.H. 1056/1646 3 at Lahore, 4 and was buried at Mashḥad. According to M. Amin Qazwīnī (for whom see p. 566 supra), “Qudsi” and “Kalim” (for whom see p. 572 infra) were simultaneously (in 1047/1637-8) engaged in composing poetical records of Shāh-Jahān’s reign.


1 Not Khān, as in the Ency. Isl.
2 As is erroneously stated by some authorities, but it is expressly denied by M. Sāliḥ.
3 In 1055/1645 according to some authorities.
4 In Kashmir according to other authorities.
5 Padshāh-nāmah, fol. 431, according to Rieu, who does not make it clear which MS. he is referring to, but evidently the passage occurs in the account of the poets at the end of the work.
[Tabaqat i Shāh-Jahānī; ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd Pādshāh-nāmah i pt. 1, pp. 444, 530, pt. 2, pp. 19, 21, 50, 80, 142, 351–3; ‘Amāl i Ṣāliḥ, near the end; Tadhkiraḥ i Tāhir i Naṣrābādī (Sprenger p. 90); Mīrāt al-ḥayāl pp. 85–8 (Bodleian 374 no. 69). Wrong date given here by a mistake of Ethé’s, see Bānkīpur viii p. 76; Kalimāt al-ḥu’arā’ (Sprenger p. 113); Hamīshah bahār (Sprenger p. 128); Safīnāh i Khwāṣhū (Bodleian 376) no. 728; Yad i baidā’; Wāqī’āt i Kāshmīr; Riyād al-ḥu’arā’; Majma’ al-nafā’is; Sarw i āzād; Khizānāh i ‘āmīrah (Bodleian 381) no. 96; Ātash-kadah (Bodleian 384) no. 217; Khulāṣāt al-kalām (Bānkīpur viii 705, no. 37); Khulāṣāt al-afkār (Bodleian 391) no. 214; Makhzan al-gharā’īb (Bodleian 395) no. 2067; Nishtar i ʾishq; Natāʾij al-afkār (Sprenger p. 536; Haft āṣmān 143–4; Rieu ii 684; Ethé 1552; Ency. Isl. under Kudā; Portraits in E. B. Havell Indian sculpture and painting, 2nd ed., plate lviii, and Būhār 391.]

728. Mīr M. Yahyā “Yaḥyā” or “Kāshī” ¹ (perhaps both) Kāshī, whose father had migrated from Shīrāz to Kāshān,² went to India in the reign of Shāh-Jahān and wrote panegyrics on him and his eldest son Dārā-Shukōh. He was appointed Imperial Librarian (Kūṭāb-dār), and commanded to write in verse a record of the reign, but he afterwards lost the royal favour and discontinued the poem. He died in 1064/1653.³ His dīwān was collected after his death by his friend “Āshnā” (see p. 577 infra). A copy is preserved at Bānkīpur (iii no. 331).

Pādshāh-nāmah, a metrical history of Shāh-Jahān’s reign:
Rieu iii 1001b (a fragment of 45 foll. consisting of panegyrics

¹ In the alphabetically arranged tadhirahs Mīr Yahyā seems always to be placed under Yahyā, which would imply that this was his takhallaṣ. ‘Abd al-Muqtadīr, however, in describing the (unique ?) Bānkīpur MS. of his dīwān calls him “Mīr Yahyā, who adopted the poetical title of Kāshī”.

² In support of this statement ‘Abd al-Muqtadīr quotes some lines ascribed to Yahyā Kāshī by “Ārzā”. If they are really by Yahyā Kāshī, they are decisive enough, but ‘Abd al-Muqtadīr does not say whether they occur in the dīwān.

³ There is some confusion in several of the tadhirahs between Mīr Yahyā Kāshī and Qādī Yahyā Lāhijī (Gūlānī), who according to Taqī Kāshī (Sprenger p. 22) died in 953 and according to the Ātash-kadah (Bodl. 384 no. 344) in 952.
on Shāh-Jahān and florid descriptions of some of his buildings. A.H. 1267/1851).

[‘Abd al-Ḥamīd Pādshāh-nāmah ii 758–9; Tadhkīrah i Tāhir i Naṣrābādī (Sprenger p. 91); Kalīmāt al-shu‘arā’ (Sprenger p. 115); Yad i biqā; Muntakhab al-ash‘ār no. 742; Riyāḍ al-shu‘arā’; Majma‘ al-nafā‘is; Khizānah i ‘āmirah (Bodleian 381 no. 134); Khulāsati al-kulām (Bānkīpūr viii 705 no. 58, Bodl. 390 no. 78); Khulāsati al-afkār (Bodl. 391 no. 468); Maḥzān al-q̲h̲arā‘īb (Bodl. 395 no. 3101); Haft āsmān pp. 156–8; Bānkīpūr iii pp. 120–2.]

729. Hīlyah i Shāh-Jahān, a mathnawi of 25 foll. describing the physical features of Shāh-Jahān (beg. Īlāhī ba-iqābāl u bā farr u shān): Bānkīpūr iii 325 (20th regnal year [of Shāh-Jahān probably]).

730. Rāy Chandar-bhān “Barahman” or “Barhaman” (both of these forms, but not of course “Brahman”, being used in his dīwān), the son of a Brahman named D’haram-Dās, was born at Lahore and was a pupil of the well-known divine ʿAbd al-Ḥakīm Siyālkoti (for whom see the I.O. catalogue of Arabic MSS., vol. ii no. 1122, Brockelmann i 417 and Sptbd ii pp. 613–14). He became secretary to Afḍal Khān (Mullā Shukr Allāh Shīrāzī, who was appointed Mīr-Sāmān in Shāh-Jahān’s first year, A.H. 1037/1628, and Dīwān i Kull in the second year, and who died in 1048/1639. See Ma‘āthīr al-umārā‘i 145–51). After Afḍal Khān’s death (but not immediately after, since according to Rieu iii 935b, evidently on the authority of the Chār chaman, his first introduction to Court took place in Sirhind, when Shāh-Jahān was preparing for the conquest of Badakhsān (A.H. 1055)) he was appointed Wāqī‘ah-nawīs i Hudūr, his duty being to attend Shāh-Jahān on his journeys and to record the daily occurrences of his court (Rieu i 397b, again apparently on the authority of the Chār chaman, written shortly after 1057). It must have been later than this that, as Khāfī Khān relates (i, p. 74010), he entered Dārā-Shukhsh’s service with the Emperor’s consent. After a time (apparently in 1066/1655–6, the year under which Khāfī Khān mentions the occurrence) he was taken
from Dārā-Shukoh and given employment in the Dār al-Inshā’ with the title of Rāy Chandar-bhān. According to the Mir’āt al-khayāl he retired from employment after the death of Dārā-Shukoh ¹ (in 1069/1659), went to Benares and died there in 1073/1662–3. According to the Mir’āt i jahān-numā (cited Rieu iii 1087a ad 397b) he died in 1068/1657–8.

He was distinguished both as a poet and as a prose-writer. For his diwan see Āsāfiyāh i p. 718 no. 453, Bodleian 1123, Brelvi and Dhabhar p. xxv no. 10, Browne Suppt. 517, Ethé 1574–5, Ross and Browne 258 (4), Ivanow 762–3, Ivanow Curzon 740, Lindesiana p. 129 nos. 84 and 640, Rehatsekh p. 98 no. 50, Sprenger no. 168. A mystical mathnawi of his was published in a Majmū’ah i rasā’il at Lucknow in 1877°*. An edition of his Munsha’āt or Inshā, letters to Shāh-Jahān and others, was published at [Lucknow] in 1885°. For MSS. see Āsāfiyāh i p. 114 no. 60, Bodleian 1385–6, Ethé 2094, ii 3047, Berlin 1070, ‘Aligarh Subh. MSS. p. 53 no 9, Rieu i 397. A Vedāntic work, Nāzuk khayālāt, translated by Chandarbhān from the Ātma-vilāsa ascribed to Shankara Āchārya, was published at Lahore in [1901°]. He also translated from Hindi into Persian Dārā-Shukoh’s questions concerning Hindu beliefs and customs and the answers to them (Berlin 1081 (2)).

Chār chaman i Barahman written soon after 1057/1647 ² and divided into four chamans ((1) descriptions of various festivals at Court with poems recited by the author at them, (2) the daily occupations of Shāh-Jahān, his capital Shāhjahānābād etc., (3) the author’s life and some of his letters, (4) moral and religious reflections): Rieu ii 838b (A.H. 1123/1711), iii 935b (A.D. 1849), Brelvi and Dhabhar p. 60 no. 8 (1) (A.H. 1186/1772–3), Ethé 2093 (A.H. 1193/1779), ii 3047, L.O. 3760 foll. 132–70 (Qawā‘id al-saltanat i Shāh-Jahān), Eton 54 (? Qawā‘id al-saltanat, finished 1196), Browne Suppt. 376 (n.d. Corpus 94), Madras (Qawā‘id al-saltanat i Shāh-Jahān. Author not stated. 2 copies).

¹ It is implied that he was at that time in Dārā-Shukoh’s service, but this may be incorrect.
² “The work was written shortly after A.H. 1057; the restitution of Balkh to Naẓr Muḥammad, which took place at that date, is mentioned, fol. 54b, as a recent transaction” (Rieu ii 838b).
Excerpts by the author: Guldastah-i Chahr Chaman-i Barahman (beg.: Gauhar-afshānī i saḥāb i qalam): ‘Alīgarh Subh. MSS. p. 53 no. 22 (A.H. 1146/1733–4), Brelvi and Dhabbar p. 60 no. 8 (2) (A.H. 1186), Rosen Inst. 23 (3).

Extract with English translation: Kowāyid us Sultanet Shahjehan, or Rules observed during the reign of Shahjehan (in F. Gladwin The Persian Moonshee, Calcutta 1795°, London 1801°*).

[Chahār chaman i Barahman, Chaman iii; ‘Amal i Šālih; Kalimāt al-shuʿarāʿ (Sprenger p. 110); Mir‘āt al-khayāl pp. 139–40 (Bodleian 374 no. 78); Hamīshah bahār (Sprenger p. 119); Muntakhab al-hubāb i 740¹⁰; Muntakhab al-ash‘ār no. 107; Riyād al-shuʿarāʿ; Gul i ra‘nā; Farhat al-nāźirīn (passage quoted in Oriental College Magazine, vol. iv no. 4 (Lahore, August 1928) p. 89); Šuhuf i Ibrāhīm; Makheen al-qharāʾib no. 404; Tahā-nikrāh i khwāsh-nawzān 55; Riyād al-afkār (Bānkīpūr Suppt. i p. 51); Sprenger 168; Rieu i 397, ii 838, iii 937, 1087a ad 397; Oriental College Magazine vol. iv no. 4 (Lahore, August 1928) pp. 2–12 (an article by S. M. ‘Abd Allāh).]

731. Mirzā Abū Ṭālib “Kalim” Hamadānī (by birth) Kāshānī (by a period of residence) went to India first in Jahāngīr’s reign. He became Shāh-Jahān’s favourite poet and received from him the title of Malik al-shuʿarā’. According to M. Amin Qazwīnī (for whom see p. 566 supra) he and “Qudsi” (for whom see p. 568) were simultaneously (in 1047/1637–8) engaged in composing poetical records of Shāh-Jahān’s reign. Having been sent to Kāshmīr to prosecute this task, he died there on 15 Dhu ’l-Hijjah in the 26th year of the reign, A.H. 1062/1652.¹

An edition of his dīwān (H. Kh. iii p. 304) was published at Cawnpore in 1879°.

(1) Pādshāh-nāmah, or Shāh-nāmah or Shāhanshāh-nāmāh or Shāh-Jahān-nāmāh, an uncompleted account of Shāh-Jahān’s reign in μaṭn-nawzā’ verse: Sprenger 305 (Mōtī Mahall), Rawān Kōshkū 1521 (1) = Tauer 552 (full analysis) (A.H. 1071/1660–1),

¹ According to M. Wārīsh and the Mir‘āt al-khayāl. The date 1061/1651 is given by several authorities.
Bänkipūr iii 316 (ends with Zafar Khān’s expedition to Tibet in the tenth year of the reign, A.H. 1046–7/1636–7. 1 A.H. 1109/1697), 317 (ends with same expedition. 17th cent.), Rieu ii 687 (five fragments (210 foll.). 17th cent.), iii 1048b (extracts only), Browne Suppt. 792 (N.d. King’s 253), Ethé 1570 (“two mathnawīs” (300 foll.)).

Among the poems included in some copies of the diwān is

(2) an account of the flight and pursuit of Jhujhār Sing’h in mathnawi verse: Rieu ii 686a (17th cent.), 686b (18th cent.), Bänkipūr iii 314 foll. 147a–159b (19th cent.), Ivanow 754.

[‘Abd al-Ḥamīd Pādskhār-nāmah i pt. 2, pp. 353–6; ‘Amal i SāḥĪḥ; Tadkhirah i Tāhir i Naṣrābādī (Sprenger p. 90); Mir’at al-ḥaqāṣī pp. 90–1 (Bodleian 374) no. 71; Kalimāt al-shu’ārā (Sprenger p. 113); Hamīshah bahār (Sprenger p. 128); Safīmah i Khwushgū (Bodleian 376) no. 747; Yād i ba’dā; Riyād al-shu’ārā; Majma’ al-nafā’īs; Sarw i āzād; Khizānah i ‘āmirah (Bodleian 381) no. 101; Ātash-kadah (Bodleian 384) no. 588; Khulâṣat al-kalām (Bänkipūr viii 705, no. 40); Khulâṣat al-afkār (Bodleian 391) no. 223; Makhzan al-gharā’īb (Bodleian 395) no. 2189; Nishtār i ‘ishq; Nātā’īj al-afkār; Sprenger p. 453; Majma’ al-fuṣahā’ī p. 28; Rieu ii 687; Ethé 1563; Bänkipūr iii 314; Shibli Nu’mānī Shi‘r al-‘Ajam iii pp. 205–230; Browne Lit. Hist. iv 258–63; Ency. Isl. under Kalīm.]

732. In Shāh-Jahān’s reign was written

Shāh-Jahān-nāmah, a metrical history of Shāh-Jahān’s reign, beginning Sīpās u thānā Izādī rā sawārā: Aumer 262 (332 foll.).

Rieu (ii p. 687a) identifies this with “Kalīm’s” Shāh-Jahān-nāmah (see p. 572 supra), but the opening words are different.

733. Rashīd Khān known as (‘urf) M. Badrī (so Khāfī Khān i 722), or Rashīd Khān Badrī al-Zamān (so Ma’āthir al-umārā’ī ii 829b), or Badrī al-Zamān Mahābat-Khānī (so Rieu i 264b,

1 According to the Khulâṣat al-kalām (Bänkipūr viii, p. 144, no. 40) “Kalīm’s” Shāh-nāmah gives a detailed account of ten years of Shāh-Jahān’s reign and consists of 14,948 verses.
probably from the *Tadkhirat al-umarā’*), accompanied Dārā-Shukhōn on his campaign against Qandahār in 1063/1653, being then Dīwān to Mahābat Kháān (? Rashīd Kháān ‘urf M. Ba’di’ kih dar-ān muhimm dar khidmat i pādshāh-zādah ham-rāh i Mahābat Kháān ta’alluqāh i dīwānī dāshī ba-ṭārīq i waqā’i’ rūy-dād i muhāsarah mī-nawisht u ba-‘ard i pādshāh-zādah rasāndah in’ām girift u ān tārīkh rā musammā ba-Tārīkh i Qandahār sāḥhtah,\(^1\) Kháāf Kháān i 722). In the 24th year of Aurangzēb’s reign he became Dīwān i Khālīsah (he is called Daftar-dār i Khālīsah in the *Ma’āthīr al-umarā’* ii 829\(^5\) in a statement referring to the 35th year). He was Dīwān to Shāh-‘Ālam when he died at Āgrah a.h. 1107/1695–6,\(^2\) more than eighty years old.

**Laṭā’īf al-akhbār**, or Tārīkh i Qandahārī, a detailed account of Dārā-Shukhōn’s unsuccessful siege of Qandahār in 1063/1653: Ethē 338 (a.h. 1094/1683 ?), 339 (n.d.), I.O. D.P. 609 (a.h. 1241/1826), Rieu i 264b (18th cent.), 265a (a.h. 1217/1802), 265a (a.h. 1234/1819), iii 1056a (extracts only. Circ. a.d. 1850), Suppt. 78 (slightly defective at end. 17th cent.), Bānkīpūr vii 567 (17th cent.), Bodleian 238 (a.h. 1115/1704 ?), 239 (a.h. 1210/1795), Blochet i 593 (19th cent.), 594 (defective at end. Late 18th cent.), Ivanow 155 (18th cent.), 156 (19th cent.), Āṣafīyah i p. 250 no. 583, Vollers 983.


[Tārīkh i Muḥammadi (Rieu ii 895) fol. 234b; Kháāf Kháān i 722\(^5\)–7; Ma’āthīr al-umarā’ ii 829\(^5\)–7; Tadkhirat al-umarā’; Rieu i 264, iii 1083b, Suppt. p. 54.]

734. Shāh-Jahān, having heard that ‘Aḥb al-Ḥamīd Lāhaurī was a master of the style of composition exemplified in Abū ‘l-Fadl’s *Akbar-nāmah*, summoned him from Patnāh,\(^3\) where he was living in retirement, and asked him to write the official record of the reign. Having completed the account of the first

---

1. This is the authority for ascribing the work to Rashīd Kháān, who does not mention his name in the text.
2. According to the Tārīkh i Muḥammadi (cited by Rieu iii 1083b ad 264b). According to the *Tadkhirat al-umarā’* he died in the 41st year of Aurangzēb.
3. Or Tattah, see Bānkīpūr vii p. 68.
two decades, which was revised by the Wazīr Saʿd Allāh Khān, ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd was compelled by old age to discontinue the work, and the annals of the third decade were written by his pupil and collaborator M. Wārīth and revised, after Saʿd Allāh Khān’s death (A.H. 1066/1656), by ‘Alāʾ al-Mulk Tūnī.1 ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd died in 1065/1654–5, and M. Wārīth was killed by a mad student on 10 Rabīʿ al-awwal 1091/1680 (the latter fact is recorded in the Maʿāthīr iʿĀlamgīrī. See a translation of the passage in Elliot and Dowson vii p. 121).

Pādshāh-nāmah,2 a history of Shāh-Jahān’s reign in three daftars each devoted to a period of ten years (the first daftar, “containing nearly the same matter as the Pādshāh-nāmah of Muḥammad Amin.” (but omitting the full account of Shāh-Jahān’s predecessors and the history of his minority) “differs from it in its wording and its division” (Rieu)): Ivanow 149 (vol. ii. Transcribed by M. Šāliḥ al-Kātib (i.e. perhaps “Kashfi”, for whom see p. 214 supra). Bears an autograph note by Shāh-Jahān, Ivanow Curzon 30 (vol. ii, slightly defective. 19th cent.), Rieu i 260 (vols. i–iii. A.H. 1109/1697), 261a (vol. i. 17th cent.), 261a (vol. i. A.H. 1124/1712), 261a (vol. ii. A.H. 1159/1746), iii 934a (extracts from vol. i. Circ. A.D. 1850), 934a (vol. iii. 17th cent.), 1031a (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1844), 1048b (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850), Blochet i 586–7 (vols. i–ii. 17th cent.), 588 (vol. iii. A.H. 1109/1697), 589 (vol. i. A.H. 1208/1793), 590 (vol. i. A redaction quite different from 586.3 18th cent.), 591 (vol. ii. 18th cent.), 592 (vol. ii–iii. Late 18th cent.),

1 ‘Alāʾ al-Mulk Tūnī was appointed Khān-sāmān in Shāh-Jahān’s 19th year (A.H. 1055–6/1645–6), received the title of Fāḍil Khān in the 23rd year (A.H. 1059–60/1649–50), and died in 1073/1663 a few days after becoming prime minister to Aūrangzēb (see Pādshāh-nāmah ii p. 755; Maʿāthīr al-umarāʾ iii 524–30, Beveridge’s trans. pp. 550–3; Rieu i 260b; Binyon and Arnold Court painters of the Grand Mogul pp. 83–4 (portrait Plate xxvi)).

2 That Shāh-Jahān did not call this work the Pādshāh-nāmah (with a B) is clear from an autograph note reproduced by Blochmann in J.A.S.B. 1870 p. 272.

3 “Rédaction complètement différente de celle du n° 586, au point qu’on serait presque tenté d’y voir le Padishah namēh de Mohammed Emin ibn Aboul Hosein Kazwini (Rieu, Catalogue, p. 258).” Unfortunately Blochet does not give sufficient particulars to render identification possible.
II. HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, ETC.


Description: Elliot and Dowson History of India vii pp. 3–5.

[For ‘Abd al-Hamīd see Pādshāh-nāmah, preface; ‘Amal i Sāliḥ, in the section on prose writers near the end; Elliot and Dowson vii p. 3; Rieu i p. 260.

For M. Wārīth see Pādshāh-nāmah, Daftar iii, preface; Ma‘āthir-i ‘Alamgīrī p. 192 (cf. Elliot and Dowson vii p. 121,
where the passage is translated); Elliot and Dowson vii p. 121; Rieu i 260.]

735. M. Şadiq entitled Şadiq Khān, apparently a Persian by birth, held at different times in Shāh-Jahān’s reign the offices of Bakhsāi, Tutor (Aiāli) to Prince Shāh Shujā‘, Shāh-Jahān’s second son, Dārōghah of the Ghusl-khānāh or private audience-chamber and Waqī‘i-nawīs at Āgra. Having remained faithful to Shāh-Jahān, he was deprived of the last office by Aurangzēb and summoned to the royal presence in Jumādā ii 1088/1658.

(Shāh-Jahān-nāmah or Tawārikh i Shāh-Jahānī or Pādshāh-nāmah), a plain narrative of Shāh-Jahān’s reign to the time of his confinement by Aurangzēb: Rieu i 262 (A.H. 1220/1805 ?), iii 1008b (defective at end. A.H. 1244/1829), Rāmpūr (modern. See JRAS. 1936 p. 281).

Description: Elliot and Dowson History of India vii p. 133.

[Autobiographical statements (see Rieu i 262); Abū ’l-Fadl Ma‘mūrī’s (?) History of Aurangzēb (B.M. MS. Or. 1671 fol. 100b. See Rieu iii 1008b).]

736. M. Tahir “Āshna” entitled ‘Inayat Khān was the son of Zafar Khān “Ahsan”, who held the governorship of Kashmir and other offices in Shāh-Jahān’s reign. He became Dārōghah i Ḥudūr and Dārōghah i Kitāb-khānāh, or Imperial Librarian, to Shāh-Jahān. In Aurangzēb’s reign he retired to Kashmir, where he died in 1077/1666–7 or 1081/1670–1. For his diwān etc. see Sprenger pp. 111, 339, Ethé 1584–5.

Mulakkhkhas (usually called Shāh-Jahān-nāmah), a history of the first thirty years of Shāh-Jahān’s reign abridged from the Pādshāh-nāmah of ‘Abd al-Ḥamid and M. Wārīth and, so far as the 4th–10th years are concerned, from that of M. Amin: Būhār 70 (only the last ten years with the special title Qarnīyah i Shāh-Jahān Bādshāh. 17th cent.), Ethé 331 (A.H. 1155/1742), Rieu i 261b (18th cent.), 262a (Introduction, first 4 years and part of the 5th. 17th cent.), Bodleian 237 (A.D. 1834), Bānkīpūr
vii 568 (19th cent.), R.A.S. P. 129 = Morley 125 (defective at end).

English translation (nearly complete) by Major Fuller: B.M. MS. Add. 30777 foll. 1–562.

Description with 45 pp. of translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson History of India vii pp. 73–120.

[Mir’āt al-‘ālam (B.M. Add. 7657 fol. 476. Cf. Rieu iii 1083b ad 261b); Tadhkiraḥ i Tahir i Naṣrābādī i pp. 58–9; Mir’āt i jahān-numā (cf. Rieu iii 1083b ad 261b); Kalimāt al-shu’arā’ (Sprenger p. 109); Hamīshāh bahār (Sprenger p. 118); Riyād al-shu’arā’; Bugh i ma’ānī; Ma’āthir al-unwarā’ ii 762–3; Tadhkiraḥ al-unwarā’; Tāriḵh i Muḥammadī (B.M. MS. Or. 1824, fol. 217. Cf. Rieu iii 1083b ad 261b); Khulāṣat al-kalām (Bānkīpūr vii no. 704 p. 138); Khulāṣat al-afkār (Bodl. 391 no. 314); Suhf i Ibrāhīm A 227; Makhzan al-gharā’ūb no. 214; Sprenger pp. 109, 118, 339; Rieu i 261, iii 1083; Bānkīpūr vii p. 77.]

737. Sh. ‘Ināyat Allāh Kanbō Lāhaurī was born at Būrānpūr, though a Lāhaurī by descent, and was (metaphorically?) the elder brother of M. Šāliḥ Kanbō, the author of the ‘Amal i Šāliḥ (see p. 579). He is best known as the author of the collection of tales entitled Bahār i dānish which he completed in 1061/1651 (see Ency. Isl. under Bahār-i dānish). After a period of service as an official he retired from the world and lived in a khānaqāh beside the shrine of Quṭb al-Dīn Bakhṭyār Kākī [at Delhi]. He died at Delhi on 19 Jumādā i 1082/1671, aged 65.

Tāriḵh i dil-gushā, a history of Shāh-Jahān and his predecessors (cf. Rieu i 263a): Browne Suppt. 234 (n.d. King’s 71).

[‘Amal i Šāliḥ iii pp. 379–82 (among the Saiyids and saints), pp. (among the prose writers. Not yet printed); Rieu ii 765, iii 1093b; S. M. Latif, Lahore: its history etc., Lahore 1892, pp. 208–9; Ency. Isl. under ‘Ināyat Allāh Kanbū.]

738. M. Šāliḥ Kanbō Lāhaurī was the pupil and protégé of Sh.
‘Ināyat Allāh Kanbō (see p. 578 supra), whom he calls his birūdar i kalān, or elder brother.¹

Practically nothing is known about his life,² and the date of his death is uncertain. S. M. Latif states on unspecified authority that he died in 1085/1674–5.³ It is scarcely possible that he can have been still alive in Śafar 1120/1708,⁴ as is implied by the use of the formula sallama-hu ‘llāh after his name in the colophon of the ‘Amal i Śāliḥ preserved in the Lahore Public Library (for the words of this colophon see ‘Amal i Śāliḥ, dibāchah i musahhih, p. 8).

His tomb still exists outside the Mochi Gate at Lahore. A small, but beautiful, mosque built by his order and completed in 1079/1668–9 stands to this day inside the Mochi Gate. The inscription recording the date is quoted by Ghulām-Yazdānī (‘Amal i Śāliḥ, dibāchah i musahhih, p. 9).

A collection of his letters and other prose compositions, which

¹ Ghulām-Yazdānī argues (‘Amal i Śāliḥ, dibāchah i musahhih, p. 6) that M. Śāliḥ cannot have been the brother of ‘Ināyat Allāh, because the latter is always called Shaikh ‘Inayat Allāh, whereas M. Śāliḥ by prefixing the words Āl i Muḥammad to his name shows himself to have been a Saïyid. The latter statement, however, is based on a misconception. The words which M. Śāliḥ prefixes to his name are bandah i Āl i Muḥammad (as in the inscription on his mosque) or fidawi i Āl i Muḥammad (‘Amal i Śāliḥ i p. 4e–7), i.e. the devoted supporter of Muhammad’s family.

² It seems impossible to identify him with the M. Śāliḥ Kanbō, whom ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd Lāhaurī describes as a brave soldier (Pādshāh-nāmah ii p. 71 antepenult.: M. Śāliḥ Kanbō kih az dilrān i jān-sipār i dargāh i khwāqān-pānah būd) and whom he mentions among those who took prominent parts in Qāsim Khān’s operations against the Franks of Hügli in 1041/1631–2 (Pādshāh-nāmah 436) and in Islam Khān’s expedition against Kūčh Hājū and Assam in 1047/1637 (op. cit. ii 71 antepenult., 7214, 738, 76). M. Śāliḥ in recording the same events, evidently on the basis of the Pādshāh-nāmah, speaks of M. Śāliḥ Kanbō in the third person (see ‘Amal i Śāliḥ i 498) and describes him as a brave and resourceful man (‘Amal i Śāliḥ ii 28711–12: M. Śāliḥ Kanbō rā kih mar d i marānāk i sāhīb i tadōbū u taraddud būd bū lashkūrī ārāstū bāwānāh i ān-jānīb rūmūd).

³ Lahore p. 209.

⁴ The Bāhār i sukhun, a collection of letters composed by himself, was compiled at the suggestion of his friend “Munir”, who died in 1054/1644. Even supposing that “Munir’s” suggestion was made in the last year of his life and that Śāliḥ was not more than twenty years old at the time (a very improbable assumption), his age in 1120 would have been eighty-five lunar years.
bears the title *Bahār i sukhun* and includes letters written by him on behalf of Aurangzēb, Shāh-Jahān, Āsaf Khān and others, was completed in 1065/1655¹ (see Ethé 2090 and 2091), and a later edition in 1074/1663-4² (see Rieu i 398, Ivanow Curzon 144).


Edition: *ʿAmal-i-Ṣāliḥ or Shāh Jahān Nūmah of Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ Kambo...* Edited by Ghulam Yazdānī, Calcutta 1912–

¹ According to Ethé, who is responsible for distinguishing two editions of the work.
² In 1073 according to Ghulām-Yazdānī (*ʿAmal i Ṣāliḥ, dibāchah i musahhīḥ*, p. 79).
³ Nearly the whole of the text has now (June 1938) been printed. The fourth fasciculus of vol. iii, which appeared in 1936, extends to the notice of ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq Dihlawi, the second in the section devoted to the *ʿulamā* etc.
Description and 8 pp. of translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson History of India vii pp. 123-32.

(2) A pompous account of the expedition sent by Shāh-Jahān under the command of Prince Murād-Bakhsh and ‘Alī Mardān Khān against the Uzbek chief Nadhir Muḥammad and of the capture of Balkh on 28 Jumādā I 1056/1646: Rieu iii 934b (19th cent.).

[‘Amal i Śāliḥ iii p. 381², i, editor’s introduction pp. 2-9; Ma’āthīr i ‘Alamgīrī 222; Rieu i 263.]

739. Sud’hāri La’l.

Ṣūfī fah i Shāh-Jahānī, a concise (32 foll.) history of Shāh-Jahān based on the ‘Amal i Śāliḥ and other works: Ethé 337 (n.d.).

740. “Bihishti” Shīrāzī was a panegyrist of Prince Murād-Bakhsh, Shāh-Jahān’s youngest son.

For a MS. of his Kullīyat (in which the Āshūb i Hindūstān apparently does not appear) see Edinburgh 305 (a.h. 1096/1684).

Āshūb-nāmah i Hindūstān or Āshūb i Hindūstān, a historical mathnawī on the war of succession between Shāh-Jahān’s sons from the rising of Murād-Bakhsh at Aḥmadābād in 1067/1657 to the death of Dārā-Shukōh in 1069/1659: Ethé 1579 (a.h. 1182/1768), Bodleian 1124 (defective at end), Rieu ii 689b (18th cent.), iii 1044a (circ. a.d. 1848).

Edition: Lucknow 1883°*.

741. Other works:

(1) A short (78 foll.) history of Bābur, Akbar and Shāh-Jahān, preceded by an account of Tūmūr (beg. Maḥāmid i jāmīlah): see § 677 supra.

(2) Waqā‘ī-i Daḵ‘han, an account of events in the Deccan in Shāh-Jahān’s reign: Blochet i 620 (18th cent.), perhaps also Āṣafiyāh i p. 258 no. 417 (a.h. 1287/1870-1).
M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (c) THE TIMŪRIDS
(7) AURANGZEB

742. M. Maʿşıüm b. Ḥasan b. Šāliḥ was for twenty-five years in the service of Prince M. Šāh-Shujāʾ, Šāh-Jahān’s second son, who was Governor of Bengal and Orissa in his father’s reign and who was put to death by Aurangzēb in 1070/1660. In 1070/1659–60 he was spending a period of leave at Māldah when he conceived the idea of recording the events of recent years and wrote his

Tārikh i Šāh-Shujāʾi (possibly identical with, or a part of, the Futūḥat i ʿAlamgīrī or Wāqiʿāt i ʿAlamgīrī described in Elliot and Dowson History of India vii 198), a life of Prince M. Šāh-Shujāʾ and of the events which preceded and followed the accession of Aurangzēb: Bānkipūr vii 572 (19th cent.), Ethé 340, Eton 191.

Extracts from the Futūḥat i ʿAlamgīrī are to be found in Rieu iii 1049a ix (circ. a.d. 1850), and 1058b fol. 64. There is a translation of the preface and headings in B.M. MS. Add. 30,779 foll. 170–9.

743. Šihāb al-Dīn Ahmad b. M. Wali Tālijī 1 accompanied Mīr Jumlah (Mīr M. Saʿīd Ardistānī, the Khān i Khānān) during his campaign against Kūch Bihār and Assam in the fourth and fifth years of Aurangzēb’s reign, A.H. 1072/1661–2 and 1073/1662–3, and after the death of Mīr Jumlah, who had sought to conceal the sufferings and losses of the Imperial army, desired to write a truthful account of the campaign, mainly with the object of bringing himself to the notice of the authorities and obtaining his recall from Bengal to the capital.

Fathiyah i ʿibrīyah (or ʿibratiyah), often called Tārikh i Āshām or Tārikh i mulk i Āshām, an account of Mīr Jumlah’s campaign, in a nuqaddimah, on the causes of the expedition, and two maqālahs ((1) Defeat of Bīm Narāyān and conquest of

1 Ṭālijī is the name of a district and people in the north of Gilān, see Ency. Isl. s.v.
Kūch Bihār, (2) Conquest of Assam ending with Mīr Jumlah’s death on his return to Khīdrpur 2 Ramadān 1073/1663, the year of composition: Blochet i 598 (A.H. 1073/1663. Possibly autograph), Bānkīpur vii 574 (“not dated, but its appearance tends to suggest that it was written immediately after the composition”), 573 (A.H. 1181/1767. Written by the author’s grandson), 575 (18th cent. Calligraphic), Bodleian 240 (with a continuation to Sha’bān 1076/1666.¹ N.d. Possibly autograph), 241 (A.H. 1093/1682), I.O. 4047 (defective. 17th cent.), Ethē 341–3, 344 (2) (extracts only), Rieu i 266a (A.H. 1170/1757), 266b (A.H. 1189/1775), iii 936a (circ. A.D. 1850), 936b (circ. A.D. 1850), 1049b (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850), perhaps also ii 798a (A.H. 1197/1783), Ivanow 157 (18th cent.), 158 (19th cent.), Berlin 491 (A.H. 1206/1792), Browne Suppt. 225 (Christ’s), 226 (Christ’s), 887 (Christ’s).

Probably the Tārīkh i Āshām mentioned without author’s name in Lindesiana p. 224 no. 156 (circ. A.D. 1760) is a copy of this work.

It is not clear from Rieu’s description whether the work which he calls “Account of Kūch Bahār, and Assam, with a detailed narrative of the campaign of Khānkhān Mū‘azzam Khān” (Rieu ii 798a vi) is the Fathiyah i ‘ibrīyah or not. He appends to the above description the words “see p. 266a” (where the Fathiyah i ‘ibrīyah is described), but this manuscript does not occur in the index under Fathiyah i ‘ibrīyah or Shīhāb al-Dīn Ṭalīsh.

Edition: Tārīkh i Āshām, Calcutta 1264/1847.²*


¹ For a summary of this continuation and two long extracts see Jadunath Sarkar’s articles in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal 1906 pp. 257–67 (Shāista Khān in Bengal (1664–66)) and 1907 pp. 405–18 (The Conquest of Chatgaon, 1666 A.D.) and 419–25 (The Feringi pirates of Chatgaon, 1665 A.D.). The articles were reprinted by Sarkar in his Studies in Mughal India (Calcutta and Cambridge 1919).

Urdu translation by Mīr Bahādur Ḍuri Ḥusainī: Tārīkh i Āshām, Calcutta 1805*.

French translation from the Urdu: Tariqu-ḥ Asham. Récit de l'expédition de Mīr-Djumlah au pays d'Assam, traduit... par T. Pavie, Paris (Angers printed) 1845*.

744. Mīr Ḍuri Ḍurāy (commonly called Mīr Ḍuri) b. M. Taqī Khwāfī was a disciple of the Shaṭṭārī saint Burhān al-Dīn Burhānpurī called Rāz i Ilāhī (d. at Burhānpur Ḏh. 1083/1672-3, or 1089/1678. See p. 462 supra), whose discourses he collected in 1053/1643-4 under the title Šhamārat al-ḥayāt (see Ethé 1896, Ivanow 1278 etc.), and in allusion to whom he chose the takhallūs "Rāzī". He was second Bakhshī to Prince M. Aurangzēb, who on his accession conferred upon him the title of 'Āqīl Khān. After serving as Dārūghah of the Ghusl-khānah and as Bakhshī i Tan, he was appointed Governor of the Province of Delhi in the 24th regnal year (a.h. 1091/1680-1092/1681) and he held this office until his death at the age of 82 in Rabī' ii 1108/Oct.–Nov. 1696.

'Āqīl Khān "Rāzī" was the author of a diwān (Sprenger 467, Bodleian 1148) and of several makhānawīs, e.g. the Muraqqā' (Ethé 1635, Berlin 962, Bānkipur iii 361-2, Ivanow 812, Sprenger 468), the Shams u parvānah (Ethé 1633-5, Bodleian 1149, Ivanow 811, Sprenger 469), and the Mihr u Māh (Ethé 1634, 1636, 1637, Rieu ii 699a, Browne Suppt. 979 (Corpus 74), Ivanow Curzon 277, Sprenger 470. Edition: Lucknow, 1846 (acc. to Bānkipur iii 361)). Some Šūfīstic meditations of his entitled Naghamāt al-ḥāzār were published at the end of 'Abd al-Ḥaqq Dīhlawi's Marj al-bahrayn at Fathpur in 1265/1849*.

(Wāqī'āt i 'Ālamgīrī), or (Zafar-nāmah i 'Ālamgīrī), an anonymous history of the first five years of Aurangzēb's reign ending with Šafar 1073/Sept.–Oct. 1662 (after which follows a


[Mīrʿāt al-khayāl pp. 238–40 (Bodl. 374 no. 97); Kalimāt al-shuʿarāʾ (Sprenger p. 111); Hamīshah bahār (Sprenger p. 123); Safīnāh i Khvāshgū (see Bānkīpūr viii p. 86 ad fin.); Riyāḍ al-shuʿarāʾ; Maʿāthīr al-umārā’ ii 821–3, Beveridge’s trans. pp. 264–6; Khulāṣat al-kalām no. 29; Makhzan al-gharāʾib no. 894; Ouseley Notices of Persian poets p. 167; Riyāḍ al-afkār (Bānkīpūr Suppt. i p. 54); Sprenger pp. 111, 123, 543; Shamʿ i anjuman p. 172; Rieu ii 699; Ethé 1896.]

745. Munshi M. Kāzīm, b. M. Amin, a son of the author of the Pādšāh-nāmah (see p. 566 supra), was appointed Munshi by Aurangzēb in the first year of his reign and was subsequently ordered to compile a history of the reign from the official records. In the 21st year (A.H. 1088/1677–8) he was appointed Dārōghah of the Ibtīyāʾ-ḵānah (Maʿāthīr i ʿĀlamgīrī p. 163). He died at Delhi in 1092/1681.


Description and 3 pp. of translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson History of India vii pp. 174–80.

An abridgment (?): Intikhāb i ‘Alamgīrīnāmah [sic] Bukhārā
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Semenov 5. For M. Sāqī Musta’idd Khān’s abridgment of this work see below.

[‘Ālamgīr-nāmah, preface; Tārīkh i Muḥammadī (Rieu iii 895) fol. 256; Elliot and Dowson vii pp. 174–6; Rieu i 267, iii 1083b.]

746. Ḥātim Khān describes himself as a khānāh-zād, i.e. the son of a court official. In the subscription to the B.M. MS. of his ‘Ālamgīr-nāmah, which was transcribed in Aurangzēb’s 47th year (A.H. 1115/1702), he is described as already dead.

(‘Ālamgīr-nāmah), a history of the early part of Aurangzēb’s reign abridged (with some additions) from M. Kāzīm’s work (see p. 586 supra) and stopping short at the beginning of the tenth year (p. 1038 in the printed text of M. K.’s ‘Ālamgīr-nāmah): Rieu i 268a (A.H. 1115/1702).


(1) Aṣṣāf-nāmah i ‘Ālamgīrī, a panegyric on Aurangzēb in mixed prose and verse: Browne Pers. Cat. 100 (i) (bears Aurangzēb’s “bookplate” of A.H. 1081/1670–1).

(2) Aʿẓam-nāmah, a similar panegyric on Prince M. Aʿẓam: Browne Pers. Cat. 100 (ii) (same MS.).

748. Īsār-Dās Nāgar,1 a resident of Paṭṭān, was from his youth to his thirtieth year in constant attendance upon the Qādī Shaikh al-Islām b. Qādī Abd al-Wahhāb (Qādī i Lashkār A.H. 1086/1675–6—1094/1683, d. at Aḥmadābād A.H. 1109/1697–8). Subsequently he was in the service of Shajāʿat Khān (Governor of Gujrat A.H. 1098/1686–7, d. 1113/1701–2), by whom he was made Amin in Jodhpur. For a service rendered to the Imperial Court he was rewarded with a command of 250 men and a jāgūr at Meerut.

Futūḥāt i ‘Ālamgīrī, a history of Aurangzēb to the 34th year of his reign A.H. 1101–2/1690–1: Rieu i 269a (A.H. 1246/1830), Edinburgh 218.

1 “Name of a tribe of Gujarātī Brāhmaṇs” (Platts).

English translation: see J. Sarkar op. cit. p. 242 (“I have made a full translation of it into English, which I intend to publish”).

[Autobiographical statements (for which see Rieu and especially Sarkar op. cit.)]

749. Sh. Ra’fat (a nephew of M. Sanā’ī (Rieu) or M. Sumnā [sic] Khān (Bānkīpur viii p. 100), or M. Thanā Khān (Bodleian 395, no. 3001) “Waḥshat” Kashmīrī) refers in his Futūḥat i ‘Ālamgīrī to an unfinished work of his entitled Ā’inah i jahān-numā on the contest of Aurangzēb’s sons for the throne.

Futūḥat i ‘Ālamgīrī, a rhetorical account of the victories of Aurangzēb, written after his death: Rieu iii 1036a (abstract only, from the unique copy belonging to ‘Ali M. Jhajharī. A.D. 1851).

750. Bhim-Sēn son of Rag’hū-Nandan-Dās, a Kāyat’h (i.e. Kāyast’ha), was born at Būrānpūr in the year 17[0]5 of the Vikramī era (A.D. 1648–9) which he equates with Shāh-Jahān’s 23rd regnal year. He served in the Deccan wars of Aurangzēb’s time under Rāo Dalpat,1 a Būndēlah chieftain in Aurangzēb’s service, and was for a time commandant of the fort of Naldrug. After the defeat and death of Kām-bakhsh (A.H. 1120/1709) he left the service and retired to Būrānpūr.

Dilgushā (Tarīkhe dilgushā or Nuskhah i dilgushā), completed A.H. 1120/1708–9, an account, based mainly on personal recollections, of military transactions in the Deccan from Aurangzēb’s march to Āgrabha (A.H. 1068/1658) to the defeat of Kām-bakhsh (A.H. 1120/1709): Rieu i 271a (A.H. 1140/1728), Blochet i 602 (late 18th cent.), Ethé 445 (defective, “only going down to about the thirtieth year of ‘Ālamgīr’s reign, A.H. 1089 (A.D. 1687)”).

1 For his life see Ma’āthir al-umarā’ ii 317 foll., Beveridge’s trans. pp. 442–6.
Abridged English translation (made from the B.M. MS.): Ferishta’s History of Dekkan... with a continuation from other native writers, of the events in that part of India... By Jonathan Scott, Shrewsbury 1794°*, Vol. ii pp. 3–123.1


[Autobiographical statements (for which see Rieu and especially Sarkar op. cit.).]

751. Mīrāz Nūr al-Dīn 2 M. “Āli” b. Ḥākīm Fath al-Dīn Shīrāzī belonged to a medical family of Shīrāz. If not born in India,3 he spent most of his life there. According to his own statement in the Bahādur-Shāh-nāmah (cited by Rieu, i p. 272a, where the passage is said to occur on fol. 44 of the B.M. MS. Or. 24) he entered the government service in Shāh-Jahān’s reign. According to the Khizānah i ‘āmirah (p. 3441) he was for a period in Aurangzēb’s reign Superintendent (Dārōghah) of the Royal Kitchen (Bāwarchi-khānah) with the title Nīmat Khān (conferred upon him in 1104/1692-3 according to the prose preface to his ḍīvān. See Sprenger p. 328). At the end of the reign he was Keeper of the Crown Jewels (Dārōghah i Jawāhir-khānah), with the title of Muqarrab Khān, and, as he tells us himself (Bahādur-Shāh-nāmah, loc. cit.), he kept the jewels at Gwalior during the warfare which followed Aurangzēb’s death and

1 Aurangzebe’s operations in Dekkan [being “a free translation of a Journal kept by a Bondela officer, who attended Dulpot Roy, the chief of his tribe, in all Aurangzebe’s campaigns, which was presented to me by the Raja of Dutfteeh, a great grandson of Dulpot Roy”].
2 See the prose preface to the ḍīvān and Sprenger p. 328.
3 According to the Safīnāh i Khwāshqā (Bānkīpūr viii p. 91) he “was originally from Maghāhad ” and “after performing the pilgrimage, he came to India in the middle of ‘Alamgīr’s reign [sic, but we know from his own statement, if Rieu has correctly reported it, that he entered the government service in the time of Shāh-Jahān]. According to the Khizānah i ‘āmirah (p. 343 penult.) Ḥākīm Fath al-Dīn came to India and, “they say” (gīyānd), Mīrāz M. was born in India, went in his childhood (dar sighār i sīn) to Shīrāz with his father, was educated there and returned to India, where he entered the service of Aurangzēb. Cf. Riyāḍ al-afkār (Bānkīpūr Suppt. i p. 57), which is probably dependent on the Khizānah i ‘āmirah.
delivered them to Bahādur-Shāh on his accession. He then received the title Dānishmand Khān and was ordered to write the official history of the reign. According to the Tārīkh i Muḥammadī he died at Delhi on 1 Rabi’ al-Awwal 1122/30 April 1710.

“‘Āli” is famous as a satirist and wit. The Waqā’ī, which is the best known of his satirical compositions, is still popular in India among those who read Persian.

His diwān has been published (without the prose preface) at [Lucknow] in 1881° and at Cawnpore in 1894*; the Ḥusn u ‘Īshq, an imitation of “Fattāḥī’s” Ḥusn u Dil, at [Cawnpore] in 1259/1843*, at Shāhjahānābād [i.e. Delhi] in 1844°, at Bombay? in 1265/1849* (preceded by the Waqā’ī), at [Lucknow] in 1783° and at Lucknow in 1899°; and the Ruqā’āt u Mudhikāt at Lucknow in 1261/1845*.

Other works of his, such as the Rāḥat al-qulūb, satirical sketches of some contemporaries, and the Risālah i Hajw i ḥukmā, a satire on physicians, are described in Ethé 1659–62, Rieu ii 744b, 796a, 850b, Bodleian 1157, 1159, and elsewhere. For the Bahādur-Shāh-nāmah see p. 600 infra.


1 For this history, usually called the Bahādur-Shāh-nāmah, see p. 600 infra.
2 See Rieu ii 703a.
3 At Lahore according to “Khwushgū”.
4 This precise date is probably correct, but other dates are given elsewhere, 1120 (Hamisīshah bahār), 1121 (Diwān i mustakhab, Sprenger p. 151, Khizānah i ‘āmirah p. 344°) and 1123 (Safīnāh i Khwushgū).

Editions: [India] 1248/1832–3 (together with the Hūsn u 'Ishq. See Rieu i 268b), 1265/1849*, [1849 ?*], [Lucknow] 1260/1844° (with marginal notes by Maqūl Ahmad Gōpāmau’ī ²), 1264/1848°* (with M.A.’s notes), Lucknow 1859° (with M.A.’s notes), [place ?] 1261/1845 (Āṣafīyah i p. 260 no. 801), [place ?] 1270/1853–4 (Āṣafīyah i p. 260 no. 258), Cawnpore 1869*, 1870° (with M.A.’s notes), 1878°* (with different notes), 1884†, 1901†, Calcutta 1915 (ed. Otto Rothfeld. See JRAS. 1916 p. 201).

Description: Elliott and Dowson History of India vii pp. 200–1.


¹ The words quoted by Vollers are those with which the prose preface to the diwān opens.

² Gōpāmau is 14 miles E. of Hardoi in Oudh.
Univ. Lib. (A.H. 1236/1821. See Oriental College Magazine, loc. cit.).


Editions: *Lucknow* 1259/1843*, 1261/1845° (two editions ?), 1899†, *Cawnpore* 1279/1862°, 1877*, 1297/1880°*, 1884†, 1896†.


Description: Elliot and Dowson *History of India* vii p. 202.

*[Hamāshah bahār* (Sprenger p. 127); *Safinah i Khwushgū* (Bānkīpūr viii p. 91); *Khāfī Khān* ii 333v; *Riyāḍ al-shuʿarāʾ*; *Tadḥkirah i Ḥusaini*; *Majmaʿ al-nafāʾis*; *Yad i baiḍāʾ*; *Sarw i Āzād*; *Dīwān i muntakhāb* (Sprenger p. 151); *Khizānāh i ʿamīrāh* pp. 333–46 (no. 82); *Kēwāl Rām Tadḥkirat al-umrāʾ*, *Ṭārīkh i Muḥammadī* (Rieu iii 895) fol. 245; *Makhzan al-gharāʾib* no. 1675; *Naghmah i ʿandaliḥ*; *Riyāḍ al-afkār* (Bānkīpūr Suppt. i p. 56); Sprenger pp. 127, 151, 328; Elliot and Dowson vii p. 200; *Rieu* i 267, ii 703a, iii 1049 (the *B.M. MS. Or. 2054 contains extracts relating to Niʿmat Kūn from several of the works mentioned above); *Encyc. Isl. under Niʿmat Kūn* (Berthels).]

752. M. Sāqī entitled *Mustaʿidd Kūn* was brought up by
Bakhtawar Khan (see p. 132 supra), whom he served as Munshi and Dīwān, and, in the last seventeen years of his life, assisted in the composition of the Mirāt al-ʿālam. After Bakhtawar Khan's death he entered the Imperial service with a mansab, and held the offices of Waqāʾūʾ-nigar, Mushrif of the Naqšš-khanah (A.H. 1095/1684), Mushrif of the Jā-namāz-khanah (A.H. 1097/1683–4), Mushrif of the Khawāṣṣān (A.H. 1110/1698), and Munshi i Nazārat (A.H. 1113/1701). In the reign of Bahādur Shāh he was requested by his patron Ināyat Allāh Khan b. Mīrzā Shukr Allāh to compile a history of the forty years of Aurangzēb's reign which, owing to the prohibition of historical writing, were not included in the ʿĀlamgīr-nāmah. He died at Delhi on 20 Shawwāl 1136/1724 at the age of seventy-five.


Text and translation of years i–x: The History of the first ten years of the reign of Alemgeer. Written... by Mohammed Sakee. Translated by H. Vansittart. Calcutta 17850*.
Description and 14 pp. of translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson *History of India* vii 181–97.

[Maʿāthīr i ʿĀlamgīrī preface and pp. 254, 255, 278, 407, 462; Tārīkh i Muḥammadī (Rieu iii 895) fol. 256; Rieu i 270, iii 1083b; *Enyc. Isl.* under Mustaʿidd Khān.]

753. Of the three recorded manuscripts which contain Ṣādiq Khān’s *Shāh-Jahān-nāmah* (see p. 577 *supra*) two (namely the Elliot MS. Or. 1671 (Rieu iii 1008b) in the British Museum and the Rāmpūr MS.) contain also a prefaceless history of Aurangzēb’s reign which to a large extent agrees closely with the corresponding part of Khāfī Khān’s history but which speaks of Shāh-ʿĀlam (Bahādur Shāh) as the reigning sovereign and must therefore have been written about twenty years earlier than [the completion of] the *Muntakhab al-kubāb* (see p. 468 *supra*). To Rieu it seemed highly probable that it was an early draft of Khāfī Khān’s account of Aurangzēb’s reign, but Professor Sri Ram Sharma has recently examined the Rāmpūr MS. and has been led to a different conclusion. In an article entitled *A new (?) contemporary history of Aurangzeb’s reign*, which he published in the *J.R.A.S.* for 1936, pp. 279–83, he states that the author mentions his name in several places and that he is Abū ’l-Faḍl Maʿmūrī.

A certain Mīr Abū ’l-Faḍl Maʿmūrī served for many years with the kūmakīs in the Deccan during Shāh-Jahān’s reign and won the esteem and friendship of successive Governors, including Aurangzēb. When the latter encamped at the Narbadah on his northward march to claim the succession to Shāh-Jahān’s throne, Abū ’l-Faḍl’s manṣab was increased to 1000/400. After the victory over Jaswant it was raised to 1500/500 and he received the title of Maʿmūr Khān. Shortly afterwards he was murdered by the disgruntled general Najābat Khān, to whom he had been sent with a message from Aurangzēb (see Khāfī Khān ii pp. 471–7, 1111–2, *Maʿāthīr al-umarā’* iii pp. 5061–4, 82613–15).

1 Prof. Sharma does not quote the actual words on which his conclusions are based.

2 This is the notation adopted by W. H. Moreland in his article *Rank (manṣab) in the Mogul State Service* (*J.R.A.S.* 1936 pp. 641–65).
Evidently, therefore, the history of Aurangzëb’s reign cannot have been written by him. It is conceivable that at a later period there may have been another official bearing the name Abû 'l-Faḍl Ma‘mûrî, but judgment must be suspended until more evidence is available. The autobiographical details which Professor Sri Ram Sharma has found in the history may eventually lead to the identification of the author. “Early in Aurangzëb’s reign,” says Professor Sharma, “he seems to have been appointed Darogha-i-Buyûtât which office he occupied for thirty years till the thirty-sixth year of Aurangzëb’s reign. Towards the end of the year 25 he was appointed Waqa‘i-Nawîs [sic] of Burhanpur to hold it along with his old appointment as a Mir-i-Sâmân. In the year 1686 he was sent to the army commanded by Prince A‘zam with some important instructions. In the year 36 of Aurangzëb’s reign, he was appointed Mir-i-Bahr. He seems to have either continued in the department of Buyûtât or was again reverted thereto, as we find him visiting the army besieging Panhâla with certain important papers in the year 44. In the year 46 he was employed as a negotiator on behalf of the besieging Mughal commanders to settle the terms of surrender with Parşrama, the commander of the fort of Khelna, which they were besieging. He seems to have survived Aurangzëb.”

**History of Aurangzëb’s reign**, beginning abruptly in the year 1068 and agreeing to a large extent with Khâfi Khân’s account: **Rieu** iii 1008b (A.H. 1244/1829), **Râmpûr** (modern. See **JRAS**. 1936 p. 281).

754. ‘Inâyat Allâh Khân b. Mirzâ Shukr Allâh Kashmirî was born in Kashmir in 1063/1653 (Târîkh i Muhammadi (B.M. MS. Or. 1824 = Rieu iii 895) fol. 260. Cf. Rieu iii 1083b ad 270b). He became Waqa‘i-i-nigâr in the 28th year of Aurangzëb’s reign, a khân in the 35th year, Divân i Tan in the 36th and Divân i Khâliṣah in the 45th. In Jahândâr Shâh’s reign he was appointed Nâzîm of Kashmir. In Farrukh-siyar’s reign he was Divân i Khâliṣah, Divân i Tan and also Şubâh-dâr of Kashmir, the last office being administered by a deputy. In the time of
Muḥammad Shāh he was Mīr-Sāmān and for a time deputy Wazīr. He died at Delhi on 7 Rabi‘ i 1138/1725 (according to the Tārīkh i Muḥammadī, cited in Rieu iii 1083b ad 270b) or in 1139/1726–7 (according to the Ma‘āthir al-umarā’ i p. 831\(^5\)).

According to the Ma‘āthir al-umarā’ ii 831 \(^1\) ‘Ināyat Allāh Khān Kashmirī made a collection of royal orders issued through him and addressed to the princes and amīrs. To this collection he gave the title Akhām i ‘Ālamgīrī, and, according to the Ma‘āthir al-umarā’, it was a well-known (mutadāwal) work, like his other compilation, the Kalimāt i tāyibāt,\(^2\) a collection of letters written by Aurangzēb himself. At the present time there are only a few recorded manuscripts bearing the title Akhām i ‘Ālamgīrī. One of these (I.O. 3887) begins with a short preface,\(^3\) in which ‘Ināyat Allāh says that for some years it had been his duty to write orders on behalf of Aurangzēb to the royal princes, to sultāns and amīrs and that after Aurangzēb’s death he had collected these and given them the title Akhām i ‘Ālamgīrī.

Akhām i ‘Ālamgīrī (beginning of preface: Ba‘d i ḥamd i nā-maḥdūd . . . wādīh bād kīh fajīr ‘Ināyat Allāh . . . ; heading of first hukm: Ba‘janāb i muqaddas i ḥadrāt i Bādshāh i Khuld-Ārām-gāh . . .; beginning of first hukm: Dar-in-wilāt az nawishtah i M. Aslam Khān ma‘rūd i pīsh-gāh i fakak-i-tilā gārdīd . . .), a

\(^1\) Khuld-Makān inshā u imtā i ā rā mi-pasandīd. Akhāmī kih ba-wasātāt i ā ba-nām i pādshah-sādahā u umārā sudār yāftah farākhum karah ba-Akhām i ‘Ālamgīrī mansūm sakhtahā. U shuqqahā i dastkhhāt i pādshah nīz jam’ kardah Kalimāt i tāyibāt nām gudhāshāh. Har dē nushkāh mutadāwal ast.

\(^2\) For the Kalimāt i tāyibāt, compiled in 1131, see Rieu i 401a, Ethé 373–4, etc.

\(^3\) In view of the fact that I.O. 3887 was, according to W. Irvine’s note on a fly-leaf, transcribed from a manuscript in the Bānkīpūr Public Library [evidently identical with no. 2017 in ‘Abd al-Muqtadīr’s Supplement, vol. ii], it is surprising to learn from ‘Abd al-Muqtadīr’s description that “The MS. is defective towards the beginning, and neither the editor’s name, nor the title of the work, is given in the work. . . . The copy, without a preface, opens abruptly thus with a letter to Shāh ‘Ālam Bahādur Shāh before his accession to the throne: — Dar-in-wilāt az nawishtah i Muḥammad Aslam Khān . . . .” Evidently the preface has disappeared since 1909, when the manuscript was copied, unless the copyist supplied it from some other source.
collection of letters¹ from Aurangzêb to his sons and various officials: BânkiPUR Suppt. ii 2017 (19th year of M. Shâh (A.H.1149/1736-7), I.O. 3887 (= Irvine 469. Transcribed from the preceding MS. in 1909. Described on fol. 1a as hisâh i awwal, but there seems to be nothing to show definitely how much of the work is contained in the volume).

The collection of anecdotes incorporating orders of Aurangzêb which has been published by Sir Jadunâth Sarkâr under the title Ahkâm i 'Alamgirî is different from the work, or the part of it, described above. According to Sarkâr (introduction p. 32) the work published by him is "the Ahkam-i-Alamgiri, attributed² to the pen of Hamiuddîn Khân (surnamed Nimchah-i-Alamgiri), whose life is given in the Masir [sic]-ul-umara, i. 605-611. But of this authorship there is no proof, and none of the three MSS. bears his name".

Ahkâm i 'Alamgirî (?), beginning Dhû'l-Faqqr Khân Bahâdur Nusrat-Jang dar waqtî kih az fath i Jinji mâmadah,³ a collection of anecdotes incorporating the orders issued by Aurangzêb in respect of the circumstances narrated: I.O. 4071 (= Irvine 340. 19th cent.), 3987 (= Irvine 252. Transcribed in 1898 from the preceding MS.), 3388 (a fragment. See Sarkâr’s introduction, p. 32), Râmpûr Nawwâb 'Abd al-Salâm Khân (see Sarkâr’s introduction, pp. 32-3).

Edition: Ahkâm-i-Alamgirî (Anecdotes of Aurangzib). Persian text [rearranged], with an English translation, notes and a Life of Aurangzib, by Jadunath Sarkar... Ahkâm i 'Alamgirî taṣnîf i Hamîd al-Dîn Khân Nimchah i 'Alamgirî ma'âh tarjâmah u tafsîr... , Calcutta 1912‡.

English translation: see Edition above. The same translation,

¹ These are actually letters, or extracts from letters, and quite different from the collection published by Sarkâr, which, as stated below, consists of anecdotes or brief historical narratives leading up to the orders issued by Aurangzêb in respect of the circumstances narrated.
² Sarkâr does not say where this attribution is to be found, or by whom it was made.
³ This anecdote is the 28th in Sarkâr’s (rearranged) edition.
without the Persian text, was published in a volume entitled *Anecdotes of Aurangzēb and historical essays by Jadunath Sarkar* at Calcutta in 1912* and 1925* (2nd ed., revised).

755. Other works relating to Aurangzēb:

(1) *‘Ain al-jīnān*, or *Waqāʿi‘ i Nawwāb Khān dar lāshkār i Aurangzēb*, in mixed prose and verse: Browne Suppt. 878.

(2) *Aurang-nāmah*, "A poem by ‘Haqīrī’ (a Roz-bihānī soldier posted in Bengal), often agrees with Maʿsūm; ends with execution of Dārā” : Aṣafiyyah i p. 220 no. 603 (A.H. 1196/1782. See The Cambridge History of India, iv p. 582, from which the above description (by Sarkar) is quoted).

(3) *Detailed history of Delhi*, particulars of the Emperors’ movements, lists of mansabs, etc. from the time of Aurangzēb to that of Farrukh-siyar, with a summary account of preceding reigns: Lahore Panjāb Univ. Lib. (see Oriental College Magazine, vol. ii no. 4 (Aug. 1926) p. 58 no. 70).


(5) *Iftīṭāh i sultaṇī*, a poetical account of Prince Aurangzēb’s war with the Uzbaks and Nadhr M. Khān, the ruler of Balkh, written in 1057/1647 by "‘Alawī” or “‘Ulwi” : Būhār 394 (A.H. 1150/1737–8).

(6) *Naṣāʾiḥ* of Aurangzēb to his sons and officials: Berlin 82 (5) (A.H. 1199/1784–5).

(7) *Nāzīm al-mulūk*, a mathnawī giving a history of India from the accession of Aurangzēb to the reign of Farrukh-siyar : Rieu iii 1056b (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850).

(8) *Sāʿāt i nahdat i ‘Alamgīr Pādshāh*, time-table of Aurangzēb’s marches from 3 Rabīʿ ii 1066 to 4 Jumādā ʿii in the 34th (36th ?) regnal year, A.H. 1103 : Blochet i 703 foll.

¹ This work is placed in Margoliouth’s catalogue among his histories of Aurangzēb, but, if it was “dated 1070 by the author”, it cannot extend beyond the beginning of his reign.

(9) Short extract dealing with Aurangzëb’s expeditions against Jaswant Singh: Ivanow Curzon 697 (19th cent.).

(10) Short life of Aurangzëb (beginning Sipâs i bi-qiyâs i Jâ’îlî Wâhid) written apparently in the latter half of the 18th century: Blochet i 603 (late 18th cent.).


(13) Titles of the princes and amîrs of Aurangzëb’s reign: Rieu iii 995a (circ. A.D. 1850).

(14) Waqâ’î i Dak’han, an account of events in the Deccan in Shâh-Jahân’s reign: Blochet i 620 (18th cent.), Aṣâfiyyah i p. 258 no. 417 (A.H. 1287/1870–1).


For Sh. M. Murâd’s history of Aurangzëb and his successors to the 21st year of Muḥammad Shâh’s reign see p. 610 infra.
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(2) *Jang-nāmah i Muḥammad Muʿazzam Shāh u Aʿzam Shāh*, by 'Aṭā' Allāh: *Āṣafiyah* i p. 236 no. 761 (defective at end).

(3) Note on the struggle that followed the death of Aurangzēb: *Ivanow* Curzon 700 (19th cent.).


758. Mīrzā Nūr al-Dīn M. "ʿĀli", entitled successively *Niʿmat Khān*, Muqarrab Khān and Dānishmand Khān, who died in 1122/1710, has already been mentioned (pp. 589–92 supra) as the author of the *Waqāʾī* i Ḥaidarābād and the *Jang-nāmah*.

(1) *Jang-nāmah*, an account of Aurangzēb's war against the Mahā-rāṇa of Udāipur and of the hostilities between Bahādur Shāh and M. Aʿzam Shāh after his death: see p. 592 supra.

(2) *Bahādur-Shāh-nāmah* or *Tārīkh i Shāh-ʿĀlam Bahādur-Shāh*, the official detailed history of Bahādur Shāh's first two years: Ethé 1659 i (abridged recension. Collated a. h. 1136/1723–4), 385 (not later than a. h. 1196/1782), 386 (an abridged recension. a. h. 1195/1781), 387 (the same abridged recension. a. h. 1217/1803), 1670 (abridged recension), *Ross and Browne* 10 (18th cent.), *L.O.* 3933, 3990 (a. d. 1897), *Bodleian* 256 (a. h. 1161/1748 ?), *Lindesiana* p. 204 no. 162 (circ. a. d. 1740–60), *Rieu* ii 745a (a. h. 1151/1738), i 272a (a. h. 1196/1782), iii 937b (a. d. 1849), 1028a (extracts only. Circ. a. d. 1850), *Aumer* 265 (a. h. 1198/1784), *Browne* Suppt. 189 (n.d.).

Description: Elliot and Dowson *History of India* vii 568.

759. Apparently in the reign of Jahāndār Shāh (a. h. 1124/1712) was written.

A florid, but circumstantial, work, of which detached fragments (20 foll.) relating to the reigns of Bahādur Shāh and Jahāndār Shāh are preserved in *Rieu* Suppt. 79 (18th cent. *Pictures*).
760. Mīrzā Mūbārak Allāh "Wādiḥ" entitled Irādat Khān (‘Ālamgīrī) was the son of Mīr Ishāq 1 entitled likewise Irādat Khān (Shāh-Jahānī, d. 1068/1658 as Šubāhdār of Oudh) who was himself the son of Mīr M. Bāqir Sāwajī entitled first Irādat Khān (Jahāngīrī) and afterwards Aʿzam Khān (see Maʿāthīr al-umara’ i 174–80). He must have been born in 1059/1649 (since he was 67 in 1126/1714). In Aurangzēb’s 33rd year, A.H. 1100/1689, he was appointed Faujdār of Chāknah 2 and in the 40th year, A.H. 1108/1697, Faujdār of Aurangābād. It was in this year that he received the title of Irādat Khān. In the 47th year, A.H. 1114/1703, he was Qal‘ah-dār of Gulbargah, and subsequently he became Qal‘ah-dār and Faujdār of Māndū. When Prince Bēdār-bakht, the son of M. Aʿżam, was appointed Governor of Mālwah, Irādat Khān became one of his intimate friends. After Bahādur Shāh’s death Irādat Khān espoused the cause of ‘Āqīm al-Shāh. During Jahāndār’s reign he remained in retirement. He died A.H. 1128/1716 in the reign of Farrukh-siyar (according to the Nātā’īj al-afkār).

In poetry he was a pupil of M. Zamān “Rāśīkh” 3 (see the Safināh i Khwushgō (Bānkīpūr viii pp. 93, 86)). He was the author of a mathnawī entitled Aʿinah i rāz (see Ethē 1674).

For copies of his diwan, or of selections from it, see Ethē 1674–5, Ivanow 834, Sprenger 551, etc.

---

1 This pedigree seems so well attested that it is surprising to find after the fasīl al-khījāb in some (most ?) MSS. of the Memoirs words in which the author ostensibly calls himself the son of Kifāyat Khān Shikastah-nawis (the actual words are: . . . fa-ba‘d āhūnī gīyād jāmī‘ u mu‘allif i in sawānīh u wāqī‘ bandah i khāsār i gunāhār Mūbārak Allāh mutakhalliṣ bi-Wādiḥ walād i maghīrat-nishān Kifāyat Khān Shikastah-nawīs khān chūn Kalīmat i ‘āliyāt etc.). There seems to be no evidence that Mīr Ishāq ever bore the title Kifāyat Khān (though Beale and Ethē say so), and this title was borne by a celebrated writer of shikastah, M. Ja‘far b. M. Muqīm Khān, who was Dīwān i Tam and Dīwān i Khālīsah to Shāh-Jahān and who died at Delhi in 1095/1684 (see the Taḥkīrah i khwushnawīsān p. 105, Ma‘āthīr i ‘Ālamgīrī p. 247, Islamic culture vol. ix, no. 3 (July 1935) p. 421).

2 "Chāknā, a place frequently mentioned... lies a little north of Pūna. See an account of Chāknā in Grant Duff’s History of the Mahrattas, vol. i, p. 61" (Elliott and Dowson vii p. 256 n.).

3 According to the Safināh i Khwushgū Irādat Khān’s mother was a sister of "Rāśīkh’s", but this is contrary to statements made elsewhere.
**Tārikh i Irādat Khān**, completed A.H. 1126/1714, memoirs of the seven years from Aurangzēb’s death in 1118/1707 to Farrukhsiyar’s entry into Delhi in Muḥarram 1125/1713: Ethē 389 (earlier than A.D. 1804), 390 (“copied from the original in the Possession of the King of Delhi”), I.O. 3925 (A.H. 1304/1886), 4031 (foll. 4b–64a. Fragment only, rather more than half of the work), Ivanow Curzon 34 (early 19th cent.), Bānkīpur vii 579 (19th cent.), Rieu iii 938a (circ. A.D. 1850), 938b (circ. A.D. 1850), 1049b (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850).

Urdu translation: Sawānīh ‘umrī i Irādat Khān by Ashraf Shamsī Ḥaidarābādī, Ḥaidarābād (date ?) (see Ḥaidarābād Coll. p. 23).


Description and 28 pp. of translated extracts (from Scott’s translation): Elliot and Dowson History of India vii 534–64.

[Mīr’āt al-khayāl pp. 307–8 (Bodl. 374 no. 112); Hamīshah bahār (Sprenger p. 130); Safinah i Khwushgū (Bānkīpur viii p. 93); Māʾāthīr al-umarāʾ i 204 ult.–205; Majmaʿ al-nafāʾis; Sarw i Āzūd; “Sirāj” Divān i muntakhab (Sprenger p. 151); Magālāt al-shuʿarāʾ (Sprenger p. 160); Taḏkhirat al-umarāʾ; Makhzān al-qāhīrāʾīb no. 2990; Sprenger pp. 130, 160, 583; Rieu i 938.]

761. **Nūr al-Dīn b. Burhān al-Dīn Fārūqī** was descended from a Balkhī who accompanied Bābur to India, fought at Karnāl and settled at Multān. On Aurangzēb’s death, when Bahādur Shāh instructed his son Muʿizz al-Dīn, then Governor of Multān, to collect an army, Burhān al-Dīn Fārūqī joined the army and took his son with him. Shortly after Bahādur Shāh’s death (20 Muḥarram 1124) Nūr al-Dīn Fārūqī was present at the storming of ‘Āzīm al-Shaʿn’s entrenchment. He complains that although he had worked hard between the death of Bahādur Shāh and that of Rāfīʿ al-Shaʿn, he received no promotion. When
Jahāndār Shāh advanced from Delhi to Āgra to meet Farrukhsiyar, Nur al-Dīn and his father at the head of 600 horsemen were posted in the advanced guard. They were forced to give way, and took refuge with ‘Abd al-Ṣamad Khān’s troops. In Farrukhsiyar’s reign Burhān al-Dīn Fāruqī remained for some time in the service of ‘Abd al-Ṣamad Khān. He then took part in Nawwāb Ḥūsain ‘Ali Khān’s expedition against Ajīt Sing’h, but when the army set out on the return march from Rajputana to Delhi, he parted company with them and returned home to Multān. Nur al-Dīn Fāruqī then settled in the Māhallah Fāruqiyan in Old Delhi. When S. ‘Abd Allāh Khān sent ‘Abd al-Ṣamad Khān to be Ṣūbadār of Lahore and to quell the insurrection of Gōbind Sing’h, Nur al-Dīn Fāruqī took the opportunity of revisiting his home after eleven years and accompanied the army to the Panjāb. His father was ill in bed when he arrived and died a month later on the 20th of Rabī‘ ii [A.H. 1227 apparently]. Unwilling to remain in Multān on account of the oppression of the Sik’h’s, Nur al-Dīn returned to Delhi, which he found in a disturbed state owing to the hostility between Farrukhsiyar and S. ‘Abd Allāh Khān. After enduring troubles of various kinds for five months he visited the shrine of the Sultān al-Mashāyiḥk [i.e. Nizām al-Dīn Auliya‘], for whom see Ency. Isl. under Nizām al-Dīn] and, invoking his help, started to write his account of the occurrences in which he had taken part. Already in the time of Bahādur Shāh he had witnessed the official recording of events, and, feeling a strong desire to write history, he had composed a Jang-nāmah. Dissatisfied with it, however, he had destroyed it. When Yūsuf Khān was instructed to record the events of Farrukhsiyar’s time, Nur al-Dīn Fāruqī was often in his presence and took much interest in his writing. Yūsuf Khān, however, told him that historiography was better avoided, since it produced only Dead Sea fruit.

Jahāndār-nāmah, an account of the struggle between Jahāndār Shāh [Mu‘izz al-Dīn, the eldest son of Shāh-‘Alam Bahādur Shāh. See Ency. Isl. under Djahāndār Shāh] and his three brothers after their father’s death, his brief reign in the year 1124/1712, his defeat by his nephew Farrukhsiyar and his
death, completed in Dhu ‘l-Qa‘dah 1127/1715: I.O. 3988 (probably A.D. 1892).

762. It was at the request of the Quṭb al-aqṭāb Shāh Shukr Allāh that Sh. M. Mun‘im Ja‘farābādī wrote his

**Farrukh-nāmah**, a history of the years 1124/1712 and 1125/1713 in eighteen dāstāns dealing with the struggles of Bahādur Shāh’s sons until the accession of Farrukh-siyar: Ethé 388 (A.H. 1128/1716).

763. Khwājah M. Khalil played an active part in the military events of the period which followed Aurangzēb’s death. He displays a strong bias in favour of the Saiyids, Ḥusain ‘Alī Khan and ‘Abd Allāh Khan.

**(Tārikh i Shāhanshāhī)**, a history of the events following Aurangzēb’s death to the beginning of Farrukh-siyar’s reign: Būhār 79 (18th cent.).

764. Mīr M. Aḥsan “Ījād” served for a time in Gujrat with the army of Prince M. A‘zam and while there made the acquaintance of the poet Mīrzā “Bēdil” and the Naqshbandi saint Shāh Gulshan [for the latter of whom see Bānkīpur viii p. 98]. Subsequently he became Faujīdar of Etawah. In Bahādur Shāh’s reign he entered the service of the Nawwāb Nizām al-Mulk and through him obtained a mansāb of 300 under Prince ‘Azīm al-Shān. In Farrukh-siyar’s reign he was appointed to write a court chronicle. According to the Divān i muntakhab he died in 1133/1720–1 (according to the Hamīshah bahār in 1131/1718–19 or soon after).

(1) **Farrukh-siyar-nāmah**, a prolix and pompous history of Farrukh-siyar’s minority and the early years of his reign (to A.H. 1125/1713): Rieu i 273a (18th cent.), I.O. 3958 foll. 167–210 (extracts only. Late 18th cent.), Aumer 265 (2) (the first four of the same extracts = I.O. 3958 foll. 167b–193b. Called in the

---

1 This title occurs on a fly-leaf. No title is mentioned by the author.
765. An author who was serving as Nā'īb under 'Ārif Bāg Khān, Governor of Lahore, at the time of 'Abd al-Šamad Khān’s expedition against the Sik’hs wrote in Farrukh-siyar’s reign:

An account of Farrukh-siyar’s accession and of ‘Abd al-Šamad Khān’s expedition against the Sik’hs (which ended with the capture and execution of Bandā in 1126), being, according to Rieu, a fragment of a larger chronicle: Rieu iii 860b (19th cent.).

766. An author at present unidentified wrote

Naṣm al-mulūk, a māthnawī giving a history of India from the accession of Aurangzēb to the reign of Farrukh-siyar and concluding with a record of the honours conferred upon ‘Abd al-Šamad Khān, who is called Saif al-Daulah, a title bestowed upon him in 1127 as a reward for his victory over the Sik’hs and who died as Šābah-dār of Multān in 1150: Rieu iii 1056b (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850).

767. The following is catalogued under the heading Musawwadāt:

A detailed history of Delhi, particulars of the Emperor’s movements, lists of manṣabs, etc. from the time of Aurangzēb

768. Other works relating to Farrukh-siyar:


2 Farrukhsiyyar-nāmah: Eton 193 (author not stated).

3 Tārikh i Farrukhsiyyarī: Aṣafiyyah iii p. 96 no. 1492 (author not stated. Damaged. A.H. 1247/1831–2).

769. Mirzā M. b. Mu‘tamad Khān (Rustam), who was born in 1098/1687, has already been mentioned (p. 141 supra) as the author of the Tārikh i Muḥammadi begun in 1124/1712–13.

('Ibrat-nāmah 1), memoirs of the author from 1117/1705–6, the year before Aurangzīb's death to the accession of Rafi‘ al-Darajat in 1131/1719: Bānkipūr vii 623 (early 19th cent. FULL ANALYSIS), Ethé 392, 2834, I.O. 3741 (early 19th cent.), 4031 (defective. 19th cent.), Ivanow Curzon 699 (begins with A.H. 1118. 19th cent.).

The statement made by Ethé (and, presumably on his authority, by ‘Abd al-Muqtadīr) that "These memoirs were translated by Captain Jonathan Scott 1786" is apparently due to a confusion of the 'Ibrat-nāmah with the Tārikh i Irādat Khān (for which see p. 602 supra).

770. Kāmrāj son of Nain-Sing'h b. Bindrāban, a Saksēnah Kāyast'h and a resident of Phaphund (a town 36 m. E of Etawah in the U.P.), calls himself a born servant of M. A‘zam Shāh, and says that his ancestors for three generations had been in the Imperial service. His father, Nain-Sing'h, accompanied M. A‘zam to Mālwhah in 1118/1706–7 as pīsh-dast in the Imperial artillery.

(1) A‘zam al-ḥarb, a detailed account of A‘zam Shāh's brief

1 The author does not formally give this title to the work, but he speaks of himself from time to time as rāqin i n ‘ibrat-nāmah. Though not necessarily intended to be the title, it may be accepted as a convenient substitute.

(2) ‘Ibrat-nāmah, a history of India from A.H. 1118/1707 onwards: Ethē 391 (Daftar i (or parts of it) extending to the accession of M. Shāh A.H. 1131/1719. Copied A.H. 1183/1769).

771. In Aurangzēb’s reign Zōrāwar Sing’h lived with his father and mother at Haidarābād. At the time when he wrote his mathnawī he must have been a wealthy man, since there were not less than two hundred women in his house.


772. A certain “Rami” wrote


773. S. M. Qāsim “‘Ibrat” Husainī Lāhaurī left Lahore, his native place, in 1130/1718 to seek employment at Delhi. He there entered the service of the Amīr al-umara’ S. Husain ‘Ali Khān.

‘Ibrat-nāmah,1 written in 1135/1722-3, a history of the Timūrids from the death of Aurangzēb to the fall of the Saiyids in 1133/1721: Rieu i 231b (cf. Rieu’s Additions and corrections, p. 1082b ad 231b. Lacks preface. Merges towards the end into the anonymous “Ṣaḥīfah i iqbāl” (see p. 609 infra). Late 18th

1 The title and the author’s name do not occur in the work itself but in an epilogue transcribed from a MS. belonging to Faqīr Nūr al-Dīn Khān and prefixed to the B.M. MS. Or. 1934 (Rieu iii 939a).

Description and 2 pp. of translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson History of India vii pp. 569–73.

[Autobiographical statements (see Rieu i 273).]

774. Shiv-Dās Lakhnawī was for long a munshi "in the service of the great".

Shāh-nāmah imunawwar-kalām, detached historical narratives and court news (with many official letters and farmāns) relating to the reign of Farrukh-siyar and the first four years of Muḥammad Shāh: Rieu i 274a (18th cent.), iii 938b (A.H. 1211/1797), 1049b vi (extract only. Circ. A.D. 1850), Blochet i 604 (end of 18th cent.), Ivanov Curzon 35 (A.H. 1209/1794), Eton 192.


Descriptions: (1) Elliot and Dowson History of India viii p. 331 ("The work contains a good deal of biography and anecdote"), (2) The contemporary view of the court of Farrukh Syer [sic], by A. M. Daula (in Journal of Indian history xv/2 (Madras, August 1936) pp. 201–9).

775. Mīr M. Riḍā "Riḍā" Dhū ’l-Faṣār was a Saiyid of Safīdūn (a village now in the State of Jīnd). He took part in an expedition under the command of Sharaf al-Daulah Irādatmand Kān against Rājāh Ajit Sing'h, Šūbāh-dār of Ajmer,
who rebelled in the fifth year of Muhammad Shāh's reign (A.H. 1135/1723. See Elliot and Dowson viii pp. 43–4). At the time when he wrote his poem in the hope that the Emperor's liberality would relieve his urgent need he held a command (‘mansāb) of 500 men.

Sharaf-nāmah i Muhammad Shāh, a mathnawī on the history of Muhammad Shāh's immediate predecessors (Bahādur Shāh etc.) and the early part of his reign (apparently to the fifth year): Rieu iii 1002 (18th cent.), 1054b (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850).

776. An anonymous author who had access to the court of Muhammad Shāh wrote

(Muhammad-Shāh-nāmah) or (Ṣahīfah i iqbāl ¹), detached chapters relating to the fall of the Saiyids and the first fourteen years of M. Shāh's reign "taken from a full history which the author had not yet thought it advisable to publish" (beginning: Biyā sāqī ai lu'bat i sinah-sāf): Rieu iii 940a (18th cent.), 1008a (shorn of preamble and written in continuation of a passage towards the end of S. M. Qāsim's 'Ibrat-nāmah (see p. 607 supra). A.H. 1230/1815), 1015b (A.D. 1850–1), 1055b viii (short extract only), i 231b (shorn of preamble and written in continuation of a passage towards the end of S. M. Qāsim's 'Ibrat-nāmah (see p. 607 supra). Cf. Rieu's Additions and corrections p. 1082b ad 231b. Late 18th cent.), Suppt. 80 (with two additional chapters at the beginning. M. Shāh's correspondence with Persia given more fully than in Rieu 940a. 18th cent.), L.O. 3934c (i.e. foll. 213a, l. 4–264b, l. 16. A.H. 1290/1873).

777. M. Qāsim, who is to be distinguished from S. M. Qāsim "'Ibrat" Lāhaurī, the author of the 'Ibrat-nāmah (see p. 607 infra), was for a time with Shāh-'Ālam's sons in Bihār. Subsequently he became Bahshā hī in the army of Nizām al-Mulk. He

¹ The author refers to the work as 'in sahīfah i iqbāl. It is not, however, implied thereby that Sahīfah i iqbāl is the title. The author of the 'Ālamgīr-nāmah, e.g., refers to his work as 'in sahīfah i iqbāl (p. 844°). The B.M. MS. Or. 1900 (Rieu iii 940a) is endorsed 'Ibrat-nāmah and Lubb i tārīkh. In the subscription of Or. 1747 vi (Rieu iii 1015b) it is called Muhammad-Shāh-nāmah.
served under his schoolmate, S. Lashkar Khān, in the operations against the Marāṭ’hā Sōmnā, brother of Appā Rāo. He seems to have been an intimate friend of Mutawassil Khān (d. 1156/1743-4, see Rieu iii 1084a), Nizām al-Mulk’s son-in-law, the Faujdar of Baghānah.

_Ahwāl al-khawāqīn_, a history of Aurangzēb’s successors to A.H. 1151/1738-9, the date of completion, divided into two parts ((1) from Aurangzēb’s death to Farrukh-siyar’s deposition, (2) from the accession of Rāfi’ al-Darajāt, this part being devoted mainly to Nizām al-Mulk’s conflict with the Saiyids and his wars with the Marāṭ’hās): Rieu i 276b (18th cent.).

778. Sh. M. Murād b. Sh. Shihāb al-Dīn b. Sh. Shams al-Dīn b. Sh. Sirāj al-Dīn b. Quṭb al-aqṭāb Sh. M. Chishti 1 is described by James Fraser, 2 who studied under him at Cambay and who mentions him in the preface to his History of Nādir Shāh, as a man famous in those parts for his knowledge of the Muhammadan civil and ecclesiastical laws.

A history of Aurangzēb and his successors to the twenty-first year of Muhammad Shāh’s reign A.H. 1151/1738 compiled at the request of James Fraser: Bodleian 262 (probably autograph).

779. M. Shafi’ “Wārid” b. S. M. Sharif was born A.H. 1087/1676-7 when his father, who had left Tihrān and entered first the service of ‘Abd Allāh Quṭb-Shāh and subsequently that of Prince Shāh-‘Ālam (Bahādur Shāh), was governor of Nāginah.

---

1 It appears from the _Mīrāt i Āhmādī_ (Appendix tr. Nawāb ‘Āli pp. 65-6) that this Quṭb al-aqṭāb Sh. M. Chishti was the son of Shaikh M. b. Ahmad b. Naṣīr al-Dīn Ahmadābādī known as Shaikh Ḥasan M. Chishti Ahmadābādī Gujrātī, who wrote an Arabic commentary on the _Qur’ān_ entitled _Tafsīr i Muḥammadī_ (Loth 103) and annotations on al-Baidāwī’s _tafsīr_ and who died A.H. 982/1575 (see Rahmān ‘Āli 214).

2 b. 1713, resided at Sūrat 1730-40, learnt Sanskrit and Zend, returned to England, became a factor in the E.I.Co.’s service and eventually a Member of Council at Sūrat, died 21.1.1754. His collection of circ. 200 Sanskrit and Zend MSS. is now in the Bodleian (see Buckland _Dictionary of Indian biography_ 155).
After his father’s death in 1117/1705–6 he served under Prince M. ‘Azīm, but soon retired and, supported by the patronage of Bairām Khān (Mirzā Bāqir afterwards Bāqir Khān), the son of Aurangzēb’s general Rūḥ-Allāh Khān, devoted himself to literature.

He was the author of a ḍīwān and four mathnawīs, viz. the Gulistān i nairang, the Mir’āt i farrukhā, the Chāman i didār, and a sāqi-nāmah.

(1) Mir’āt i wāridāt, a stilted history of the Indian Timūrids to M. Shāh’s 16th regnal year, A.H. 1146/1733–4, the date of completion, followed by an account of the battle between Mubāriz al-Mulk Sarbuland Khān and Mahārājāh Abhai Singh at Ahmadābād in 1141/1728–9: Rieu i 275b (late 18th cent.), Bodleian 424 (apparently the fourth tabaqah, completed A.H. 1142/1730 and consisting of (1) a geographical and historical account of certain countries, (2) a short memoir on contemporary Indian history, defective at the beginning, (3) biographies of Indian poets and authors. Lacunae. N.d.), Bānkīpur vii 580 (part relating to M. Shāh’s reign. A.D. 1811), I.O. 3881 (M. Shāh’s reign. Probably A.D. 1885. Transcribed from the Bānkīpur MS.).

(2) Tārikh i Chaghatāy, apparently a later recension of the preceding work, the preface after a different exordium (which begins Jahān jahān sitāyish) agreeing with that of the Mir’āt i wāridāt except that the title Tārikh i Chaghatāy is substituted, the latter part of the history being more concise and brought down to Nādir Shāh’s departure from India in 1152/1739: Rieu iii 924b (A.H. 1217/1802), 925a (transcribed from the preceding A.D. 1852), 1050b (extracts. Circ. A.D. 1850).

1 d. at Delhi in 1145/1732–3. See Rieu iii 1084a, Tārikh i Muḥammadī (presumably under the year 1145), Ma’ūthir al-numara’ ii 31516 (where the date is not given).

2 According to the preface this is only the first of the four tabaqahs of which the work was planned to consist (viz. (1) Kings and amīrs, (2) faqīrs, (3) ‘ulamā’, (4) poets).

3 In the colophon of this MS. the work is called Tārikh i Chaghatāy, but the sixteenth year of the reign is several times spoken of as the current year and the history is not brought down to A.H. 1152.
Description and 3 pp. of translated extracts (relating to M. Shāh’s interviews with Nādir Shāh): Elliot and Dowson History of India viii pp. 21–24.

[Safīnāh i Khwūṣkū (cf. Bānkīpur viii p. 111); Šuḥuf i Ibrāhīm, wāw, no. 78.]

780. Ānand Rām “Mukhlīṣ”, son of Rājah Hirdē Rām, K’hatrī Lāhaurī,1 is described by “Shafīq” (Gul i ra’īnā, Bānkīpur viii p. 132) as the most eminent of all the Hindu poets [sc. who wrote in Persian]. He was a pupil of “Bēdil” and a friend of “Ārzū”. In 1132/1719–20 he was appointed Wakīl 2 for Nawwāb I’timād al-Daulah Qamar al-Dīn Khān (Muḥammad Shāh’s Wazīr). He was also Wakīl for ʿAbd al-Ṣamad Khān, Nāẓim of the sūbah of Lahore and Multān, and had the title of Rāy-Rāyān. He died at Delhi in 1164/1751.

In addition to his Dīwān (for which see Ethé 1707, Nadhīr Aḥmad 194 (Rāmpūr)) he is the author of (1) Rūqa’āt i Mukhlīṣ, a collection of his own letters redacted in 1149/1736–7 (MSS. Panjab Univ. Lib. (see Or. Coll. Mag. vi no. 4 (Aug. 1930) p. 99), Bānkīpur ix 882 i [?] I.O. 3981), (2) Mīrāt al-iṣṭilāh, a dictionary of poetical phrases and proverbial sentences 3 completed in 1157/1744 (MSS. Rieu iii 997, Bānkīpur ix 810), (3) Pārī-ḵhānah, an introduction written in 1144/1731–2 to an album of calligraphic specimens and drawings (MSS. Bānkīpur ix 882 ii, Ivanow Curzon 156), (4) a long letter written by order of Muḥammad Shāh to a Ṣafawīd king on the latter’s accession to the throne (MSS. Bānkīpur ix 882 iii, Ivanow Curzon 156 I.O. D.P. 491 (e)), (5) Chamanistān written in 1159/1746, a collection of anecdotes,

---

1 According to the Khizānah i ‘āmirah the home of his family was Sūd’haram “az tawabi i Lāhaur”, i.e. apparently Sohdara (as it is spelt in the List of Indian post offices), near Wazirābād.

2 In accordance with the Indian custom by which, according to the Khizānah i ‘āmirah, amirs used to have representatives at court (Ḍabītah i Hind asi kih dar darbār i salāfīn az umarā’ ḥa’ib u ḥādīr wukalā’ mi-bāshand).

3 “In the Mīrāt al-Iṣṭilāḥat [sic] the author gives incidentally various historical notices relating to the Dehlī court and to celebrated contemporaries” (Rieu iii 997b).
accounts of some contemporaries, descriptions of trees, flowers and fruits, admonitions, witty sayings etc. (Edition: Lucknow 1877*). MSS. Bänkîpûr ix 882 iv, Ivanow Curzon 156 [?], (6) Hangāmeh i ‘ishq, written in 1152/1739–40, the love-story of Kunwar Sundar Šen, of the Karnátak, and Râni Chand Parbâ (MS. Bänkîpûr ix 882 v), (7) Kâr-nâmah i ‘ishq, written in 1144/1731–2, the love-story of Prince Gauhar of China and Princess Mamlakat (MSS. I.O. Johnson Album 38 (beautifully illustrated), Bänkîpûr ix 882 vi), (8) Intikhâb i Tuhfah i Sémî, an abridgment of Sémî Mirzâ’s tadkhîrah (MS. I.O. DP. 718).

(9) Tadkhîrah i Ánand-Räm “Mukhlîs”, a history of the war of Muhammad Shâh with Nâdir Shâh: *Áligarh* (see Irvine Later Mughals ii p. 380).

Description and 22 pp. of translated extracts ¹: Elliot and Dowson History of India viii 76–98 (from a MS. belonging to Nawwâb Diyar’ al-Dîn).

(10) Account of a journey from Delhi to Muktéasar in 1150/1737: Ethé 2724, Râmpûr (see Nadhîr Ahmad 61).


[Hamîshah bâhâr (Sprenger p. 129); Safînah i Khwushgû (Bänkîpûr viii p. 113); Muntakhab al-ashb’âr (Bodl. 379) no. 656; Riyâd al-shu’ârâ’; Majma’ al-nafâ’is; Nikât al-shu’ârâ’ (cf. Sprenger p. 262); Maqâlât al-shu’arâ’ (Sprenger p. 159); Khizânah i ‘âmîrah pp. 425–6 (Bodl. 381 no. 115); Jâm i jahân-numâ by Mahârat Khân; Gul i ra’nâ (Bänkîpûr viii p. 132); ‘Igd i Thuraisiyyû (Bänkîpûr viii no. 709 fol. 60a); Makhsan al-qharâ’îb no. 2633; Safînah i Hindî (Bänkîpûr viii no. 715 fol. 77b); Nîghtar i ‘ishq (one of the sources used by S. M. ‘Abd Allâh in his article mentioned below); Natâ’ij al-afkār; Garcin de Tassy ii p. 376; Nizâmī Badāyûnî

¹ The translator was “Lt. Perkins”.
781. In the 22nd year of Muḥammad Shāh, a.h. 1153/1740–1, was composed

*A sketch (51 foll.) of the first 22 years of M. Shāh’s reign especially Nādir Shāh’s campaign in India and the doings of Nizām al-Mulk Āsaf-Jūh (beg.: Dar bayān i talab i Nizām al-Mulk? . . . chūn dar muhimmat i saltanat Khidrī w i qadar-qudrat . . .):* Blochet in 612 (latter half of 18th cent.).

782. It was in 1153/1740–1 at the request of Shāikh ‘Alā’ al-Dīn, an old associate of the Amīr al-umarā’ (Khwājah M. Āsim) Şamsām al-Daulah Khān i Daurān (the commander defeated by Nādir Shāh at Karnāl), that M. Muḥsin b. al-Ḥanīf Siddīqī, a native of Bijnaur, wrote his

**Jauhar i şamsām,** a wordy and hyperbolic account of Nādir Shāh’s invasion, based on information received from Sh. ‘Alā’ al-Dīn, with a brief history of Aurangzēb’s successors: *Browne* Suppt. 364 (King’s 132), *Ivanow* 2nd Suppt. 929 (a.h. 1224/1809), *Rieu* iii 941 (circ. a.d. 1850).


Description and 3 pp. of extracts from Fuller’s translation: Elliot and Dowson *History of India* viii 72–5.

783. An anonymous dependent of Şamsām al-Daulah Khān i Daurān wrote

(Risālah i Muḥammad Shāh u Khān i Daurān), a turgid, fulsome and historically unimportant account of the life and times of Şamsām al-Daulah Khān i Daurān (Khwājah M. Āsim, who was a trusted official with a command of 7,000 in Farrukhsiyar’s reign, was appointed Amīr al-umarā’ by Muḥammad Shāh after the fall of the Saiyids and in 1151/1739 was in command
against Nādir Shāh at Karnāl, where he received a fatal wound. See Maʿāthir al-umarāʾ i 819–23: Browne Suppt. 675 (A.H. 1199/1784–5), Rieu ii 277b (A.H. 1202/1788), iii 941a (A.H. 1262/1846).

784. Sh. M. ‘Alī “Hazīn” Lāhiji Jilānī was born at Isfahān in 1103/1692 and died at Benares in 1180/1766 (for further information see the section Biography: Poets).

(1) (Tadhkirat al-aḫwāl), an autobiography written in 1154/1741 and containing a good deal of historical information about the Afghān invasion of Persia and Nādir Shāh’s invasion of India (for MSS. and editions see the section Biography: Poets).

(2) Wāqiʿat i Īrān u Hind, on events in Persia and India from 1134/1722 to 1154/1741, beginning al-Ḥamdū li-walīyihī (probably the same as no. (1)): Ethé 1714 (A.H. 1183/1769).

(3) A short note on the Persian invasions of India, completed at Ḥusainābād in 1180 and beginning Muwāfīq i siyār i muʿtabarah dafaʿātā kih lashkār i Īrān ba-Sīnd u Hind dar āmadah: Berlin p. 54 no. 11, Ivanow 1749, Bāṅkīpūr Suppt. ii 2240 (19th cent.).

785. A Persian who went to India and entered the service of Šafdar-Jang wrote

(1) A poem on Nādir Shāh’s invasion: Blochet iii 1931 (defective at end. Mid 18th cent.).

(2) A poem on Muḥammad Shāh’s operations against the Marāṭhās or Rōhelahs or both after Nādir Shāh’s departure from India: Blochet iii 1931 (mid 18th cent.).

(3) Fath-nāmah i Šafdarī, completed in 1155/1742, a poem on the operations of Saʿādat Khān and Šafdar-Jang against the Marāṭhās: Blochet iii 1931 (mid 18th cent.).

1 “la guerre des Maharattes du Rohilla [sic] contre Mohammed Shah... après la retraite de Nadir Shah... l’histoire commence, au folio 16 recto, avec le récit de la guerre que Bhakount [? Bhagwant] fit à Djansar [? Jānn-nithār] Khan, et de la mort de ce personnage, après lequel vient l’histoire de la lutte que Mohammed Shah soutint contre Bhakount.”
(4) A poem on Ṣafdar-Jang’s return from the war against the Marāṭhās and on Muḥammad Shāh’s operations against Rājah Nawal: Biochet iii 1931 (mid 18th cent.).

786. Mīrzā Muḥammad-Bakhsch “Āshob” b. M. Ghiyāth was born at Delhi in Sha’bān 1128/1716, the fourth year of Farrukh-siyar’s reign. After his father’s death he was brought up by his maternal uncle Mīrzā M. b. Rustam (for whom see pp. 141 and 606 supra) and his grandfather ‘Ināyat Allāh Bēg entitled Qaswar Khān. He entered the service of Muḥammad Shāh and remained in it until Nādir Shāh’s invasion (A.H. 1151/1738). Then for some years he served the Wazir Imām al-Daulah Qamar al-Din Khān (killed A.H. 1161/1748 at the Battle of Sirhind) and his sons the Khān i Khānān Intīṣām al-Daulah (d. 1167/1753–4) and Mu‘īn al-Mulk, distinguishing himself in the operations against Aḥmad Shāh Abdālī and in the contest of the Khān i Khānān against Ṣafdar-Jang. Then for fifteen years he served the Wazir ‘Imād al-Mulk Ghāzī al-Din Khān as Mīr Munshī and in other capacities. Serious ill-health having caused him to sever his connexion with ‘Imād al-Mulk he lived successively at Farrukhābād, where he was ill for a year, and for some troubled years at Lucknow, Fyzabad and Allahabad. Then Āṣaf al-Daulah invited him to enter his service and leaving Farrukhābād for Lucknow and Fyzabad he enjoyed prosperity for five or six years. Subsequently he was for a short time in the service of Richard Johnson (for whom he copied the I.O. MS. Ethē 224 in 1194/1780) and in 1196/1782 at the invitation of Jonathan Scott, whom he had met at Colonel Polier’s house at Lucknow, he went to Allahabad in order to write his history of Muḥammad Shāh. According to the Khulāṣat al-afkār he died in poverty at Lucknow in 1199/1784–5.

He wrote a considerable amount of poetry, including (1) Ṣā‘ulat i Fārūqī or Fustūḥ al-Islām fi bilād al-Rūm wa‘l-Shām, a mathnawī based on the Pseudo-Wāqidī and planned to consist of three volumes but probably never continued beyond the second,1

1 Only two volumes had been completed when he wrote his autobiography.
which was completed in 1160/1747 \(^1\) (MSS.: I.O. 3940 (vol. i of the *Kulliyāt*), Lindesiana p. 192 no. 783, Bānkīpūr Suppt. i no. 1801 (vol. i only) and doubtless also Bānkīpūr iii no. 420 (*Kulliyāt* i Āshōb, much disarranged). Edition: Aʿẓamgarh 1252/1836-7 (see Qāmūs al-aʿlām i col. 45).

(2) A *dīwān*, for which see Sprenger p. 342 no. 115, Bānkīpūr iii no. 420 (*Kulliyāt*), Browne Suppt. 499.

(3) *Kār-nāmah*, a *mathnawī* on the war against Aḥmad Shāh Abdālī, which terminated in 1162/1749: Ivanow Curzon 302.

(4) *Falak-āshūb*, written at Bharatpūr, a historical compendium in 700 distichs ending with the death of Ḥāfiz Raḥmat Khān (a.h. 1188/1774): Eton 142.

(5) (*Sawāniḥ i aḥwāl i Āshōb*), \(^2\) a short and almost dateless autobiography written towards the end of his life: I.O. 3940 foll. 1-9a (early 19th cent.), 4034 (a.d. 1888), 3938 (a.d. 1892).

(6) *Tārīkh i shahādat i Farrukh-siyar u julūs i Muḥammad Shāh*, written in 1196/1782, a valuable but chronologically unprecise account of the life and reign of Muḥammad Shāh, apparently intended to come down to the date of composition but probably never finished, since the B.M. and I.O. copies end with the death of Nādir Shāh, a.h. 1160/1747: Rieu iii 944a (a.h. 1199/1785), 1051b (extracts only). Circe. a.d. 1850, Ethé 422 (a.h. 1200/1786), Browne Suppt. 239 (King’s 94).

Description and a translated extract (1 p.): Elliot and Dowson *History of India* viii 232-4.

[Autobiography (see above); *Tārīkh i shahādat i Farrukh-siyar*, preface and elsewhere; *Khulāsat al-afkār* (Bodl. 391 no. 479); *Makhzan al-qhārāʾ ib* no. 153 (?)]; Beale *Oriental

---

\(^1\) According to a statement at the end of the table of contents in Bānkīpūr Suppt. i no. 1801.

\(^2\) The author does not give this work any formal title, but he refers to it as *Sawāniḥ i aḥwāl* in some words prefixed to the ghazals which follow it in the I.O. MS. 3940 (*Chūn az taqīrī u lahūrī i sawāniḥ i aḥwāl farāqhat dast dād*).
biographical dictionary; Elliot and Dowson History of India viii 232; Rieu iii 944; Bānkīpur iii p. 247; S. Shams Allāh Qādirī Qāmūs al-a‘lām (in Urdu) i (Ḥaidarābād 1935) coll. 44–5.]

787. For further information concerning works dealing with Nādir Shāh and his invasion of India see pp. 322–29 supra. In addition the following works and fragments may be mentioned:

(1) A criticism of the actions of Muḥammad Shāh and his Ḥārrān, especially Ḥārrān i Daurān, at the time of Nādir Shāh’s invasion, beginning Kaifīyat i sultaṇat i mulk i Hindūstān: Ivanov Curzon 36 (A.H. 1241/1826).

(2) Fragment relating to Nādir Shāh’s invasion: Rieu iii 10506 (circ. A.D. 1850).

(3) Ḥalāt i Nādir Shāh, a very short (9 foll.) account of Nādir Shāh’s invasion in Persian prose interspersed with Hindi verses, written in Samwat 1795 [A.D. 1738] by Amar, a resident of Chandārī: I.O. 4008 (probably A.D. 1896).

(4) Tārikh i hamlāh i Nādirī, apparently an extract from some history: Āṣafiyyah i p. 224 no. 544.

788. Sh. Ḥusām Allāh wrote in 1161/1746

Fath-nāmah, a mathnawī on Ḥāmīd Shāh Abdālī’s [first] invasion: Blochet iii 1934 (late 18th cent.).

789. It was for Mu‘īn al-Mulk that Ghulām-Muḥyi ’l-Dīn Khān wrote his


790. Other works relating to Muḥammad Shāh:

1 For Ḥāmīd Shāh Abdālī’s later invasions see pp. 620–1 infra and also pp. 397–9 supra.
2 Called Mīr Mānū, son of I’timād al-Daulah Qāmar al-Dīn Khān and Şāhāb-dār of Lahore and Multān, d. Muharram 1167/1753 (see Rieu i p. 2796).
3 Possibly identical with the author of the Fūṭūḥi-nāmah i Şamādī (see p. 664 infra).
(1) Concise history of Hindūstān from the birth of Aurangzīb to the time of M. Shāh: R.A.S. P. 345 (1) = Morley 100.

(2) Diary of events in the last few years of M. Shāh’s reign from 18 Dhū ’l-Qa‘dah 1159/2 December 1745 to 11 Jumādā ii 1161/8 June 1748, by an anonymous eye-witness (beg.: Chūn az būgalamūn-hā i rūzgār): Ethé 410 (perhaps incomplete. Autograph ?).

(3) Extract relating to M. Shāh’s reign, especially the inroads of the Marāt’hās and Nādir Shāh’s invasion, the last date mentioned being a.h. 1157, the twenty-fifth regnal year (beginning Dhikr i takhhulul dar šubajāt i mamālik i mahrūsah): Rieu iii 1005b iii (A.H. 1230/1815), I.O. 3934d (i.e. foll. 264b–272b. A.H. 1290/1873).

(4) Istiṣāl i Sādāt i Bārkhah, a long letter describing the downfall of the Saiyids Husain ‘Ali Khān and ‘Abd Allāh Khān said to have been written by order of Muḥammad Shāh in answer to a letter from “Ṭahmāsp Mīrzā, Ruler of Īrān”, i.e. Shāh Ṭahmāsp II (A.H. 1135/1722–1144/1731), with a preface in which Munawwar ‘Ali Khān says that he obtained the disarranged sheets of the letter from the library of “the late Sirāj al-Dīn ‘Ali Khān Ārzū” [who died in 1169/1756. See Rieu ii 501–2, etc.] and, having arranged them in proper order, gave it the title mentioned above: I.O. 4002 (A.D. 1894 ?).

(5) Lists of Wākils (or Wazīrs), Dīwāns, Mīr Bakhshīs etc. from the reign of Akbar to that of M. Shāh: Rieu iii 926a (19th cent.).

(6) Muḥammad-Shāh-nāmah: Eton 195 (author not stated in the catalogue).

(7) Nādir al-zamānī, or Tārikh i Muḥammad-Shāhī, by Khwush-hāl Chand: see pp. 136–7 supra.


1 See p. 625 infra. This work, if it is not merely a part of the Siyar al-muta‘akkhirīn, does not seem to be mentioned elsewhere.
(9) Tārīkh i Muḥammad-Shāhī, or Nādir al-zamānī, by Khwush-hāl Chand: see pp. 136-7 supra.

791. Ghulām-Ḥasan "Thāmin" Ṣiddīqi Farshūrī Bilgāmī was for some years associated with S. M. Ṣāliḥ "Saiyāḥ", entitled Shār-andāz Khān, an employee (naulkar) of Nawwāb Sāfdar-Jang (chand sāl ba-hamarāhi i . . . S. M. Ṣāliḥ . . . būdam, I.O. 3958, fol. 140a, l. 6). In 1169/1755-6 the Saiyid left Shujā‘ al-Daulah [Ṣafdar-Jang's successor as Nawwāb-Wazīr of Oudh], and, with Ghulām-Ḥasan, entered the service of Aḥmad Khān Bangash at Farrukhābād. In 1173/1759-60 Ghulām-Ḥasan was in the employ of Nawwāb Sā‘d Allāh Khān b. ʿAlī M. Khān Rōḥēlah. In 1197/1783 at the instigation of his friend ("mushīqī") Sh. Allāh-Yār Bahādūr b. Sh. Allāh-Yār shahīd (for whom see pp. 142-3 supra) he went to Allahabad and met Captain Jonathan Scott [Sh. Allāh-Yār's employer]. In the same year at Captain Scott's request he wrote his account of Aḥmad Shāh Abdālī's invasion. His Shārā'īf i 'Uthmānī, a history of the 'Uthmānī clan of Bilgām, was begun in 1159/1746 (MSS.: I.O. 3913a, Ivanow 277).

(Ba‘dī az aḥwāl i Ahmad Shāh Bāḏshāh Abdālī), an account of Ahmad Shāh's third invasion in 1169/1755-6 [as the author says, but actually in 1170/1756-7] written in 1197/1783: I.O. 3958 foll. 139-66 (late 18th cent.).

[Autobiographical statements in the account of Aḥmad Shāh's invasion.]

792. Other works relating to Aḥmad Shāh Durraṇī's invasions:

(1) Ahmad-nāmah, a more or less metrical account completed on 20 Jumādā i 12. A.H. 1184/1770 by 'Abd al-Laṭīf “Laṭīf”, of K’hark’haudah [in the Rohitk division of the Panjūb]: I.O. 3964 (18th cent.).

(2) Aḥwāl i Bhāō Marhaṭṭah u sabāb i ţamadan i i ba-Hindūstān u kushtah shudan i i bā tamām hamrāhiyān dar muḥārābah i Ahmad Shāh i Abdālī bah ḥudūd i Pānī-pat: Ethē 527 (12)-(13) (2 copies, one dated A.H. 1197/1783).
(3) **Kār-nāmah**, a *mathnawi* on the war against Ahmad Shāh Abdālī which terminated in 1162/1749 by Mirzā Muḥammad-Bakhsh “Āshōb”, who died at Lucknow in 1199/1784–5 (see pp. 616–18 *supra*): **Ivanow** Curzon 302 (18th cent.).

A number of works relating to Ahmad Shāh Abdālī’s invasions have already been mentioned on pp. 397–9 *supra*. Cf. also pp. 761–5 *infra* and Jadunath Sarkar *An original account of Ahmad Shāh Durrānī’s campaigns in India and the battle of Panipat* (from the Persian life of Najib-ud-daulah, British Museum Persian MS. 24,410) in *Islamic culture vii/3* (July 1933) pp. 431–56. For the Persian life of Najib al-Daulah see p. 694 *infra*.

793. A contemporary resident of Delhi wrote the **Tārikh i Ahmad-Shāh** (beginning, without preface in the B.M. MS.: *Chun zuhūr i har umūr i ‘uzmā*), a detailed history of Ahmad Shāh (reigned 1161/1748–1167/1754, d. 1188/1775): **Rieu** iii 941b (A.H. 1267/1851).

English translation (omitting the last quarter of the work) by Sir D. Forsyth: **B.M.** MS. Add. 30,783.

Extracts from this translation: Elliot and Dowson *History of India* viii pp. 104–23.

794. **M. ‘Ali Khān Anṣārī** has already been mentioned as the author of the general history *Bahr al-mawwāj* completed according to the preface in 1209/1794–5 but in fact extending to 1211/1796 (see p. 144 *supra*) and of the *Tārikh i Muẓaffarī*, a history of the Indian Timūrids composed originally in 1202/1787–8 but subsequently continued to 1225/1810 (see p. 522 *supra*).

**Tārikh i Ahmad-Shāhī**, a short history of Ahmad Shāh written in 1196/1782: *Ethē* 423 (autograph ?).

795. **Shākir Khān** was the fourth son of Shams al-Daulah Luṭf Allāh Khān Ṣādīq (*Khān-sāmān* to Muḥammad Shāh, see *Maʿāthir al-umārā* iii 177–8) and a brother of ‘Īnāyat Khān “Rāsīkh”. At the time of Nādir Shāh’s invasion he was *Bakhshī* in the Risālah i Sultānī. When Ahmad Shāh Abdālī sacked
Delhi in 1170/1756, he escaped to Benares. Having failed to obtain the support of Mīr Qāsim, he sought the protection of British officials.

*Tārikh i Shākir-Khān*, a dateless, unprecise and disorderly history of Muḥammad Shāh and his successors down to the beginning of Shāh-ʿĀlam’s reign: *Rieu* i 279b (18th cent.), *I.O.* 3973 (defective. Circ. A.D. 1884).

796. Of unknown authorship is the


Description and 3 pp. of translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson *History of India* viii pp. 140–3.

797. ʿAbd al-Qādir Khān, commonly called (ʿurf) Ghulām-Qādir Khān, 1 Jāʿisi 2 was the son of Maulawi Wāṣīl ʿAlī Khān, Qādī ʿl-Quḍāt of Bengal. In his youth he enjoyed the society of two well-known historians, ʿAlī Ibrāhīm Khān (who was Chief Magistrate 3 at Benares and who died there in 1208/1793–4. See p. 700 infra) and S. Ghulām-Ḥusain Khān (for whom see pp. 625–40 infra). Jonathan Duncan (who was Resident at Benares from 1788 to 1795) sent him more than once on political missions to Nāpāl and, according to his own statement in the *Hashmat i Kashmīr*, his reports were submitted to Col. Kirkpatrick, translated and printed. *Rieu* adds that he is mentioned as a member of the 1793 mission by Col. W. Kirkpatrick in *An account of the Kingdom of Nepaul. Observations made during a mission to that country in 1793*, pp. xi and 367.

At the time when Wazīr ʿAlī Khān, Nawvāb-Wazīr of Oudh,

---

1 He is called Maulawi Ghulām-Qādir Khān Jāʿisi in the *Imād al-saʿādat* p. 165 ult. ʿAbd al-Qādir himself mentions the ʿurfī nām in the *Tārikh i Imād al-Mulk* but not in the *Hashmat i Kashmīr*.

2 Jāʿisi is an old town in the Rāy Bareli District.

3 “Daroga,” of the Court at Benares, that is, President of the tribunal there, in the time of Warren Hastings’ Governorship (Buckland *Dictionary of Indian biography* p. 10).
was deposed in favour of Sa‘ādat-‘Ali Khān [a.h. 1212/Jan. 1798] ‘Abd al-Qādir Khān was rafīq (presumably meaning “personal assistant” or the like) to John Lumsden, Resident at Lucknow, and conveyed to Wazīr ‘Ali Khān the announce-
ment of his deposition [‘Imād al-sa‘ādat p. 165 ult.]

He was for a time in the service of Mahārājāh Amrit Rād, who by order of the Governor-General Marquess Wellesley [and therefore not earlier than 1798, since Lord Wellesley was Governor-General from May 1798 to July 1805] took up his residence in Benares. Through the influence of the British Agent, Ḥāshmat al-Daulah Wm. Augustus Brooke, ‘Abd al-Qādir’s personal jāgīr was made hereditary, and to him he dedicated the Ḥāshmat i Kashmir, a history of Kashmir completed at Benares in 1245/1830 (see p. 685 infra).

In Jumādā i 1250/1834 Mr [or rather Captain] Thoresby [Superintendent of the Sanskrit College at Benares] suggested that he should make a search for a biography of the Nawwāb Ghāzī al-Dīn Khān ‘Imād al-Mulk written during a visit to Benares by one of the Nawwāb’s confidants (mutawassīlān). ‘Abd al-Qādir Khān replied that, although for nearly fifty years he had been living at Benares in the Aiwān i Dārā-Shukh, which at that time (al-hāl) was known as the Ḥawelli Rājā Shitāb Rāy or ‘Adālat i Qudīmeh, he had never seen such a person or heard of his book. He would, however, himself write a life of the Nawwāb ‘Imād al-Mulk.

(Tārīkh i ‘Imād al-Mulk), a history of ‘Imād al-Mulk Ghāzī al-Dīn Khān Firūz-Jang, the Wazīr of Aḥmad Shāh (reigned A.H. 1161/1748–1167/1754) and ‘Ālamgīr II (reigned A.H. 1167/ 1754–1173/1759), based partly on oral information from various persons including the Nawwāb himself, who had recounted to the author at Kālpī some of the events of his life, and also on written sources such as the Nawwāb’s letters (khufūj), the Tārīkh i Shujā’ī of Harcharandās and the Haḍīqat al-agālim of Sh. Ilāh-Yār Bilgrāmī (see p. 142 supra): Bānkīpur vii 615 (19th cent.), I.O. 4000 (A.D. 1892. Apparently transcribed by the same copyist as the Bānkīpur MS.), 4001 (abridged. Late 19th cent.).
798.  **M. Šālih “Qudrat”** is, according to the colophon of the Bānkīpūr manuscript, the author of the *Tārikh i ‘ālí fī silk al-la‘ālí*.

(1) *Tārikh i ‘ālí fī silk al-la‘ālí*, written at the request of James Brown, a history (without dates) of Aurangzēb’s successors from Bahādur Shāh to Shāh-Ālam II, the account of the last reign being only summary and ending with Visvāsa Rāo’s death in 1174/1760: **Bānkīpūr** vii 581 (A.D. 1785), *Browne* Suppt. 242 (A.H. 1199/1784–5. King’s 73).

(2) **Najaf-nāmah**, a poem (unfinished?) in the ramaḍ metre narrating the victorious operations of Nawwāb Dhu ’l-Faqār al-Daulah Najaf Khān against the *T’hānah-dār* of Maidān K’harī, against Chandū, *Faujdār* of Köl and the Jāt Rājah Nawal Sing’h in the fifteenth year of Shāh-Ālam, A.H. 1187/1774: **I.O. D.P.** 1277 (18th cent.).

799.  **Mīrzā Jawān-bakht,** afterwards known as Jahāndār Shāh, was the eldest son of Shāh-Ālam. He was appointed Regent by Ahmad Shāh Abdālī in 1761 after the battle of Pānīpat, and administered the empire until his father’s restoration in 1771. In April 1784, on account of the unsettled affairs of his father, he escaped from Delhi and went to Lucknow. From there he accompanied Warren Hastings to Benares, where he lived the rest of his life and died on 31 May 1788.

**Account of his own escape from Delhi,** written at the request of Warren Hastings: no MSS. recorded.

---

1 “The same prince, who, in the year 1784, made his escape from Dhely, and threw himself on the protection of Mr. Hastings; who by his influence with the vizier, obtained for him an allowance of forty thousand pounds per annum. On his death a liberal share of this pension was continued to his women and family, who yet reside at Banaras, under the English protection” (Ferishta’s History of Dekkan . . . By Jonathan Scott, vol. ii p. 241 n.). For his life see W. Francklin History of Shah Aulum, pp. 154–62, Beale Oriental biographical dictionary, pp. 190–1, etc.
English translation by Jonathan Scott: Memoir relative to the state of India ... by Warren Hastings, London 1786*, pp. 163–96.

800. Tāhmās Khān, born near Bāyazīd in Asia Minor, was captured as an infant by Nādir Shāh’s Uzbaks. Some years later he was taken by his Uzbak master to India, where he served in the army of Mu‘īn al-mulk (d. 1167/1753–4), the Shābāh-dār of Lahore. After a period in the service of Aḥmad Shāh Durrānī, who created him a Khān, he returned to India and served successively under Dābitāsh Khān and Najaf Khān at Delhi. At the time when he wrote his Tāhmās-nāmah he was living at Delhi in great affluence, and had received from Shāh-‘Alamat the title of Muḥkim al-Daulah Tāhmās Khān I’tiqād-Jang. He mentions that he had previously written a sketch of his life in Turkī and a Turkī manual entitled Aḥmad-nāmah. The Urdu poet “Rangīn” was a son of his.

(Tāhmās-nāmah), discursive memoirs of his own life and an account of contemporary events written for his children and completed in 1193/1779: Rieu iii 980b (18th cent.).

Description: Elliot and Dowson History of India viii p. 100.

801. The precise subject of the Wāqā‘i‘ i Shujā‘i is not clear from the Eton catalogue, but it may be mentioned here since it can scarcely be entirely irrelevant.


802. Nawwāb 2 S. Ghulām-Husain Khān Tabātabā‘i Ḥasanī was born at Shāhjahānābād, i.e. Delhi, the home of his ancestors for some generations, 3 in 1140/1727–8 (Siyar al-muta‘akhkhārin,

1 Shujā‘ al-Daulah, Nawwāb-Wazīr of Oudh, died on 29 January 1775 (i.e. 27 Dhū ‘l-Qa‘dah 1183).
2 So according to the title-pages of the Calcutta edition: on the title-page and in the publisher’s colophon of the Lucknow edition he is called Munshī S. Ghulām-Husain Khān.
3 Tawallud i faqīr u maskin i ābā u ajdād i pidari u mādārī dār al-khilāfah Shāhjahānābād ast (S. al-m. iii p. 948).
Lucknow 1866, iii p. 948\textsuperscript{21-22}, Raymond's trans., reprint Calcutta 1926, iv p. 88). In his fifth year under stress of poverty ('\textit{usrat zūr āward}, S. al-m. iii p. 948\textsuperscript{23}) his mother's grandmother, a paternal aunt of 'Ali-Wirdī Khān Mahābat-Jang,\textsuperscript{1} sold her house at Delhi and took Ghulām-Husain, his father and mother and some other relations to Murshidābād, where, according to Ghulām-Husain, 'Ali-Wirdī Khān was then living \textsuperscript{2} in the service of Shujā' al-Daulah, the Nāzīm of Bengal (S. al-m. iii p. 948\textsuperscript{23-25}, trans. iv p. 88). When 'Ali-Wirdī Khān was appointed Governor of the province of 'Azīmābād, Ghulām-Husain's father, S. Hidāyat-'Ali Khān, accompanied him \textsuperscript{3} and made the town of 'Azīmābād (i.e. Patna) his home (Ba'd i čand rūz Mahābat-Jang ba-yāwārī-yi iqbal nizāmat i sūbah i 'Azīmābād yāft wālid i marhūm ba-rafaqat i i dar baldah i madhkūrah rasīdah tawāqṭun guzād, S. al-m. iii p. 948\textsuperscript{25-26}, trans. (1926) iv p. 88). S. Hidāyat-'Ali Khān prospered at 'Azīmābād and eventually became Nā'īb of the province \textsuperscript{4} (S. al-m. ii p. 522\textsuperscript{18}: wālid i faqīr rā kih nā'īb i sūbah i 'Azīmābād būd). The houses and estates acquired by him were still in the possession of Ghulām-Husain, his eldest son, in 1195/1781, when he was writing the Siyar al-mu'ta'akhkhīrūn (az-ān zamān īlā 'l-ān kih sāl i nawād u panjum az mī'āh i duwāzdahum i Hijrat ast dar-īn makān

\textsuperscript{1} S. al-m. iii p. 948\textsuperscript{19}: juddah i mâdar i faqīr 'ammah i Mahābat-Jang. 'Ali-Wirdī Khān was not a Bengali, but went to Bengal from Delhi.

\textsuperscript{2} If, as is usually stated, 'Ali-Wirdī Khān became Governor of 'Azīmābād in 1729, it seems unlikely that he was living at Murshidābād when Ghulām-Husain, born in 1140/1727-8, was in his fifth year.

\textsuperscript{3} If 'Ali-Wirdī Khān became Governor of Bihār in 1729 (see the preceding note), and if Ghulām-Husain, born in 1140/1727-8, was in his fifth year when he and his father went to Murshidābād, it follows that his father must have settled in 'Azīmābād some years after 'Ali-Wirdī Khān became Governor. Evidently some of the facts or the dates given by Ghulām-Husain are inaccurate.

\textsuperscript{4} Apparently only for a short time. He was holding this office when Şafdar-Jang went to 'Azīmābād towards the end of 1155/1742. In the next year he left Haibat-Jang's service and went to Delhi. He had previously been Bakhshī of Haibat-Jang's army (S. al-m. ii p. 500\textsuperscript{4}, trans. (1926) i p. 358) and Faujdār of the parganah of SNWT (S. al-m. ii p. 505 penult., trans. (1926) i p. 371). Subsequently he became Bakhshī to Shāh-ʻAlam. As a poet he used the \textit{tākhallus} "ʻDamīr" (cf. Sprenger pp. 219, 237 (under Hidāyat)).
İzad ta'ālā ba-kām u ārām u ba-‘izzat u iḥtishām nigah-dāskhāt buyūt i mamāliqah u maḥallāt i mamālik u al-tamgīlā ba-qadr i qismat kih dar zāhīr ba-sabab i ghūfrān-panāh Mahābat-Jang mubassar āmadah dar qabālah i tāsarruf u aqāt dar guðkar ast, S. al-m. iii p. 948 antepenult., trans. (1926) iv p. 88. His jāgīr near Rohtās, where he founded the village of Ḥusainābād and where he spent the years of his retirement before his death on 3 Jumādā i i 1179/1765 (S. al-m. ii p. 776, trans. (1926) iii p. 16), is often mentioned by Ghulām-Ḥusain, both father and son repeatedly visiting their relations at that place.

In 1156/1743 Hīdāyat-‘Alī Khān, leaving the service of Haibat-Jang, the Governor of ‘Azīmābād, migrated for a time to Shāhjahānābād, and it was from there that Ghulām-Ḥusain went in Muharram 1158/Jan.–Feb. 1745 to ‘Azīmābād for the purpose of marrying the daughter of his maternal uncle, ‘Abd al-‘Alī Khān. In the following month, though he had no official employment (bī ‘alāgah i naukārī), he served with (ba-rāfāqūt i) his uncle in the army of Haibat-Jang, which defended ‘Azīmābād against Muṣṭafā Khān (S. al-m. ii p. 536, trans. (1926) i p. 449). At the end of 1161/1748 Ghulām-Ḥusain presented himself before Saʿīd Ahmad Khān Šājalat-Jang (‘Alī-Wirdī Khān’s son-in-law) at Mongīr (“Monghyr”) and was taken into his service (mubālagah numūd kih hamīshah dar safar u ḥadār mulāzim bāyad būd u waḥī ba-qadr i maʿāsh barāyī bandah ... muqarrar numūdah āst-khātt farrūmūd. S. al-m. ii p. 573 penult., trans. (1926) ii p. 72). Soon afterwards Šājalat-Jang was appointed Faujdār of Pūrniyāh, an office which he held for seven years until his death in 1169/1754 (S. al-m. ii pp. 575, 602, trans. (1926) ii pp. 74, 141). Among the favours received from him by Ghulām-Ḥusain was the right to collect by deputy the revenue of the parganah of Sripūr, a privilege which gave him an income of seven thousand rupees a year (S. al-m. ii p. 602, trans. (1926) ii p. 140). When Šājalat-Jang was succeeded by his eldest son Shaukat-Jang, Ghulām-Ḥusain resigned (S. al-m. ii p. 607, trans. (1926) ii p. 153 (mistranslated): bandah kih az ‘aql u araḍa’ i ʿū īṭīla’ i tamām dāskh ba’d i kāmyābī i ʿū istifā-yī naukārī numūd). Some time later, however, he yielded to Shaukat-Jang’s entreaties and reluctantly entered the service of a man
whom he disliked and despised (S. al-m. ii p. 623 ult., trans. (1926) ii p. 194). In Muḥarram 1170/Sept.–Oct. 1756 Shaukat-Jang, having conceived the absurd idea of wrestling Bengal, Bihar and Orissa from Sirāj al-Daulah, who had recently (9 April 1756) succeeded ‘Ali-Wirdī Khān, was defeated and slain in a battle with Sirāj al-Daulah’s forces. Ghulām-Ḥusain, who was regarded by Sirāj al-Daulah as Shaukat-Jang’s instigator (S. al-m. ii p. 631\textsuperscript{14-15}, trans. (1926) ii p. 214), escaped after some adventures from Sirāj al-Daulah’s dominions and went to Benares, where several of his relations, some of them banished by Sirāj al-Daulah, were living (S. al-m. ii p. 632\textsuperscript{17}, trans. (1926) ii p. 217). In Shawwāl 1170/June–July 1757 Sirāj al-Daulah was defeated by Clive at Plassey, and Mīr Ja’far Khān, a brother-in-law of ‘Ali-Wirdī Khān, was proclaimed Governor of Bengal.

Mīr Ja’far Khān had been a close friend of Ghulām-Ḥusain’s father, and in their early days Ghulām-Ḥusain and his brother Naqī ‘Ali Khān, especially the latter, had known him well (S. al-m. ii p. 643\textsuperscript{19-24}, trans. (1926) ii p. 247). They felt, therefore, that their star was in the ascendant, and that circumstances were favourable for their return to ‘Agīmābād, where their homes and estates were situated (S. al-m. ii p. 642\textsuperscript{19-20}). Mīr Ja’far, however, showed himself hostile, and Naqī ‘Ali Khān, having gone to ‘Agīmābād with some of his relations, soon received through Rājah Rām Nārāyan, the Governor, an order to return. Only through the influence of Mīr Ja’far’s elder brother, Mīr M. Kāzīm Khān, was he permitted to stay. Ghulām-Ḥusain himself soon afterwards went to ‘Agīmābād and obtained Rām Nārāyan’s permission to live there (S. al-m. ii p. 643\textsuperscript{1-15}, trans. (1926) ii pp. 248–9). For some time he was in poor circumstances (har chand ‘usrat u tahē-dastī i bisyār dar-ān awān lāhiq būd. S. al-m. ii p. 647 ult., trans. (1926) ii p. 260), though at Rām Nārāyan’s request Mīr Ja’far restored to him some estates (jāgīrāt i qadīm) near Mōngīr (S. al-m. ii p. 649\textsuperscript{15}, trans. (1926) p. 265). About this time he was introduced by his friend Mīr

\textsuperscript{1} The eldest son of Zain al-Dīn Aḥmad Khān Hāibat-Jang (already mentioned p. 627 supra), ‘Ali-Wirdī Khān’s nephew, son-in-law and adopted heir.

\textsuperscript{2} So in the printed text, but perhaps a corruption of Taqī (see p. 635 infra).

\textsuperscript{3} See Buckland Dictionary of Indian biography p. 348.
'Abd Allāh Ṣafawī to Mr. Amyatt, the recently-appointed Chief of the Patna factory (S. al-m. ii p. 651^10^-11, trans. (1926) ii p. 270). With Dr. Fullarton, the Medical Officer of the Patna factory, whom he often mentions and whom he came to know well, he was acquainted in 1173/1759–60, if not earlier (cf. S. al-m. ii p. 676^1^-2, trans. (1926) ii p. 333). Rām Nārāyan was virtually the independent ruler of the province of 'Aẓīmābād (S. al-m. ii p. 651 ulti., trans. (1926) p. 271 penult.). Ghulām-Ḥusain, having accepted from him a small allowance (qaṭīl wajhī. S. al-m. ii p. 653^19^, trans. (1926) ii p. 276), was in his service, and before long he and his brothers were able to recover their estates (jagīrāt) near Rohtās, which had been seized by a neighbouring zamīndār, when the brothers were banished by Sirāj al-Daulah (S. al-m. ii p. 653 penult., trans. (1926) ii p. 276). In 1172/1759 the Shāh-zādah ʿAlī-Guhar and Muḥammad-Qulī Khān, the Nāzīm of Allahabad, made their unsuccessful invasion of Bengal. In the retinue of the Shāh-zādah was Ghulām-Ḥusain’s father, Bakhshī al-Mulk Naṣīr al-Daulah S. Hidāyat-ʿAlī Khān Bahādur Asad-Jang (S. al-m. ii p. 657^22^, trans. (1926) ii p. 286), who, though living in some magnificence at Delhi, had for sixteen years contributed nothing to the support of Ghulām-Ḥusain and his mother (S. al-m. ii p. 660^6^, ^0^, trans. (1926) ii p. 293). Ghulām-Ḥusain was sent by Rām-Nārāyan to the enemy’s camp with a view to approaching his father and entering into negotiations with the Shāh-zādah (S. al-m. ii (iii) p. 661^3^-4, trans. (1926) ii p. 296). He did not return to ‘Aẓīmābād, but, before the failure of the final attack on the town, retired with his mother, his wife and other female relations to Sahasrām in the territory of Pahlawan Sing’h (S. al-m. ii p. 669^3^, trans. (1926) ii p. 316). Shortly afterwards the Shāh-zādah and Ghulām-Ḥusain’s father arrived at Sahasrām. Ghulām-Ḥusain and his brothers, having thrown in their lot with the Shāh-zādah and incurred the hostility of the Nāzīm of Bengal and his British supporters, could not return to ‘Aẓīmābād, and at Ghulām-Ḥusain’s suggestion they and their father attached themselves

---

1 Amyatt became Chief of the Patna factory in 1759 (see Buckland Dictionary of Indian biography p. 13).
to Pahlawān Sing’h, who was proposing to resist Miran, Mīr Ja’far’s son, and the British. Pahlawān Sing’h wished the Shāh-zādah to join him but failed to win his confidence. The Shāh-
zādah, deciding to write to Colonel Clive (S. al-m. ii p. 670 ult., trans. (1926) ii p. 320 ult.), sent his munshīs to Ghulām-Ḥusain’s father with instructions to draft a letter. Their drafts failing to win approval, Ghulām-Ḥusain at his father’s request drafted a letter which was approved. Soon afterwards Ghulām-Ḥusain and his wife went to Benares and he remained there for some months (S. al-m. ii p. 672, trans. (1926) ii p. 323). When the Shāh-zādah in 1173/1759, having just claimed the throne as Shāh-‘Ālam II, appeared for the second time near ‘Azīmābād, Ghulām-Ḥusain was again living there, having obtained the reluctant consent of Rām Nārāyan and a welcome from Mr. Amyatt and Dr. Fullarton (S. al-m. ii pp. 675 penult., 6761-3, trans. (1926) ii p. 333).

In 1174/1760 Mīr Ja’far was deposed, and Mīr Qāsim appointed Nāẓīm in his stead. In 1174/1761, when Major Carnac encamped outside ‘Azīmābād before marching against Shāh-‘Ālam and Monsieur Law and defeating them at Gayā, Ghulām-Ḥusain joined Carnac, with whom were Rājah Rām Nārāyan and Rāj Ballabh. Being unable on account of his straitened circumstances (binā bar ‘usrat i sāl-hā. S. al-m. ii p. 699 ult., trans. (1926) ii p. 397) to provide his own equipment, he was provided by Carnac and Hay with a tent, horses and arms. Enjoying the confidence of the British and being at the same time a well-wisher (daulat-khwāh) of Mīr Qāsim Khān, he was sent from the camp to the latter at Bud’hgām with a request from the British Commanders that he would come to ‘Azīmābād and decide between the contradictory advice given by Rām Nārāyan and Rāj Ballabh. Mīr Qāsim Khān declined to come on that occasion, but not long afterwards he moved to ‘Azīmābād and from there sent Ghulām-Ḥusain on a mission to Calcutta. For two or three months he remained there (S. al-m. p. 70623, trans. (1926) ii p. 416), trying to carry out his mission, which was to induce Mr. Amyatt (a member of the Calcutta Council. See Buckland Dictionary of Indian biography p. 13) to put Rājah Rām Nārāyan
under the control of Mir Qāsim Khān. Soon after Ghulām-Ḥusain returned to ʿAzīmābād, he was summoned by Mir Qāsim Khān, who was then at that place, and asked to surrender his estate at Monghyr in order that it might be conferred on a certain Gurgīn Khān. Mir Qāsim Khān promised to compensate him by giving him an estate elsewhere, but set out for Bhōjpūr and Sahasrām without carrying out his promise. Ghulām-Ḥusain, being heavily in debt and without camp equipage, was unable to accompany him (S. al-m. ii p. 70913-21, trans. (1926) ii pp. 424-5). He was living thus in straitened circumstances at ʿAzīmābād, when Dr. Fullarton suggested that he should go to Mir Qāsim Khān at Monghyr, since the British could not protect him or openly help him in view of their agreements with Mir Qāsim. Accepting the advice, Ghulām-Ḥusain went to Monghyr in Dhū ’l-Ḥijjah 1175/June–July 1762. In Muḥarram 1176/1762 Mir Qāsim Khān gave him a present (īnʿām) of 5,000 rupees and ordered that the arrears of his salary should be paid and that thenceforward he should be paid regularly month by month (S. al-m. ii p. 7131-10, trans. (1926) ii pp. 434-6). For the moment, therefore, his circumstances were improved, but in view of his relations with the British his position was difficult and he lived in constant dread of Mir Qāsim Khān’s suspicions (S. al-m. ii p. 71315-16, trans. (1926) ii p. 436).

When Amyatt was sent by the Calcutta Council in 1176 on an embassy to Mir Qāsim, the latter deputed Ghulām-Ḥusain and a friend of his to meet Amyatt on his way to Monghyr and find out his real intentions (S. al-m. ii p. 7222, trans. (1926) ii p. 458). In 1177/1763 Ghulām-Ḥusain accompanied Mir Qāsim on his march from Monghyr to ʿAzīmābād, was present at his defeat by the British forces and went with the defeated army to the neighbourhood of Benares (S. al-m. ii p. 74310-11, trans. (1926) ii p. 513). At this point he left the army (S. al-m. ii p. 74338, trans. (1926) ii p. 517) and lived at Benares for some months (S. al-m. ii p. 7469-10, trans. (1926) ii p. 524). In Ramaḍān 1177/March 1764 the army of Shāh-ʿAlam and the Nawwāb-Wazīr of Oudh, which Mir Qāsim had joined, reached Benares. Ghulām-Ḥusain attached himself to it (S. al-m. ii p. 7469-10, 25-26, trans. (1926) ii pp. 524-5) and he was present at the subsequent
engagements without being actually in anyone’s employ (Faqīr kih sav-rishtah i naukarī bā kasī na-dāsht bar aspī suwār . . . ham-rāh i ʿishān dar fauj i ‘Ālī-Jāh būd. S. al-m. ii p. 749\textsuperscript{10–21}, trans. (1926) ii p. 532). Dissatisfied with Mir Qāsim, he had joined the Emperor, but, seeing the inefficiency of the Nawwāb-Wazīr’s army, he disliked to stay with such a disorderly crowd. Dr. Fullarton, with whom he had remained in correspondence, had repeatedly suggested that he should induce the Emperor to throw in his lot with the British. Ghulām-Ḥusain transmitted the suggestion through intermediaries (S. al-m. ii p. 751\textsuperscript{13–18}, trans. (1926) ii pp. 535–6), and the Emperor, weary of the insubordination of the Nawwāb-Wazīr, agreed to the proposal and sent Ghulām-Ḥusain with a letter to the British Commander at ‘Ażmābād (S. al-m. ii p. 751 penult., trans. (1926) ii p. 537). Shortly afterwards (evidently in 1178/1764–5) Ghulām-Ḥusain was asked by Major (afterwards Sir Hector) Munro whether he could contrive to put the fortress of Rohtās in the hands of the British. He wrote to the Qal‘ah-dār, a man under obligations to his family, and pointed out the advantage of being on the winning side. The Qal‘ah-dār accordingly arranged that Rohtās should be surrendered (S. al-m. ii p. 758\textsuperscript{6–16}, trans. (1926) ii p. 553).

In 1179/1765 Ghulām-Ḥusain, having been recommended by Dr. Fullarton, was working under Mr. Sage, Chief of the Benares factory (Dar-īn auqāt faqīr ba-sipārīsh i Dākhtar Fullarton dar rafqat i Miṣṭar Sēj . . . shudah būd. S. al-m. ii p. 776\textsuperscript{17}, trans. (1926) iii p. 16). On hearing of his father’s death, he left Mr. Sage and went to Ḥusainābād. Soon afterwards possession of the jāgīr was confirmed to him as the eldest son (S. al-m. ii p. 777\textsuperscript{2–3}, trans. (1926) iii p. 17). In 1180/1767 Rājah Shīṭāb Rāy [Nāʿīb-Dīwān of Bihār] went to Calcutta to meet Henry Verelst, the new Governor of Bengal. Ghulām-Ḥusain, desirous of entering his service, went with him (faqīr ham binā bar ḥusn i sulūk i ā ā gāsid i rafqatasya gushtah ham-rāh rafīt. S. al-m. ii p. 780\textsuperscript{12}, trans. (1926) iii p. 24). In 1187/1773–4 (apparently) he spent two or three weeks in Calcutta making arrangements for a pilgrimage to Mecca (S. al-m. ii p. 797\textsuperscript{2–7}, trans. (1926) iii pp. 70–1). In 1188/1774–5, having become surety for a zamāndār, whom he had
known for many years, he suffered a loss of fifty or sixty thousand rupees and was reduced to poverty. A month later Colonel (afterwards General) Goddard, with whom he was already acquainted, arrived in 'Azīmābād on his way to assume the command of Chunār Fort. Hearing of Ghulām-Ḥusain's plight, he took him with him to Chunār and put him in charge of the financial arrangements there (faqīr rā dar kār-hā-yī mālī i ān-jā mukhtar sākhāh). Not long afterwards Goddard was appointed to the command of Aṣaf al-Daulah’s army. Ghulām-Ḥusain spent 14 months with him at Lucknow and then returned to 'Azīmābād (S. al-m. iii p. 9524). Early in 1192/1778, desiring to approach the British authorities with reference to a personal matter, which he does not particularise, he took the opportunity of accompanying Colonel Goddard from 'Azīmābād to Calcutta. Unfortunately, although he had two or three interviews with Hastings, whom he had known for some considerable time (S. al-m. ii p. 80618-14), his journey was fruitless. The British, he says, were too much occupied with wars and personal quarrels to have any time to spare for the affairs of Indians, and Colonel Goddard, on whose support he had relied, was put in command of the Bengal contingent which marched across India to aid the Bombay army against the Marāṭ’hās (S. al-m. ii p. 805, trans. (1926) iii p. 98). He had declined Colonel Goddard’s offer to take him with the army as Mūr Munṣhī and envoy to the Marāṭ’hā generals (S. al-m. ii p. 80615-13, trans. (1926) iii p. 101: az Karnal Gādār ma’lum shud kih mī-khwāhad faqīr rā mulāzim i khowd gandanad ammā maskhūṭ ba-du kār yakā ān-kih ba-ṭaur i Mūr Munṣhī umār i dār al-insā’ ba-faqīr rujū’ būdah bi mulāḥazah u ʾislāḥ i in ʾagāl al-anām šūrat i iqām na-yābad duwwum ān-kih safar i sifārat i Dak’han2 ham ba-faqīr muta’alīq bāshad bandah kār i duwwum rā ba-khauf i pūrī i dūrī az ‘iyāl u atfāl

1 Thomas Goddard, who eventually became Commander-in-Chief of the Bombay Army and who died in 1783, raised “Goddard's battalion” of sepoys at Murshidabad in 1764, was in command at Berhampur in 1774 and of the contingent at Lucknow in 1776. See Buckland’s Dictionary of Indian biography.

2 For the meaning of this expression cf. p. 807: dar hāngām i ʾaḥbāb i Marḥṣṭah ba-sīfārat i Dak’han nazī i sardārān ʾi ān-jā raft u mawrid i ‘ināyat i garafān dar-in asfār gārdidah...
u mahrūmī az taqūlī i quṭūm [sic] i waḥidah ... inkār nunūd).
In Rabī‘ ii 1194/1780 he found himself obliged to go again to Calcutta to settle some business (ba-idhīrār i infiṣāl i muʿāmalah i khwud). During that journey he was preparing the brouillon of the Siyar al-mutaʿakkhirīn (S. al-m. ii p. 813⁴⁻⁸, trans. (1926) iii p. 118). While at Calcutta he had an interview with Hastings, who was sympathetic and promised that his wish would be accomplished, but the promise was not fulfilled (S. al-m. ii p. 816 ante-penult., trans. (1926) iii p. 129).

The year 1195/1781 is several times mentioned as the current year in the Siyar al-mutaʿakkhirīn, but there is one passage (ii p. 820⁴¹) where 1198/1783-4 is described as “last year”. If the Sharaf-nāmah mentioned below is a work of his, he was alive in 1221/1806-7, and, if the Bāṅkīpūr MS. (No. 282) is really an autograph, he cannot have died before 1230/1815. In that case he must have lived to a very advanced age.

Although Ghulām-Ḥusain records the fact of his entry into the employ of several different persons, it is not his practice to state the precise designation of the office that he held. We have seen, however, that the position offered to him by Colonel Goddard was that of Mīr Munshī and it may be surmised that in at least some of the other cases he was employed as a Munshī. In one passage he mentions that “to the present day” Mr. Hastings praises his letters (va-iṭāl-ān Gawarner Imād al-Daulah Mistār Hashting Bahādur Jalādat-Jang muḥarrarāt i faqīr rā mī-sitāyad. S. al-m. ii p. 674¹⁸⁻¹⁷, trans. (1926) ii p. 329, where the passage is inaccurately translated).

In addition to the Siyar al-mutaʿakkhirīn he wrote (1) Bishārat al-imāmah,¹ a mathnawī on the lives of his ancestors, especially the miracles of his great-grandfather S. Faid Allāh Ṭabāṭabā‘ī and his grandfather S. ‘Alīm Allāh Ṭabāṭabā‘ī (MS. : Bāṅkīpūr Suppt. i no. 1991), (2) a theological work on the prerogatives of ‘Ali and his descendants, being a Shi‘ite interpretation of certain traditions quoted in the Fawātih of Mīr Ḥusain al-Maibudhī.

¹ Mentioned in the Siyar al-mutaʿakkhirīn ii pp. 523¹⁸, 613¹³.
(MS. Bânkîpur xiv no. 1319, defective at both ends and of unknown title), (3) an Arabic tafsîr (tafsîr dar tâzi’î bî mîhâ-varah), (4) a commentary on the Mathnawî of Jalâl al-Dîn Râmî, (5) other theological works (u dîgar kutub i kalâmîyah), (6) a dîwân (u dîwân i aṣâr’âr). Nos. (3)–(6) are mentioned here on the authority of “a short biographical account of the author by Sayyid ‘Alî Muhammad Shâd (the well-known Urdû poet of Patna) written in his own hand” 1 on a fly-leaf at the beginning of the Bânkîpur MS. of the Bîshârat al-imâmâh. A work entitled Sharaf-nâmah written in 1221/1806–7 by Ghulâm-Ḥusain Khân, Munshî i Dâr al-inshâ’ i Istâ’ Indîyâ Kampanî (Aṣâfiyâh iii p. 104 no. 1314, a MS. dated 1268/1851–2), may also be by him. It is included in the historical part of the Aṣâfiyâh catalogue, but its precise subject is not stated.

Siyar al-muta’akhkhîrin, a history of India from Aurangzâb’s death in 1118/1707 to 1195/1781, begun in Safar 1194/Feb. 1780, completed in Ramâdân 1195/Aug. 1781 and containing 2

1 This short biographical note, for a transcript of which I am indebted to the kindness of the authorities of the Oriental Public Library at Bânkîpur, contains no information of importance about Ghulâm-Ḥusain Khân apart from the statement concerning his writings. It does, however, show that descendants of his father, Nawwâb S. Hidâyat-‘Alî Khân, were living at Patna quite recently. Thus his second son Nawwâb Fakhr al-Daulah Taqi [so, but Naqi in the printed text of the Siyar al-muta’akhkhîrin] ‘Alî Khân was the father of Nawwâb S. Kâzîm ‘Alî Khân, who was the maternal grandfather of Nawwâb al-Ḥâjj S. Wilâyat-‘Alî Khân, C.I.E.

2 The author regarded his work as consisting of three daftars, but only the third is clearly indicated as such by a colophon in which he returns thanks to God for the completion of the daftar i siwvum (Lucknow editions p. 96116. Cf. pp. 6111 and 657 ult., where he promises to deal with certain events in the daftar i siwvum). That the Mughaddimah is Daftar i and the rest of the work Daftar ii may be inferred from the fact that, like Daftar iii, they, and no other parts, begin with formal exordia. If the Bânkîpur MS. no. 282 is an autograph, this inference is confirmed by the author himself, since in that MS. the Mughaddimah ends with the words Tammat kiâb (? kiâbat) i daftar i awwal. The MSS. show some differences of arrangement. In some, for example, the continuation of the history of India from 1153 to 1195 (i.e. Daftar iii) precedes the history of Bengal. That is not the original order. In the preface to Daftar iii (Lucknow editions p. 846) the author says that, having narrated the events of Muhammad Shâh’s reign to its twenty-second year and having afterwards dealt with the history of Bengal and ‘Aṣâfiyâh, he will fulfill his promise to give in another daftar (daftar i dîgar) the rest of that monarch’s reign and the history of subsequent times.
(1) a history of the Timūrids from Aurangzēb’s death to Nādir Shāh’s departure in 1152/1739 (beginning Sipās i bīqiyyās u sitayish i sarmadī-asās and corresponding to pp. 374–486 in the Lucknow editions), (2) a history of Bengal from the death of Shujā’ al-Daulah [in Dī̄ ʿl-Hijjah 1151/March 1739] to 1195/1781 (no separate basmalah. First heading: Dhikr i riḥlat i Shujā’ al-Daulah ŠūBah-dār i Bangālah etc. Corresponding to pp. 487–544 in the Lucknow editions), (3) a continuation of the history of India from 1153/1740 to 1195/1781 (beginning: HaMad u thanā-yi Pādshāh i ʿalā ʿl-iṯlāq, and corresponding to pp. 546–61 in the Lucknow editions), (4) a Khātīmah containing some remarks on Aurangzēb’s character and an account of his capture of Bijāpūr and Golconda (headed Khātīmah i kitāb mutadammin i bārihāz ahwāl i Aurangzēb ʿĀlamgīr in the MS. Aumer 240, but in the published editions this section is appended to the Muqaddimah (Calcutta 1836 pp. 400(?–439, Lucknow editions pp. 337(?–372 without any heading. In Mustafā’s translation it occurs at the end of the work (Calcutta 1926, vol. iv pp. 124–234)), (5) a subsequently added Muqaddimah, which is in fact the Khulāsat al-tawārīkh of Sujān Rāy1 (for which see p. 454 supra) with slight alterations and a preface containing a dedication to Warren Hastings: Bānkīpūr vii 582 (with Muqaddimah. Hūsainābād, a.h. 1230/1815. Apparently autograph 2), 583–4 (with Muqaddimah. a.h. 1233/1818), Suppt. 1769 (Muqaddimah only. a.h. 1236/1821), 1770 (with Muqaddimah, but breaking

1 There is no question of a plagiarism here, as Nassau Lee supposed. Ghulām-Ḥusain does not claim the Muqaddimah as his own work, but states quite clearly that it was written by yākī az mumtāsibān i pīshāh i ʿinghā. The author of the Khulāsat al-tawārīkh does not mention his name in the preface to that work (at least in the form of his preface which occurs in nearly all the MSS.). He does, however, mention that his profession was munshi-garī.

2 As already stated (p. 627), Hūsainābād was a village founded by Ghulām-Ḥusain’s father on his jagīr near Rohtās. The colophon, quoted by Abdul Muqtdarī, does not contain the name of Ghulām-Ḥusain but states that the MS. was completed ba-dastūrī i aqlām i in agall al-anām (a formula used elsewhere by Ghulām-Ḥusain, e.g. at the end of Daftar iiii). The MS. was bought for Rs. 150 in the belief that it was an autograph, apparently by Nawwāb S. Vilāyat ʿAli Khān, of Patna, whose maternal grandfather was Nawwāb Kāzīm ʿAli Khān, the son of Ghulām-Ḥusain Khān’s younger brother, Nawwāb Fakhr al-Daulah Taqī ʿAli Khān.

1 The colophon of the Muqaddimah is dated 1198 (26 Nov. 1783–13 Nov. 1784), but it is not clear whether this colophon is due to Ghulām-Ḥusain or to the copyist. No such colophon occurs in the published editions.
in Āṣafīyāh i p. 230 no. 512 (A.H. 1210/1795-6) and no. 759 (A.H. 1231/1816) is a part of the Siyar al-muta’akhkhirīn.

Editions: (1) Seear-ool mutakh-reen. . . The exploits of the moderns, or the history of the empire of Hindoostan, from the year 1118 to 1194 of the Hijrah (A.D. 1752) . . . compiled by Nuwwaub Syed Gholam Hosein Khan, Tuba Tuba-ee, edited by Hukeem Abdool Mujeed . . . Calcutta 1248/1833* (Daftars ii (422 pp.) and iii (115 pp.).

1 The B.M. has only Daftar iii in this edition.


English translation (omitting the Mugaddimah but containing the Khātīmah): A translation of the Sūr Mutaghārīn; or, View of Modern Times . . . [by “Nota Manus”, i.e. Ḫājjī Muṣṭafā, originally Raymond (for whom see Buckland’s Dictionary of Indian biography p. 353)] Calcutta 1789** (most of this edition was lost at sea), [1902–3**] (a reprint with index), 1926* (another reprint with index).

Partial translations: (1) History of Bengal from the accession of Alivverdee Khan Mahabui Jung [to the year 1780, being part vi or, in other words, vol. ii, pp. 309–461, of Ferishta’s History of Dekkan . . . By Jonathan Scott, Shrewsbury 1794** (see p. 449 supra), (2) The Siyar-ul-mutakherin . . . Revised from the translation of Haji Mustafa . . . by J. Briggs. Vol. i. London 1832** (Oriental Translation Fund. No more published. This translation, about one-fifth of the work, corresponds to vol. i pp. 1–369

1 In the printer’s colophons of this edition each daftar is called merely in jild, without mention of any number. Nothing is said on the title-page about volumes, daftars, or jilds.

2 The pagination runs continuously through the three jilds (i.e. daftars), jild ii beginning at p. 373 and jild iii at p. 845.
in the 1789 edition of Ḥājjī Muṣṭafā’s translation and ends with the defeat of Sarfarāz Khān by ‘Ali-Wirdi Khān in 1153/1740).

Extracts: (1) Selections from Sairul Muta-akh-kharin... Prescribed as a rapid reading course for B.A. Examination of Allahabad University for 1920–21. Allahabad 1919*. (2) Intikhāb az Siyar al-muta’akkhīrīn [with a glossary]. Allahabad 1922*. (3) Intikhāb i Siyar al-muta’akkhīrīn [the reign of Akbar from the Mugaddimah]. Lucknow [1928*].

Urdu translations: (1) Iqbal-nāmah, by S. Bakhshish-‘Ali Faidābādi, Delhi (see Garcin de Tassy i p. 284, where the authority for saying that this translation was printed at Delhi is given as the “Report of public instruction, 1843–1844; append. cxv”), (2) Mir‘ūt al-salāfīn, by Gökul Prasād, [Lucknow] 1874*.

Description: Elliot and Dowson History of India viii pp. 194–8.

Abridgment: Mulakkhaṣ al-tawārīkh or Zubdat al-tawārīkh, by Farzand-‘Alī al-Ḫusainī, of Mōngir, or Maulawī ‘Abd al-Karīm, Head Munšī of the E.I.C.'s Persian Office (Dār al-ṭinšā‘), or both,1 in three daftars (i) from Timūr to A.H. 1152/1739, (ii) Bengal and Bihār from circa 1140/1727–8 to A.H. 1195/1780–1, (iii) the Timūrids from A.H. 1153/1740–1195/1780–1: Ivanow Curzon 40 (A.H. 1250/1834), Bāṅkīpūr vii 585 (A.H. 1279/1862), Rieu iii 943a (19th cent.).

Editions: Calcutta 1243/1827*, Āgra 1247/1831 (see Rieu iii 943a).

Description of the Mulakkhaṣ al-tawārīkh: Elliot and Dowson History of India viii p. 199.

[Siyar al-muta’akkhīrīn, Lucknow 1866, vol. ii (iii) pp. 948–52 (the 10th, 9th and 8th sections from the end of the work) and many other places in vols. ii and iii (most, but not by any means

1 The printed edition of 1827 contains prefaces by both of these persons, the former of whom calls the work Mulakkhaṣ al-tawārīkh, while the latter, giving 1825 as the date of writing, calls it Zubdat al-tawārīkh. The English title-page calls it Moolakhkhus-oal-tawareekh and says that it was “prepared chiefly by Maulavi Abdool Kerim”. On the Persian title-page the title is given as Zubdat al-tawārīkh and ‘Abd al-Karīm is named as the epitomator.
all, of these passages can be traced with the help of the indexes to
the [1902–3] and 1926 editions of Raymond’s translation; An account
of Gholam Hossein Khan, Author of a very valuable
and interesting Work, intitled “Söür Mutakharin, or a View of
Modern Times”, translated [or rather, summarised] from the
Persic Original [i.e. the above-mentioned passage in the Siyar
al-muta’akhkhirîn (Lucknow 1866, vol. ii (iii) pp. 948–52)] (in
The Asiatic Annual Register . . . for the year 1801, London 1802,
Characters, pp. 28–32); Riyâd al-wisâq (Sprenger p. 170);
Eliot and Dowson History of India viii pp. 194–7; Buckland
Dictionary of Indian biography p. 164; Ency. Isl. under Ghulam
Husain Khan (unsigned and short).]

803. According to Jonathan Scott “The Persic Journal of the
cruel proceedings of the unprincipled and inhuman Rhohilla
chief, Gholam Kaudir was written by an eye witness on the
scene of their perpetration, and transmitted to me by my brother
Captain Richard Scott.”

Account of Ghulam-Qâdir’s proceedings at Delhi: no
MSS. recorded.

English translation: Ferishta’s History of Dekkan . . . By

804. Ghulam-‘Ali Khân b. Bhik’hârî ¹ Khân was the son of
Nawwâb Raushan al-Daulah Bhik’hârî Khân Rustam-Jang, the
friend and minister of Mu’in al-Mulk (d. 1167/1753–4), the
Şuâh-dâr of Lahore. He was Munshî to Prince Jawân-bâkh
Jahândâr Shâh ² and was living at Lucknow in 1798 when
Captain W. Francklin published his History of the reign of Shah
Aulûm.

(1) Shâh-‘Âlam-nâmah or A’in i ‘Âlam-Shâhi,³ a bom-
bastic history of ‘Âlamgîr II (reigned 1167/1754–1773/1759) and

¹ Bhik’hârî is a Hindi word for a mendicant which is used also as a proper
name.
² For whom see p. 624 supra.
³ These are the titles by which the author refers to this work in the preface
to his Muqaddimah i Shâh-‘Âlam-nâmah. On the fly-leaves of manuscripts
and elsewhere it is sometimes given other titles, such as Târikh i ‘Âlam-Shâhi.
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Edition: Shah Alam Nama... Edited by... Harinath De [Fasc. i, 1912], A. al-Ma’mūn Suhrawardy and Āqā M. Kāzim Shīrāzī [Fasc. ii, 1914, extending to A.D. 1761], Calcutta 1912–(Bibliotheca Indica).


The history of the reign of Shah-Aulum... By W. Francklin, London, 1798, is largely based on the Shāh-‘Ālam-nāmah.

(2) Mujaddimah i Shāh-‘Ālam-nāmah, a history of the Mughuls from the death of Aurangzēb to the accession of ‘Ālamgīr II, A.H. 1167/1754, written after the Shāh-‘Ālam-nāmah as an introduction to it: Bodleian 266 (autograph), Rieu i 278b (18th cent.), 279b (18th cent.).

805. Maulawī Khair al-Dīn Muhammad Ilāhābādī, who was born in 1165/1751 and died about 1827, has already been mentioned (pp. 520–2 supra) as the author of a sketch of Timūrid history.

‘Ibrat-nāmah,2 the fullest and best extant history of Shāh-‘Ālam II (reigned 1173/1759–1221/1806) extending to A.H. 1206/1791 and divided (in most MSS.) into a Mujaddimah and two Daftars: Rieu iii 946a (19th cent.), 947b (Mujaddimah and 1st Daftar only. Circ. A.D. 1850), 948a (detached sections. Circ. A.D. 1850), 1026b (extracts from a later recension, said to extend beyond the accession of Akbar Shāh. Cf. Rieu iii 947b. Circ.

1 Not ‘Ali Djawhar, as in the Ency. Isl.
2 The book is so called in allusion to the warning conveyed by Ghulām-Qādir’s career.
A.D. 1850), 1051b (extracts only), Ivanow 177 (A.H. 1217/1802–3), 178 (to middle of 2nd Daftar), Ivanow Curzon 38 (part of Daftar i), Bānkīpur vii 587–9 (A.D. 1886), Suppt. 1768 (19th cent.), I.O. 3908–10 (latter half of 19th cent.).

Table of contents of vol. ii with translated extracts: B.M. MS. Add. 30,710, foll. 368–85.

Description and 16 pp. of translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson History of India viii 237–254.
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806. The forty-fifth year of Shāh-‘Ālam’s reign [A.H. 1218/1803–4] is mentioned as the current year at the end of—

An anonymous history of the successors of Aurangzēb from his death to the thirtieth year of Shāh-‘Ālam II (A.H. 1202/1787–8) beginning, without a preface, Rāwiyān i ma’nī-pardāz u nāqilān i haqīqat-ṭirāz: Bānkīpur vii 590 (A.H. 1238/1822).

807. Ghulām-Ḥusain Khān b. M. Ḥimmāt Khān says in his history of the Zamīndārs of Benares (Bānkīpur vii 608, see below in the sub-section devoted to Benares) that he was in the service of Rājah Balwand Sing’h and his son Rājah Chait Sing’h (deposed A.H. 1195/1780).


808. M. Ḥāzhīr al-Dīn Mīrzā ‘Alī Bakhṭ Gūrgānī, called Mīrzā i Kalān and, as a poet, “ʿAṣfārī,” was the grandson of a daughter (nawāsah-zādah) of M. Muʿīzz al-Dīn Pādshāh (i.e. Jahāndār
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Shāh), son of Shāh-ʿĀlam Bahādur Shāh. In 1211/1797 at Maqṣūdābād (an old name for Murshidābād), nine years after leaving Delhi, he decided to write his memoirs, the Wāqiʿāt i Azfārī. In the khātimah to these memoirs he mentions seven of his earlier works, viz. (1) Lughat i Turkī i Chaghātāy, a Chaghātāy dictionary (MS. Rehatsek p. 54 no. 27), (2) an enlarged Persian translation of Mir ʿAli Shīr's Maḥbūb al-qulūb, (3) Niṣāb i Turkī, (4) Těngrī-Tārī, a Turkish-Hindi imitation of the Khāliq-Bārī ascribed to Amīr Khusrau, (5) a Persian metrical translation of the Risālah i qabrīyāh [or 'Alāmāt al-qadāyā], a treatise on the signs of approaching death ascribed to Hippocrates, (6) Nushkāh i sāniiāt, a parænetic work, (7) a second Chaghātāy Niṣāb in 452 verses written at 'Azīmābād. Another work, Favā'id al-mubīadī, is mentioned earlier in the memoirs. For his Urdu dīwān see Sprenger p. 602 no. 599.

Wāqiʿāt i Azfārī, an account of the overthrow of the Gūrgānīs (i.e. the Timūrids) by Ghulām-Qādir, the Rohilla who captured Delhi in 1788, the author’s escape from captivity and his wanderings until A.H. 1221/1806: Berlin 496 (A.H. 1227/1812), Rieu iii 1051b (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850), Madras.

Urdu translation 2: Tarjāmah i Wāqiʿāt i Azfārī... mutarjāmah i ʿAbd al-Sattār... bāh tāshīh u tarmīm i Muḥammad Ḥusain "Maḥwī" Siddīqī... Madras (Bangalore printed) 1937 (Bulletin of the Department of Arabic, Persian and Urdu [Madras University], No. 1).

Description: Elliot and Dowson History of India viii p. 234.

[Subḥ i waṭan p. 35; Garcin de Tassy i p. 265; Sprenger p. 208; Berlin Pers. Cat. no. 496.]

809. Munshi Munnā Lāl, or Mannū Lāl, the son of Bahādur Sing’h, tells us (in a passage quoted by ‘Abd al-Muqtadir) that, having passed his fiftieth year and lost his sight, he had ended the detailed narrative of Shāh-ʿĀlam’s reign with the 30th year and had given only a summary account of events from the 31st

1 For editions of the Arabic text see Ellis.
2 From a MS. (location unspecified, but presumably that recorded in the Madras catalogue).
to the 48th [and last] year. A Tārīkh i Dakan by Rāy Munnā Lāl, who may of course be a different person, is mentioned in Āṣafīyah i p. 224 no. 797 (Edition: place? 1303/1885-6).

(Shāh-‘Ālam-nāmah) or (Tārīkh i Shāh-‘Ālam), a history of Shāh-‘Ālam's reign (A.H. 1173/1759-1221/1806): Bānkīpur vii 586 (the only recorded MS, containing the whole reign. A.H. 1226/1811), Rieu iii 943b (breaks off in the 24th year, 1196/1782. 19th cent.), 1027a (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850), 1052b (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850).

Description: Elliot and Dowson History of India viii 393.

W. Francklin used this work for his History of the reign of Shah Aulūm and describes it (p. 198) as a “MS. of Munnoo Loll, a Hindoo, containing the thirteen first years of the reign”.

810. Rāy Ṭek Chand was Akhḵār-nawīs to the East India Company at Shāh-‘Ālam’s court. The Rūz-nāmehā-i Shāh-‘Ālam was transcribed from his newsletters (akhḵār).

(Rūz-nāmehā-i Shāh-‘Ālam), a journal of events at the court of Shāh-‘Ālam from the beginning of the 31st regnal year (1 Jumādā i 1173/28 Jan. 1759) to his death on 7 Ramaḍān 1221/19 Nov. 1806 in the 49th regnal year: Bānkīpur vii no. 620 (19th cent.), I.O. 3921-2 (A.D. 1885).

811. Bhagwān-Dās Pandit Shīvpūrī began his Makhzan al-futūḥ in the time of Shāh-‘Ālam II (reigned 1173/1759-1221/1806) and finished it in the first year of his successor M. Akbar Shāh (reigned A.H. 1221/1806-1253/1837).

Makhzan al-futūḥ (a chronogram = 1222/1807–8), an account of Lord Lake’s operations against the Marāthās from his advance upon Delhi, 7 Aug. 1803, to his treaty with Hōlkar, Dec. 1805, and his return to Calcutta: Rieu iii 948b (A.D. 1849), 1050b (extract only. Circ. A.D. 1850).

812. For a poem, or poems, describing Lord Lake's operations against Bharatpur see p. 689 infra.

813. Mullā Firūz bin Kāwūs was born at Broach in 1758. At the age of ten he accompanied his father, a Parsee priest, on a
journey to Persia for the purpose of obtaining answers from the Zoroastrians of Persia to a number of religious questions. They went first to Yazd, afterwards to Iṣfahān and Shīrāz and remained in the country for twelve years. On their return they settled at Bombay. From 1794 he acted as a Parsee priest of the "Kadmi" sect. In 1807, at the suggestion of Jonathan Duncan, he undertook to write on the model of Firdausi's Shāh-nāmah a poem dealing with the history of the British power in India. He completed this work when over seventy years of age but he did not live to see it in print. In 1818 he published an edition and translation of the Dasātir (see Edwards col. 187). In 1822 he helped to found the Bombay Samāčār, a newspaper to which he made frequent contributions. In 1828 he published a work on intercalation (see Edwards col. 213), a subject on which there was much controversy at that time among the Parsees. His Pand-nāmah (Rehatsek p. 132 no. 20) was published at Bombay in 1342/1923* and in the Qā'idah-i Fārsiyān, a collection of three works by different authors, at the same place in 1880*. For other works of his, which are all in Persian and mostly in verse and which include a Dīn-kard-i manzūmah, see Rehatsek's Catalogue raisonné of the Arabic, Hindostani, Persian and Turkish MSS. in the Mulla Firuz Library, e.g. pp. 181, 215.

He died on 8 October 1830, bequeathing his library to the Elders of the "Kadmi" sect of Zoroastrians for the benefit of all castes and creeds. In 1854 the Mullā Firūz Madrasah was founded to commemorate his name and to this madrasah the library was for a time attached, but in 1857 it was detached and came under a separate committee.

Jārj-nāmah, an epic poem on the history of British power in India to A.D. 1817: Sprenger 218, Rehatsek p. 97 nos. 46–8 (autograph).


[Rehatsek Catalogue raisonné of the ... MSS. in the Mulla Firuz Library pp. vii–viii, 215 etc.; Buckland Dictionary of Indian biography p. 146; Portrait in the Jārj-nāmah.]
Maulawī M. Faḍl i ‘Azīm "‘Azīm" gives some account of his life at the beginning of his Afsānah i Bhartpur, which he wrote in 1241/1826 (see p. 689 infra). He became secretary to William Fraser¹ at Delhi, served him for twenty years [which included the time spent on Fraser’s staff,² when the latter accompanied General Martindell’s army as Political Agent in the Nepalese War of 1814–16, returning to Delhi in August 1815 ³], and then by his influence obtained employment in the office of "the Board". Unfortunately this employment proved disappointing, since his chief continually found fault with him. He resigned and was reduced to sore straits. Happily Fraser returned to Delhi, and on the outbreak of hostilities against Bharatpur, Faḍl i ‘Azīm accompanied his old master on the campaign. Subsequently he became a Deputy Collector in the Sahāranpūr District.⁴ In addition to the Afsānah i Bhartpur and the Waqā‘i’i Kūhistān he wrote a romantic mathnawī entitled Shām i shabistān, which was published at Shāhjahānābād [i.e. Delhi] in 1269/1853*.

Waqā‘i’i Kūhistān, an account of the Nepalese War in prose interspersed with narratives of the same events in mathnawī verse: I.O. 4020 (transcribed from the lithographed edition).

Edition: Shāhjahānābād [i.e. Delhi] 1269/1853*.

M. Ashraf Khān was the second son of Nawwāb Dūndē ⁵ Khān, a Lāl-Khānī Rājpūt ⁶ ra’īs of Kamaunah (now in the Bulandshahr District), who in his fort at Kamaunah offered a

¹ For whom see Buckland Dictionary of Indian biography pp. 155–6.
² Waqā‘i’i Kūhistān p. 4: dar in zamān ba-hamrāhi i Ḍūn-dūn mausūf ba-kār i nawāṣt u khwānd i Ḍūm-dūn u parwānah-fāt u intizām i muhimmat maṣrūf . . . bād.
³ W. i K. p. 76.
⁴ W. i K., title-page.
⁵ For the spelling of Dūndē see ‘Imād al-sa‘ādat p. 40¹⁰: Dūndē Khān bā dāl i muhmālah u wāw i ma‘rūf u nān i maqhrūnah u dāl i muhmālah u yā i maqhūl.
⁶ This Dūndē Khān is to be distinguished from the Rohillah chieftain of the same name, who was associated with Bisaulī in the Badāyūn District and who died in 1770 (see the Badaun District Gazetteer, p. 148).
stubborn resistance to the British at the time of the conquest of the Doáb in 1803–6. In the Vikrami year 1860 (A.D. 1803) Ashraf Khan was twelve years old. When his father evacuated Kamaunah and afterwards Gannauri, they crossed the Jumna to Rājpūtānah and took part in military operations in Jaipur and elsewhere.

Ashraf-nāmah, an account of Dūndē Khān’s military exploits.

Edition: Kōl 1271/1854°*.

816. “Farāsū”, who wrote the Fath-nāmah i Angrēz, is probably identical with the Farāsū or Faransū, who is mentioned as an Urdu poet by Sprenger (p. 227) on the authority of the Urdu tadkhirahs ‘Īyār al-shu’arā’ and Gulshan i bē-khār and also by Garcin de Tassy (i pp. 444–5, iii p. 373). He was in the service of the Bēgam Šāmrū (who died in 1836: see p. 691 infra) and was a European. His surname is given in corrupt forms (Captain François Akden (?), a son of Gobiennent; Faraçu ou Fransu, fils de Gust (Auguste) ou de Gūstū (Augustin)) by Sprenger and Garcin de Tassy, but there seems to be little doubt that he is Farāsū Gōtlib, i.e. Francis Gottlieb, a German born in Poland and educated in India, who wrote in Persian a history of the Jāt Rājahs of Bharatpur (see p. 690 infra).


817. Mīrza Asad Allāh Khān “Ghālib”, who was born at Āγrah in 1212/1797 and died at Delhi in 1285/1869, has already been mentioned (pp. 525–7 supra) as the author of the Mihr i nīm-rūz.

Dastanbūy, reminiscences of the Mutiny at Delhi.


818. A Muḥammadan, who conceals his name, wrote his
Zafar-nāmah i waqā'ī i Ghadr in 1276/1859 for the information of the Secretary of State for India and the Members of Council.


819. M. Bashir Lakhnawi ¹.

Tadhkirah i ghadr i Hind . . . mausūm bah Sahifah i wālā-quadri u A'inah i hairat-numā, a history of the Indian Mutiny.


820. Nawwāb Amir 'Ali Khān Bahādur was born at his ancestral home, Bārī near Paṭnāh, in 1810. In 1829 he became Assistant (at Calcutta) to the Ambassador of the King of Oudh, Naṣīr al-Dīn Haidar, in 1845 Government Pleader in the Sadr Dīwānī 'Adilāt, in 1857 special Assistant to the Commissioner of Paṭnāh and in 1864 Khān Bahādur (a title conferred by the Government) and Member of the Bengal Legislative Council. In 1867 he entered the service of the deposed King of Oudh, then living near Calcutta, and rendered valuable service in connexion with the settlement of his debts. He was appointed Madār al-mahāmm and received the title of Wazīr al-Sultān. In 1875 he was made a Nawwāb and in Nov. 1879 he died. For his Wazīr-nāmah, a work on the history of Oudh and especially the life of Wājīd 'Ali Shāh, see p. 712 infra.

(1) Amir-nāmah, memoirs of the author, preceded by a brief history of British rule in India, with an abstract translation in English.

Editions: Calcutta 1870[-71]°, 1874°* (enlarged).

(2) Bēring-nāmah, a life of Thomas George Baring, 1st Earl of Northbrook, Viceroy of India 1872–6.

Edition: Calcutta 1876*.

[Amir-nāmah; Wazīr-nāmah; Shamī anjuman pp. 73–4; ¹ The nisbah is followed by a query in the B.M. catalogue, but whether this indicates doubt concerning the nisbah or concerning M. Bashir's authorship of the Tadhkirah i ghadr i Hind is not clear.]
Loke Nath Ghose *The modern history of the Indian chiefs, rajas, zamindars, etc.*, pt. ii, Calcutta 1881, pp. 14–18; Buckland *Dictionary of Indian biography* p. 12.]

821. Munshi *Bishan La‘l “Nāzir”* completed his *Qaisarī-nāmah* in 1297/1880.

*Qaisarī-nāmah*, a poetical account of events in India under Lord Lytton and Lord Ripon: *Rieu* Suppt. 372 (circ. A.D. 1880).

**HISTORY OF INDIA: (e) THE TĪMŪRIDS Etc.: APPENDIX**

822. (1) Biographical notices of M. Khān Bangash and his sons, on S. Saʿādat Khān Burhān al-Mulk and his successors, on ʿAlī M. Khān Rōhēlah, Najib al-Daulah, Mīrza Najīf Khān, Jaʿfar Khān Naṣīrī, afterwards Murshid-Quli Khān, and his successors in Bengal, and some other amīrs, followed by an account of the Marāṭhās, Sikhs, Jāts and the English, written circ. A.H. 1197/1783 by an unnamed author: *Rieu* ii 798b xi (foll. 120–5. A.H. 1197/1783).

(2) *Jang-nāmah i Dakan*, a detailed diary of the operations in southern India under Colonel Camac, without author’s name or preface: *Bodleian* 282 (defective at end).

(3) Poem on the wars between the British and the states of Central and Southern India at the beginning of the 19th century (beginning *Ba-nām kih nām-ash har nāmah* [sic]): *Vollers* 991 (defective at end).


(5) *Tuḥfah i Akbarī*, a history of the Nizāms, of the Timūrids from Ahmad Shāh to Shāh-‘Ālam, and of the Panjāb
from the rise of the Sik'hs, written apparently in 1219/1804–5 by Khwājah 'Abd al-Ḥakīm: see p. 753 infra.

(6) Work of unknown authorship and title divided into three bābs, of which the first two treat of the relations between the East India Co. and various Hindu rulers since the Faṣlī year 1182 (= A.D. 1775), while the third is devoted to the art of siege-warfare among the Indians of former days (sardārān i salaf): Berlin 521.

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (f) SIND

823. ‘Ali b. Ḥāmid b. Abī Bakr al-Kūfī, having been compelled by adverse circumstances to leave his native land, settled at Uchh. In his fifty-eighth year, a.h. 613/1216–7, or not long after, he conceived the idea of writing an account of the Muḥammadan conquest of Sind and went to Alūr and Bhakkar with a view to obtaining information on the subject. Maulānā Qāḍī Ismā‘il b. ‘Ali Thaqafī, a descendant of one of the conquerors, showed him an Arabic book composed (or transcribed) by one of his ancestors. ‘Ali b. Ḥāmid translated this book into Persian and dedicated the translation to ‘Ain al-Mulk Fakhr al-Dīn Ḥusain b. Abī Bakr al-As̱h‘arī, who was Wazīr to the ruler of Sindh, Naṣīr al-Dīn Qubāchah.

Chach-nāmah,¹ as it is usually called, or Tārīkh i Hind or Fatḥ-nāmah, as it is called in the preface, a historical romance telling the story of Chach, the Rājah of Alūr, and the conquest of Sind by M. b. Qāsim al-Thaqafī, a.h. 92/710: Lahore Panjāb Univ. Lib. (a.h. 1061/1651). See Oriental College Magazine, vol. ii, no. 4 (Lahore, August 1926), p. 56, Rieu i 290b (a fragment (foll. 25) only. 19th cent.), iii 948b (a.h. 1248/1832), Blochet i 630 (1st half of 19th cent.), Banākpur vii 597 (a.h. 1272/1856), Ivanow 184 (A.D. 1871), Ethé 435 (n.d.).

¹ Rieu states that according to the Ta'baqat i Akbarī [beginning of Ta'baqah viii] the original title was Minhāj al-masālik.
According to Elliot and Dowson History of India i p. 137 the Chach-nāmah is common in India.

English translation: The Chachnamah, an ancient history of Sind, giving the Hindu period down to the Arab Conquest. Translated... by Mirza Kalichbeg Fredunbeg... Karachi 1900° (a continuation translated from other Persian sources and entitled A history of Sind. Volume II was published by Mirzâ Qilîch Bêg in 1902, The Chachnamah being by an afterthought regarded as A History of Sind. Volume I).

Translated extracts: (1) Account of the expedition of Chach... extracted from the Chach Nameh... by Ensign Postans ¹ (in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol. vii (1838) pp. 95–96, 297–310), (2) Of the early history of Sindi, from the "Chuch Namuh" and other authorities. [Translated] By Lieut. Postans ¹ (in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol. x (1841) pp. 183–97, 267–71), (3) Elliot and Dowson History of India i pp. 138–211.

Description: Elliot and Dowson History of India i pp. 131–7.

824. Mir M. Maşum "Nâmi" b. S. Şafâ’ī al-Ḥusainī al-Tirmidhî al-Bhakkari, the son of a Shaikh al-Islâm at Bhakkar, went to Gujarāt some time after his father’s death, which occurred in 991/1583, and became a friend of the historian Niżâm al-Dîm Āḥmad (for whom see p. 433 supra). He entered Akbar’s service and in the 40th regnal year, a.h. 1003–4/1595–6, was given a mansâb of 250. In 1012/1603–4 he was sent on a mission to Shâh ‘Abbâs, and after his return Jahângir gave him the title of Amîn al-Mulk. He returned to Bhakkar in 1015/1606–7 and died there soon after.

According to ‘Abd al-Qâdir Badâ‘ûnî he was the author of a diwân and of a mathnâwî in the metre of [“Jâmi’s”] Yûsuf u Zalîkhâ. According to Taqî Kâshî [as summarised in Sprenger

¹ "Even the later professed translations by Lieutenant Postans, in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (No. LXXIV., 1838, and No. CXL, 1841) give merely an abridged account of the transactions, which is moreover unfortunately disfigured by many misprints" (Elliot and Dowson i p. 137).
p. 37] he wrote two ǧīwāns of ghazals, two sāqī-nāmahs and five mathnawīs ((1) Ḥusn u Nāz in the metre of Yūsuf u Zalīkhā, (2) Parī-ṣūrat in the metre of Lailā Majnūn, (3)–(5) [titles not stated] in the metres of the Haft paikar, the Sikandar-nāmah and the Makhzan al-asrār). In the Maʿāthir al-umratāʾ the title of the last, the only one there mentioned, is given as Maʿādīn al-asfār. There seem to be no recorded manuscripts of these works except possibly the Diwān i Nāmī described by Flügel (i no. 629), which is shown by the chronograms which it contains to be by a poet of the tenth century, and less probably the apparently different Diwān i Nāmī described by Dorn (no. 475) (1) transcribed in 1043/1634). A short medical work of his, the Mufradāt i Maʿṣūmī or Mufradāt i Nāmī, has been preserved (see Bānkīpur xi no. 985, Ivanow 1550).

Tārīkh i Sind, often called Tārīkh i Maʿṣūmī, a history of Sind from the Muḥammadan conquest to its annexation by Akbar divided into four chapters called juz’ ((1) the conquest of Sind, (2) its history under the governors appointed by the Kings of Hindūstān to 801/1399 and under the Sūmrah and Sannlah dynasties to 916/1510, (3) the Arghūn dynasty to the death of Sulṭān Maḥmūd Khān in 982/1574 and some rulers of Tattah to 993/1585, (4) history of Sind from 982/1574 to Akbar’s annexation and of the subsequent governors to A.H. 1008/1599–1600): Ivanow 185 (A.H. 1046/1636–7), Rehatsek p. 71 no. 7, (A.H. 1080/1669–70), Rieu i 291a (17th cent.), 292a (17th cent.), 292a (18th cent.), iii 949a (A.D. 1849), 949a (with some additional matter. A.D. 1851), Lahore Panjāb Univ. Lib. (A.H. 1159/1746. See Oriental College Magazine, vol. ii no. 4 (Lahore, August 1926), p. 56), Ethé 436 (A.H. 1186/1772), 437 (A.H. 1216/1802), Ross and Browne 239 (circ. A.D. 1864), I.O. 3747, 3373, 3916, R.A.S. P. 70 = Morley 59 (A.H. 1233/1817), Asafiyah i p. 226 nos. 292 (A.H. 1227/1812), 674, iii p. 96 no. 1373, Lindesiana p. 194 no. 377 (A.H. 1247/1831–2), Blochet i 632 (A.H. 1260/1844), Bānkīpur vii 599 (19th cent.).

English translation: *A history of Sind... written... by Mahomed Masoom; and translated... by Captain G. G. Malet... assisted by Peer Mahomed... Edited by R. H. Thomas. Bombay 1855* (Selections from the records of the Bombay Government. No. xiii.—New series).

Sindhi translation: by Munshi Nandirim, place ? 1861 (see The Chachnamah... translated... by Mirza Kalichbeg Fredunbeg, Karachi 1900°, p. ii).

Translations of extracts: (1) Elliot and Dowson History of India i pp. 215–52, (2) A history of Sind. Volume II (in two parts). Part I.—Giving the Mussulman period from the Arab Conquest to the beginning of the reign of the Kalhórahs [from the Tārikh i Maśūmī and the Tuhfat al-kirām]. Part II—Giving the reigns of the Kalhórahs and the Tálpurs down to the British Conquest [from the Tuhfat al-kirām, the Fath-nāmah of M. ‘Azīm, and the Fīr-nāmah]. Translated [or summarised] from Persian books by Mirza Kalichbeg Fredunbeg... Karachi 1902°.

[Tabaqat i Akbarī ii p. 500; Muntakhab al-tawārīkh iii pp. 364–75; Akbar-nāmah iii p. 424 (continuation), p. 836; Ā’in i Akbarī p. 230 no. 329 (merely his name in the list of Dū-sād-uj-abānīhā), Blochmann’s trans. p. 514 (the fullest biography in English); Taqī Kāshī Khūlsat al-osh‘ār, appendix ix (summarised Sprenger p. 37); Safīnah i Khwāshgū (Bodl. 376 no. 460); Riyād al-shu‘ārā’ (Ivanov Curzon 57 no. 1635); ‘Alī Shēr “Qāni’” Magālāt al-shu‘ārā’, near the end; Idem Tuhfat al-kirām, towards the end of Mūjallad iii; Ma‘āthir al-unārā’ iii pp. 326–9; Suhuf i ‘Ibrāhīm; Makhzan al-gharā‘ib no. 2754; Morley pp. 72–3; Sprenger pp. 37, 65; Elliot and Dowson History of India i p. 213; Haft āsmān pp. 126–7; Rieu i p. 291; Beale Oriental biographical dictionary p. 269; Nizāmī Badāyūnī Qāmūs al-mashāhīr (in Urdu) ii p. 201.]

¹ For some remarks on this translation see Elliot and Dowson i pp. 214–15: “This work has been translated by Capt. G. Malet... but so literally, as not to be fit for publication in its present shape. [There is a copy of this translation in Sir H. Elliot’s library, which, on examination, is found to contain matter that is entirely absent from all the five MSS. above specified...]"
825. "Idrākī" Bēg-Lārī Tattawi, of the Arghūn tribe, was the author of a mathnawī entitled CHNYR-nāmāh,¹ which he composed in 1010/1601–2, as is shown by a hemistich quoted in the Maqālāt al-shu‘arā‘ by ‘Alī Shēr "Qānī"", who had seen no other poems by this author. 'Alī Shēr "Qānī" does not mention the Bēg-Lār-nāmāh in his short notice of "Idrākī", nor is the author's name mentioned in the Bēg-Lār-nāmāh itself. The work is, however, ascribed to Idrākī T'hattawi in a manuscript (B.M. Or. 2073, Rieu iii p. 1061) containing notices of 29 MSS. in the library of the Mullās of Tattah, which was drawn up for Sir H. M. Elliot in 1266 by S. Šābīr 'Ali, a grandson of 'Alī Shēr "Qānī".

Bēg-Lār-nāmāh, a biography of Khān i Zamān Amīr (or Shāh) Qāsim Khān b. Amīr S. Qāsim Bēg-Lār, a military commander who flourished under the Tarkhān rulers in Akbar's time and who had reached his seventieth year in 1017/1608–9, the date of composition (though there are later additions): Blochet i 631² (A.H. 1078/1667), Bānkipūr vii 598 (A.H. 1233/1818), Rieu iii 949b (A.H. 1265/1849), I.O. 4398 (lacunæ. A.H. 1269/1852). Three copies in Sind were known to Sir H. M. Elliot.

Description and 7 pp. of translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson History of India i pp. 289–99.

['Alī Shēr "Qānī" Maqālāt al-shu‘arā‘ (I.O. 4398 fol. 4b); Rieu iii 1096b (ad p. 949b).]

826. Mīr Tāhir Muḥammad "Nisyānī" b. S. Ḥasan, of Tattah, was in the service of Mīrzā Ghāzī Bēg Tarkhān "Waṣārī" (Governor of Sind A.H. 1008/1599–1018/1609), and was in his twenty-fifth year when at the time of Akbar's death, A.H. 1014/1605, he received permission to return to Tattah, his native town. He there devoted himself to the study of the Persian

¹ It appears from what "Qānī" says about this mathnawī that CHNYR [? = Chunair, possibly an arbitrary diminutive of Chandar] is the name of a person, the husband of Lilā. The name does not occur in the verses quoted by "Qānī" from the mathnawī.

² The reference in the Bānkipūr catalogue to "Rosen, p. 366" seems to be a mistake for Blochet pp. 364–6, i.e. vol. i no. 631.
poets under Maulānā Ishāq al-Bhakkarī. It was at the request of Mīrzā Shāh Muḥammad Bēg ʿĀdil Khān, eldest son of Shāh Bēg Khān Arghūn (Governor of Qandahār a.h. 1002/1593–4—1028/1619 and of Tattah a.h. 1028/1619), that he began in 1021/1612–13 his Tarīkh i Tāhiri, which he completed in 1030/1620–1, being then in his fortieth year.

**Tarīkh i Tāhiri**, a history of Tattah from the earliest times to a.h. 1018/1609: Bānkipur vii 600 (a.h. 1223/1808), Rieu i 292b (lacuna near beginning, 19th cent.), iii 949b (19th cent.).

Description and 33 pp. of translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson *History of India* i pp. 253–88.

827. Mīrzā M. Ṣāliḥ Tarkhān b. Mīrzā ʿĪsā Tarkhān (who became Ṣūbah-dār of Tattah in 1061/1651 and who was a great-grandson of Mīrzā ʿĪsā Tarkhān, the founder of the Tarkhān dynasty extinguished by Akbar), desiring to read an early history of his ancestors entitled *Tarkhān-nāmah*, asked S. Jamāl b. Mīr Jalāl al-Dīn al-Ḥusainī al-Shīrāzī to find a copy of this book. S. Jamāl was unsuccessful, and therefore he wrote in 1065/1654–5¹ a *Tarkhān-nāmah* of his own, which he compiled from a number of works mentioned in his preface, but mainly, according to Elliot and Dowson i p. 301, from M. Maʿṣūm’s *Tārīkh i Sind* (for which see p. 652 supra).

**Tarkhān-nāmah**,² a history of the Arghūn and Tarkhān rulers of Sind (a.h. 926/1520–961/1554 and 961/1554–1000/1592 respectively) preceded by an account of their Mongol ancestors and continued to the death of Mīrzā ʿĪsā Tarkhān in 1061/1651 and the succession of his son Mīrzā M. Ṣāliḥ to the Ṣūbah-dārī of Tattah: Rieu iii 950a (a.h. 1265/1849), 950a (circ. a.d. 1850), 950b (19th cent.), I.O. 3871 (19th cent.).

Description and 23 pp. of translated extracts: Elliot and Dowson *History of India* i pp. 300–26.

¹ According to Rieu this date is mentioned incidentally in the genealogical tables. There are no such tables in I.O. 3871.
² Sometimes called *Arghūn-nāmah*.
828. Mîr 'Alî Shêr "Qâni" Tâttawî was born in 1140/1727–8 and was still alive in 1202/1787–8 (see p. 138 supra). In addition to the works mentioned on p. 138 he wrote I’lân i gham, an account of the martyrs of Karbalâ’, Maktû-nâmâh, notices of the saints of Mount Makli, and a Mukhîrâr-nâmâh (see Rieu iii p. 1061b).

(1) Tuhsat al-kirâm (a chronogram = 1180/1766–7, the date of inception, A.H. 1181 being given as the date of completion, but later dates (e.g. 1188) occur), a history in three volumes (muqallad), of which the first is a general history from the earliest times, the second an account of the seven climates in the manner of the Haft iqlîm with notices of the celebrated men of the principal countries and cities, and the third a special history of Sind: Bânkîpur vi 479 (A.H. 1233/1817–18), Rieu ii 846a (A.H. 1246/1830), iii 950b (vol. i only. A.D. 1851), 950b (vol. ii only. 19th cent.), 950b (vol. iii only. A.H. 1261/1845), 950b (vol. iii only. A.H. 1266/1850), I.O. 4535 (vol. iii only. A.H. 1295/1878).

Edition (of vols. ii and iii only): Lucknow 1304/1886–7*
(3 vols.).

Translations of extracts: see p. 139 supra.

(2) Târîkh i ‘Abbâsiyâh, two histories of the Kalhûrah

1 More than half of this volume is predominantly biographical.

2 The first volume of this edition, though ostensibly a part of the Tuhsat al-kirâm, has in reality nothing to do with that work, being a topographical account of Ahmâdâbâd followed by biographies of Gujrâti saints. It is in fact approximately the first half of the khâtimah of the Mir’ât i Ahmâdî and corresponds to pp. 1–129 in the Baroda edition. There are two copies of this lithograph in the India Office. They differ in the title-page of vol. ii, the inscription in the one case giving the MAṬBA’I Ḥasanî [?] Ithnâ-‘Ashârî, Mahallah Farrâgh-khânah, Wazîr-ganj, Lucknow, as the place of printing and in the other case merely the MAṬBA’I Ḥasanî [so] Ithnâ-‘Ashârî without any further topographical information (Dar MAṬBA’I Ḥasanî Ithnâ-‘Ashârî raunaq i ṣab’ yâft). It is only on the title-page of vol. ii in its first-mentioned form that Lucknow is specified as the place of printing. Vol. iii has the imprint Nâshîrî Press, Dalhârî [presumably a part of Lucknow]. No press or place of publication is mentioned on the title-page of vol. i (which title-page is missing from the first I.O. copy). The edition is mentioned by Mîrzá Qilîch Bîg in his translation of the Châch-nâmâh (see p. 650 supra), preface, p. iii n.: “This book was printed some years ago without the permission of the heirs of the author, and several copies were disposed of secretly.”
dynasty, one in prose and the other in verse, both unfinished: Rieu iii 1061b (extracts only).

829. M. ‘Azīm al-Dīn Ḥusainī Shīrāzī Tattawi lived in the reign of Mīr Fath-‘Alī Khān Tālpur, ruler of Sind from 1197/1783 to 1216/1801.

_Fath-nāmah_, a metrical history of the ‘Abbāsī or Tālpur 1 Amīrs of Sind, written in 1199/1785 2 and dedicated to Mīr Fath-‘Alī Khān 3: Ivanov Curzon 303 (defective. Early 19th cent.), Rieu iii 1041a (extracts only. Circ. a.d. 1850), 1056a xv (extracts only).


830. Of unknown authorship is

_(Tawārikh i ‘Abbāsiyān),_ 4 a sketch of the history of the Kalḥūrah dynasty to about 1226/1811, the last event for which a date is given being the death of Miyān M. ‘Alī Khān b. M. ‘Ārif Khān b. Miyān ‘Abd al-Nabī Khān in that year: I.O. D.P. 755 foll. 13–20.


_The short account of the decline of the Kalhūrah dynasty and the rise of the Tālpurs:_ no MSS. recorded.

English translation: _A narrative of events which led to the decline and subversion of the Sovereignty of the former Rulers of Sind,—and to the usurpation of that State by its present possessors, who are of the tribe of Bulooch—originally from Talpoor. Translated from the Persian by Captain Pogson (extracted from the Calcutta Magazine)._ Pp. 272–88. [Calcutta 1831*].

---

1 So called as the descendants of Talā Khān.
2 In 1191 according to Rieu, but this seems to be incorrect, perhaps a misprint.
3 According to Rieu the poem "has been subsequently continued to his death in A.H. 1203", but there is evidently some mistake here, since Mīr Fath-‘Alī Khān died in Muḥarram 1217/1802.
4 This title or description is scrawled at the top of the first page.
832. Muʿizz al-Daulah Muʿīn al-Mulk Fīrūz-Jang Mīr Šūbadār Khān was the son of Mīr Fath-ʿAli Khān Tālpur, ruler of Sind from 1197/1783 to 1216/1801. A mystical mathnawī entitled Judāʾi-nāmah by “Mīr Soubdarkhan, ʾemīr du Sind” is described in Blochet iii no. 1933, but it is not clear whether its author was the same Šūbadār Khān.¹

Fath-nāmah, a metrical history of the Tālpurs, especially of Mīr Fath-ʿAli Khān, completed in 1254/1838 (?) : Bānkīpur Suppt. i 1931 (Bengali year 1253/1846).

833. Mīr Yār-Muḥammad Khān was a son of Mīr Murād ʿAli Khān Tālpur, Ruler of Sind from 1244/1828 to 1249/1833, and on his father’s death became, like each of his three brothers, the ruler of a quarter of Sind. In 1259/1843, after the conquest of Sind by Sir Charles Napier, Mīr Yār-Muḥammad Khān was taken, like the other Mīrs, as a state prisoner first to Bombay and then to the village of Sāsūr, about 24 miles from Poona. In 1260/1844 they were taken to Calcutta and shortly after Mīr Yār-Muḥammad Khān accepted the choice of living at Hazaribagh. In 1270/1854 the East India Company gave the Mīrs permission to return to Sind, if they liked, and in Rajab 1273/Feb.–March 1857 Mīr Yār-Muḥammad Khān reached Haidarābād.

Frīr-nāmah, a history of Sind in the time of the Tālpur dynasty based in its earlier part on the Fath-nāmah and in its later part on personal experience, written in 1857 [1859 ?]² and dedicated to Mr. (afterwards Sir) Bartle Frere, with whose Commissionership the work ends : no MSS. recorded.


¹ Mīr Fath-ʿAli Khān’s father was called Šūbadār Khān.
² Mīrzā Qilīch Bōg says that the Frere-nāmah was written in 1857 but it apparently extends to 1859, since the last sentence of his “translation” is “Mr. Frere became Governor of Bombay and left Sind in 1859, when he was succeeded by Mr. Inverarity” (with the footnote “The Frerenāmah which we have been translating, ends here”).
[A history of Sind. Volume II...translated from Persian books by Mirza Kalichbeg Fredunbeg, pp. ii, 220, 221, 237, 238.]

834. Khân Bahâdur Khudâ-dâd Khân son of Râdî Khân (otherwise Rîdâ M. Khân), an Afghân of the Tarîn tribe, entered the service of Government in 1853, and in 1855 he was employed in the Jâgîr and Political Department. He served for many years with credit as Mîr Munshî to the Commissioner in Sind. In 1892 he received the title of Khân Bahâdur and on his retirement in 1899 to his home at Sukkur he was given a jâgîr. He says that in 1862 he published a Mâkrân-nâmah and in 1867 a Khalîj-nâmah on the Persian Gulf. In 1869 he was ordered to write an account of the famous ruined places in Sind. This account, he says, was translated into English and published. Another work of his, Wagâ‘î al-sair i Jaisalmîr, an account of a tour in 1859, was published at Karâchî in 1875*.

Lubb i târîkh i Sindh (on English title-page Lab [sic] tarih Sind), a history of Sind from the earliest times to A.H. 1318/1900, the date of completion, with a summary in English.

Edition: Amritsar 1318/1900*.

[Autobiographical statements in the Lubb i târîkh i Sindh; Sahâfah i zarîn (in Urdu) by Prâg Narâyan Bhârgava, Lucknow 1902, Bombay section, pp. 52–3; Portrait, ibid. facing p. 49.]

835. Other works:

1) Nażârat al-Sind, i.e. Personal observations on Sindh by Lieut. T. Postans (London 1843*) translated into Persian by Bishan Narâyan, who added a few notes on subsequent events down to 1858: Ivanow 186 (A.D. 1859).

2) Tawârîkh i tâzah-nawâ‘i, a history of Sind, by Mirzâ ‘Aţâ Muḥammad Shikârpûrî: Rieu iii 10406 (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850).

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (g) BAHAWALPUR

836. Lâlah Daulat Rây, son of Lâlah ‘Izzat Rây, whose father had been in the service of Nawwâb M. Mubârak Khân, was deprived of his ancestral madad i ma‘âsh, the ta‘alluq of
Jalālābād, by Rukn al-Daulah Bahāwal Khān II (A.H. 1186/1772–1224/1809). He migrated to Multān and there he continued the history of Bahāwalpūr on which he had been engaged. In consequence of the periodical invasions of Ranjit Sing’h he went to Ḥaidarābād in Sind, and served under the Amīrs Karam-ʿĀlī Khān and Murād-ʿĀlī Khān. Subsequently, however, he returned to Bahāwalpūr and was living there under Bahāwal Khān and Śādiq Khān (A.H. 1224–41). He died in 1246/1830.

**Mir’āt i daulat i ‘Abbāsī** (a chronogram = 1224/1809, but the work was completed in 1227/1812), a history of the ‘Abbāsī Dāwud-putras, the ruling dynasty of Bahāwalpūr, down to 1224/1809¹: **R.A.S.** P. 90 = Morley 88 (A.H. 1247/1831–2), **Bāṅkipūr** Suppt. i no. 1774 (A.H. 1262/1846), **Rieu** iii 951a (19th cent.).

Edition: Delhi 1850°* (differs materially from the B.M. MS.).

[Autobiography in *Mir’āt i daulat i ‘Abbāsī*, appendix (apparently absent from the B.M. and Bāṅkipūr MSS.); M. A’ẓam *Igbāl-nāmah i saʿādat-āyāt* (cf. Rieu iii p. 951a²²–30); Morley pp. 90–1; Rieu iii 951a.]

**837. WDYRH** ² Jān Muḥammad Khān Matūfānī.


**838. M. A’ẓam b. Maulawī M. Šāliḥ Asādī Hāshimi** Fārūqī Bahāwalpūrī tells us that in Nawwāb Śādiq Khān’s second year, A.H. 1225–6/1810–11, he was sent by the Nawwāb on a mission to the Tālpur Amīrs, who were then threatening Bahāwalpūr, and subsequently to Multān. His *Igbāl-nāmah i saʿādat-āyāt* was undertaken by order of Śādiq Khān, who instructed him “to embody in the same a record of the first two years of the reign left in an unfinished state by Lālah Daulat Rāi” (Rieu iii

¹ “It is not merely a history of the Nawābs of Bhāwalpūr, but comprehends that of Sind, Afghanistan, Multān, Jūdhpūr and the Sikhs, during an eventful period as regards our western frontier of India” (Morley p. 92).

² Vocalisation and meaning of this word not ascertained.
According to the Bahawalpur State Gazetteer, p. 62, he was appointed Tawarih-nawis, or Chronicler, by Nawwab Sadiq M. Khan II in 1809. In the B.M. MS. Or. 1740, foll. 98–9 (Rieu iii p. 1013a iii), are the beginnings of a Tadhkirat al-khawâqin, written in 1251/1835–6, and a Tarih i Kashmir, both by Hajji M. A'zam Pashâwari, who, according to Rieu (iii p. 1097a), is called at the end M. A'zam Asadi Hasimi, and who is evidently therefore identical with the historian of Bahawalpur.

1 Igbâl-nâmâh i sa'âdat-âyât (beginning: Zidd i fihris i muskhaq i masâikh), a history of Sadîq Khan's reign, detailed for the first four or five years extremely brief for the years 1230/1815–1241/1826: Rieu iii 952a (19th cent.).


839. In the time of M. Bahâwal Khan III was written Khulâshah i tawârikh i 'Abbâsiyah, called in the colophon Tawârikh i Jawâhir i 'Abbâsiyah 3 (beginning: Jahân jahân sitâyish), abridged from a work by S. Nûr Allâh and divided into a mugaddimah (on the genealogy of the Khâns) and three qism (1) from Sultan Ahmad II to the death of Mubârak Khan, (2) M. Bahâwal Khan II, (3) M. Sadîq Khan): Browne Hand-list 347 (88 foll. A.H. 1258/1842).

840. Mubâriz al-Daulah Pir Ibrâhim Khan Khwâshgî 4 was born in 1794 at Qasûr, 34 miles S.E. of Lahore. In

---

1 For a Tarih i Kashmir written about 100 years earlier by a different M. A'zam see p. 683 infra.

2 By M. A'zam Asadi al-Hashimi according to the Lindesiana catalogue. For a Khulâshah i tawârikh i 'Abbâsiyah called in the colophon Tawârikh i Jawâhir i 'Abbâsiyah, and therefore possibly identical with M. A'zam's work (though the latter, consisting of “2 vols. in 1”, seems likely to be a larger work than the former, which extends only to 88 foll.), see p. 661, l. 17, infra.

3 This title suggests the possibility that the work may be identical with the Jawâhir i 'Abbâsiyah which has just been mentioned, but the latter, consisting of “2 vols. in 1”, would seem to be a larger work than the former, which extends to only 88 leaves.

4 This is the name of an Afghân clan.
1808, the year following Ranjit Sing’h’s annexation of Qaşūr, he migrated with his father and other relatives to Mamdōt. In 1817 he entered Ranjit Sing’h’s service, but failing to win such promotion as he desired, he went to Delhi and studied medicine. In 1837 he entered the service of the East India Company, and in 1840 he was appointed British Agent at the court of Bahāwalpūr. At the time of the First Sik’h War (1845–6) he rendered valuable services, for which he was rewarded with a ḥil’at and the title of Khān Bahādur. In 1848 he took the Bahāwalpūr forces to support Herbert Edwardes in the operations against Multān, where Mūlrāj was besieged after the murder of Vans Agnew and Anderson. Edwardes speaks highly of him in A year on the Punjab frontier in 1848–9.

In 1851 he visited England, but a breakdown in health forced him to leave the country in January 1852. Soon after his return to Bahāwalpūr the title of Mubāriz al-Daulah was conferred upon him. He died in 1856.

A brief account of his visit to England together with a short history of his tribe was published by him in 1854¹ under the title Sairistān (see Islamic culture iii no. 3 (July 1929) pp. 454, 472). His autobiography ² published in English by E. B. Eastwick in January 1852, that is to say, just about the time when he left England on his return to India, was presumably written in Persian.³

*(Tārīkh i Bahāwalpūr)*, ⁴ “an abbreviation of the family annals of Nawab Bahawal Khan” (see p. 663, n. 1, *infra*) written at the request of Captain J. D. Cunningham: MS. at one time in the possession of Capt. Cunningham.

Abridged translation: *The History of Bahawalpur, with notices of the adjacent countries of Sindh, Afghanistan, Multan, and the

¹ At [Bahāwalpūr] according to the British Museum catalogue, at Multān according to M. Shafi. In the B.M. catalogue the work is mistakenly entered under “Mubāriz ul-Daulah, Nawab of Bahawalpur”.

² See the list of authorities below.

³ That Pir Ibrāhīm Khān had little, if any, knowledge of English is shown by the fact that on his visit to England he was accompanied by an interpreter (see Oriental College Magazine v, no. 3, p. 311).

⁴ Correct title unknown.
West of India. [Abridged and translated from Pir I. Khan’s history] By Shahamat Ali. London 1843.*

[Memorandum of Peer Ibraheem Khan, Bahadur, British Agent at the Court of Bhaouwalpur, London 1852* (an autobiography. The I.O. copy bears on a fly-leaf the inscription “Presented to the Library of the E.I. College by E. B. Eastwick, Author of the Memoir, Jany 1852”, which presumably means that Eastwick translated the work, probably from a manuscript); Sauristān (see above), Multān 1854; H. B. Edwardes A year on the Punjab frontier in 1848–9, London 1851, vol. ii, pp. 314, 319, 344, 377; Gazetteer of the Bahawalpur State, Lahore 1908, pp. 70, 71, 72, 74, 78, 80; Munārīz al-Daulah Pir Ibrāhīm Khan Khwāshqī Qasūrī (an Urdu article by M. Shafi in the Oriental College Magazine, vol. v, no. 3 (Lahore, May 1929) pp. 1–3. Portrait facing p. 1); Islamic culture, vol. iii, no. 3 (July 1929), p. 172 (in an article by M. Shafi entitled An Afghan colony at Qasur].

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (h) THE PANJĀB

841. The Janam-sākhī, written in Panjābi, is a life of Guru Nānak, the founder of the Sik’h religion. For information concerning it see Rieu i 293b and the works on the Sik’h religion cited by him.

1 This work is not expressly said to be a translation from the Persian. According to Shahāmat ‘Ali’s Preface “The Work, of which the following is an abstract, is an abbreviation of the family annals of Nawab Bahawal Khan. It was abridged at Bahawalpur by Peer Ibrāhīm Khan, the British native agent there, at the request of Captain J. D. Cunningham . . . who is now our political agent at Bhopal. On his appointment to the latter agency in 1846, I became aware that he had some valuable Oriental MSS. in his possession, and asked him to give me some work, in which I might employ my leisure hours usefully to myself and to the public. He most liberally and readily gave me two MSS.; viz. one, the present work, and the other a religious book . . .”

2 Shahāmat ‘Ali was Persian Secretary to Sir C. M. Wade, whom he accompanied on missions to Bahawalpur (1833) and Peshawar (1839), and was afterwards Mīr Munṣī to the Political Resident in Mālwhā. He is the author of The Sikhs and Afghans, in connexion with India and Persia, immediately before and after the death of Ranjeet Singh: from the journal of an expedition to Kabul, through the Panjāb and the Khaibar Pass (London 1847*, 2nd ed. 1849*).
Janam-sāk'hi: for the numerous editions of the Panjabi original see the catalogues of Panjabi books in the British Museum and the India Office.

Persian translation: Janam-sāk'hi, a condensed translation completed in 1806 by Khwājah 'Abd al-Ḥakīm Khān 1 at the request of Col. (afterwards Sir) John Malcolm and with the assistance of Agī Rām, a Nānakpant'hi darwīsh: Rieu i 293a (19th cent.).

Another Sik'h work translated presumably from the Panjabi and presumably by the same Khwājah 'Abd al-Ḥakīm Khān is

Tarjamaḥ i Mulāqāt i Nānak, an account of Gurū Nānak's interviews with a number of holy personages of various times and countries: Rieu i 293b (19th cent.).

842. A certain Ghulām-Muhīyī 'l-Dīn 2 wrote

Futūḥat-nāmah i Ṣamādī (a chronogram = 1135/1722–3), a florid biography of Saif al-Daulah 'Abd al-Ṣamad Khān Bahādur Dīlīr-Jang, 3 who in Farrukhāb's reign (A.H. 1124/1713–131/1719) became Governor of Lahore, crushed the Sikhs and captured their leader Bandah in 1127/1715, became Governor of Multān in Muhammad Shāh's seventh or eighth regnal year (A.H. 1137–9/1724–6) and died A.H. 1150/1730–8 (see Ma'āthir al-'umārā' iī 514–17, Beveridge's translation pp. 71–3): Rieu iii 970b (circ. A.D. 1850).

843. The Aḥwāl i Dinā Bīg Khān was written by "an old Gooru at Khurturpore, who has also written a Punjabi dictionary, in which he has introduced no end of Hindu [? Hindee] words". 4

1 Possibly identical with the author of the Tuhfah i Akbarī (see pp. 752–3 infra).
2 Possibly identical with Ghulām-Muhīyī 'l-Dīn Khān who wrote a Zafarnāmah on Ahmad Shāh Durrānī's [first?] invasion of India (see p. 396 supra).
3 For a fragment of a chronicle written in Farrukhāb's reign and containing an account of that Emperor's accession in Delhi and of the expedition of 'Abd al-Ṣamad Khān against the Sikhs, by an author who was serving at that time as Nā'b under 'Ārif Bīg Khān, Governor of Lahore, see p. 805 supra and Rieu ii 860b.
4 According to a letter from J. C. Blagrave to Sir H. M. Elliot preserved with the MS.
Ahwâl i Dinâ Bég Khân, a life of Ādinah Bég, who served under Mu‘in al-Mulk, Governor of Lahore, against Ahmad Shâh Durrâni in 1162/1749, was Governor of the sâbâh for twelve years in the reign of ‘Alamgîr II and died in 1172/1758: Rieu iii 1044a (A.D. 1847?).


Summary: Elliot and Dowson History of India viii p. 167 n.¹

844. Major James Browne was sent from Calcutta to Delhi in 1784 as "English Minister at the Court of his Majesty Shah Alum". "Having met," he says, "with two Hindoos of considerable knowledge, who were natives of Lahore, where they had resided the greater part of their lives, and who had in their possession, accounts of the rise and progress of the Sicks, written in the Nuggary (or common Hindoo) character, I persuaded them to let me have a translation of one of them in the Persian language, abridging it as much as they could do, without injuring the essential purpose of information. . . . This Persian sketch of an history, I have translated into English." The Persian sketch referred to was the Risâlah i Nânâk Shâh of Bud’h Sing’h K’hâtri, commonly called (‘urf) Arôrah (or Arôrâ), who describes himself as a servant of the Delhi court and an inhabitant of Lahore. He says that he was attached to the service of Major James Browne (Nawwâb Mu‘in al-Daulah Naṣîr al-Mulk Major James

¹ The summary is short enough to quote. "This Adîna or Dîna Beg Khân, whose name will frequently recur in these pages, was by caste an Arâin, and son of a man named Channû, an inhabitant of the village of Sarakpûr, near Lahore. He was brought up in a Mughal family, and in early life spent a good deal of his time at Allahabad, Cawnpore and Bajwâra. He became a soldier, but seems to have thrown aside that profession for revenue work. He was an able man and a good accountant, and he began as collector of the village of Kanak near Lūdhîyâna, from which humble position he advanced till he was made Governor of Sultânpur, an office which he held at the time of Nâdir Shâh’s invasion. He died without heirs at Khânpûr near Hoshiyârpûr, where a fine tomb was erected over his remains. These particulars are extracted from a little work called Ahwâl Adîna Beg Khan. . . ."
Browne Şâhib Angrêz Bahâdur Şalâbat-Jang) and that he was helped in the composition of his work by Lâlah ‘Ajâ’îb Sing’h Sûraj.


English translation: *History of the origin and progress of the Sicks* (the second of James Browne’s *India tracts*, London 1788*).

845. **M. Afḍal “Afḍal”** b. M. Ḥafîz was born at Sûd’îrah in the Siyâlkot District and died in 1210/1795–6 at Talwandî Mûsâ Khân, in the Gûjrânwâlâ District, to which his father, “a man of great piety and learning,” had been invited by Mûsâ Khân, a local chief. A collection of his Persian and Urdu poems is in the possession of his descendants.

**Târikh i Jân Muḥammad**, a poem giving an account of a battle fought in 1204/1790 near Gûjrânwâlâ between Khân i Jahân entitled Sarîr Khân and the infidels (i.e. probably the Sik’hs), in which Jân Muḥammad b. Mûsâ Khân was killed: Ethé 2901 (circ. 1270/1853–4).

[M. Nâẓîm in the *JRAS*. 1927 pp. 846–7.]

846. Lâlah or Pandit Bakht-Mal was the grandfather of Dîwân Amar Nâṭ’h “Akbarî” (for whom see pp. 668–70 *infra*). His father had migrated from Kashmîr to Lahore, where he had attained high position, but on the Governor’s dismissal he had gone to Delhi. It was there probably that Bakht-Mal was born. It was at any rate from there that he went for a time to Oudh. Declining offers of employment from Āṣaf al-Daulah, he returned to Delhi. At the end of 1805, when Lord Lake drove Jaswant Râo Hôlkar to the Bias and sent John Malcolm on a mission to Ranjit Sing’h, Bakht-Mal accompanied Malcolm and wrote for his information a work on the Sik’hs. This work is referred to by him in the preface to his *Khâlsâh-nâmah*, where he says that “during the days of leisure he had enjoyed in the companionship of Bhâi La’l Singh” he had written a detailed history
of the Sikhs, which was stolen by thieves when only half finished, and a short history, which was taken away by John Malcolm, and that he had now written a third work of moderate size on the same subject. His grandson, Diwan Amar Nāth, says that he wrote works entitled (1) Ṭīlasm i shakar-rīz, (2) Bāgh i bā-bahār, (3) Ėrī-nāmah (sic ?), and (4) Sing’h-nāmah (Sikh-nāmah).


(2) Khāl[ı]sah-nāmah, a history of the Sikhs to A.H. 1222/1807–8: Rieu i 294a (A.H. 1229/1814).

[Autobiographical statements in the Khālsah-nāmah (see Rieu i 294a: Amar Nāth Zafar-nāmah i Ranjit Sing’h pp. 36¹⁴–37, 93, editor’s introduction pp. iii–iv.)

847. Khwush-waqt Rāy was, according to H. T. Prinsep (Origin of the Sikh power in the Punjab, Calcutta 1834, preface, p. x), “for many years the Agent and Intelligencer of the British Government at Umritsur.” He himself says that he was in the service of the East India Company, and that he had been appointed official News-writer, Wagā’h-nigār, for the Panjab. According to the B.M. manuscript his history of the Sikhs was written at the request of Colonel (afterwards General Sir) David Ochterlony. In the I.O. manuscript a space left for the name of the person at whose suggestion the work was written has been filled with the name and Persian titles of Charles Theophilus Metcalfe (afterwards Lord Metcalfe).

¹ Malcolm’s Sketch of the Sikhs (London, 1812*) is based partly on this work. Amar Nāth calls it the Sing’h-nāmah (Sikh-nāmah) and says that “Mālikam Sāhib Bahadur ān kitāb rā ba-nām i khwud bastah maqāţīh i alwāb numūdah ba-sawād i Hind firistādand”.
² Zafar-nāmah p. 37.
³ Cf. Prinsep’s statement in the preface to his work mentioned above: “A Persian account of the affairs of the Sikhs in the Punjab was obligingly communicated to the compiler by Sir Charles Metcalfe. The manuscript had been delivered to Sir Charles by its author, Khooshwuqt Raee, who was for many years the Agent . . .”
(Ahwāl i firqah i Sik’hān), a history of the Sik’hs from their origin to A.D. 1811, the date of composition: Rieu i 2945 (A.D. 1835), I.O. 3897 (early 19th cent.).

848. Dayā-Rām Pandit, originally resident in Kashmir, migrated with his father to Delhi and thence after a time to Lahore. In 1228/1813 when Diwān Gangā-Rām marched against the fortress of Pūnczh Dayā-Rām accompanied him and it was there that he wrote his Shīr u shakkar. A Persian diwān of his is preserved in the Panjāb University Library.

Shīr u shakkar, a history of Ranjit Sing’h to A.H. 1228/1813: Lahore Panjāb Univ. Lib. (see Oriental College Magazine, vol. ii, no. 4 (Lahore, August 1926), p. 57).

849. Lālah Möhan was in the service of Ranjit Sing’h, who in the year v.s. 1881/1824–5 ordered him to go to Multān and bring Mir Ghulām–‘Alī to court.

Rūz-nāmchah i Ranjit Sing’h, a history of Ranjit Sing’h to the year v.s.1886/1829–30: Bānkipūr Suppt. ii 2020 (19th cent.).

850. Diwān Amar Nāt’h “Akbari” was the son of Diwān Dinā Nāt’h, Ranjit Sing’h’s Finance Minister. His grandfather, Bakhτ-Mal, has already been mentioned (pp. 666–7 supra) as the author of two historical works. Amar Nāt’h was born in Vikrami Sambat 1879/1822–3 (Zafar-nāmah p. 15516–19). In v.s. 1885/1828–9, at the age of six, he went to a maktab where he was taught by Maulawī Ahmad-Bakhsh “Yak-dil ” Chishti Lāhaurī.

---

1 No formal title is given to the work by its author either in its preface or at the end, but he describes it in his preface as a guḍhārīsh i ahwāl i bid’at i firqah i Sik’hān u paighambarān i ʾishān ba-tariq i intikhab u mujmal (so in the I.O. MS., where bid’at i seems to be an addition not found in the B.M. MS.).

2 According to G. L. Chopra The Panjab as a sovereign state, Lahore 1928, pp. i, iii, the work was written in August 1834, but in the I.O. MS. the year 1811 is mentioned at least twice (in the preface and in the last sentence) as the date of composition.

3 b. Lahore 1212/1795, d. 1284/1867, the author of a diary in 20 volumes which contains valuable information concerning the history of the Panjāb from 1236 to 1277 (1819 to 1860) and which is now in the possession of his grandson Maulavi Ḥamid ‘Ali Chishti (see Sir Abdul Qadir’s article An unpublished diary of Sikh times in the Journal of the Panjab Historical Society vol. vi, no. 2 (1917), pp. 82–7, Sita Ram Kohli’s introduction to the Zafar-nāmah p. v., and his note on p. 123 of that work).
At an early age he had acquired considerable skill in Persian composition. He was only in his eleventh year (dar 'ahd i yawdah-salaqi, Z.-n. p. 213), when, in v.s. 1889/1832–3,¹ he wrote a series of bombastic laudations of gardens in Lahore to which he gave the title Raqqat al-azhar and which, or part of which, he included in the last (forty-first) chapter of the Zafar-namah. In v.s. 1891/1834–5, at the age of sixteen, he wrote a fath-namah on the conquest of Peshawar which was published throughout Ranjit Sing'h's dominions (ba-tamam mulk i mahrusah sharaf i isdar yafrah, Z.-n. p. 231⁰) and which is incorporated in the Zafar-namah (pp. 231–6). According to Sitā Rām Köhlī he was one of the Bakhshis, or Paymasters, of the irregular cavalry of the Khālsah Government and is mentioned several times in the pay-rolls. From “family traditions and a few other indirect sources” Sitā Rām Köhlī has learnt that Diwān Dīnā Nat'h had his son removed from his office in 1845 “for reasons which are rather obscure”, and that he spent the rest of his life in intellectual pursuits until his death from cholera on 1 August 1867, at the age of forty-five. A collection of his Persian poems was published by his son Diwān Rām Nat'h in 1873 under the title of Diwān i Akbarī.

(Zafar-namah i Ranjit Sing'h), a history of Ranjit Sing'h to the year v.s. 1892/1835–6: Lahore Panjāb Univ. Lib. (defective at end, breaking off in the year v.s. 1884/1827–8. See Oriental College Magazine, vol. ii, no. 4 (August 1926), p. 57, and Sitā Rām Köhlī's introduction, p. xiii). This MS. and two others, one belonging to the author's family and the other to Rāy Šāhib Pandit Wazir Chand, were used in the preparation of the edition mentioned below.


¹ The chronogram Bāgh i Iram (Z.-n. p. 237) indicates the date 1244/1828–9, an unexplained discrepancy.
II. HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, ETC.

[Zafar-nāmah pp. 3614, 11516, 15516-10, 1747, 14-15, 176 ult., 177, 18510-23, 186, 19510-17, 21318-23, 214, 221 penult. (for ta’kūd read ta’lif), 2318-9, 2481; Sītā Rām Kōhli’s introduction pp. iii–ix.]

851. It may perhaps be worth mentioning here that a beautifully illuminated manuscript at Bānkīpur (Catalogue, vol. vii no. 622) contains the financial accounts of Ranjīt Sing’h’s army.

852. Ghulām-Muḥyī ’l-Dīn surnamed (mulaqqab) Būṭī Shāh Lūd’hiyānī ‘Alawī Qādirī wrote his Tārīkh i Panjāb in 1258/18421 at the request of Captain Murray, Resident at Lūd’hiyānāh, in whose office he was a Munshī.2


853. The Ranjīt-Sing’h-nāmah mentioned below was written not later than 1846, since, according to Ethē, the MS. contains “Two entries, dated 1846, Lahore, on the last fly-leaf”.

Ranjīt-Sing’h-nāmah, a short modern mathnawī in honour of Ranjīt Sing’h and his sons, giving the principal events of their lives: Bodleian ii 2365 (Pictures).

854. M. Naqī Pashāwārī b. Mullā Khwājah-Bakhsh went to Lahore, the city of his forefathers, and was an eye-witness of the

---

1 The chronogram in the preface is
Chu juztam sāl i tārifash khirad guft * kih tārīkhash ham az nāmah birūn ār.
Wa-li ghair az mi’dāt ai dānīsh-āgin * zi’a’dād i nukhustān juzw ma-shmār.
This seems to indicate 1258, not 1264, as Rieu supposed.

2 This statement concerning Captain Murray comes from the author’s colophon in the I.O. MS. 3893.
events which followed the death of Ranjit Singh’s. At the request of Bakhshi Bhagat-Ram he composed a record of those events.

(Shēr-Singh-nāmah), a diffuse and stilted account of events at Lahore from 1255/1839 (death of Ranjit Singh’s) to 1259/1843 (assassination of Shēr Singh and accession of Dalip Singh after the restoration of order by Rājah Hirā Singh, to whom the work is dedicated and in whose service the author probably was): Rieu iii 952b (19th cent. 9 pictures), Ethé 505 (12 Pictures), 2991 (A.H. 1270/1853–4), Bodleian MS. Pers. e. 30 (n.d.).


855. Mīr Ṭaiyīb Allāh Ruhtāsī.

Jawāhir-nāmah, an epic poem on the reign of Shēr Singh: Ethé ii 3041 (autograph?).

856. Lālah Sōhan Lal Sūri, son of Lālah Ganpat Rāy, son of Lālah Ḥukumat Rāy, was Wakil at the court of Ranjit Singh’s for twenty-seven years, and he held the same position during the reigns of his successors until the deposition of Dalip Singh’s in 1849. Ranjit Singh’s more than once rewarded him for his historical writings. In 1851 the Panjab Government granted him a jāgīr for life with an annual value of Rs. 1000. According to Sir R. Temple he died in 1852.

Sir Richard Temple says “His habit of noting down what passed seems to have been hereditary, for his father, Lālah Ganpat Rāi, who before him had been vakīl not only to Mahārájā Ranjit Singh, but also to his father and grandfather Mahan Singh and Chhart Singh, had kept similar records of all he saw for some 40 years previously. He died in very advanced life in A.D. 1828, and has left many MSS. behind him, but they

---

1 This title does not occur in the text, but in an English note in Ethé 505.
2 In an English notice prefixed to the fifth daftar in the published edition of the ‘Umdat al-tawārīkh he is described as “official diarist to the Court of the Sikh Maharajas”.
3 ‘Umdat al-tawārīkh i p. 171.
are not of any special value, as his son used them all in his great compilation”.

(1) ‘Umdat al-tawārīkh, a large and important history of the Sik’hs, divided (in its final form ?) into five daftars and extending from the time of Nānak to the author’s own time (to 1831 in the R.A.S. MS., to 1849 in the published edition): R.A.S. P. 89 = Morley 87 (“Tārīkh-i Mahārajāh Ranjīt Singh.” ¹ Presented by Ranjīt Sing’h to Sir Claude Wade in 1831), Ross and Browne 137 (Daftars ii and iii only. A.H. 1260/1844).

Edition: Lahore 1885–9°*.²

(2) ‘Ibrat-nāmah, a poem on the events following the assassination of Shēr Sing’h until the accession of Dalīp Sing’h.

Edition: Lahore [1885*. Supplied gratis to purchasers of the ‘Umdat al-tawārīkh].

[Autobiographical statements in the ‘Umdat al-tawārīkh (which has not been examined for biographical purposes); a note by Sir R. C. Temple printed on the inside of the cover of vol. i of the Lahore edition.]

857. Ganēsh Dās, called (‘urf) Bad’hrah,³ was Qānūngō of the chaklāh of Gujrat in the Panjāb, when Mahārajāh Gulāb Sing’h took him to Jamūn and appointed him to the daftar of that province (probably not long before 1847, when the Rāj-darshānī was completed). On a sheet of paper attached to fol. 1a of Ethē ii 3020 (Chār bāgh i Panjāb) just before this MS. was sent to the Paris Exhibition of 1855 by the Panjāb Committee at Lahore he is described as “an Official in the service of the British [Indian] Government”.

¹ According to G. L. Chopra The Panjab as a sovereign state, Lahore 1928, pp. i, ii, “the author called it Umdat-ut-Tawariikh (f. 199), the title which he applied to his enlarged work, written subsequently, and published by his son in 1884. . . . Both the language and the facts differ, though only to a slight extent, from the author’s published work, called Umdat-ut-Tawariikh.”
² The E.M. catalogue describes the work as “including the diary of Maharaja Ranjit Singh”, but that is misleading, since the “diary” (rūz-nāmchah) is Sōhan Lāl’s account of Ranjīt Sing’h’s doings.
³ This surname (vocalisation uncertain ?) came to Ganēsh Dās by inheritance from an ancestor, Kākā Mal Bad’hrah, a descendant of the Rājahs of Ajmēr, who was Governor of Siyālkōt and Bahlōlpūr circ. A.H. 894/1489 (see Rieu iii 955).
(1) **Chirāgh i Panjāb** (a chronogram = 1262), a history of the Panjāb from the earliest times to A.H. 1262/1846 written in a very short time at Lahore and presented to the Nāzīm of the Panjāb: *Rieu* iii 9526 (A.D. 1851), *Ethé* ii 3019 (A.H. 1270/1854).

(2) **Chār bāgh i Panjāb** (a chronogram = 1265/1849), or *Risālah i Šāhib-numā*, a greatly expanded recension of the preceding work extending to A.D. 1849 (Lord Dalhousie): *Ethé* ii 3020 (A.D. 1854).

858. Munshi 'Abd-al-Karim 'Alawi has already been mentioned (pp. 402-4 supra) as the author of the *Muhārabah i Kābul u Qandahār* and of the **Tārikh i Ahmād**.

**Tārikh i Panjāb tuḥfatān li-l-ahlūb**, an account of the British conquest of the Panjāb in the First (1845-6) and Second (1848-9) Sik'h Wars.

Edition: Muḥammadi Press (Ḥājjī M. Ḥusain), [Lucknow ?] 1265/1849*.

859. Muftī 'Ali al-Dīn b. Muftī Khair al-Dīn Lāhaūrī left his native place Lahore in 1239/1823 on account of the oppression of the Sik'h's and settled at Ludhiana. He was serving under Charles Raikes, Commissioner of Lahore, in 1854, when he compiled his **'Ibrat-nāmah**.

**'Ibrat-nāmah u 'Umdat al-tawārīkh**, a large and

---

1 *Šāhib i Nāzīm i Panjāb*, presumably Henry Lawrence, who was appointed President of the Board of Administration in 1849.
2 Rieu gives the title of this MS. as *Risālah i Šāhib-numā*, but is reproved by Ethé for doing so on the ground that that title properly belongs to the *Chār bāgh i Panjāb*.
3 In the preface to this copy the dedicatee is Mr. Richard Temple, the words *Šāhib i Nāzīm i Panjāb* not being used.
4 So in the preface to the lithographed edition, which has *Tārikh i Panjāb tuḥfatān li-l-ahlūb* on the title-page.
5 It does not appear that 'Abd al-Karim was an eye-witness of events in these wars or even resident in the Panjāb. His account is derived mainly from English and Urdu newspapers but partly from oral information.
6 See Buckland *Dictionary of Indian biography* p. 347.

xxx
important ¹ work on the geography, statistics and history of the Panjāb, especially the Sik’hās, to A.D. 1849: Ethé 504 (A.H. 1270/1854. Autograph).

860. ‘Abd al-Ḥaqī “Ḥādiq,” who mentions his name on p. 11² and his takhallus on p. 113 of the Ḥālāt i jang i Malkah u Sit’hānah, tells us on p. 12 that Hindūstān was his home but that, owing apparently to the successive encroachments of the British, he had migrated first to Sind and then to the mountainous [frontier] region where he wrote his poem.

(Ḥālāt i jang i Malkah u Sit’hānah), a versified account of hostilities between the fanatical Hindūstāni emigrants settled at Sit’hānah and Malkah² and the British-Indian army from Sir Sydney Cotton’s expedition in 1858 to the “Umbeyla [Anbēlah] campaign” of 1863.

Edition: Paṭnah 1901⁰⁴.

861. Rāy Bahādur Kanhaiyā Lāl “Hindi” was Executive Engineer at Lahore, to which he had migrated early in life from Jalēsar, his birthplace in the Āgrah District.

Among his Persian works were (1) Bandagi-nāmah, religious poems, Lahore 1870*, 1295/1878*, Cawnpore 1873⁰³, (2) Gužār i “Hindi” (English title: Poetical Essays, on Persian, on Moral Subjects, entitled Goolzar-i-Hindee), Lahore 1283/1867⁰º, 1286/1869*, 1870°, 1873⁰*, (3) Yādgār i “Hindi” (English title: Poems in Persian entitled Yadgar-i-Hindee, containing a brief account of the great Prophets, Kings, Rulers, and Philosophers of the world), Lahore 1290/1873⁰º.

For his Urdu works, much more numerous than his Persian, see Garcin de Tassy, ii pp. 159–61, and Blumhardt’s catalogues of Hindustani printed books in the British Museum (under

¹ See G. L. Chopra The Punjab as a sovereign state, Lahore 1928, pp. ii–iii.
² Two villages situated respectively at the foot and on the north side of Mt. Mahābān. See Sir Sydney Cotton’s Nine years on the North-West Frontier of India, from 1854 to 1863 (London 1838), Col. J. Adye’s Sitana: a mountain campaign on the borders of Afghanistan in 1863 (London 1867), and other works.
³ This Cawnpore edition is included, presumably by mistake, in the I.O. catalogue of Hindustani books.
Kanhaiyā Lāl, called Alakhadhārī) and the India Office Library (under Kanhaiyā Lāl, Executive Engineer, Kanhaiyā Lāl, Pandit, Kanhaiyā Lāl (Alakhadhārī) and Kanhaiyā Lāl (Hindi)). One or two of these works are probably not by Kanhaiyā Lāl “Hindi”.

Ranjit-nāmah, or Zafar-nāmah i Ranjīt Sing’h, a mathnawī on the history of Ranjīt Sing’h written, or begun, in 1874.

Edition: Zafar-nāmah i Ranjīt Sing’h al-ma‘rūf Ranjīt-nāmah, Lahore 1876.º*

[Ranjīt-nāmah pp. 28–32, 603; Garcin de Tassy ii pp. 159–61.]

862. M. Aḥsan Allāh Khān “Thāqib” wrote
Ātash i bi-dūd, a history of the British conquest of the Panjāb.

Edition: Āgrah 1297/1880º.

863. Dūni-ehand Bālī wrote when Dilāwar Khān was head of the Gak’hār tribe¹ (i.e. 1117/1705–6—1139/1726–7)

Kai-Gauhar-nāmah, composed A.H. 1137/1724–5, a history of the Gak’hārs (G’hak’hārs or Gak’hārs), a Muhammadan and mainly Shī‘ite tribe, who (or some of whom) believe themselves to be descended from Kai-Gauhar, a Kayānīan prince, and who live now in N.W. India (Rāwal Pindī, Aṭak, Jihlām and Hazārah Districts and in Jammū), from their origin to the date of composition with special reference to their saints: Rieu iii 1012b (circ. A.D. 1850), Ivanow 188 (mid 19th cent.),² Ethé ii 3021 (“Ghakkar-nāmah”).

864. Rahim ‘Ali Khān son of Ḥafız al-Dīn Khān known as Nobkī, a Kayānī Gak’har resident in the village of Dōmeliyān (Parganah Rohtās), wrote in 1256/1840–1 his

² The opening words given by Rieu and Ivanow do not agree.
Rahim-namah, a history of the fortress of Rohtas and of the tribe of the Gak'hrs: Rieu iii 954b (circ. A.D. 1850).

865. Ganesh Das, the author of the Risalah i Sahib-numa (see p. 673 supra) and the Raja-darshan (see p. 687), sent to Sir H. M. Elliot

A notice of Raja Jaipal and the Gakhar tribe: Rieu iii 1037a vii foll. 41–3 (circ. A.D. 1850).

866. Tadkhirah i Gakhharan, an account of the chiefs of the Gakhar tribe: Rieu iii 1054b foll. 180–5 (extracts only).

867. Mahtab Sing'h, a Kayaˈst'ha, was a native of Mirlipir, a village in the Bhognipur-Musanaagar pargana of the Cawnpore District. Having gone to Lahore in search of employment he entered the service of Prince K'harak Sing'h, Ranjit Sing'h's eldest son. For five years he worked in the secretariat (daftar) of the pargana of Sahiwal i Balouchan. In the Vikrami year 1881 (A.D. 1824–5) he was put in charge of the secretariat (daftar) of Hazarah.

Tavarih i mulk i Hazarah or Tarikh i Hazarah, a history of Hazarah and the neighbouring districts especially in the thirty years v.s. 1876/A.D. 1819–v.s. 1906/A.D. 1849: Ethe 506 (A.D. 1854), Ivanow 187 (not later than A.D. 1852).

868. Nur Muhammad, commonly called Cheela, of the Sayal tribe, was a highly respected landowner in the Jhang district and an Arabic and Persian scholar. He died in January 1862.

Tarikh i Jhang Sayal, written for Major G. W. Hamilton and completed in Sept. 1862 by the author's son, a history of the Jhang District (between Lahore and Multan) and of its chief inhabitants the Sayals, a Rajput clan who migrated in the 13th century from Jaunpur to the Panjab, where their chief Ray Sayal became a convert to Islam: Rieu i 295a (A.D. 1862), 295b (same hand).

Editions: (1) The history of Jhang Siyal. By Noor Mahomed Chela of Wased Ustana [with an English preface by Col. G. W. Hamilton], Meerut 1863°, (2) Tarikh i Jhang Sayal, Maghi'anah
[1912*] (reprinted from the 1863 edition with omission of the English translation).

[Tārikh i Jhang Sayāl, khātimah; Hamilton’s preface to the Meerut edition.]

869. Miscellaneous works relating to the Panjāb:

(1) Account of the origin of some towns in the Panjāb: Rieu iii 954a (A.D. 1848).

(2) Account of the Sardārs of Ballabhgarh (Faridābād) from the death of Sūraj-Mal Jāt to the departure of Mr. Metcalfe, a musawwadah by Munshi Khalil Allāh Khān: Rieu iii 1038b (circ. A.D. 1850).

(3) Account of Ballabhgarh, a musawwadah by Munshi Khalil Allāh Khān: Rieu iii 1041a (perhaps identical with no. (2). Circ. A.D. 1850).

(4) Ahwāl i Bābā Nānak: Rehatsek p. 72 no. 9 (2).


(6) Haqīqat i binā u ‘urūj i firqah i Sikhān, a short history of the Sikhs (circ. 20 foll.) from the time of Nānak to Timūr Shāh Abdālī’s conquest of Multān: R.A.S. P. 69 (7) = Morley 83, P. 69 (8) = Morley 84.

(7) Kaftiyat i Sirmür, a short account (15 foll.) of the Rājahs of Sirmür: Rieu iii 957b (19th cent.).

(8) Legendary history of Parasrūr and Siyālkôt, by M. Muqīm b. Sh. Raḥmat Allāh: Rieu iii 954a (18th cent.).

(9) Notice of Rājah Jagat Sing’h, son of Rājah Bāsū and zamīndār of Mau and Pat’hān, Panjāb, relating chiefly to the expedition sent against him under the command of Khān i Jahān S. Muẓaffar Khān in the 15th year of Shāh-Jahān’s reign: Rieu ii 837b (A.D. 1690).

(10) Personal statement addressed by the Rājah of Rēwārī to the Indian government with the object of proving his loyalty during the Mutiny: Rieu Suppt. 134 (circ. A.D. 1860).

(11) Reports of the waqā’i‘-nawīsān of Dērah Ismā‘īl Khān
and Peshawar for the years v.s. 1896/1839, 1898/1841 and
1902/1845: Lahore Panjāb Univ. Lib. (see Oriental College

(12) Tadhkira al-umara’, historical notices of some
princely families of Rājpūtānah and the Panjāb, completed in
1830 by Lt.-Col. J. Skinner: see p. 688 infra.

(13) Tawarikh i Rājagān i Hindūr, a short history of the
state of Hindūr or Nalāgārh in the Simla district followed by a
number of fārmāns and sanads received by the Rājahs from the
time of Hūmāyūn to A.D. 1862: Lahore Panjāb Univ. Lib.
(see Oriental College Magazine, vol. ii, no. 4 (Lahore, August
1926) p. 60).

(14) Tuhfah i Akbarī, a concise history of the Nizāms of
Haidarābād, of the Tūmūrids from Aḥmad Shāh to Shāh-‘Ālam,
and of the Panjāb from the rise of the Sikhs written apparently
in 1219/1804–5 by Khwājah 'Abd al-Ḥakīm (cf. p. 664 supra,
n. 1): see p. 753 infra.

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (j) KASHMĪR

“In Mughal times and later, a host of Muslim and Hindu
historians writing in the official Persian language recorded
the events that occurred in their own life-time, as well as the
traditions which they heard from living witnesses. None of
them, however, reached the standard of Kalhana. What little
they tell of the Hindu period they borrowed from him, and
borrowed in a most perfunctory manner. The most important
among these later historians are Haidar Malik of Tsodur, a
contemporary of the emperor Jahangir; Narayan Kaul, who
compiled his history in A.D. 1721; Hasan, who wrote in the
last quarter of the eighteenth century; and Birbal Katsur,¹
who is still more recent” (Ram Chandra Kak Ancient monuments
of Kashmir, p. 15).

870. Kalhana was the son of a certain Canpaka probably
to be identified with one of the chief officials of King Harṣa

¹ Spelt Katsar on p. 172 of R. C. Kak’s work.
M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (j) KASHMIR

(A.D. 1089–1101). The family probably belonged to the town of Parihāsapura. It was in the year 4224 of the Laukika era (A.D. 1148–9) that he wrote the introduction to his Rāja-taranāṅi and he completed the work in the following year. [For the scanty facts concerning the author which may be derived from his work see Stein’s translation pp. 6–21.]

Rāja-taranāṅi, a metrical Sanskrit history of Kashmir in eight cantos.

Sanskrit text 1: (1) Kalhana’s Rājataranāṅi, or Chronicle of the Kings of Kashmir. Edited by M. A. Stein. Bombay 1892 0*.
(2) The Rājataranāṅi of Kalhana. Edited by Durgāprasāda, son of Vrajalāla (and (vols. 2–3) P. Peterson). Bombay 1892–6 0* (Bombay Sanskrit Series, nos. 45, 51 and 54).

English translation: Kalhana’s Rājataranāṅi... Translated... by M. A. Stein. 2 vols. Westminster 1900 0*.

Persian translation (perhaps that made for Akbar by Mullā Shāh-Muḥammad Shāhābādī and rewritten in an abridged form by ‘Abd al-Qādir Badā’ūnī in 999/1590–1 2): Ethé 508 (incomplete), Rieu i 296α (portions only. 18th cent.), Ivanow 1698 (late 18th cent.).

871. For the Tārīkh i Rashidī of Mirzâ Ḥaidar Dughlāt see pp. 273–6 supra.

872. An anonymous author, apparently a dependant of Saiyid Shāh Abū ‘l-Ma‘ālī, 3 whose exploits he records at some length, completed the Bahāristān i Shāhī in 1023/1614.

Bahāristān i Shāhī, a history of Kashmir, especially of the Muhammadan period, to A.H. 1023/1614, events from A.H. 986/1578–9 being treated very fully: Rieu i 297α (defective. 18th cent.), 297b (defective at both ends. 17th cent.), iii 955b (Or.

---

1 For further bibliographical information see the British Museum Sanskrit catalogues.
2 A translation by Maulānā ‘Imād al-Dīn is mentioned among the sources of Sujān Rāy’s Khulāṣat al-tawārīkh (see Rieu i 230).
3 S. Shāh Abū ‘l-Ma‘ālī was prominent in the disturbances preceding Akbar’s conquest of Kashmir, and subsequently after serving under Rājah Mān Sing’h for twenty-four years he received from Jahāṅgīr a mansab and a jāgīr in Tattah.
1799) foll. 78b–254a (the Muḥammadan period. A.H. 1264/1848), Ethé 509 (n.d.).

873. Mullā Ḥusain Qārī is mentioned by M. Aʿẓam in the preface to his Wāqiʿāt i Kashmir as the author of a concise history of Kashmir earlier than that of Ḥaidar Malik.


This may perhaps be identical with

Tārīkh i Kashmir, a history of Kashmir to A.H. 1024/1615 written by Ḥasan (sic ?) b. ‘Ali Kashmirī at the request of Jalāl al-Dīn ² Malik M. Nājī b. Malik Nuṣrat (i.e. apparently the grandfather of Ḥaidar Malik, see § 874 infra): Bodleian 315 (defective at beginning, the first words being: maʿdilat-shiʿār u hukumat i ḥākimān i naṣafat-dīṭār).

874. Ḥaidar Malik b. Ḥasan Malik b. Malik M. Nājī Chārwarah (or Chādwarah), ³ a member of a noble Kashmirī family having its hereditary seat at Chārwarah, a village near Srīnagar, was for twenty-four years in the service of the penultimate King of Kashmir, Yūsuf Shāh Chak (reigned A.H. 986/1578–9—993/1585), whom he followed in his banishment to his jāgīr in Bengal. As Faujdar of Jāʿīs he led a successful expedition against Rājah Balbhadra. In 1016/1607 he protected Mihr al-Nisāʿ (afterwards Nūr-Jahān) after the death of her husband, Shīr-afgan. Jahāṅgīr gave him the titles Chaqhatāy and Rāʿīs al-Mulk and appointed him Governor of Kashmir.

(Tārīkh i Kashmir), begun A.H. 1027/1618 but not completed before 1030/1620–1, a history of Kashmir from the earliest

¹ It is not clear from the Lindesiana catalogue whether this is the correct title or a mere description (assuming that it is not a copy of M. Aʿẓam’s work).

² The laqab of Ḥaidar Malik’s grandfather is given by Aumer as Kamāl al-Dīn.

³ “Ḥaidar Malik takes his epithet Cūdura, recte Tṣūdūr, from the Kasūr village of that name situated in the Nāgām Pargaṇa, some ten miles south of Srīnagar, close to the village of Vahṣṭor” (Stein’s translation of the Rāja- tarāṅgini, vol. ii, p. 374 n. 111).
times to its conquest by Akbar, mainly an abridgment of the Rāja-tarānginī but with some additions in the later period: Ethé 2846 (A.H. 1046/1636), 510 (containing a second part which is divided into six bābs and deals with the history of contemporary dynasties in Īrān, Tūrān, etc. N.d.), Rieu i 298f (a fuller text, defective at beginning. 17th cent.), 297b (A.H. 1216/1802), iii 955b (Or. 1799) foll. 10b–78b (Hindu period. A.H. 1264/1848), Aumer 266 (lacune. A.H. 1131/1718–19), Blochet i 625 (late 18th cent.), 626 (an abridgment, perhaps = Aumer 267, see § 875 infra), Browne Suppt. 245 (A.H. 1197/1783. King’s 81), Bodleian 316 (n.d.), 317, Eton 200.

[Autobiography in the Tārikh i Kashmir, Khātimah, Qism i; Jāhānghir-nāmah pp. 304, 347 = Rogers and Beveridge ii pp. 154, 238; Iqbāl-nāmah i Jāhānghirī p. 159; Rieu i 297b–298a.]

875. By order of Jāhānghir was written

An anonymous history of Kashmir (beginning al-Hamdu li-llāhi Rabbi ’l-ālamān . . . wa-bā’id bā-hukm i amr i dīl-padhār i Shāhānsāh Jāhānghir shurū; dar tahrīr i intikhāb i Tārikh i Kashmir mi-ravād), agreeing closely in the earlier part with Häidar Malik’s history and ending with Akbar’s conquest: Aumer 267, Blochet i 626 (?) (described as an abridged redaction of Häidar Malik’s history, without preface or author’s name. Early 18th cent.).

876. In 1094/1683 “Sarādat” composed


877. In the fourth year of Shāh-Ālam, A.H. 1122/1710–11, Ārif Khān, Nā’ūb and Divān of the Shūbah of Kashmir, wished to become acquainted with the contents of the Sanskrit chronicles of Kashmir, which he had collected. Narāyan Kaul “Ājīz” accordingly compared Häidar Malik’s florid and diffuse translation (see p. 680 supra) with the Sanskrit originals and prepared an abridgment in simple style.


Navaḍīr al-akhbār, a history of Kāshmīr, mainly of the Muḥammadan period, to Akbar’s conquest, professing to disregard the statements of unbelievers like “Kalhan Pandit”: Rieu i 299b (A.D. 1820).

879. Mullā M. Taufiq “Taufiq” Kāshmīrī died at the age of 89 towards the end of the twelfth century of the Hijrah. According to ʿAbd al-Muqtadīr the latest date found in the Būhār MS. of his dīwān (catalogue, no. 414) is 1188/1774.

Ahwāl i Kāshmīr, a maṭhnāwī describing the valley of Kāshmīr and the political events which led to the subjugation of the country in Akbar’s reign: Ethé ii 3035 (A.H. 1267/1851).

[Makhzan al-gharāʾīb no. 465 (?); Shamī i anjuman p. 99.]

1 In M. Aslam’s list of his authorities as quoted by Ethé (Bodleian, col. 172 ult.) the author of the Navaḍīr al-akhbār is said to be M. Amin Balkhī. H. H. Wilson (Asiatic Researches xv p. 5) and von Hügel (Kāshmīr p. 3) give his name as Rāfi‘ al-Dīn Muḥammad.
880. Khwajah M. A'zman Didaah-mari (?) 1 b. Khair al-Zaman Khân Kashmîrî Mujaddidî must have been born circ. 1101/1689–90 or 1102/1690–1. He was a pupil of Mullâ 'Abd Allâh, Murâd Bîg, Kamîl Bîg, Mîr Hâshim and others and, as a Şûfî, the disciple of M. Murâd Naqshebandî (d. 1134/1721–2 according to M. A'zman (see Rieu i 300a) or on 17 Rajab 1131/1719 according to the Khazînât al-âsfâyâ i p. 6593). He died a.h. 1185/1771–2.

Works of his entitled Faid i Murâd, on the life and sayings of his pîr, Fawwâd al-mashâyikh, on fuqr, Risâlah i ikhbat al-jabr, Tajribat al-tâlîbîn, Ashjâr al-khulûd, Thamarât al-ashjâr and Sharh i Kibrît i aîmar are mentioned by Raheem âlî.

(1) Wâqi'ât i Kashmîr (a chronogram = 1148/1735–6, the date of inception, but 1160/1747 was the date of completion), called also Târikh i A'zamî and Tawârîkh i DWMRI, a history of Kashmîr from the earliest times to 1160/1747 devoted mainly to the lives of the holy men (also poets and scholars) who flourished in each reign and divided into a mugaddimah, three qisms and a khâtûmah:

1. Rieu i 300 (18th cent.), 301a (18th cent.), 301a (A.D. 1820), iii 956b (18th cent.), 956b (19th cent.), 957a (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850), Blochet i 629 (A.H. 1205/1790), Ivanov Curzon 41 (defective. Late 18th or early 19th cent.), Ethé 513 (a.h. 1217/1802), Bodleian 319 (A.H. 1220/1805), Bânkipur vii 601 (19th cent.), Bûhâr 81 (19th cent.), Așafiyah i p. 258 no. 290, Lahore Panjab Univ. Lib. (see Oriental College Magazine, vol. ii, no. 4 (Lahore, August 1926), pp. 58–9), Rehatsek p. 82 no. 22, Salemann–Rosen p. 13 no. 607.

Edition: Târikh i Kashmîr i A'zamî, Lahore 1303/1886*.

Urdû translation: Mohammad Azeem's [sic] History of Kashmeer translated from the Persian into Urdoo by Moonshee Ashraf Alee of the Dehlie College... (Târikh i Kashmîr). [Delhi 1846*].

1 This nisbâh, apparently not mentioned by M. A'zman himself in his preface, is appended to his name by M. Aslam in his list of authorities (quoted by Ethé, Bodleian cat., col. 173a, cf. Rieu iii 956b, where, however, it is transliterated Dêdah Marû, and Rieu Suppt. p. 57a, where it is written Didaahmari). The word is spelt DWMRI (with ð) by Raheem 'Ali and DWMRI by 'Uglâm Sarwar (Khazînât al-âsfâyî in pp. 6594, 682*).

2 Târikh i A'zamî ma'rûf ba-Tawârîkh i DWMRI, as Raheem 'Ali calls it.
II. HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, ETC.

(2) *Lubb al-tawārīkh*, a brief history of Kashmir from the Deluge to A.H. 1166/1753: Ethé ii 3022 (n.d.).

[Khazinat al-æṣfiyà, p. 682; Rieu i 300, iii 1084b–1085a; Rahmán ‘Ali 180.]


*Gauhar* 2 i ‘alám tuhfat-an 3 li-l-Sháh 4 (or li-l-Sháh–‘Álam), 5 or Gauhar-nâmah i ‘alám, 6 written circ. A.H. 1190/1776–1200/1786 and dedicated to Sháh–‘Álam II (reigned A.D. 1759–86), a history of Kashmir based mainly on the Wāqí‘áti *i Kashmir* of Khwajâ M. A‘zam (possibly the author’s father), which is reproduced with few alterations, and the *Nūr-nâmah* (see above), and divided into a *mugaddimah* (geographical), six *tabaqahs* ((1) the origins, Dá‘údi Kings and Pandavas, (2) Hindu Râjâhs, (3) Sháh-Miri dynasty, (4) the Chaks, (5) the Mughals, (6) the Afghâns, Ahmad Sháh’s conquest, etc. No recorded copy seems to go further than A.H. 1150/1737 in the fifth *tabaqah* and a (non-extant) *khâtimah* (on peculiarities and marvels):

*Bodleian* 320 (late 18th cent.), *Ivanow* 189 (18th–19th cent.), I.O. 3931 (extracts copied from the preceding MS.), Rieu Suppt. 85 (19th cent.), iii 956b (extracts only. Circa A.D. 1850).

882. ‘Abd al-Qâdîr Khán, commonly called (‘urf) Ghulám-Qâdîr Khán, b. Wâsîl ‘Alî Khán Jâ‘isi has already been mentioned (pp. 622–4 supra) as the author of the *Târîkh i ‘Imâd al-Mulk*.

1 Described as a contemporary of Sultân Zain al-‘Abidin (reigned A.D. 1423–1474).
2 This is presumably an allusion to Sháh–‘Álam’s name ‘Alî-Gauhar.
3 So Ivanow 189. Cf. the title of ‘Abd al-Karîm’s history of the Panjâb (p. 673 supra).
4 So Bodleian 320, Ivanow 189, Rieu Suppt. 85.
5 So Rieu iii 956b.  6 So in the dedicatory verses.
Hashmat i Kashmir, completed at Benares in 1245/1830 and dedicated to the British Agent Hashmat al-Daulah William Augustus Brooke, a history of Kashmir based mainly on Aslam’s history (see p. 684 supra) and followed by short accounts of Tibet and Qalmāqistān, Badakhsān, and the Afghān hill tracts of Paglē, Ghōr, Ghaznmīn and Kōh i Sulaimān: Rieu Suppt. 86 (A.H. 1247/1831), iii 1016a (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850), Ivanow Curzon 42 (A.H. 1286/1869), Philadelphia Lewis Coll. p. 67.

Edition: [Calcutta.] 1832*.

883. Pandit Birbal known (ma‘rūf) as Kāchar¹ composed in 1251/1835 his


884. Of unknown authorship is the

Lubb al-tawārīkh, a history of Kashmir to A.H. 1262/1846 with a second volume on its geography, administration, revenue, produce etc.: Rieu iii 957a (A.H. 1263/1847), apparently also Browne Pers. Cat. 103, foll. 121–232 (vol. i only, defective at beginning, the first date being A.H. 995/1587).

885. At the desire of some English officials Mirzā Saif al-Din, who was “record writer in Kashmir”, compiled a short history of Kashmir from the earliest times to A.H. 1277/1860–1. In the following year he died, and some time afterwards his brother and successor Mirzā Muḥyi ‘l-Din at the request of General Courtland, then recently appointed British Agent in Kashmir, added a few subsequent events.


¹ In Ram Chandra Kak’s Ancient monuments of Kashmir this word is spelt Katsur on p. 15, and Katsar on p. 172, one of the two spellings being doubtless a misprint.

² This title is given in the Oriental College Magazine. No Persian title is mentioned in the Bodleian catalogue.
886. Diwān Kirpā-Rām belonged to a well-known family of Eminābād in the Gūjrānwālā District of the Panjāb, who "have from the commencement of Maharaja Gulab Singh's reign practically monopolized the office of Diwan or Prime Minister, and are therefore responsible for much of the good or evil repute attaching to the rule of the Dogras in Kashmir". He succeeded his father, Jwālā Sahāy, as Diwān in 1865 and held the office until his death in 1876. "He was slightly less conservative than his father, and was zealous in encouraging education, establishing hospitals, opening up thoroughfares, introducing silk and other industries, and improving the system of revenue collection. But his death at the early age of 44 prevented his undertakings from being brought to a satisfactory finish."

In addition to the two works mentioned below he wrote a pamphlet (26 pp.) entitled Madinat al-tahgīq in defence of certain Hindu practices criticised by Muslims. (Edition: Siyālkūt 1877.*.)

According to The Friend of India (a Calcutta newspaper) for 12.9.1867 (p. 1093) he at that time "presided over" a weekly paper, the Bidyā Bīlās, published by a literary society of which the Mahārājah was patron.

(1) Gulzār i Kashmir, a concise history of Kashmir with chapters on its topography, products, trades etc., written in 1864.

Edition: Lahore 1870–1.* (1870 on the cover, 1870 and 1871 in the tārīkhs at the end).

(2) Gulāb-nāmah, a life of Mahā-rājah Gulāb Sing'h, completed in 1922 Vikrami/1865.


1 This date does not occur in the edition, which retains on the title-page the date v.s. 1932 and on pp. 10–12 the chronograms (v.s. 1933, A.D. 1876) of the previous edition.
Ali’s Urdu translation, Tazkira-i-Rausa-i-Punjab [sic], there is a portrait of Kirpā-Rām facing p. 209 in vol. ii.)

887. Miscellaneous works relating to Kashmir:


(4) Epic poem (modern) describing the history of Baltī or Baltistān, a small state in the north of Kashmir: **Bodleian** 1995 (defective at both ends).

(5) A history of Kashmir beginning Ḥamād ʾī ān mubdīʾī kih ‘ālam ʾī jūd and consisting of accounts of the Hindu period and the Muhammadan period extracted respectively from Ḥaidar Malik and the Bahāristān i Shāhī, an introduction on such matters as the mythical lake which once filled the vale of Kashmir and its draining by demons at Solomon’s command, and an appendix on some remarkable localities in Kashmir: **Rieu** iii 955b (A.H. 1264/1848).

(6) **Mukhtaşar tārikh i Kashmir** (48 pp.), by Muftī ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Muḥammad: **Lahore** 1884†.

(7) **Tārikh i Kashmir**: **Lindesiana** p. 225 no. 158 (circ. A.D. 1750).

(8) **Tārikh i Kashmir (Shuja’ i Ḥaidarī)**, by M. Ḥaidar: **Āṣāfiyyah** iii p. 96 no. 1384 (A.D. 1840).

**M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (k) JAMMU**

888. Ganēsh Dās, called (*urf*) Bad’hrah, has already been mentioned (pp. 672–3 supra) as the author of histories of the Panjāb entitled Chirāgh i Panjāb and Chār bāgh i Panjāb.

Rāj-darshānā, a history of the Rājahs of Jammūn from the earliest times to A.D. 1847: **Rieu** iii 955a (circ. A.D. 1848), Ethé 507 (defective).
M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (l) HUNZA

889. M. Riḍā Bāg began in 1339/1920


M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (m) RĀJPŪTĀNAH

890. Lieut.-Colonel James Skinner, the son of Lieut.-Colonel Hercules Skinner and a Rājpūt lady, was born in 1778. From 1796 to 1803 he served in the Marāṭhā army of the Mahārājah Sindia of Gwalior, first under de Boigne and afterwards under Perron. Having resigned on the outbreak of the First Marāṭhā War, he served with distinction under Lord Lake and raised the regiment of irregulars known as Skinner’s Horse. In 1827 he was given the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel and the title of C.B. He died at Hānsī on 4 Dec. 1841 and on 17 Jan. 1842 he was buried in the church built by himself at Delhi.

In 1925 he completed at Hānsī and dedicated to Gen. Sir J. Malcolm his Tashrīḥ al-aqūām, an account of Indian tribes and castes (see Rieu i 65a).

Tadhkirat al-umarā’, completed in 1830 and dedicated to Sir J. Malcolm, historical notices of some princely families of Rājpūtānah and the Panjāb: Rieu i 302a (A.D. 1830. With portraits of the contemporary princes), 303b (A.D. 1830. Without the portraits), iii 958a (circ. A.D. 1850).

[J. Baillie Fraser Military memoir of Lieut.-Col. James Skinner, London 1851; Buckland Dictionary of Indian biography p. 392; etc.]

891. Munshī D’hōnkal Sing’h was in the service of Ranjīt Sing’h, the Jāt Rājah of Bharatpur (A.H. 1776–1806),¹ and was employed by him in his negotiations with Lord Lake.

(Wagā’ī i tasalluṭ i Śahībān i Angrēz Bahādūr dar mulk i Miyān i Dō-āb) or (Tasalluṭ i Śahībān i Angrēz) or

¹ For further information see Mill History of India vi pp. 597–612; Creighton Siege of Bhurtpore p. x.
(Waqā‘ī i D’hōṅkal Sing’h) or (Jang-nāmah i Bharatpūr), completed A.H. 1221/1806–7, a prolix and turgid history of the Marāṭhā war in Northern India and especially of Ranjīt Sing’h’s part in it from 1803 (rise of Perron and Lake’s march against him) to 1805 (fall of Bharatpūr and Lake’s treaty with Ranjīt Sing’h) : Rieu i 305a (A.H. 1234/1819), 305b (A.H. 1250/1834).

892. For Ṣafdar ‘Ālī Shāh “Munsīf’s” continuation of his Jirjīs i razm containing a metrical account of the Bharatpūr campaign of 1804–5 see the section History : India : Marāṭhās.

893. Maulawī M. Faḍl i ‘Aẓīm “‘Aẓīm” has already been mentioned (p. 646 supra) as the author of a history of the Nepalese War entitled Waqā‘ī i Kūhūstān. He accompanied William Fraser as secretary during the operations against Bharatpūr.


Apparantly different from this and beginning differently (Kunam-yād i ān dāwar i dāwarān) is the Tārikh i Bharatpūr, or Zafar-namah, “a poetical account of the siege of Bharatpūr by Lord Lake 3 . . . ascribed to Maulawi Faḍl ‘Aẓīm, and said to be founded on a prose narrative by a Brahman called Shambū, or Shambhū” : Sprenger 520 (A.S.B.), Ivanow 886 (calligraphic), Rieu iii 1054a (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850), 1056a (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850).

894. Ānand Rāy is the author of a

1 See Rieu iii 958a.

2 No formal title is given to the poem by the author, but he twice speaks of it as the afsānah i Bharatpūr (fol. 5a, l. 2 : Bi-kun naẓm afsānah i Bharatpūr * jafā-kārī i Durjan i gur-qāvārūr; fol. 5a, l. 4 : Zi-farmūdān i hātif-am ahud darār * kih bi-nawīsum afsānah i Bharatpūr).

3 This was an earlier siege (in 1805). The operations in 1825–6 were commanded by Lord Combermere.

895. Francis Gottlieb describes himself as a German born in Poland and educated in India. He is apparently identical with the Urdu and Persian poet "Farāsū" (for whom see p. 647 supra). It was for Major Abraham Lockett that he wrote his history of the Jāṭ rājahs of Bharatpūr.

History of the Jāṭ Rājahs of Bharatpūr from their origin to A.D. 1826: Rieu i 305b (19th cent.).

896. Of unknown authorship is

A history of Bharatpūr from A.D. 1805 to A.D. 1827 (accession of Balwant Sing’h) written in continuation of D’hōnkal Sing’h’s history (for which see p. 688 supra): Rieu iii 958a (19th cent.).

897. Major James Browne (for whom see p. 665 supra) obtained from Jaipur in 1198/1783–4 a Hindi history of the Kaṅhīwāhah Rājahs. This was translated into Persian by the Major’s munshī Jān i ‘Ālam Shīrīn-raqam, who completed his task at Āgra in Shawwal 1198/Aug.–Sept. 1784.

Bansāvalī 1 i buzūrgān i Mahārājah D’hīrāj 2 Sawāʾī Pratāp Sing’h Bahādur, a history of the Kaṅhīwāhah Rājahs of D’hūnd’hār (afterwards of Jaipur) from their origin to 1198/1783–4: Rieu i 301a (A.H. 1198/1784).

898. Basāwān La’l “Shādān.” b. Nansuk’h Rāy Kayat’h Saksēnah, of Bilgrām, was for twelve years Nā’ib Munshī to a certain Rāy Dātā Rām. It was in 1240/1824–5 that he wrote his Amīr-nāmah at the request of Amīr al-Daulah M. Amīr Khān, a leader of banditti who in 1817 was recognised by the British as first Nawwāb of Tūnk and who died in 1834, and his son, Wazīr al-Daulah M. Wazīr Khān.

1 This, the Hindi form of the Sanskrit vamsāvalī, means “genealogy”.
2 Sanskrit Mahārāj adhīrāj.

English translation by H. T. Prinsep: Memoirs of the Puthan soldier of fortune, the Nuwab Ameer-ood-Doulah Mohummad Ameer Khan, Chief of Seronj, Tonk, Rampoor, Neemahera, and other places in Hindooostan. Calcutta 1832⁰⁹.


[For Amīr Khān see H. T. Prinsep History of the political and military transactions in India during the administration of the Marquess of Hastings, London, 1825; Buckland Dictionary of Indian biography p. 12; Ency. Isl. i 330.]

899. Other works:

(1) Account of the Rājahs of Alwar to the then reigning Bēnī Sing’h (d. 1857): Rieu iii 1012b (19th cent.).

(2) Aḥwāl i rājahā i Jaipūr : Browne Suppt. 17 (King’s).

(3) History of the Rājahs of Anbēr and Jaipūr from their origin to the time of composition (circ. A.H. 1260/1844): Rieu iii 1029b (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850).


M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (n) SARD’HĀNAH

900. Lālah Gōkul Chand was private secretary to Zēb al-Nisā’ Bēgam, better known as Bēgam Samrū,¹ who succeeded her husband, the adventurer Walter Reinhardt, as jāgīrdār of

¹ For her life see Brajendranath Banerji Begam Samru (Calcutta 1925), which contains a good bibliography, Severin Noti Das Fürstentum Sardhāna (Freiburg i. Br. 1906), H. G. Keene in the Calcutta Review for 1880, etc.
Sard‘hānah 1 in 1778, became prominent in the events of Shāh-‘Ālam’s reign and died in 1836. A prose history of Zēb al-Nisā’ by Munshī Jai-Sing’h Rāy having been lost, Gōkul Chand was asked to write one in verse.

Zēb al-tawārīkh, a metrical life of Bēgam Samrū, composed in 1822: Rieu ii 724a (A.D. 1822).

It is not clear whether Lindesiana p. 224 no. 779 (Tūrīkh i Bēgam Samrū. A.D. 1841) is a copy of this or of a different work.

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (o) LAND’HAURAH

901. Account of the rule of Rājah Rām-Dayāl Sing’h of Land’haurah, Sahāranpūr District: Rieu iii 1012a (19th cent.).

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (p) PARĪCHHATGARH

902. History of the Rājahs of Parīchhatgarh in the Meerut District: Rieu iii 1012a (foll. 53–56. 19th cent.).

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (q) KŌL Etc.

903. Sundar Lāl son of Naubat Lāl, a Kāyat’h (i.e. Kāyast’ha) of the Māṭ’hur caste, was a munshī in the Khāliṣah Office and lived at Kōl.

Majmū’ah i faid u Gul i bi-khasān, 2 a history of Kōl, Mat’hurā and Brindāban written a.h. 1241/1825–6: Rieu iii 959a (extracts only (26 foll.). Circ. a.d. 1850).

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (r) ĀGRAH

For various works describing the Tāj Mahall and other buildings at Āghrah, often with more or less historical information, see the sub-section Topography.

904. Mānik Chand was one of the students of the Government College, Āghrah, who responded to the request of James Stephen

---

1 Sardhānah is 12 miles N.W. of Meerut.
2 Gul i bi-khasān is the title given to the work in the table of contents at the end of the B.M. MS.
Lushington, Acting Collector at Ágrah 1825–6, for a historical account of Ágrah and its buildings.

**Ahwāl i shahr i Akbarābād**, a history of Ágrah and an account of its buildings: *Rieu* iii 958b (19th cent.), iii 1044a (circ. A.D. 1844).

905. Another of the Ágrah students who responded to J. S. Lushington's invitation was Lālah Sīl Chand.


An abridgment (?) : *Hūlīt i Akbarābād* by Sīl Chand: *Rieu* iii 1031a (“almost complete”, but only filling foll. 21–58 of the MS.).

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (s) FARRUKHĀBĀD

906. Nawal Rāy, son of Hīrā La‘l, Ilāhābādī was in the service of Ahmad Khān Bangash, Nāwāb of Farrukhābād, when in 1170/1756–7 he wrote his *Tawārīkh i Ahmad-Khānī*.

**Tawārīkh i Ahmad-Khānī** in two bāb, of which the first is a metrical account of Ahmad Khān Bangash to his installation on the *masnad* in 1164/1751 and the second a metrical translation of tales collected from Hindi sources by a certain Gaurī Datt: *Rieu* iii 1003a (slightly defective at end. 18th cent.), 1054a (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850).

907. Mīr Ḥusām al-Dīn Guwāliyārī, surnamed (mulāqqab) Muṭlaq ‘Alī Shāh, left Gwalior, his home, and entered the service of the Nāwāb of Farrukhābād.

**Muḥammad-Khānī**, a history of the Bangash Nāwāb of Farrukhābād from the time of the founder, Muḥammad Khān Bangash, who died in 1156/1743 and after whom the work is evidently named, to the reign of Ahmad Khān, who died in

---

1 The author calls himself faqīr i sarāqāt-taṣqīr mulāqqab Muṭlaq ‘Alī Shāh ‘urf Mīr Ḥusām al-Dīn Guwāliyārī.
1185/1771 and who was evidently dead when this history was written, though the I.O. MS. contains no account of his death and apparently no date later than 1171/1757–8: I.O. 3896 (perhaps defective at end. Transcribed probably in 1878).

908. S. M. Wali Allāh b. Aḥmad ‘Alī Farrukhābādī (d. 1249/1833–4) has already been mentioned (p. 25 supra) as the author of a commentary on the Qur'ān entitled Naẓm al-jawāḥir wa-naqd al-farā'īd.


M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (t) THE ROHILLAS (RŌHĒLAHS)

909. Ghulām Muḥyī ‘l-Dīn (see Ivanow 870), or simply Muḥyī ‘l-Dīn, “Dhaudi” b. Abī ʿl-Ḥasan (Saiyid ‘Abd al-Laṭīf, see Ivanow l.c.) was the author of Madāʾīl al-maṣḥāyīkha, a collection of qaṣīḍahs in praise of Qādirī saints (see Ivanow 871).

Najīb-nāmah, a metrical (matḥnawī) history of Najīb al-Daulah, composed, when the author was 35 years old, probably in 1185/1771–2: Ivanow 870 (A.H. 1185/1771–2), Ethé 1715 (A.H. 1213/1798).

910. Nothing seems to be known about Saiyid Nūr al-Dīn Ḥusain Khān Bahādur Fakhrī, who, according to a note on a fly-leaf of the British Museum MS., is the author of

A detailed history of Najīb al-Daulah,1 a Rohillah chief who was made Amīr al-umarāʾ by Aḥmad Shāh Durrānī, fought against the Marāṯ’hās and Jāts and was virtual ruler of Delhi until his death in 1184/1770: Rieu i 306a (end of 18th cent.).

1 For an Urdu history, by Durgāprasād, son of Munnā Laʾl, see Blumhardt’s India Office Catalogue of Hindustani MSS. no. 50.


911. A dependant of Dâbiâtâ Khân, who does not mention his name in the text but who in the colophon is called Munshi Lachhmi Narayan, wrote

*A turgid account of the capture of Etawah* by Sharaf al-Daulah Dâbiâtâ Khân on 29 Ramadân 1187/1773: *Rieu* iii 960â (a.h. 1268/1852).

912. Munshi Shiv-Parshâd was in the service of Nawwâb Fâid-Allâh Khân, the Rohilla chief of Râmpûr, who sent him as his *wakil* to Bilgrâm to negotiate with the British colonel there. At the request of Mr. Kirkpatrick, whom he met at Bilgrâm, he wrote his

*Târikh i fâid-bakhsh*, completed a.h. 1190/1776 and dedicated to Fâid-Allâh Khân, a history of the Rohilla Afghans of Kâţhâr to their defeat by Shujâ‘ al-Daulah and the E.I.Co. at Lâl Dâng in 1188/1774: *Rieu* i 306â (late 18th cent.), 307â (with some omissions and additions. Late 18th cent.), 307â (lacks the preface. a.d. 1802), iii 959â (with additions. 19th cent.), 1051â (extracts only. Circ. a.d. 1850), *Bodleian* 1972 (lacks preface), *Edinburgh* 236, *Athê* 584, 585 (lacks the preface), 586 (lacks the preface. Extends to 1185/1771), *I.O.* 3942 (early 19th cent.), 3882 (a.d. 1893).

Free translation (with additions by the translator): *An historical relation of the origin, progress, and final dissolution of the government of the Rohilla Afghans in the Northern provinces of*
Hindostan. Compiled from a Persian Manuscript and other original papers. By Captain Charles Hamilton. [London,] 1787**.

Description: Elliot and Dowson History of India viii 175–9.

Criticism: Sir J. Strachey Hastings and the Rohilla War, p. xvi.

913. Nawwāb M. Mustajāb Khān was one of the fourteen sons of the famous Rohullah chieftain Ḥāfīz Raḥmat Khān, who died in 1188/1774 and is buried at Barāli (see pp. 396–7 supra, Buckland Dictionary of Indian Biography 184, Ency. Isl. ii 214–5, and the various histories of India). According to Beale’s Oriental Biographical Dictionary Mustajāb Khān died on 2 Shawwāl 1248/[22] February 1833.


Much abridged translation: The life of Hafiz ool-moolk; Hafiz Rehmat Khan, written by his son, the Nawab Moost'ujab Khan Buhaodoor, and entitled Goolistan-i-Rehmut. Abridged and translated... by C. Elliott. London 1831** (Oriental Translation Fund).

Description: Elliot and Dowson History of India viii 301–12.

---

1 Capt. Hamilton refrained from calling this work a translation, though “in great measure it was literally so”, because “in some parts of it (those, in particular, which treat of such proceedings of the English government as were any way connected with it) he has necessarily had recourse to other sources of information”. Capt. Hamilton calls the author “A Rohilla, a confidential servant of one of their chiefs”, but this was no doubt merely a surmise on the part of the translator, who presumably had before him a manuscript lacking the preface in which the author mentions his name. An English note on the fly-leaf of Ethē 585 identifies the work with Capt. Hamilton’s original.

2 b. circ. 1753, entered military service of E.I.Co. in 1776, translated the Hidayah (The Hedayat, or Guide; a commentary on the Mussulman laws, London 1791, 2nd ed. 1870), died 14 March 1792.
Criticism: Sir J. Strachey _Hastings and the Rohilla War_ p. xvii ("They [i.e. the Gulistān i Rahmat and the Gul i Rahmat] have little historical value. The object of their authors was to eulogize Hafiz Rahmat; everything that seemed to throw discredit on him is suppressed, and in the narrative of the events which led to the Rohilla war the facts are often completely misrepresented. For instance, no reference, except one that is altogether misleading, is made to the treaty entered into in 1772 between the Rohillas and the Vizier, which was attested by the English Commander-in-Chief, and the non-fulfilment of which led to the ruin of the Rohilla Government").

(2) _Damimah i Gulistān i Rahmat_, an account of Faid Allāh Khān, the ruler of Rāmpūr, and of the hostilities between his sons after his death, written in 1233/1817–18 at the suggestion of Charles Elliott as a supplement to the _Gulistān i Rahmat_: I.O. 3891 foll. 291–311 (A.D. 1878).

Much abridged translation: _The life of Hafiz ool-moolk, Hafiz Rehmut Khan, ... Abridged and translated ... by C. Elliott_ (see above), pp. 130–41.

914. Nawwāb M. Sa‘ādat-Yār Khān b. Ḥāfiz Muḥammad-Yār Khān, of Barēli, was a grandson of Ḥāfiz Rahmat Khān and a nephew of Mustajāb Khān. He is the author of a treatise on the alleged Jewish origin of the Afghāns (Browne Suppt. 1462, Palmer’s Trinity Coll. Cat. p. 157).

_Gul i Rahmat_, written in 1249/1833–4, an enlarged version of the _Gulistān i Rahmat_: Bānkipūr vii 603 (19th cent.), Rieu iii 1051b (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1851), I.O. 3968 (19th cent.).


Criticism: see p. 697, l. 1 supra.

915. _Ghulām-Jilāni “Rif’at” Rāmpūri_ died in 1235/1819.¹

¹ This date is given by Nadīr Ahmād, who mentions the _Intihāb i Yādgār_ of Amīr Minā’ī (d. 1318/1900) as an authority for _Ghulām-Jilāni’s_ life.
There is a copy of his diwan in the Rampur State Library (see Nadhir Ahmad 137).

(1) Durr i manzum, a metrical history of Nawab Faid-Allah Khan and his children: Aṣafiyah i p. 240 no. 268, Rieu iii 10356 (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850).


[Amir Minâ'i Intikhâb i Yâdgâr, Nadhir Ahmad 137.]

916. The year 1249/1833-4 is referred to as "the present year" at the end of a History of the Rohilla chiefs of Muradabad, afterwards of Rampur, to 1219/1804-5 (beg.: Ba'd i hamd u thanây i Khudây), probably by the same author as the Sketch of Indian History mentioned on p. 474 supra, which gives special attention to the Rohillas: Rieu iii 1007b (19th cent.), I.O. 3738 (19th cent.).

917. Three years after the death of Ahmad 'Ali Khan, i.e. in 1258/1842, was written A short account of the Rohilla chiefs of Rampur to the death of Ahmad 'Ali Khan in 1839: Rieu iii 1012a iv (19th cent.).

918. Other works:

(1) Nuqûl u khusut dar 'amal i jang i Rōhelah: Berlin 529-30.

(2) Nuzhat al-damâ'ir, a history of the Afghan power in India, by Ahmad 'Ali, a resident of Muradabad: Browne Pers. Cat. 80.

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (u) JAUNPûR

919. Maulawi Khair al-Din Muhammad Ilâhâbâdi died about 1827 (see pp. 520-2 supra).

Jaunpûr-namah or Târîkh i Jaunpûr in two bâbs, viz. (i) history of Jaunpûr to 'Ali-Quli Khan's defeat by Akbar in 974/
1566–7,¹ (ii) account of the foundation of its ancient buildings: Bodleian 283 (A.D. 1813), Ivanow 202 (A.H. 1253/1837), Rieu i 311a (A.H. 1282/1866), iii 964a (A.D. 1843), 1055a (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850), Browne Suppt. 231.

Editions: Jaunpūr 1878*, 1899°.


The article on Jaunpūr in the Calcutta Review, vol. 41, pp. 114–58 is largely based on this work.

920. Ghulām-Hasan Zaidī Wāsiṭī was munshī to Charles Chisholme, Registrar of Jaunpūr, at whose request he wrote his historical account of Jaunpūr. His account of Calcutta will be mentioned further on.

A short historical account of Jaunpūr in two fasls (viz. (i) foundation and Sharqī dynasty, (ii) chief buildings) and a tatimmaḥ (on six scholars of Jaunpūr, the last being Raushān ʻAlī Jaunpūrī,² the author’s master, then on the staff of the College of Fort William): Rieu i 311b (autograph? Circ. A.D. 1805), Browne Pers. Cat. 108 i.

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (w) BENARES

921. Ghulām-Ḥusain Khān b. M. Himmat Khān (see p. 642 supra) was in the service of Rājah Balwand Sing’h and his son Rājah Chait Sing’h.

A history of the Zamīndārs of Benares from the time of Rājah Mansā Rām to the deposition of Rājah Chait Sing’h in 1195/1781, edited and published by the author’s grandson, Subhān ʻAlī b. Ḥasan ʻAlī Khān, with a dedication to Rājah Isāri Parshād Nārāyān (acc. 1835): Bāṅkīpur vii 608.

¹ The Akbar-nāmah places this event in 972/1565.
² Raushān ʻAlī translated Bahā’ al-Dīn al-ʻAmīlī’s Khulāṣat al-hisāb into Persian and wrote some grammatical works (Qawā'id i fārisī etc.).
922. Nawwāb Amīn al-Daulah ‘Azīz al-Mulk ‘Ali Ibrāhīm Khān "Khalīl" ¹ Naṣīr-Jang ² belonged to Paṭnāh. He is described in the Siyar al-muta’akhkhīrīn (Calcutta ed. ii p. 173⁹) as the grandson (nawāh) ³ of Maulawi M. Naṣīr and the son of a sister (hamshīrah-zādah) of Zā’īr Ḥusain Khān [who is himself described on the same page as the son (khalāf) of Maulawi M. Naṣīr]. His father’s name is not mentioned in the Siyar al-muta’akhkhīrīn nor apparently in the prefaces to ‘Ali Ibrāhīm Khān’s own works.

He was a close friend and trusted adviser of Mīr Qāsim Khān, who on becoming Nawwāb-Nāṣīm of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa in 1760 appointed him to examine the military accounts, and subsequently employed him to execute various important commissions. When Mīr Qāsim Khān after his defeats in 1763 sought refuge with Shujā‘ al-Daulah, the Nawwāb-Wāzīr of Oudh, ‘Ali Ibrāhīm Khān accompanied him but did not go with him on his further flight to Rohilkhand.

On M. Riḍā Khān’s ⁴ recommendation he was appointed Dīwān by Mubārak al-Daulah, who became Nāṣīm of Bengal in 1183/1770. M. Riḍā Khān dismissed him in 1191/1777, and he lived in seclusion for a time. It was apparently in 1781 ⁵

¹ According to Sprenger “Yūsof ʿalyy and Shōrīsh mention him under Khalyl and ʿishqy under Ḥāl”. The second takhllus mentioned by Sprenger is presumably a corruption of the former.

² Sprenger writes Nāṣīr-Jang, but Abd al-Muqtadir (Bānkīpūr viii p. 137) Naṣīr Jang.

³ According to Sprenger “his mother’s grandfather was the learned Mollā Mohammad Naṣyr”. If the facts given in the Siyar al-muta’akhkhīrīn are correct, “mother’s grandfather” should be emended to “maternal grandfather”.

⁴ Cf. V. A. Smith Oxford history of India, p. 503: “Clive insisted on keeping up the fiction of the ‘double government’ and conducting the administration in the name of the Nawāb, whose authority was vested in two Nāibs or Deputies, Muhammad Razā Khān for Bengal, and a Hindu, Mahārājā Shīṭāb Rāī, for Bihār.”

⁵ See the Benares Gazetteer (1909) p. 204: “On the 28th of September Hastings returned to Benares and there formally installed as successor to Chet Singh the young Raja Mahip Narayan Singh, the son of Balwant Singh’s daughter. At the same time the revenue of the province was raised to forty lakhs, while an independent magistrate was appointed for the city of Benares, the first to hold this post being Ali Ibrahim Khan.”
that he was appointed Chief Magistrate at Benares, and it was there that he died in 1208/1793–4.

His friend and fellow-‘Azīmābādī, Ghulām-Husain Khān Ṭabāṭabā’i, often mentions him in the Siyar al-muta‘akkhīrin.

In addition to the account of Chait Sing’h’s rebellion he wrote a history of the Marāṭ’hā wars (completed at Benares in 1201/1786–7. See p. 761 infra) and three tadḥkirahs, the Gulzār i Ibrāhīm (Urdu poets, completed in 1198/1784. See Rieu i 375b, iii 1069a, Bānkīpūr viii 707, Bodleian 389), the Khulāṣat al-kalām (writers of mathnawīs, completed in the same year. See Lindesiana p. 177, Bodleian 390, Bānkīpūr viii 704–5, 706) and the Suhuf i Ibrāhīm (about 3,278 ancient and modern poets, completed at Benares in 1205/1790. See Berlin 663, Bānkīpūr viii 708).

(1) Gulzār i Ibrāhīm (?), an account of the rebellion of Rājah Chait Sing’h of Benares in 1195/1781: Rieu iii 1033b (cire. A.D. 1850).

(2) “a declaration by ‘Ali Ibrāhīm Khān, respecting the manner in which he had acquitted himself as governor of Benares, his maintenance of public order, his suppression of various abuses, and his impartial administration of justice,” accompanied by numerous testimonials with signatures and seals, A.H. 1198/1784 being the latest date on a seal affixed: Rieu Suppt. 405 (a paper roll undated).

[A few autobiographical statements in the prefaces to his works; Siyar al-muta‘akkhīrin, Calcutta ed. ii p. 172 et passim; A translation of the Sīr mutaqherin [by Nota manus = Ḥājjī Muṣṭafā = Raymond] reprint, Calcutta 1926, vol. iii pp. 83 n., et passim (see the index under Aali-Hibrahim-Qhan); Tadhkirah i Yūsuf ‘Alī Khān (of. Sprenger p. 194); Tadhkirah i Shōrīsh; Tadhkirah i ‘Īshqā; Sprenger pp. 180, 194; Beale Oriental

1 According to Buckland he was “‘Daroga’ [sic] of the Court at Benares, that is, President of the tribunal there”.

2 This title occurs in the subscription. Its correctness is doubtful, since it is the title of a tadḥkirah of Urdu poets completed by ‘Ali Ibrāhīm Khān in 1198/1784.
biographical dictionary p. 57; Buckland Dictionary of Indian biography p. 10.]

923. Maulawi Khair al-Din Muḥammad Ilāhābādī died about 1827 (see pp. 520–2 supra). His Tuhfah i tāzah was written at the request of Abraham Welland, Judge at Jaumpūr.

Tuhfah i tāzah, or (Balwand-nāmaḥ), a history of the Zamīndārs of Benares from the time of Rājah Mansā Rām to the deposition of Rājah Chait Sing’h in 1195/1781 (chapters iv and v which the author intended to devote to Mahīpat Narāyan and Īdīt Narāyan Sing’h having apparently never been written): Ivanow 204 (A.H. 1253/1837), Rieu iii 964b (circ. A.D. 1850), 965a (A.D. 1844), Bāṅkiṅpūr vii 607 (19th cent.), Ethē 473, 2842 (fragment of Bāb iii), I.O. 3894 (A.D. 1892), 3911 (A.D. 1879).

English translation: The Bulwuntnamah translated from the Tuhfa-i-Taza of Fakir Khair-ud-din-Khan, by R. Curwen, Allahabad 1875 (see Heffer’s Catalogue no. 94 (1912), item 1090).

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (x) GHĀZĪPŪR

924. Of unknown authorship is

(Tārikh i Ghāzīpūr), a short history of Ghāzīpūr devoted mainly to biographies of some celebrities buried there or connected therewith: I.O. 4084 (A.D. 1878 or 1879?).

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (y) GŪRAK’HPŪR

925. Of unknown authorship is

Tārikh i Muʿazzamābād maʿrūf bah Gōraḵhpūr, a short (28 pp.) history of Gorakhpur from the beginning of the 11th century to 1797: Edition: [Lucknow,] 1872°.

926. Muftī Ghulām-Ḥaḍrat was at one time Muftī and Ṣadr Amin at Gōraḵhpūr.¹

¹ Possibly identical with Muftī Ghulām-Ḥaḍrat Lak’hnawī, Muftī iʿadālat i baldah i Lak’hnāʿī, who died in 1234/1818–19 (see Rahmān ‘Alī 154).
Kawā'if i dil' i Gōrak'hpur, a short history of Gōrak'hpur to the time of its cession to the East India Company by the Nawwāb-Wazīr of Oudh: I.O. 4540 (probably transcribed in 1810, the date on the title-page of the English translation), 'Alīgarh Subh. MSS. p. 58 no. 954/12 (Tārīkh i Gōrak'hpur).

MS. English translation: History of Goruckpoor, I.O. 4540 (bound up with the Persian text).

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (z) A'ZAMGARH

927. Gird'ūrī, a clerk (muḥarrir) in the office of the Qānūn-gāyān, wrote in 1216/1801

Intīzām i rāj i A'zamgarh, a history of the Rājahs of A'zamgarh from the time of Abhiman and Sāgar (in the time of Akbar and Jahāngīr) to the end of the rāj on the death of the Rājah M. A'zam Khān in 1771: Edinburgh 237 (A.H. 1289/1872).

928. S. Amir 'Ali Rīḍawi was alive in 1289/1872.

Sargudhasht i rājāhā i A'zamgarh, a history of A'zamgarh from the time of Abhiman Sing'h to the transfer of the district to the British in 1801 by Sa'ādat-'Ali Khān of Oudh: Edinburgh 238 (A.H. 1289/1872, autograph).


929. Of unknown authorship is

(Tārīkh i A'zamgadh), a history of A'zamgarh from the time of Abhiman Rāy to 1887 (beginning: Ḥamd i gūnāgūn Parwardgārī rā sazād): I.O. 4038 (probably A.D. 1907).

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (aa) OUDH (AWAD'H ¹)

930. A friend of Burhān al-Mulk Sa'ādat Khān, Governor of Oudh, wrote

An account of Burhān al-Mulk's part in the military operations against Nādir Shāh.

¹ Not Awadh, as in the Encyclopædia of Islam and elsewhere. To turn the time-honoured English corruption Oudh into Oudh is still more absurd.
English translation [from a MS. in the possession of the translator]: Memoirs of Delhi and Faizabad, being a translation of the "Tariikh Farahbaksh" of Muhammad Faiz Baikhsh... by W. Hoey, vol. i, appendix (14 pp.).

931. Maulawi Khair al-Din Muhammad Ilahabadi died about 1827 (see pp. 520–2 supra).


932. Munshi Inām ‘Ali b. M. Khwurram Shāh Munshi was for ten years in the service of Ṣafdar-Jang (1739–1756) and for twelve years in that of Shujâʿ al-Daulah (1756–1775). He then retired to Bijnaur, his native place.

Aṣaf al-Āṣaf, in five muskhahs ((i) historical, (ii) letters, (iii) anecdotes, (iv) ghazals and qīṭāhs, (v) Rēkhtah poems), the first being divided into five rūkns ((i) Saʿādat Khān, (ii) Ṣafdar-Jang, (iii) Shujâʿ al-Daulah, (iv) Aṣaf al-Daulah (d. 1212/1797) to 1198/1783, (v) Wazīr ‘Ali Khān, who succeeded in 1212/1797 but was deposed after a few months, this last rūkn being an addition to the original draft, which was written in 1199/1784–5): Rieu iii 960b (Muskhah i only; copied from an autograph. Circ. 1850).

933. It was presumably in the time of Aṣaf al-Daulah that "Mauzūn" wrote his

Aṣaf-nāmah, a mathnawi on the campaign of Aṣaf al-Daulah against Ghulām-Muḥammad Khān, of Rāmpūr: Būhār 421 (19th cent.), possibly also I.O. 4056.

934. Abū Tālib ʿIṣfahānī (for whom see p. 144–6 supra) was born at Lucknow in 1166/1752–3. He held various appointments under the Government of Oudh and the E.I.Co.’s agents there, and died at Lucknow in 1220/1805–6. It was in 1211/1796–7 at Calcutta that Captain Richardson asked him to write
a history of the time of Āṣaf al-Daulah (1775–97). He accordingly wrote his

*Tafṣīḥ al-ghāfīlīn,* of which no MSS. seem to be mentioned in library catalogues.

English translation [from a MS. in the translator’s possession]:

*History of Āṣafu’id Daulah, . . . being a translation of ‘Tafzīhul ghaflīn,’ . . . compiled by Abu Tālib . . . and translated . . . by W. Hoey, Allahabad 1885*.

935. Āghā M. ‘Ali Bihbahanī wrote

*Tārikh i Wazīr ‘Alī,* presumably a history of Wazīr Āli Khān, who became Nawwāb of Oudh on Āṣaf al-Daulah’s death in September 1797 but was deposed by Sir John Shore in January 1798: no MSS. recorded.


936. An anonymous author completed on 6 Dhū ‘l-Hijjah 1215/1800 his

*Igbāl-nāmah,* a metrical account of the accession of Wazīr Āli Khān and his dethronement by Sir John Shore: *Būhār* 423 (A.H. 1316/1898–9).

937. For the *Ma’dīn al-sa’ādat* of S. Sulṭān ‘Alī Ḥusainī Šafawī Ardabīlī, a history of the Indian Timūrids and of the Nawwābs of Oudh dedicated to Sa’ādat ‘Alī Khān and brought down to his seventh year, A.H. 1218/1803–4, see p. 520 *supra.*

938. S. Ghulām-‘Alī Khān Naqawī b. S. M. Akmal Kān, born at Rai Bareilly, was taken in his eighth year to Delhi, where his father was physician to Shāh-‘Ālam and tutor to Prince M. Akbar. In 1202/1788, when Delhi fell into the power of the Rohillah Ghulām-Qādir Khān, Ghulām-‘Alī, who was still a student, and his father fled to Lucknow and the Deccan respectively. In 1213/1798–9 he joined his father in the Deccan and wandered about South India with him for seven years. After his father’s death he returned to Oudh, and in 1222/1807
he entered the service of Colonel John Baillie (‘Imād al-Daulah Afḍal al-Mulk J. B. Bahādur Arslān-Jang), the British Resident at Lucknow. In the printer’s colophon to the 1864 edition of the ‘Imād al-sa‘ādat he is described as John Baillie’s Mīr Munshī.

For his Nigār-nāmah i Hind, an account of the Battle of Pānīpat (1174/1761) written after the ‘Imād al-sa‘ādat and likewise for John Baillie, see p. 399 supra.


Editions: [Lucknow,] 1864°, 1897°.

Description: Elliot and Dowson History of India viii pp. 394–5.

[‘Imād al-sa‘ādat, preface ; Rieu i 308a ; Bānkīpur vii 604.]

939. M. Faiḍ-Bakhsh b. Ghulām-Sarwar left his birthplace Kākōrī in Safar 1183/1769, when still a boy, for Faiḍābād (Fyzabad), the seat of Shujā‘ al-Daulah’s government. Some years later he became Taḥwīldār of the Treasury under the eunuch Jawāhir ‘Alī Kān, the Nāẓir (d. 1214/1799), and held the same appointment under his successor Dārāb ‘Alī Kān.

(1) Farah-bakhsh (called in some copies Bahr al-ifādat), a history of Fyzabad from 1179/1765–6 to 1233/1817–18, the date of composition, preceded by an account of the Indian Timūrids to the downfall of the Saiyids: Rieu i 309b (A.H. 1247/1832), 310b (1st pt. (i.e. the Timūrids) only. A.D. 1865), iii 1026a (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850).


(2) *Autobiography* with numerous biographical notes on his relations, friends etc., who belonged to different zamīndār families of Lucknow, Faidābād etc., with many references to contemporary political events, written, at least partly, in 1230/1815: Ivanow Curzon 87 (rather bad condition).

940. Qādī M. Șādiq Khān "Akhtar" Hūglawi, one of the qādī-zādagan of Hūgli, near Calcutta, lived at Lucknow in the time of Ghāzī al-Dīn Haidar and received the title of Malik al-shu‘arā'. According to the *Sham‘ i anjuman* he died at Lucknow after the Mutiny. According to the *Riyād al-afkār* (as summarised by ‘Abd al-Muqtadir) "he lived for some time at Lucknow and the Deccan". Of his works Sprenger mentions (1) Sarāpā sūz, an Urdu mathnawi composed in 1231/1816 and lithographed at Lucknow, (2) Șubh i şādıq, an autobiography in ornate Persian, (3) Mahāmīd i Haidarī, (4) a tadhkīrah of Persian poets, 1 "which is said to be very valuable," and (5) an inshā' entitled *Haft akhtār*. Sprenger says that the first three had been printed but not the last two. The *Sham‘ i anjuman* mentions (1) Șubh i şādıq, (2) Nūr al-inshā', (3) Mahāmīd i Haidarīyah, (4) Nughūd al-hikam, and (5) diwān i fārisī u Urdu-yi rekhah. In the *Riyād al-afkār* only no. (3) and another work Hadīqat al-irshād (on inshā') 2 are mentioned. For his *Makhzan al-jawāhir* see p. 151 supra. The *Mahāmīd i Haidarīyah* (Edition : Lucknow 1238/1823*), a panegyric in prose and verse (by M. Șādiq himself, not by various authors) on Ghāzī al-Dīn Haidar, contains nothing of historical interest.

*Guldastah i mahabbat*, an account, in prose and verse, of the meeting of Lord Hastings and Ghāzī al-Dīn Haidar.

1 *Aftāb i ‘alam-tāb* (see Oriental College Magazine iii no. 2 (Feb. 1927) p. 54).
2 For a MS. see Bānkīpur ix no. 887.

[Riyāḍ al-asḵār (see Bānkīpūr Suppt. i p. 49); Sprenger p. 599; Shamʿi anjuman pp. 63–4; Bānkīpūr ix p. 123.]

941. It was at the request of Lieut. John Doeswell Shakespeare, Second Assistant to Colonel [afterwards Sir] John Low, Resident at Lucknow 1831–42, that ‘Abd al-ʿAḥad b. Maulawi M. Fāʿiq, who had been twelve years in the E.I.Co.’s service, composed in 1253/1837–8 his

Waqāʿiʿ i dil-padhār, a history of Pādshāh Bēgam, wife of Ghāzī al-Dīn Ḥaḍrār (Shāh-Zamān, who reigned a.h. 1229/1814–1244/1827), to the year 1253/1837–8, when she tried to place upon the throne Munnā Jān, a pretended son of her husband’s successor: Rieu iii 961b (a.h. 1266/1849), Ivanow Curzon 46 (a.h. 1279/1862), Āṣafīyah iii p. 112 no. 1273.

942. It was for Ghāzī al-Dīn Ḥaḍrār (1814–27) that M. Šāliḥ wrote his

Bahr al-saʿādat, a history of Oudh described by Sprenger as a revised edition of the ‘Imād al-saʿādat: Rieu iii 1053b (extracts only. Circ. a.d. 1850).

943. To the reign of Ghāzī al-Dīn Ḥaḍrār (1814–27) presumably belongs


944. M. Muḥtāsham Khān was the son of Nawwāb Maḥabbat Khān “Maḥabbat”, who wrote works in Persian, Urdu and Pushtu (see Blumhardt Cat. of Hindustani MSS. no. 161, Garca in de Tassy ii 349, Ethé 2452, etc.), and the grandson of the celebrated Rohillah chieftain, Ḥāfiz Rahmat Khān (for whom see pp. 396–7 supra).

Tāriḵ i Muḥtāsham, a history of the Oudh dynasty to the
death of Naṣīr al-Dīn Ḥaidar in 1253/1837, the date of composition: Bānkīpur vii 605 (a.h. 1217/1802–3)!! In this copy the account of Naṣīr al-Dīn Ḥaidar’s predecessors occupies more than half of the work and fills 173 leaves or thereabouts, I.O. 4090 (contains the reign of Naṣīr al-Dīn Ḥaidar and little more, the account of his predecessors being reduced to a sketch of about 17 leaves. A.D. 1839).

945. Apparently of unknown authorship is the Tārikh i Shāhīyah i Nishāpūrīyah, a history of Oudh from the time of Saʿādat Khān [not Saʿādat-ʿAlī Khān] to 1254/1838 in the reign of M. ʿAlī Shāh: Rāmpūr (see Nadhīr Ahmad 60).

946. Fakhr al-Daulah Davār al-Mulk Rājāh Ratan Singh “Zakhmī” b. Rāy Bālāk Rām, a Saksēnah Kāyast’h, whose grandfather was Dīvān and Aṭāhīq to Aṣaf al-Daulah and afterwards Nāzīm of Bārēlī, was born at Lucknow A.H. 1197/1782–3, went to Calcutta in 1218/1803–4 and served the E.I.Co. for some years. In 1230/1814–15 he returned to Lucknow and eventually became Minister of Finance. He died in 1851. He wrote a tadhkīrāh entitled Anīs al-ʿāshiqūn, a philosophical treatise called Jām i gīh-nūmā (see Rieu iii 1096) and a dīwān (lith. Lucknow 1253/1837–8. See Sprenger 570).

Sultān al-tawārīkh, a detailed history of the Oudh dynasty to the death of M. ʿAlī Shāh in 1258/1842: Rieu iii 962 (a.h. 1265/1849), I.O. 3961 (a.d. 1878).

The preface contains a statement that the work is divided into two tabāqahs. If the subscription of the Bānkīpur copy is correct, the first tabāqah ends with the death of Naṣīr al-Dīn Ḥaidar, that is to say, with the conclusion of the work as preserved in the only two copies at present recorded in published catalogues. The I.O. MS. seems to contain no indication of the beginning or end of any tabāqah. It is not clear what the second tabāqah could contain (unless perhaps an autobiography), if, as stated in the preface, the work was completed in 1253, and if, as implied by the Bānkīpur subscription, the first tabāqah ended with an event of that year.

The kings of Oudh were of Nishāpūrī descent.

The British Museum manuscript of the Sultān al-tawārīkh was presented to Sir H. M. Elliot by the author “about the time of his death, 1851”. According to Sprenger he died in 1850 or 1851.
947. **S. Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥaidar**, as he is usually called, or S. Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥusainī Ḥaidarī, as he calls himself in a versified chronogram at the beginning of his history, or S. Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥaidar Ḥasanī al-Ḥusainī al-Mashhādī Tūn [sic; read Tūsī?], Ṭabāsī *al-maʿrūf bah* S. Muḥammad Mīr Ṣāḥib Zāʿīr, as he is called on the title-page of the Urdu translation, says in that work that he became translator to the Lucknow Observatory in the reign of Naṣīr al-Daulah M. ‘Alī Shāh (A.H. 1253/1837–1258/1842), and that he had translated nineteen scientific works, most of which had been printed. Garcin de Tassy mentions a *Risālah i maqrāfīs* [Delhi 1850* according to Blumhardt], a *Risālah i ālāt i riyāḍī* and a translation of Paley’s *Natural theology*. The last, entitled *Maʿrifat i tabārī* (Garcin gives a different title), was published, according to Blumhardt, at Delhi in 1848* (Garcin says Lucknow 1848). Another work with which he was associated was *The Lucknow Almanac for the year 1849. Translated into Persian by Syed Kumaloooddeen and assistants* . . . (*Taqwīm i sultānī*), Lucknow 1849° (see Edwards under Ephemerides). Sprenger tells us that “In 1849,¹ Kamāl aldyn Ḥaydar, Munshiy to the observatory, wishing to ingratiate himself at court, wrote a history of the Royal family of Oudh. Two passages happened to displease His Majesty, and instantly the observatory was abolished and printing was forbidden at Lucknow, lest this objectionable production might be published.”

(*Tārikh i Awdād‘*), a history of the Oudh dynasty to the accession of Wājīd ‘Alī Shāh in 1263/1847: *Rieu* iii 962b (A.D. 1849), 963a (A.D. 1848) [These MSS. contain at the end (1) a metrical narrative by “Ahmad” ² of an attempt on the life of the Wazīr Amin al-Daulah, (2) a circumstantial account of affairs in Oudh at the beginning of Wājīd ‘Alī’s reign, to June 1849 in the 1st MS., to Oct. 1848 in the 2nd, (3) a history of the

¹ One of the B.M. MSS. is dated 1848.
² i.e. presumably Mīr ‘Alī b. Mīr Najaf ‘Alī (see Puran Chand’s *Ijāz al-siyar*, MS. I.O. 3886 fol. 224b marg.).
Observatory], Ivanow 2nd Suppt. 931 (enlarged version, extending to A.D. 1858. Defective and damaged. Autograph?).

Edition: There seems to be no trustworthy evidence that the Persian text has been published. Rieu probably had the Urdu translation in mind when he said that the work had been published under the title of Sawāniḥāt i Salāṭīn i Awad’h at Lucknow in 1879.


[Autobiographical statements in the Tārīkh i Awad’h (see Rieu iii 962b); Sprenger p. vi; Garcin de Tassy i pp. 548-9.]

948. Pūran Chand was probably employed in the Dīwān i Wizārat at Lucknow, since he says that on 5 Ṣafar 1268 he was present there as usual (ḥasb-i dastūr) and was conversing with Mushīr al-Daulah (Ījāz al-siyār fol. 15a). On a certain occasion he accompanied Ray Pratāp Narāyan (fol. 288a) and on another he was sitting in the court of Ahmad Khān Bangash at Farrukhābād (fol. 290a). In the preface to the Ījāz al-siyār he gives a list of 18 works which he had written or edited. The Ījāz al-siyār is there described as an abridgment of the Sulṭān al-siyār, which he hoped shortly to complete.

Ījāz al-siyār, a history of Oudh written in 1267/1850-1 (but, as already stated, the date 1268 is mentioned) for Wājīd ‘Alī Shāh: I.O. 3886 (probably A.D. 1850-1 or soon after, perhaps autograph).

949. Lāl-ji, son of Munshi Sītal Parshād, son of Munshi Shiv Kumār, a resident (mutawattīn) of Karāḍ, wrote his Sulṭān al-ḥikāyāt in Muḥarram 1270/1853.

950. Nawwāb Amīr ‘Ali Kḥān has already been mentioned (p. 648 supra) as the author of the Amīr-nāmah and the Bēring-nāmah.

Wazīr-nāmah, begun apparently in 1288/1871–2, completed in 1292/1875, and divided into four bābs ((i) a short account of the Qarā-Yūsufi dynasty of Oudh to the end of Wājîd ‘Alī’s reign, (ii) the mission of the Queen-Mother to England to appeal against the annexation of Oudh, (iii) Wājîd ‘Alī’s residence at Garden Reach, Calcutta, and the author’s services to him, (iv) works or extracts from works in prose and verse by Wājîd ‘Alī Shāh, poems by the author and others).

Edition: Cawnpore 1293/1876*.

951. Kunwar Durgā-Parshād “Mihr” Sandīlī has already been mentioned (p. 491 supra) as the author of the Gulistān i Hind.

Būstān i Awa‘d’h, a history of Oudh in six daftars ((i) Hindu kings, (ii) Wazīrs of the Delhi Emperors, (iii) Kings of Oudh, (iv) the period of the Mutiny, (v) the author’s ancestors, (vi) on Sandīlah and its notables, Wājîd ‘Alī’s death etc.

Edition: Lucknow 1892*.

952. Mīr Saiyid Muḥammad “Shā‘ir” b. S. ‘Abd al-Jalīl 1 Ḥusainī Wāsiṭī Bilgrāmī was born at Bilgrām in 1101/1689. When his father retired in 1130/1717–18 from the offices of Bakhshī and Waqā‘i‘-nawīs in the sarkārs of Bhakkar and Sīwistān, S. Muḥammad was appointed to these offices by Farrukhsiyar and he held them through the period of Nādir Shāh’s invasion. In 1155/1732 he left Sīwistān and returned to Bilgrām, where he died on 8 Shāb‘ān 1185/12 November 1772.

He wrote poetry in Persian, Arabic and Urdu, made an abridgment of the Musta‘rāf under the title al-Juz‘ al-ashra‘f

1 A detailed biography of S. ‘Abd al-Jalīl Bilgrāmī in Urdu was published at Allahabād in 1929 by S. Maqbul Ahmad Sāmdānī under the title of Ḥayāt i Jalīl. See also Ma‘āthīr al-kirām, Subḥat al-marjān pp. 79–85, Rahmān ‘Alī 108–9, Sham’ i anjuman p. 313.
min al-Mustaṭraf, and compiled a small collection of his father's letters. He was the maternal uncle of Ghulām-'Ali "Azād" Bilgrāmī.

**Tabsirat al-nāzirīn**, composed A.H. 1182/1768 and divided into a muqaddimah (on seven Bilgrāmī Saiyids anterior to A.H. 1100/1688–9), a maqālah (chronologically arranged information concerning events which occurred from A.H. 1101/1689–90, the date of the author’s birth, to A.H. 1182/1768–9 in the lives of Bilgrāmī Saiyids and others, especially their births, marriages and deaths, and in the contemporary history of India) and a khātīmah (on solar eclipses, chronograms etc.): Rieu iii 963b (A.D. 1852), Ivanow 190 (A.H. 1290/1873), Bānkīpūr vii 606 (A.D. 1875), Āṣāfiyāh iii p. 98 nos. 1422, 1494, I.O. 3912 (A.D. 1882).

[Safīnah i Khwūshqū (Bānkīpūr viii p. 111); Ma'āthīr al-kirām; Tabsirat al-nāzirīn; Subhat al-majān 87–9; Sham‘ i anjuman p. 234; Rahmān ‘Ali 83; Ḥayāt i Jalīl (in Urdu) by S. Maqbūl Aḥmad Ṣāmdānī, Allahabad 1929, pp. 159–63.]

953. Saiyid ‘ʿAbīd Ḥusain, a resident of Sahasrām, was a pleader (wakīl) in the Civil Court of Mirzāpūr.

**Tārikh i Jā‘is** (chronogram = 1285 Fašlī = A.H. 1295/1878), a short (23 pp.) history of the village of Jā‘is (once in the Sharqī kingdom of Jaunpūr, later in the Mānīkpur sarkār of the sūbah of Ilāhābād, now in the Rāy Barēlī district of Oudh), with accounts of some of its famous men, based mainly on the Māzhār al-ʿağā‘ib of S. Ḥusain ‘Alī.

Edition: Allahabad 1295/1878*.

954. Other works:

(1) *Ahwāl i Nawwāb Burhān al-Mulk wa-ghairah* : Ethē 527 (14) (foll. 124b–135a).

(2) *Burhān i Awad‘h*, by Maulawi S. Ibn i Ḥasan: *ʿAlīgarh* Subh. MSS. p. 58 no. 954 (14).
M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (bb) BENGAL AND ORISSA

955. ‘Alā’ al-Dīn “Ghaibī” ʿIsfahānī called Mirzā Nat’han 1 and created Shitāb Khān by Jahāngīr was of Persian descent but was born in India. His father Malik ‘Alī entitled Iḥtimām Khān was sent to Bengal by Jahāngīr as Mīr-Bāhīr (“chief of artillery and flotilla (nawwara)” according to Sarkar). Mirzā Nathan took a prominent part in military operations against the Ahoms and neighbouring peoples (for details see the index to S. N. Bhattacharyya’s History of Mughal North-East Frontier policy).

Baharistān i Ghaibī, a history of Bengal and Orissa in Jahāngīr’s time divided into four bāḥs or daftars ((1) entitled Islām-nāmah, on the governorship of Islām Khān Chishti, (2) governorship of Qāsim Khān, (3) governorship of Ibrāhīm Khān Fath-Jang, (4) usurpation of Shāh-Jahān for about a year (A.D. 1623)) subdivided into dāstāns: Blochet i 617 2 (autograph acc. to Sarkar).


956. M. Wafâ ‘Azimābādī was a panegyrist of Mahābat-Jang.

Waqā‘ī i Mahābat-Jang, an account of Mahābat-Jang

1 For this name see the remarks of S. N. Bhattacharyya in his History of Mughal North-East Frontier policy pp. vii–viii.

2 There is a rotograph of this MS. in the possession of Dacca University Library.
beginning with the events which immediately preceded his accession to the Niẓāmat in 1153/1740 and extending to the year 1161/1748, in chronogrammatic sentences, each indicating the date of the event narrated: Bānkipūr Suppt. i 1776 (A.D. 1870), apparently also Browne Suppt. 1365 (Waqā‘i’i ı̇ b adā‘ı’i ı̇ aḥwāl ı̇ muḥārābāt ı̇ Bāngālah, by Shāh Wifāq [sic, but with a query] ‘Aẓīmābādī, described as “a rhymed chronicle of the wars in Bengal in 3 parts, each with a separate pagination, dealing respectively with the years 1156/1743-4, 1158/1745-6, and 1161/1748”. A.D. 1826. Corpus 102[1] and probably also Lindesiana p. 232 no. 772 (“History of Bengal”, by Shāh M. Wafā. Circ. A.D. 1830).

957. Of unknown authorship is the


Edition: Benares 1824*. ¹

958. Munshī Salīm Allāh was Munshī to Mīr M. Ja‘far Khān (Nāẓim of Bengal 1170/1757-1174/1760 and 1177/1763-1178/1765) and afterwards to Henry Vansittart (Governor of Bengal 1760-4), by whose order he wrote his Tawārīkh i Bāngālah.

Tawārīkh (or Tārīkh) i Bāngālah, a history of the Nāẓims of Bengal, Ibrāhīm Khān, Ja‘far Khān, Sarfarāz Khān, Shuja‘ al-Daulah and ‘Alī-Wirdī Khān from the rebellion of Sōbhā Sing’h in 1107/1695-6 to 1169/1756: Ethé 478 (not later than

¹ Bāl-Mukund presumably.
A.D. 1787), ii 3017 (n.d.), I.O. 3955 (18th cent.), Ivanow Curzon 48 (slightly defective. A.D. 1787), Āṣafīyah iii p. 94 no. 1038 (before A.D. 1792), Rieu i 312b (defective at end. 18th cent.), Berlin 498, Edinburgh 231 (defective).

English translation: A narrative of the transactions in Bengal, during the Soobahdaries of Azeem us Shan, Jaffer Khan, Shuja Khan, Sirafraz Khan and Alyvirdy Khan. Translated ... by F. Gladwin. Calcutta 1788. 1

[Shigarf-nāmah i Wilāyat, tr. Alexander, p. 3.]

959. No. 618 in vol. i of his Catalogue des manuscrits persans de la Bibliothèque nationale is described by Blochet as

Téheuvour nāma. Histoire du Bengale sous le gouvernement de Mir Mohammed Djafer Téheuvour.

Blochet adds “L’auteur de cette histoire ne se nomme pas et le titre n’est donné qu’aux folios 6 v°, 7 r°; Téheuvour fut gouverneur du Bengale sous le règne du sultan Mohammed Shah, vers 1144.” There seems to be some mistake here. Mu’taman al-Mulk ‘Alā’ al-Daulah Ja’far Khān Bahādur Asad-Jang, previously entitled Murshid-Qulī Khān, who became Dīwān of Bengal in Muḥammad Shāh’s reign and Šubah-dār in that of Farrukh-siyar and who died in 1138/1725–6 (see Ma’āthīr al-umarā’ iii pp. 751–2), was the son of a Hindu and had no claim to the title Mir. If Blochet is right in prefixing the title Mir to M. Ja’far’s name, the person referred to in the Tahawwur-nāmah (if that is really its title) is doubtless the well-known Mir M. Ja’far Khān, who was Nāẓīm of Bengal from 1757 to 1759 and again from 1763 to 1765. It may be surmised that the title Tahawwur-nāmah is an allusion to Henry Vansittart, Governor of Bengal 1760–4, whose titles were Naṣīr al-Mulk Shams al-Daulah Tahawwur-Jang. 2 Unfortunately Blochet does not quote the opening words of the MSS. which he describes, and

1 In the B.M. catalogue this translation is entered under ‘Azīm ul-Shān and in the I.O. catalogue under Narrative of the Events (sic).
2 Neither the earlier nor the later Ja’far Khān seems to have borne the title Tahawwur-Jang.
therefore it is not possible to tell from his catalogue whether the Tahawwur-nāmah is identical with one of the histories described in other catalogues.

**Tahawwur-nāmah:** Blochet i 618 (A.H. 1187/1773).

960. Yūsuf ‘Ali Khān b. Ghulām-‘Ali Khān has already been mentioned (pp. 139–40 supra) as the author of the Ḥadiqat al-safā’. The authority for ascribing to him the *Tārīkh i Mahābat-Jang*, in which the author’s name is not mentioned, is the Rev. J. H. Hindley (see Rieu i 312a, ii 806a).

(*Tārīkh i Mahābat-Jang* or *Tārīkh i ‘Ali-Wirdī Khān*), a history of ‘Ali-Wirdī Khān Mahābat-Jang, Nāzim of Bengal (d. 1169/1756), and his successor Sirāj al-Daulah (d. 1170/1757), completed at Allahabad in 1177/1763–4: Rieu i 312a (defective, 18th cent.), 312a (ending with Rām Narāyan’s appointment as Nā’ūb of Bihār. A.H. 1198/1788), 312b (ending at the same point. 18th cent.), iii 965a (ending shortly before the same point. 18th cent.), 1039a (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850), 1054b (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850), Ivanow 205 (ending with Rām Narāyan’s appointment. 19th cent.), I.O. 4025 (transcribed (probably in 1903) from Ivanow 205), Browne Suppt. 251 (n.d. King’s 111), Bodleian 279 (ending with Rām Narāyan’s appointment), Edinburgh 232.

English translation: *Ferishta’s History of Dekkan… and the history of Bengal, from the accession of Alverdee Khan to the year 1780* [translated as far as the death of ‘Ali-Wirdī Khān “from a Persian manuscript”, identifiable with the *Tārīkh i Mahābat-Jang*]… *By Jonathan Scott, Shrewsbury 1794*ο*, vol. ii pp. 313–58.

961. “Musāfīr,” an enthusiastic supporter of the British, was with the Marāṭ’hā army at Benares and subsequently at Allahabad.

**Fath-nāmah,** composed A.H. 1180/1766–7,¹ a mathnawī on the British wars in Bengal from the first year of ‘Ālamgīr II

¹ The author states that he had previously composed a similar account in Hindī.
(A.D. 1754) to the peace with Shāh-ʿĀlam and the grant of the
diwānī of Bengal to the E.I.Co. (A.D. 1765): Rieu ii 717a (circ.
A.H. 1180/1766–7).

962. Karam-ʿAli, a member of the family of the Nāzīms of
Bengal, who was in the service of Nawwāb S. M. Riḍā Khān
Muẓaffar-Jang, wrote his Muẓaffar-nāmah in 1186/1772–3.

Muẓaffar-nāmah, a history of the Nāzīms of Bengal from
the rise of Nawwāb ʿAli-Wirdī Khān (d. 1169/1756) to the arrest
of Muẓaffar-Jang in 1186/1772: Rieu i 313a (A.H. 1188/1774),
I.O. 4075 (18th cent.), Ethé 479 (n.d.), Bānkipūr vii 609 (19th
cent.).

963. Ghulām-Husain “Salīm” Zaidpūr migrated from
Zaidpūr (near Bārah Bankī, in Oudh) to Māl dah in Bengal and
became Dāk Munshī, or Postmaster, there under George Udny,
at whose request he wrote the Riyāḍ al-salāṭīn. He died in
1233/1817–18.

Riyāḍ al-salāṭīn (a chronogram = 1202/1787–8, the date of
completion), a history of Bengal divided into a muqaddimah
(on geography and the early rājahs) and four rauḍahs ((1) the
viceroy of the Sulṭāns of Delhi, (2) the independent kings, (3) the
Nāzīms under the Timūrīds, (4) the British): Oxford Ind. Inst.
MS. Pers. A iv 28 (not later than A.D. 1805), Ivanow 206 (A.H.
1267/1851), 207 (A.D. 1870), Rieu iii 965b (extracts only. Circ.
A.D. 1850), Būhār 82 (A.D. 1874), Berlin 497.

Edition: The Riyḍzu-s-salāṭīn . . . edited by Moulavi Abdūl
Hak Abīd, Calcutta 1890–1°* (Bibliotheca Indica. No index).

Translation: The Riyāžu-s-salāṭīn . . . translated . . . , with notes,
by Moulavī Abdus Salam, Calcutta 1902–4°* (Bibliotheca Indica.
With index).

[Ihā Ḥakī Ḥakī Khvārshī l jahān-numā (J.A.S.B. vol. lxiv
Ency. Isl. under Ghulām Husain.]

964. An anonymous author completed on 9 Dhū ’l-Ḥijjah
1206/30 July 1792
Akbār al-ṣidq (beg. Hamd u sipās i bi-qiyās mar Dāvarīrā kih aṭkam al-ḥākimīn ast), a history of Bengal under British rule: Berlin 520.

965. An eye-witness wrote

An account of the death of Nawwāb Muẓaffar-Jang (i.e. M. Ridā Khān) in 1206/1791-2 and the events which succeeded it: Berlin 13 (3).

966. S. Nadhr-'Ali b. S. Farzand i 'Alī b. S. Hidāyat Allāh Jā'isi completed his Sawāniḥ i gharāʾib in 1213/1798-9. His father was in the service of Nawwāb Sarfarāz Khān [Nāzim of Bengal from 1151/1739 to 1153/1740], apparently as a military officer. In the Sawāniḥ i gharāʾib (fol. 12a) it is stated that Mīr Farzand i 'Alī obtained leave from Sarfarāz Khān and returned home [i.e. to Jā'is, a place which is praised in the preface] with his son [presumably S. Nadhr-'Ali] after an absence of twenty years.

Sawāniḥ i gharāʾib, a short history of the Nawwābs of Bengal (and of contemporary events in the šūbahs of Allahabad and Oudh) from the time of M. Ja'far Khān to the death of Shujāʿ al-Daulah of Oudh [in 1188/1775]: I.O. 3977 (circ. A.D. 1892).

967. Intīzām al-Mulk Muntāz al-Daulah Mahā-rājah Kalyān Sing'h Bahādur Tahawwur-Jang b. Muntāz al-Mulk Mahā-rājah Shitāb Rāy Bahādur Mansūr-Jang succeeded his father 1 as Nā'ib-Nāẓim of Bihār in 1187/1773. Unlike his father, of whom Captain Randfurlie Knox said “This is a real Nawab; I never saw such a Nawab in my life”, he was a man of no great ability and is described in the Siyar al-mutaʾakhirīn (ii 8106.

1 For whom see Buckland Dictionary of Indian biography p. 347, Siyar al-mutaʾakhirīn, Lucknow 1866, ii pp. 791-6 (Raymond’s trans., reprint Calcutta 1926, iii pp. 49-67, ending with some sentences absent from the published text of the Persian original), and many other passages (for which see the indexes to the [1902-3] and 1926 reprints of Raymond’s translation); V. A. Smith The Oxford history of India, 1920, pp. 503, 513, 514: and almost all works dealing with the history of Bihār and Bengal at this period.

2 Quoted by V. A. Smith, Oxford history of India, p. 514, from the Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society iii 127.
Raymond’s trans. reprint 1926, iii p. 109) as a mere cipher in the Council at ‘Aznābād.

“In the Faṣlī year 1188 (A.D. 1781), during the administration of Warren Hastings, Kalyān Singh was taxed thirty-four lakhs of rupees as the revenue of Bihār, which he had to pay out of his own private means, owing to a deficit caused by the revolt of Chait Singh, Rājah of Banāras, and certain obstinate landholders of Bihār. Thus ruined, he repaired to Calcutta in Faṣlī 1195,¹ and lived there for twenty-four years, enjoying the warm favour of the English officials. In Faṣlī 1217 ² he fell ill, and after an illness of ten months, which ended in the loss of his eyesight, he left for Patna in Faṣlī 1218.³ He found his beautiful houses and gardens there in a ruinous condition, and so took up his residence in the Pathrī Garden, near Bānkīpur, which he took on hire. He bitterly complains of the unkind treatment he received at the hands of his fellow citizens. He was still suffering from various diseases, and had made up his mind to return to Calcutta, when he heard of Mr. Abraham Welland’s arrival. He paid a visit to Mr. Welland, who subsequently, through the author’s son, Mahārājah Kunwar Daulat Singh Bahādur Dilīr Jang, asked him to write a detailed account of Nawwāb Mīr Muḥammad Qāsim Khān, Nāzim of Bengal. With this request he immediately complied . . . He tells us that because of his blindness he could make no use of his memoranda, or of other historical sources, but had to depend on his own recollections” (quoted from Abdul Muqtadir’s summary of the autobiographical part of the preface to the Khulāṣat al-tawārīkh).

He wrote poetry both in Persian and Urdu, using the takhallus “‘Āshiq” (Sprenger p. 205, on the authority of the Tadhkirah i Shōrīsh and “‘Sarwar’s” “Undah i muntakhabah). In 1211/1796 he completed an unimportant compendium of geography entitled ‘Ajā’ib al-buldān (MS.: Berlin 356).

¹ i.e. A.D. 1789–90. Presumably this was on his deposition from the Niyābat, for which event a different, and apparently incorrect, date, A.H. 1198 = Faṣlī 1193 [sic] is given below (p. 721, l. 9).
² i.e. A.D. 1810–11.
³ i.e. A.D. 1811–12.
(1) 'Ajā'ib al-wāridāt, memoirs of the author and his father, completed at Calcutta in 1205/1791 and divided into a muqaddimah and four bābs: Berlin 523 (autograph?).

(2) Khulāsat al-tawārīkh, a history of the Indian Timūrids to A.H. 1227/1812 (the date of completion) followed by (Bāb ii, or Wāridāt i Qāsimī, as it is called in some MSS.) a detailed account of events in Bengal and Bihār from Mīr M. Qāsim’s accession to the Nizāmat in 1174/1760 to the time of the author’s deposition from the Niyābat of Bihār “in A.H. 1198 = A.D. 1783” (so Abdul Muqtadir, while Rieu says “the Faṣlī year 1193, A.H. 1198”¹), when he was called to Calcutta: Rieu i 283b (Bāb i only. Circ. A.H. 1227/1812), 313b (Bāb ii only, with the title Wāridāt i Qāsimī. ‘Azīmābād, A.H. 1227/1812), iii 923b (Bābs i–ii. Circ. A.D. 1850), Bānkīpūr vii 594 (Bābs i–ii. A.D. 1906).


[Autobiographical statements in the preface to the Khulāsat al-tawārīkh (summarised in Rieu i pp. 283b–284a and Bānkīpūr vii pp. 110–11); Siyār al-muta’ākhkhirīn, Lucknow 1866, ii pp. 810⁴⁻⁸,¹⁴⁻²¹ (Raymond’s trans., 1926, iii pp. 109–11) ; Sprenger p. 205; Nizāmī Badāyūnī Qāmūs al-mashāhīr (in Urdu) ii p. 155].

968. S. ‘Ali b. Ṭufail ‘Ali Khān b. Mubāriz al-Mulk Iḥtishām al-Daulah Bilgrāmī dedicated his Tārīkh i Manṣūrī to the Nawwāb Nāẓim Farīdūn-Jāh S. Manṣūr ‘Ali Khān Bahādur Nuṣrat-Jang (Nawwāb of Murshidābād from 1838 to 1881) sometime between 1264/1848 (a date mentioned in the work) and 1270/1854, the date of the R.A.S. MS.

Tārīkh i Manṣūrī, a history of Bengal containing little that is new apart from “some original matter obtained from the inhabitants of Murshidābād.” (Blochmann), the last chapters being devoted to the Nawwāb Nāzims, their children and

¹ The Faṣlī year 1193 corresponds to A.H. 1201–2, the Hijri year 1198 to Faṣlī 1189–90. Presumably the correct date is Faṣlī 1195, which has been mentioned above as the year in which “he repaired to Calcutta.”


969. For extracts relating to Bengal from the Khwurshm i jahân-numā of S. Ilâhi Bakhsh Ḥusainī Angrēzābādī see p. 152 supra.

970. Khān Bahādur Khundkār Faḍl i Rabbi was born at Sālār (Pargannah Fatehsing, District Murshidabadd) on 13 August 1848. His father, Maulawi ‘Ubaid al-Akbar, was Mir Munshi to the last Nawwāb-Nāzim of Bengal, Masūr ‘Ali Khān Faridūn-Jāh. From November 1869 to 1874 Faḍl i Rabbi was in England as “correspondence clerk and officer in charge of the household” to the Nawwāb Nāzim, who had gone there to represent his grievances to the House of Commons and who continued to live there until 1881. On his return to India in 1874 Faḍl i Rabbi was made Amīn i mahallat (Manager of estates) by the Nawwāb Nāzim’s son, S. Ḥasan ‘Alī (who was created Nawwāb Bahādur of Murshidabadd in February 1882, the title of Nawwāb Nāzim of Bengal having become extinct in November 1880 when Masūr ‘Ali Khān resigned the position). Subsequently he became Naʻīb-Dīwān and in 1881 Dīwān of Murshidabadd. In 1896 the title of Khān Bahādur was conferred on him. His name appears in the list of Honorary Magistrates at Murshidabadd in Thacker’s Indian Directory for 1916 (the last year in which such a list is given).

An Urdu work of his, Taṣāq al-nihād, an account of the Khondkārs of Murshidabadd, the old Muslim family to which he belonged, was published at Āgra in 1897°.

Haqīqat i Musalmān i Bangālah (in Persian ¹ or in Urdu ?): no copies traced.

¹ It is included here as a Persian work on the authority of the British Museum catalogue, but nothing is said in the translation about the language of the original.


971. Of unknown authorship is

Tāriḵh i Jahāṅgīrīnagar, a short (20 foll.) history of Dacca from Akbar’s conquest to the Nizāmat of Ḥusain al-Dīn Khān about the beginning of Shah-‘Ālam’s reign: Edinburgh 233 (n.d.).

972. S. ‘Ali Ḥusainī Qazwīnī, or, to give him his full titles, Nawwāb Intīzām al-Daulah Naṣīr al-Mulk S. ‘Ali Khān Bahāduṣr Nuṣrat-Jang, became Sūbah-dār (or Nawwāb) of Dacca in 1200/1785-6 and died at the age of sixty-three on 1 Dhū 'l-Qa‘dah 1237/20 July 1822.

Tāriḵh i Nuṣrat-Jangī, 1 a very brief history of Bengal and especially of Dacca from Akbar’s conquest to A.H. 1200/1785-6: Ivanow 208 (not later than 1817), Gotha Arab Cat. v p. 497 no. 30 5*. Edition 2: Tāriḵh-i-Nuṣratjangī. [Edited] by Harinath De. (Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol. ii, no. 6, pp. 121-53 (Calcutta 1908 5*).)

973. At the request of Major William Francklin Shyām Parshād Munshi compiled in November and December 1810 his

Khulāṣah i awwāl i Gaṟh u jā i dīgar (for other forms of the title see Ethé), a topography and history of the fortress

1 Blochmann described the work as “good-for-nothing”, but Harinath De disagrees.

2 This edition, based on the A.S.B. MS. and on two MSS. in private possession, contains a continuation to A.D. 1843, the date of the death of Nawwāb Ghāzī al-Dīn Muḥammad, the last Nawwāb of Jasārat Khān’s line, by S. ‘Abd al-Ghānī, known as (‘urf) Ḥamīd Mir, b. S. M. Ḥusain Khān Husainī, a son of Nuṣrat-Jang’s ‘Arīd-bēgī.
of Gaur (for which see Ency. Isl. etc.) and the township of Panduah: Ethé 2841.

974. Ghulām-Hasan Zaidi Jaunpūrī, fl. circ. A.D. 1805, has already been mentioned (p. 699 supra) as the author of a short historical account of Jaunpūr.

A short account of Calcutta, its climate, topography etc.: Browne Pers. Cat. 108 ii.

975. Nawwāb-Zādah S. Ashraf al-Din Ahmad b. Nawwāb Wazīr al-Sultān Fakhr al-Mulk S. M. Amīr ‘Alī Khān Bahādur, seventh Mutawalli of the Imāmbārah at Hoogli (appointed 1875) and author of several works including the Nau rātan, an anthology of Persian poetry (Lucknow [1883°]), was born in 1855 and educated at the Calcutta Madrasah and the Doveton College, Calcutta. He was a Fellow of the Calcutta University and a Trustee of the Aligarh College. In 1893 he received the title of Khān Bahādur.

Tabaqāt-i Muḥsiniyāh ² (on English title-page Tabaqa-i-Muhsinīya or the Persian History of the Hooghly Emambarah), on the history of the Hoogly Imāmbārah and the lives of its chief benefactors and custodians (the author p. 38, 57 foll.).


976. Other works:

(1) Account of the war of the East India Co. with Mīr Qāsim Khān (beginning Az jumlāh i būqalamūnī i rūzgār and apparently taken mostly from the Siyar al-muta‘akhkhārīn): Bodleian 280.

(2) Fragment giving a review of the Governors of Bengal

¹ For S. Amīr ‘Alī Khān see p. 648 supra.

² Ḩājī M. Muḥsīn, who died on 24 Dhū ’l-Qa‘dah 1227/1812, was a merchant of Hoogli noted for his charitable benefactions. See Life of Ḥāji Muḥammad Muḥsīn by Mahendra Chandra Mitra, Calcutta 1880, The modern history of the Indian chiefs, rajas, zamindars etc. by Loke Nath Ghose, pt. ii, Calcutta 1881, pp. 304–9 and Ency. Isl. under Muḥammad Muḥsīn, where further references are given.
from the time of Jahānghir (A.D. 1605) to that of Farrukh-siyar (A.D. 1719): Bodleian 278.

(3) Notes and memoranda relating to the history, administration and revenue of Bengal, written for Col. Sir J. Murray: Rieu i 409.

(4) Notice of Manī Bēgam, wife of Mir Jaʿfar Khān: Rieu i 409b.

(5) Three poems on the wickedness and miserable end of Nand Kumār: Rieu ii 797b.


M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (cc) GUJRĀT

977. An author who does not mention his name but who tells us incidentally in his account of the year 847/1443–4 that he was born on the 18th of Dhū ʿl-Hijjah in that year, when his father was taking part in the expedition of Sulṭān ‘Alāʾ al-Dīn [Aḥmad] b. Aḥmad Bahmanī against the fort of Mudkal, wrote a history of the Muẓaffarīd dynasty which contains no title in the preface but which on the title-page of the India Office manuscript is called with doubtful correctness Tārīkh i Muẓaffar-Shāhī.¹

Tārīkh i Muẓaffar-Shāhī [?], a flowery history of the Muẓaffarīds to the year 889/1484 or thereabouts written in the

¹ The connexion of the author’s father with the Bahmanī court suggested to Rieu the possibility that this work may be identical with “a history of Gujrāt entitled Maʿṣīr i Maḥmūdshāhī, also called Tārīkh i Maḥmūdshāhī, the author of which, Mullā ‘Abd ul-Karīm Hamadānī, had long been attached to Khvājah Maḥmūd Gāvān, the celebrated minister of the Bahmanīs. . . .” The correctness of that conjecture can neither be proved nor disproved at present. Rieu does not specify the source of his information concerning ‘Abd al-Karīm Hamadānī and his Maʿṣīr i Maḥmūd-Shāhī. ‘Abd al-Karīm’s life of Maḥmūd i Gāvān is summarised by Firīṣṭah at the end of his account of Sulṭān Muḥammad Shāh Bahmanī. A general history entitled al-Ṭabaqāt al-Maḥmūd-Shāhīyah by ‘Abd al-Karīm b. M. al-Namūdīhī [? Niṣbāh doubtful] has already been mentioned (p. 109 supra).
regain of Maḥmūd Shāh Bēgarah and beginning with the words
Bar ṭabaqāt al-Maḥmūd-Shaḥī-yah, which contains much information about Gujarāt to the year
978. For the general history al-Ṭabaqāt al-Maḥmūd-Shaḥī-yah, under the year mentioned].
979. A work entitled Maʿāthīr i Maḥmūd-Shaḥī was written by a certain ‘Abd al-Khāliq BRHĀM[?]
known as (al-maʿrūf bi) Sar-birahnah, who died in 895/1489–90 [according
to ‘Abd al-Karīm al-Nāmīdīhi (? al-Ṭabaqāt al-Maḥmūd-
Shaḥī-yah (Eton 160. Cf. p. 109 supra), under the year mentioned].
According to Rieu, who does not specify his authority, “a history of
Gujrāt entitled Maāṣīr i Maḥmūdshāhī, also called Tārīkh i Maḥmūdshāhī” was written by ‘Abd al-Karīm Hamadānī,
who “had long been attached to Khwājah Maḥmūd Gāvān,
the celebrated minister of the Bahmanīs” and who wrote a
life of Maḥmūd i Gāvān which Firishtah summarises at the end
of his account of Sultaṇ Muḥammad Shāh Bahmanī. A
supplement to one of these works, probably the first, or possibly to
yet another work of the same title, was written by order of
Maḥmūd Shāh Bēgarah by an author whose preface contains
neither his own name nor the title of his work.

(Doamah i Maʿāthīr i Maḥmūd-Shaḥī),¹ a flowery history
of the reign of Sultaṇ Maḥmūd Shaḥ Bēgarah from the time
when he despatched an army against Bahādur Gīlānī [in 896/
1490–1 according to the Zafar al-wālih i p. 169] to the surrender
of Asīr Fort by Yūsuf Ḥaftī to Aʿzam Humāyūn [in 916/1511
according to the Zafar al-wālih i p. 59], written by order of
Maḥmūd Shāh as a supplement to the Maʿāthīr i Maḥmūd-
Shaḥī of an unspecific author and beginning Ba-nām i shahanshāh i mulk i qidam: I.O. 3841 (apparently only the first of
the two maqālahs ((1) on Maḥmūd Shāh, (2) on his contem-
poraries) mentioned in the preface. A.H. 1299/1882).

¹ On the title-page of the I.O. manuscript the work is called Tārīkh i
Maḥmūd-Shaḥī, which may possibly be the correct title.
980. It was by order of Abū 'l-Nasr Sulṭān Muẓaffar Shāh II that a certain "Qānī'ī" wrote

Tārīkh i Muẓaffar-Shāhī, [?], an account, in prose interspersed with many verses, of the capture of Shādi-ābād (Māndū) in 942/1518: Rieu i 287a (A.H. 1223/1808), I.O. 4521 (A.H. 1267/1851).

981. A certain "Muṣī'ī" completed A.H. 941/1534-5 and dedicated to Bahādur Shāh

Ganj i maʿānī, a mathnawī on Bahādur Shāh’s victories: Ivanow Curzon 251 (16th cent.).

982. Mīr (or Shāh) Abū Turāb Wali b. Shāh Quṭb al-Dīn Shukr Allāh, or Shāh Abū Turāb al-Uraidi al-Ḥusainī, as he is called in the Zafar al-walīkh (p. 548), was a Shīrāzī (Salāmī) Saiyid, whose grandfather had migrated from Shīrāz and in 898/1492–3 had settled in Chānpānēr. In 974/1566–7 Mīr Abū Turāb was evidently an employee or a supporter of the Gujratī noble Chingiz Khān who sent him to negotiate with I’timād Khān. Chingiz Khān was murdered in Safar 975/1569, and in 980/1572–3, when Akbar first entered Gujrat, Mīr Abū Turāb was sent by I’timād Khān to the Emperor with a letter inviting him to take the country. He accompanied Akbar on his progress through Gujrat and received various marks of the royal favour. In 985/1577 Akbar appointed him Mīr i Ḥājj, and on his return in 987/1579 he brought with him to Āgra a large stone bearing the impression of the Prophet’s foot (gadam i Rasūl). In 988/1580 he received permission to take this stone to Gujrat and he erected it at Asāwal near Aḥmadābād. In 992/1583 I’timād Khān was appointed Governor of Gujrat, and Shāh Abū Turāb Amīn i ṣūbah. He died on 13 Jumādā i A.H. 1003/1595 and was buried at Asāwal.

Tārīkh i Gujrat, a history of Gujrat from the reign of Bahādur Shāh (A.H. 932/1526–943/1536) to the taking of Aḥmadābād by Muẓaffar Shāh III in 992/1584: Rieu iii 967 (A.H. 1151/1738–9).

1 This title, of doubtful genuineness, occurs not in the work itself but in the copyist’s colophon and on the title-page of the I.O. MS.

[Autobiographical statements in the Tārīkh i Gujrat (for these see Rieu iii 967 and Ross's introduction to his edition and his summary of contents); Akbar-nāmah i p. 146, iii pp. 217, 281, 318, 403, 411, 454 and doubtless elsewhere (see the index to Beveridge's translation of this volume, when it appears); Zafar al-wālīk bi-Muẓaffar wa-ālih (in Arabic) pp. 499²², 504⁶, 506⁶, 507⁴, 548¹⁸, 567¹⁸, 603⁶, 606⁵. ²⁰⁻²¹; Mir'āt i Aḥmadr, khātimah (Baroda 1930) p. 64, English trans. (Baroda 1928) p. 57; Maʿāthr al-umārāʾ iii pp. 280-5, Beveridge's translation pp. 142-4 (summarised by Blochmann in his translation of the Avīn i Akbarī pp. 506-7); Rieu iii 967.]

983. Sikundar b. M. Manjhu ¹ b. Akbar served under the Khān i Aʿzam (Mīrzā ‘Azīz Kūkhah, Governor of Gujrat) in the campaign which ended with the capture and death of Muẓaffar Shāh III, the dethroned king of Gujrat, in 1000/1591.

In 1026/1617 he was visited at Aḥmadābād by Jahāngīr, who mentions him in his Memoirs (tr. Rogers and Beveridge i 427) as a man well acquainted with the history of Gujrat, who had been for eight or nine years in the Imperial service.


¹ M. 'urf Manjhu, as the MSS. have it, or Miyān Manjhu, was steward of the estate of Saiyid Bukhārī's descendants (see Rieu iii 1084b ad p. 287b). Some of the MSS. omit the ibn before Akbar.
A.H. 1049/1639), ii 3015 (old), I.O. 3844 (probably circ. A.D. 1882),
Ross and Browne 8 (17th cent.), Lindesiana p. 157 no. 900
(A.H. 1094/1683), Morley 69 (A.H. 1196/1781), Eton 177 (A.H.
1200/1785–6), Rehatsek p. 76 no. 13 (A.H. 1213/1798–9), Bānkīpūr
vii 610 (18th cent.), Bombay Fyzee 8 (A.D. 1849), 9 (not old),
Salemann-Rosen p. 18 no. 141.

Editions: Bombay 1831°*, 1890°*.

English translation: Mirati Sikandari, or The Mirror of
Sikandar . . . Translated by Fazlullah Lutfullah Faridi. [Bombay
1899°*.]

Cf.: The history of India as told by its own historians. The local
Partially based on a [nearly complete] translation [of the Mir'āt
i Sikandarī] by . . . J. Dowson . . . Forming a sequel to Sir H. M.
Elliot's History of the Muhammadan Empire of India. London
1886°*.

984. Mīrzā M. Ḥasan b. M. 'Alī was eight or nine years old in
1120/1708, when he went to Gujrat from Burhānpūr (Mir'āt
i Aḥmādī i p. 134°–5), his father having been appointed Waqā'i-
nīgār of the jāgīr of Prince M. Jahāndār Shāh in the sūbah of
Aḥmadābād (M. i A., i p. 38314°–15). On his father's death in
1157/1744 he succeeded by royal decree to his father's mansāb,
his office (Amūn or Superintendent of the Cloth Market), his
title (‘Ali Muḥammad Khān) and his jāgīr (M. i A., ii p. 3266°–7).
In 1159/1746 he was appointed Dīwān of Gujrat (M. i A.
ii p. 340), and in 1163/1750 the title of Bahādur was conferred
upon him (M. i A., ii p. 39517).

Mir'āt i Aḥmādī, as it is usually called, or Mir'āt i Aḥmādī
i sūbah i Aḥmadābād Gujrat, as the author called it, begun in
1170/1756–7 and completed in Safar 1175/September 1761, a
history of Gujrat from the earliest times to Ahmad Shāh
Abdālī's victory over the Marāt'hās at Pānīpat in 1174/1761 with a
khātimah containing a description of Aḥmadābād, lives of the
saints and saiyids buried there, accounts of its inhabitants,
Hindu tribes and temples, measures, weights etc., t'hānahs,
officials and their duties, districts and parganahs of Gujrat,
its ports, rivers, mountains and sights: Ethé ii 3016 (A.H. 1175/1761, transcribed by the author’s grandson,\(^1\) except possibly the khâtimah, though that “seems to be written by the same hand”), Ethé 444 (A.H. 1199/1785), L.O. 3843 (A.H. 1299/1882), Lindesiana p. 122 nos. 901–2 (A.H. 1195/1780), Bânkîpur vii 611 (A.H. 1199/1785), Rieu i 288b (A.H. 1202/1788), 289b (breaking off in Aurangzéb’s 13th year, 18th cent.), 289b (an abridgment, A.D. 1808), Leyden iii p. 13 no. 925 (A.H. 1202/1787), R.A.S. P. 82–4 = Morley 70–2 (A.H. 1238/1822–3), P. 85 = Morley 73 (detached portions), Bombay Univ. p. 263 (Sambat 1881), Bombay Fyzee 7 (A.D. 1849).


English translation of the history down to Akbar’s invasion, i.e. about one-sixth of the whole work: The political and statistical history of Gujarāt, translated from the Persian of Ali Mohammed Khán... to which are added... annotations and... introduction. By J. Bird. London 1835\(^*\) (Oriental Translation Fund).

English translation of the Khâtimah: The Supplement to the Mirat-i-Ahmadi. Translated... by Syed Nawab Ali... and C. N. Seddon... Baroda (Bombay printed) 1924* (Education

\(^1\) A MS. written in 1176/1761 by a certain M. Mukarram and bearing on the title-page an impression of the author’s seal and his autograph note of ownership is, or was, preserved at Cambay (see Mirat-i-Ahmadi. Supplement. Translated... by S. Nawab Ali... and C. N. Seddon, foreword, p. xiii n., where the library or person owning the MS. is not specified). A reproduction of the title-page of that MS. forms the frontispiece of the Baroda edition of the Persian text.

\(^2\) According to Jadunath Sarkar’s foreword to pt. ii of the Baroda edition “This edition contains only the first volume down to A.D. 1714 (or about one-half of it) together with the second volume.... The text as printed here is hopelessly corrupt, with frequent lacunae....”
Department; Mirat-i-Ahmadi. Supplement. Translated ... by Syed Nawab Ali ... and C. N. Seddon ... Re-issue—corrected. Baroda (Calcutta printed) 1928* (Gaekwad's Oriental Series, 43).

Translations of extracts: The history of India as told by its own historians. The local Muhammadan dynasties. Gujarat. By ... Sir Edward Clive Bayley ... Partially based on a translation [of parts of the Mir'āt i Sikandarī and the Mir'āt i Ahmādī] by ... J. Dowson. ... Forming a sequel to Sir H. M. Elliot's History of the Muhammadan Empire of India. London 1886**.

For an Urdu translation and two incomplete Gujrātī translations see Bombay Univ. p. 264.

[Autobiographical statements in the Mir'āt i Ahmādī (two or three of these in Rieu i 289 and in the foreword to the English translation of the Khātimah); Rieu i 289.]

985. Ranchhōr-jī, a son of the celebrated Diwān Amar-jī of Jūnāgārh, was born in Samwat 1824 Vikrāmi/A.D. 1767. Most of his life was devoted to the service of the Nawwābs of Jūnāgārh as was that of his father Amar-jī and that of his elder brother Raghunāth-jī, who was likewise Diwān, and who died in 1819. Like them he played a prominent part in the incessant warfare between Jūnāgārh and the neighbouring states. According to James Burgess Ranchhōr-jī was in his turn Diwān of Jūnāgārh, but this does not seem to be expressly stated in the Wazā'i i Sōrat'h.

Tārīkh i Sōrat'h or Wazā'i i Sōrat'h, a history of Sōrat'h¹ or Saurāshtrā, especially of Jūnāgārh and Nawanagar, in the author's time with a sketch of its earlier history, completed (according to the Edinburgh Univ. catalogue) in Jēth of Samwat 1886/16 Dhū 'l-Hijjah 1245/9 June 1830²: Bombay

¹ Sōrat'h (= Kāt'hiyāwār) is to be distinguished from Sūrat, the name of a port on the other side of the Gulf of Cambay.
² This date does not seem to occur in Rehatsek's translation. The date Samwat 1896/A.H. 1256 (= 1840) occurs in an addition (by the author?) which appears on p. 234 of Rehatsek's translation.


MS.Gujarâti translation by Manî-shankar Jata-shankar Mujamândar (see Rehatsek’s translation pp. iii, 25).


986. Sh. Ahmâd, alias Bakhshû Miyân, b. Sh. Hâmid b. Sh. Bahâdur was Munîf at Sûrat and died in 1265/1848–9. He wrote a historical work entitled Hadîqat i Ahmâdî in three volumes. He had intended to rewrite this and divide it into fifteen parts, but he died when he had completed only one part, to which he gave the title Hadîqat al-Hind.


987. Other works:

1) Haqîqat (Haqâ’iq, Ahwâl) i sârkhâr i Gâyakwâr, a short history of the Gâykwâr Mahârâjâhs of Baroda from their origin to A.D. 1818, by Munshi Sûrâ-Bhây: I.O. 4525 (A.H. 1269/1853), 4526 (about the first third of the same work. Same hand).

2) Historical notices of Sûrat and Kâch Makrân: I.O. 3817.

3) Muntakhab i ahwâlât i zain al-bilâd Ahamdâbâd, a short history of Gujrât from the time of the Hindu Râjahs
to that of Ragunat’h Rāō, when ‘Ālī M. Khān was Dīwān of the province, possibly compiled by the copyist Bāng [?] Lā’l son of Tarang [?] Lā’l: I.O. 4545 (A.D. 1849).

(4) *The Salatin-i-Baroda*, being Mr. F. A. H. Elliot’s “Rulers of Baroda”, rendered into Persian... by Maulavi Farid ud-Din Ahmad. Bombay 1898*


(6) *Tārikh i salāṭīn i Gujrāt*, a very brief (21 foll.) chronicle of the rulers of Gujrat from Sulṭān Aḥmad Shāh (A.H. 813/1410) to A.H. 961/1554, the last date mentioned in the text, or a little later: Bodleian 271 (n.d.).

**M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (dd) CUTCHE**

988. The *Nasab-nāmah i Jārējah* is based on the oral statements of a certain Ūpādyah Kurji Jādēv Mīr,¹ an inhabitant of Virah in the *parganah* of Bhūj. These were written down in P’hāgun 1878/Feb. 1822 and were translated from the Gujratī into Persian by order of Mr. Walter, Assistant Resident of Cutch.

*Nasab-nāmah i Jārējah*, a history of the ruling tribe of Cutch from its origin to the Hindu year 1875/1819: Rieu i 290 (A.H. 1237/1822).

**M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (ee) INDORE**

989. It was at the request of Jaswant Rāō Hōlkar’s bakhshī, Bhawānī Shankar, that Mōhan Singh wrote the *Waqā’i’ i Hōlkar*, which he completed in 1223/1808.

*Waqā’i’ i Hōlkar*, a history of Jaswant Rāō Hōlkar, who succeeded his brother Kāshī Rāō as ruler of Indore, was defeated by Lord Lake in 1804, became insane in 1806 and died in 1811: Bāṅkipūr vii 618 (A.H. 1223/1808, not autograph), Bodleian 1970 (not later than A.D. 1812), I.O. 3930 (19th cent.).

¹ Vocalisation of these names partly conjectural.
M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (ff) BHÔPÂL

990. Nawwâb Shâh-Jahân Bêgam "Shîrîn", born on 3 July 1838, was proclaimed ruler of Bhôpâl on 10 Jan. 1847 under the regency of her mother Sikandar Bêgam, the widow of Nawwâb Jahângîr Muḥammad Khân. On 1 May 1860 she abdicated in favour of her mother. On 30 Oct. 1868 Sikandar Bêgam died, and Shâh-Jahân Bêgam again became ruler of the State. She died on 16 June 1901 and was succeeded by Sulṭân-Jahân Bêgam, her only daughter by her first husband, Nawwâb Naẓîr al-Daulah Bakhsî Bâqî Muḥammad Khân, whom she had married in 1855 and who died in 1867. Her second husband, whom she married in 1871, was Nawwâb Ṣiddîq Ḥasan Khân, who has already been mentioned (pp. 27–8 supra).

Her Urdu diwân (Diwân i Shîrîn) was published at Cawnpore in 1872,* and another Urdu work, Tahâhîb al-niswân, at Delhi in 1889*.

Tûj al-îqbûl târîkh i riyyâsat i Bhôpâl, a history of Bhôpâl to the year 1289/1872.
Edition: Cawnpore 1289–90/1873*.
Urdu version: Cawnpore 1873*.

English translation (from the Urdu): The Tûj-ul Ikbûl Târîkh Bhopal; or the History of Bhopal. By H.H. the Nawâb Shâhjahan . . . Translated by H. C. Burstow. Calcutta 1876°*.


M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (gg) MÂLWAH

991. 'Ali b. Maḥmûd al-Kirmanî called Shihâb i Ḥâkim was in the service of Maḥmûd-Shâh Sulṭân Khaljî of Mâlwaḥ (reigned 29 Shawwâl 839/16 May 1436–19 Dhû 'l-Qa'dah 873/31 May 1469), after whose death he wrote at the command of his son
and successor Sultan Ghiaath al-Din (reigned 873/1469-906/1500) his

Ma'athir i Mahmud-Shah, a flowery history of Mahmud-Shah with a brief account of his predecessors, especially Sultan Hushang and Muhammad-Shah (Ghazni Khan): Berlin 511 (a seal dated 1182/1768-9), Browne Suppt. 249 (A.H. 1199/1785. King's 67), Bodleian 270 (slightly defective at beginning. N.d.).

992. Of unknown authorship is


993. A Tarikh i Malwa by Karam-'Ali is mentioned by C. E. Luard as one of the authorities used by him in compiling the Malwa Gazetteer (Bombay 1908), but no copies of this work seem to be recorded in any published catalogue.

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (hh) GWALIOR

994. Sh. Jalal Hisari was secretary to Saiyid Muzaffar Khan Barhah,1 surnamed Khan i Jahân, who was Governor of Gwalior from Shah-Jahân's accession to 1055/1645-6. For his Wāqi'ah i Jhōjhār Sing'h see p. 737 infra.

Guvāliyār-nāmah, a history of Gwalior to 1055/1645-6 based on a Hindī work by a Brahman named Syām: Rieu ii 838a (A.D. 1690).

995. Hiraman b. Gird'har-Dās was Munshā to Mu'tamad Khan (Khwajah Nur), who was Governor (Commandant) of Gwalior from A.H. 1071/1660-1 to 1078/1668.

(Guvāliyār-nāmah), a history of Gwalior to A.H. 1078/1668 based on Jalāl Hisāri's work: Rieu i 303b (A.H. 1080/1669), Eton 201.

1 See Ma'athir al-umara'i pp. 758-766.
996. "In August 1780 Major Popham most cleverly escaladed the strong fortress of Gwâlior at night and took it without losing a man" (V. A. Smith *The Oxford History of India*, Oxford 1920, p. 533). It has already been mentioned (p. 520 § 687 supra) that Captain W. Bruce was one of the officers who took part in that operation.

(*Ahwâl i qâl'ah i Guwâliyâr*), a short history of Gwalior to 1194/1780 written down from the dictation of Môtî Râm and Khwush-hâl, two inhabitants of Gwalior, by order of Captain William Bruce: *Rieu* i 304b (18th cent.), 304b (19th cent.), *ETHÉ* 499.

997. *Khâir al-Din M. Ilâhâbâdi* died about 1827 (see pp. 520-2 supra). Attached by General Stibbert to the staff of Captain William Bruce, who was in charge of the commissariat of Major Popham's force (cf. p. 736 l. 1 supra), he had witnessed the capture of Gwalior in August 1780. In 1206/1791-2 he left Allahabad for Lucknow at the invitation of Āsâf al-Daulah and while there Dr. Bruce showed him a *Guwâliyâr-nâmah*. Finding it defective in matter and badly written, he recast it and enlarged it with an account of the British capture of the fortress, the operations of Colonel Camac against Mahâdâji Sînd’hiyâh and the recapture of Gwalior and Gôhad by the latter.


998. It was at the request of Neil Benjamin Edmonstone²

---

¹ The author refers to his work by these titles near the end of the *Tühfah i lâzâl* (see Bânkimpr vii 607).
² b. 1765, went to Calcutta 1783, for a time Persian translator to Government, Private Secretary to the acting Governor-General 1788, Chief Secretary to Government 1809, Member of the Supreme Council 1812-18, Director of the E.I.Co. 1820, d. 4 May 1841 (see Buckland *Dictionary of Indian biography* p. 132).
that an anonymous author wrote his 

\textit{Aḥwāl i Mād'hauji Sīnd'hīyah}. 

\textit{Aḥwāl i Mād'hauji Sīnd'hīyah}, a life of Mahārājah Mahādajī Sīnd'hīyah (acc. 1769, d. 1794) : \textbf{Berlin} 515.

999. An anonymous \textit{Guvvāliyār-nāmah} is the basis of the \textit{History of the fortress of Gwalior} mentioned below.

\textit{Guvvāliyār-nāmah} : no MSS. recorded, unless it is one of the works described above.

English translation : \textit{History of the fortress of Gwalior}. [Translated] by Shrimant Balvant Row Bhayasaheb, Scindia. [With a continuation by the translator to his own time.] \textbf{Bombay} 1892\textsuperscript{os*}.

1000. Other works :

(1) \textit{Aḥwāl i Mahārājah Sāwā'ī Rānā Chhatar Sing'h ... Rānā Gōhad}, an account (44 foll.) of events in the years 1777 and 1778 relating mainly to Gōhad, a fort which now forms part of the State of Gwalior but which was then held by a Jāṭ rānā : \textbf{Berlin} 519.

(2) Extracts relating to Chandērī and its Mahārājahs from a number of historical works : \textbf{I.O.} 3928 (19th cent.).

(3) \textit{Ḥaqīqat i rājahā i Ujjain} : \textbf{R.A.S.} P. 69 (3) \textit{=} Morley 58.

\textbf{M. HISTORY OF INDIA : (jj) BŪNDĒLK'HAND}

1001. Shailkh Jalāl Ḥišārī has already been mentioned (p. 735 supra) as the author of a \textit{Guvvāliyār-nāmah}.

\textit{Wāqī'ah Ḫojhār Sing'h}, an account of Ḫojhār Sing'h Būndēlah, Rājah of Unchah (Oorcha), and especially of the expedition sent against him by Shāh-Jahān under the command of Saiyid Muẓaffar Khān Khān-Jahān\textsuperscript{1} and his consequent overthrow and death in 1044/1634–5 : \textbf{Rieu} iii 838a (A.D. 1690).

\textsuperscript{1} To whom the author was at one time secretary.
1002. Kēshav Dās (Keśava Dāsa) wrote in Hindustani

Barsing’h-charitra, an encomiastic account of Rājah Birsing’h Dēō, of Oorchā, the murderer of Abū ’l-Faḍl (for whom see pp. 541–51 supra).

Persian translation: *Farah-bakhsh i jān* (a chronogram = 1244), made in 1828–9 by Rāy Šīv Parshād at the request of Turner Macan: Ethé 484 (a.h. 1244/1829).

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (kk) THE DECCAN

1003. M. Hāḍī b. M. Mahdī known as Mirzā Mahdī Khān Šafawi has already been mentioned as the author of the *Diyā’ al-‘uyūn* (p. 54 supra) and the *Majnū’ah i Mirzā-Mahdī-Khānī* (p. 519 supra).

*Qadāyā-yi salāṭīn i Dakan* (a chronogram = 1156/1743), a history of the Deccan based mainly on Firīshṭāb and divided into seven bābūs: Ethé 446 (only 1st bāb (Bahmanīs) and greater part of 2nd (‘Ādīl-Shāhs) to a.h. 1005/1596–7).

1004. Lachhīmī Narāyān “Shafiq” Aurangābādī (see pp. 476–8 supra).

*Tāmmīq i shīgarf* (a chronogram = 1200/1786), a history of the Deccan dedicated to Richard Johnson: Ethé 447 (R. Johnson’s copy, received by him in 1788), 448.

Later edition (?) written a.h. 1203/1788–9: Rieu ii 859b (breaks off in an account of the Marāṭhās. Early 19th cent.).

1005. Some information concerning M. ‘Abbās “Rif’āt” Shirwānī has already been given on pp. 226–7 supra. For his Sulṭān-nāmah and his *Tārikh i Qaisar i Rūm* see p. 421 supra.

*Bāgh i chahār-chaman*, a short history of the Deccan

1 Presumably this is the correct form of the name which Ethé writes Gisēdās.

2 This work (beg. *Bar ḍamā’ir i āghā-dilān*) is without title or preface, but is conjecturally assigned by Rieu to Lachhīmī Narāyān on account of the substantial agreement of the chapter on the Marāṭhās with the *Bisāt al-ghanā‘im*. 

1006. Other works:


(2) *Jang-nāmah i Dakan*, a detailed diary of the operations in southern India under Colonel Camac without author's name or preface: Bodleian 282 (defective at end).

(3) *Khizānah i Rasūl-Khānī dār tārikh i Dakan*: Āṣafīyah i p. 238 no. 606.


(5) *Waqāʿī i Dakan*, history of events in the Deccan in Shāh-Jahān’s reign: Blochet i 620 (18th cent.), Āṣafīyah i p. 258 no. 417 (possibly not the same work. A.H. 1287/1870–1).

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (II) THE BAHMANIDS

1007. S. ‘Ali b. ʿAziz Allāh Ṭabarābā,1 or al-Ṭabarābāʾī,2 al-Ḥasanī went to India from al-ʿIrāq and entered the service of the Quṭb-Shāh [evidently either Muḥammad-Quli, who came to the throne in 989/1580, or his predecessor Ibrāhīm]. Shortly afterwards he witnessed the siege of Naldrug [989–90] in the suite of M.-Quli Quṭb-Shāh.3 Apparently he left the Quṭb-

1 Burhān i maʿāthī r p. 59920 and also in the colophon of the author’s son, p. 632 ult.
2 B. i m. p. 592.
3 B. i m. p. 534 penult.: Ḥawī i in aurāq rā ham dar-ān nazarī zī awlīyat i ʿIrāq itīfāg i Hindūstān usfūdah dar sikl i Muḥammad i ʿalabah i ʿulyā-yi Quṭb-Shāhī intizām dāshī u dar-ān rūz dar mlīzmat i hadrat i Quṭb-Shāh bar bulandī kih muskīrī bar ḫīr u maʿrākah i paikār būd istādah īn waqīyāh ī ḫāʾilah rā ba-rāy al-ʿain musḥāhadah mī wūmād.
Shāhī service for that of the Nizām-Shāhs, since his Burhān i ma‘āthīr was written by order of Burhān Nizām Shāh, who reigned from 999/1591 to 1003/1595.

Burhān i ma‘āthīr (a chronogram = A.H. 1000/1592, the date of inception), a history of the Bahmanids of Gulbargah, the Bahmanids of Bidar and the Nizām-Shāhs of Ahmadnagar to the year 1004/1596: Browne Pers. Cat. 104 (as far as A.H. 999 autograph dated A.H. 1003/1594, the remainder written by the author’s son in 1038/1628), Suppt. 173 (King’s 64), Rieu i 314b (A.H. 1197/1782–3), Ethé 449 (slightly defective), Romaskewicz p. 4 no. 969.

Edition: Haidarabad (Delhi printed) 1355/1936† (Silsilah i makhṣūṭūtāt i fārisiyah, 2).


1008. S. Asad Allāh, commonly called (‘urf) Mīr Nawwāb, was a First Ta‘alīq-dār under the Government of Haidarābād.

Mukhtar al-akhbār tuḥfat al-akhyār,1 a history of the Bahmanid dynasty.


M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (nn) AHMADNAGAR

1009. Shāh Tāhir b. Shāh Raḍī al-Dīn al-Īsmā‘īlī al-Husainī al-Dak’hānī was a teacher (mudarris) at Kāshān, who acquired such influence that he aroused the jealousy of Shāh Ismā‘īl and the hostility of the Sādr, Mīr Jamāl al-Dīn Astarābādī.

1 Mukhtar al-akhyār tuḥfat al-akhbār according to the Āṣafiyah catalogue.
Feeling insecure, he fled to India in 926/1520. Landing at Goa, he stayed for a time at Paréndah, but in 928/1522 he went to Ahmadnagar on the invitation of Burhān Niẓām-Shāh and became his trusted adviser. He converted Burhān Niẓām-Shāh to the Shi‘ite belief and propagated it with much success in the Deccan. He died at Ahmadnagar in 952/1545, or 953/1546, or 956/1549.

A collection of his letters, Inshā‘, or Munsha‘īt, i Shāh Tahir, partly official and partly private, has been preserved (see Rieu i 395, Bānkīpur Suppt. ii 2121).

**Fath-nāmah**, an account of the conquest of Shōlapūr by Burhān Niẓām-Shāh: Bānkīpur Suppt. ii 2119 (A.H. 1077/1666–7 or soon after).

[Tuhfah i Sāmī, Tihrān A.H.S. 1314, p. 29; Burhān i ma‘āthir pp. 251–8 (arrival in India), 258–68 (conversion of the king etc.), 324–6 (death) and elsewhere; Majlis al-mu‘minūn pp. 352–4 (the last biography in Majlis vii); Firishtah, Bombay ed., ii pp. 213–30 (in the account of Burhān Niẓām-Shāh); Beale Oriental biographical dictionary p. 369; Rieu i 395; Bānkīpur Suppt. ii pp. 94–5.]

1010. For the *Burhān i ma‘āthir* of ‘Alī b. ‘Azīz Allāh Ṭābātābā see p. 740 supra.

1011. “On the back of the first leaf in the present volume” [i.e. the *Muntakhab i tawārīkh i Bahrí*] “there is a note, in English, stating that it contains sketches of the Ahmadnagar history, by the late Kāzī ’Abd an-Nabī, ‘from original papers in his possession, transcribed from the original MS.’ In the first lines of the text it is mentioned that the Jāmī’ al-‘Ulām, written by the late Kāzī ’Abd an-Nabī, is the source from which the extracts relating to Ahmadnagar are derived; and it would appear that that work was arranged in alphabetical order, since the extracts are said to have been taken from the Chapter of Alif with Há.” *‘Abd al-Nabī* b. Qādī ‘Abd al-Rasūl Ahmadnagari is described by Raḥmān ‘Alī as a pupil and disciple of Shāh Wajih al-Dīn ‘Alawī Ahmadabādī. The well-known Gujrātī saint and scholar of that name (for whom see Raḥmān ‘Alī
249 etc.) died in 998/1590 and cannot have been the immediate teacher of ‘Abd al-Nabī Aḥmadnagarī, whose Persian commentary on the Kāfiyyah of Ibn al-Ḥājib, Jāmī’ al-ḥumūd manba’ al-fuyūd, was written in 1144/1731–2 (Editions: Cawnpore 1881° (2nd ed.), 1896° (4th ed.)). The Jāmī’ al-ʿulām, from which the information relating to Aḥmadnagar is taken, must presumably be the work which in the preface is called Dustūr al-ʿulāmā’ jāmī’ al-ʿulūm al-ʾaqtilyah hāwī ’l-furū’ waʾl-ʿusūl al-naqtiyah (on the title-page of the printed edition Jāmī’ al-ʿulūm al-mulaqqab bi-Dustūr al-ʿulāmā’) and of which the first fann, an Arabic dictionary of technical terms, was published at Ḥaidarābād in 1329/1911. It may be conjectured that one of the funūn of that work is a geographico-historical dictionary in Persian.


[Rahmān ‘Alī p. 135].

1012. Shīhāb al-Dīn was Qāḍī of Aḥmadnagar in the early part of the 19th century.

Shīhābī, a historical work [on the Deccan?] compiled from Firistahā, Khāfī Khān, the Jāmī’ al-ʿulūm and the Yād-dāštī i buzurgān : I.O. 4536 (passages relating to Aḥmadnagar only from the accession of Aḥmad Shāh [II] Bahmanī to the time of [Henry] Pottinger circ. 1229 Fašlī).
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1013. Rafī’ al-Dīn Ibrāhīm b. Nūr al-Dīn Taufīq Shīrāzī was born in, or about, 947/1540–1, and went to India originally as a merchant. From his twentieth year he served ‘Alī ’Ādil-Shāh (reigned 965/1557–987/1579), at first apparently as steward (khwān-sālār), and acted sometimes as his secretary. In 1005/1596–7 (i.e. in the time of Ibrāhīm ’Ādil-Shāh II, who reigned from 987/1579 to 1035/1626) he was sent on an important mission to Aḥmadnagar, and about this time he held the offices
of Governor of Bijapur, Steward to Prince Fath Khan and Master of the Mint. He wrote an abridgment of the *Rauḍat al-ṣafā* and a work entitled *Farhang-nāmah*.

_Tadhkirat al-mulūk_, begun in 1017/1608–9 and completed in 1020/1611–12, a history of the ‘Ādil-Shāhs to 1020/1611–12 and of contemporary Indian and Persian dynasties: Blochet i 619 (18th cent.), Rieu i 316α (A.D. 1832), iii 1040α (extracts only). Circ. A.D. 1850, Suppt. 83 iii (19th cent.), Bodleian 276, Rehatsek p. 73 no. 11, Ethé 2538 (somewhat curtailed. A.D. 1879), Āṣafiyah iii p. 100 no. 1081 (A.H. 1306/1888–9. Title given as *Tuhfat al-mulūk*).


[Autobiographical statements in the _Tadhkirat al-mulūk_; _Futūḥat i ʿĀdil-Shāhī_ (Rieu i 317a) foll. 169a, 216b–227b; Rieu i 316a.]

1014. M. Ḥakīm (? Ḥakīm M.) Amīn, or Amīnā, "Ātashī" was a court-poet of Sultān Muḥammad ʿĀdil-Shāh (A.H. 1036 or 1037/1626 or 1627–1067/1656). For a MS. of his *Kulliyāt* see Ethé 1536.

ʿĀdil-nāmah, a mathnavī on the exploits of Sultān Muḥammad ʿĀdil-Shāh: Ethé 1536 (4) (defective at beginning. A.H. 1042/1633).

1015. Ḥāshim Bēg "Fuzūnī" Astarābādī having performed a pilgrimage to Mecca was prevented by the unsafety of the roads from returning home and so set out for India, landed on the coast of Malabar and went to Bijapur, where Muṣṭafā Khan presented him to Sultān Muḥammad ʿĀdil-Shāh.

_Futūḥat i ʿĀdil-Shāhī_, a history of the ʿĀdil-Shāhs to A.H. 1054/1644–5: Rieu i 317α (17th cent.), 318α (abridged. 19th cent.).

[ʿAbd al-Nabī Mai-khānah pp. 443–9; *Makhzan al-gharāʾib* no. 1909.]

1016. Abū ʿl-Qāsim al-Ḥusainī composed
Gudastah i gulsan i râz [?], a history of Muḥammad ʿĀdil-Shâh: Browne Coll. H. 17 (13) = Houtum-Schindler 24 (defective at end).

1017. S. Nūr Allāh b. Qādī S. ʿAlī Muḥammad al-Ḥusainī al-Qādirī was one of the men of letters in whose society ʿAlī ʿĀdil-Shâh II (a.h. 1070/1660–1083/1672) delighted.

(Târîkh (Tawârîkh) i ʿAlî-ʿĀdîl-Shâh(i)(yah)), a turgid history of ʿAlī ʿĀdil-Shâh II from his birth to the invasion of Râjah Sai Sing’h and Shivâjî and their final repulse in 1076/1665–6, completed in 1077/1666–7: ʿĀṣafiyāh i p. 226 no. 556, iii p. 96 no. 1076 (a.h. 1097/1683–6), Lindesiana p. 207 no. 937 (circ. a.d. 1720), Rieu i 318a (18th cent.), iii 966b (defective at end. Circ. a.d. 1850), 318b (a.d. 1821), Ethî 450 (n.d.), 451 (n.d.), 452 (a.h. 1233/1818), 453 (19th cent.), I.O. 4533 (a.h. 1298/1880), Ivanow 1st Suppt. 760 (early 19th cent.), Gotha Arabic Cat. v p. 487 no. 9** (4) (a.h. 1257/1841).

[Ahwâl i salāfün i Bîjâpûr (B.M. MS. Add. 26,270 fol. 30); Rieu i 318.]

1018. At the request of ʿAbd al-Muḥammad Shâh-nawâz Khân an anonymous author ¹ compiled the

Tawârîkh i haft kūrsâ, a sketch of ʿĀdîl-Shâhî history to 1097/1686 in seven majâlis: Ethî 454.

1019. An anonymous author, who is called by Grant Duff (History of the Mahrattas i p. 78) ² Syud Moideen [= Muḥyî ʿl-Dîn ?] Peerzadah and by Erskine (in a note at the end of

¹ According to H. H. Wilson The Mackenzie Collection, 2nd ed., Calcutta 1828, p. 374, the author is “Ased khan of Lar” (? Asad Khân Lârî). It may perhaps be the history mentioned in § 1019 as by Mir Ibrahim b. Mir Ḥusain Lâr Asad-Khân. On a fly-leaf of the I.O. MS. the authorship is ascribed to Futûr Khân [sic ?].

² “A history of Beejapoor, written by Syud Moideen Peerzadah, suggested by numerous enquiries put to him by English officers, who have been much in the habit of visiting Beejapoor since the last Mahratta war. It was finished in January 1821: and although great pains have been taken, the author’s dates, by confusing the Soorsun and Hejrî eras, are frequently much misplaced. His industry, however, is very commendable.”
the B.M. MS. Add. 26,269) Suedd Ghulam Moideen Peerzadah, compiled in 1221/1806-7 from the histories of Mir Ibrāhīm b. Mīr Ḥusain Lūr Asad-Khānī (written in the time of ‘Alī ‘Ādil-Shāh II) and Shaikh Abū ‘l-Ḥasan (who died a few years before the capture of Bijāpur) his

Āhvaūl i salāṭīn i Bijāpūr, a sketch of ‘Ādil-Shāhī history to the death of Sikandar in 1111/1699: Rieu i 318b (A.H. 1236/1821), R.A.S. P. 76 = Morley 64.

1020. Ghulām Murtadā called Şāhib Ḥadrat was an acquaintance of J. C. Grant Duff, the author of a well-known History of the Mahrattas, who mentions him in that work (vol. i p. 98) not indeed as the author of the Basāṭīn al-salāṭīn but as “a Peerzaduh, styled Sahib Hazrut, son-in-law of Abdoolah Sahib, a very venerable and sensible old man, the most respectable person now in Beejapoor” ¹ and as the owner of “original memoranda for a history of Beejapoor, partly arranged by Abdool Hossein [sic, for Abū ‘l-Ḥasan] Qazee, who died a few years before the city was finally captured.” According to the British Museum copies the Basāṭīn al-salāṭīn was completed in 1237/1822, which is indeed the date of Add. 26,269, and according to one of them it was intended for presentation to Mr. Grant, the Resident [i.e. the afore-mentioned J. C. Grant Duff, originally Grant, British Resident at Satārah, for whom see Buckland’s Dictionary of Indian biography p. 178]. In the other recorded copies, however, the name of Ghulām Murtadā is replaced in the preface by that of Muḥammad Ibrāhīm al-Zubairī and the date of completion is given as 1240/1824.


¹ “He is full of legendary information, and on seeing and conversing with him, in the midst of lofty domes and falling palaces, one fancies himself in company with the last of the inhabitants of that wonderful place.”

Urdu translation: by M. Faḍl al-Ḥaqq also called Ahmad Miyān, Baroda 1895* (Nāgarī character).
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1021. It was in 1016/1607, according to Sprenger,¹ that "Fursī" composed his Nasab-nāmāh or Nisbat-nāmāh i shahryārī, as Sprenger calls it.

Nasab-nāmāh, or, according to Sprenger, Nisbat-nāmāh i shahryārī, a poem of about 20,000 verses on the history of the Qūṭ-Shāhī dynasty extending to the beginning of M.-Quli's reign (A.H. 989/1581–1020/1611): Sprenger no. 227 (Mōtī Mahall and A.S.B.), Ivanow 690 (fine copy. A.H. 1022/1613 (?)), 691 ("Tarārikh i Qub-Shāh," an abridgment (?),² made possibly by Ḫirā La'l "Khvush-dīl", Ḥāidar-Quli Khān's Munshī, to whom the work is ascribed in the colophon of this MS. Defective and perished copy. Late 18th cent.), Ethe 1486 (the same abridgment. N.d.).

1022. It was at the command of Sultān Muḥammad Qūṭ-Shāh, who reigned from 1020/1612 to 1035/1626, that an anonymous author wrote the Tārīkh i Sultān-Muḥammad-Qūṭ-Shāhī, which was (doubtless only in part) abridged from an earlier history and completed in Sha'bān 1026/1617.³

¹ Ivanow was "unable to discover the date of composition, 1016/1607, given in Spr. 409" and thought the poem probably earlier.
² "The author's name is given (on ff. 3v, 9v, 107 etc.) as Fursī, the same as in the preceding work, and a collation with it shows that both works are not only identical in their arrangement and contents, but even that in the present version there are a great number of hemistichs agreeing word for word with those in No. 690. The connection of both works is beyond dispute, but it is difficult to determine the nature of this relation" (Ivanow).
³ Rieu's statement (copied by several later cataloguers) that this work was begun in Sha'bān 1026 and completed at the beginning of 1027 is apparently due to misunderstanding of a passage in which the author says that he completed it in Sha'bān 1026, the beginning of the 27th year of the Sultān's life.
Tārikh i Sultaṇ-Muḥammad-Qutb-Shāhī, as the author calls it in the preface, or Tārikh i Qutb-Shāhī, as it is sometimes called, a history of the Qutb-Shāhī dynasty to the end of 1025/1616: Ethé 456 (A.H. 1078/1668), 457 (A.H. 1197/1783–1198/1784), 458–62 (5 copies, one described as old), I.O. 3676(a) (A.D. 1852), 4534 (A.D. 1880 ?), Blochet iv 2325 (A.H. 1082/1671), i 621 (early 18th cent.), Leyden iii p. 10 no. 922 (not later than A.D. 1680), Rieu i 322a (3 copies, one of the 17th cent.), 3206 (A.H. 1196/1782), iii 957a (extracts only), Bāṅkīpūr vii 613 (A.H. 1171/1757–8), Browne Suppt. 243 (Christ's), 244 (A.H. 1199/1784–5). King's 89), Aṣafīyāh i p. 228 nos. 401, 374, 680, 790 ("Tārikh i Qutb-Shāhī"). Probably not all the same work, since only 374 is expressly stated to be the same work as 401, which is described as written in 1026), Bodleian 277, R.A.S. P. 80 = Morley 68.

1023. Maḥmūd 1 b. 'Abd Allāh Nishāpūrī entered the service of Sultaṇ Muḥammad-Quli Qutb-Shāh in 995/1587. He made a pilgrimage to Mecca and also a long journey through Persia. At one place in his Ma'āthir i Qutb-Shāhī i Maḥmūdī A.H. 1033/1624 is mentioned as the current year, but elsewhere a later date, A.H. 1038/1629, occurs. It seems probable that he is identical with the author of the Tārikh i Turkmāniyāh (see p. 299 supra).

Ma'āthir i Qutb-Shāhī i Maḥmūdī, a history originally written in three volumes but afterwards several times altered and enlarged, of which the portion surviving in Ethé 463 contains a brief sketch of the reign of Sultaṇ Muḥammad Qutb-Shāh with a detailed account of contemporary events especially under the Ṣafawīs based on the 'Ālam-ārāy i 'Abbāsī and divided into 12 maqālahs: Ethé 463 (portion only, defective at end).

1024. Nigām al-Dīn Ahmad  b. 'Abd Allāh al-Shīrāzī al-Ṣā'īdī.

Hadīgat al-salātīn, a pompous history of Sultaṇ 'Abd Allāh Qutb-Shāh (b. 1023/1614, acc. 1035/1626, d. 1083/1672) from

1 Ethé calls the author of the Ma'āthir i Qutb-Shāhī i Maḥmūdī "Muḥammad bin 'Abdallāh of Nishāpūr" and the author of the Tārikh i Turkmāniyāh "Ibn 'Abdallāh Maḥmūd of Nishāpūr" without suggesting their identity.
his birth to the sixteenth year of his reign, A.H. 1050/1640–1: 
Rieu i 321a (A.H. 1196/1782), 322a (defective. 18th cent.), Ethé
464 (A.D. 1807), I.O. 3676 (b) (A.D. 1852).
Edition (of "Part I"): Ūaidārābād 1350/1932*1 (edited by
S. 'Alī Asghar Bilgrāmī).

1025. For the Ḥadiqat al-‘ālam of Mīr-‘Ālam (Abū 'l-Qāsim
b. Raḍī al-Dīn al-Mūsawī) see p. 751 infra.

1026. M. Qādir Khān "Munshi" Bīdārī was the author of
works entitled Tārīkh i Āṣaf-Jāhī (see p. 755 infra), Tawārīkh
i farkhundah (see p. 755 infra), Sair i Hind u gulgasht i Dakan,
written in 1247/1831–2 (see Āṣafīyāh i p. 242 nos. 286 and 754),

(1) Tārīkh i Qutb-Shāhī : Rieu iii 1037b (extracts only.
Circ. A.D. 1850).
Edition: Burhāniyāh Press, Ūaidārābād (see Ūaidārābād
Coll. p. 50, where the date is not mentioned).

(2) Tārīkh i Qādirī, a history of the Qutb-Shāhs written in
1249/1833–4 (and probably identical with the preceding work):
Āṣafīyāh i p. 228 no. 409 (A.H. 1300/1882–3), no. 679 (A.H. 1307/
1889–90).

1027. Other works :

(1) (Naqīl i Jamshīd Khān), a short anonymous account
of the reign of Jamshīd Khān Qutb-Shāh : D.M.G. 11 (38 foll.
A.H. 1246/1831).

(2) Tārīkh i Dakan ḥalāt i Qubīyāh : Āṣafīyāh iii p. 96
no. 1178.
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1028. Mir M. Aḥsan "Ījād" has already been mentioned
(p. 604 supra) as the author of a history of Farrukh-siyar.

Tārīkh i futūḥat i Āṣafī, manżūm (Shāh-nāmah i Dakan),

1 Cf. Luzac’s Oriental List, vol. xlix, no. 3 (July–Sept. 1933), p. 93, where
the place of publication is given as Karachi.
a poem on the events of forty years in India and the conquests of Āṣaf-Jāh: Āṣafiyyah iii p. 96 no. 1493 (defective at both ends. A.H. 1133/1720-1).

1029. When Nizām-‘Ali Khān was marching against Rag’hunāt’h Rāū, he asked M. Faid-Bakhsh Qāḍī Aurangābādī to write an account of the campaign.

History of the campaign against Rag’hunāt’h Rāū and other Marāṭ’hā commanders from 22 Sha’bān 1187/9 Nov. 1773 to his defeat and flight on 6 Rabī’i 1188/17 May 1774: Bāṅkipūr vii 614 (31 foll. 19th cent.).

1030. Mun‘im Khān b. ‘Abd al-Mughnī Hamadānī 1 Aurangābādī 2 was in the military service of Nizām-‘Ali Khān, from whom he received the titles of Mun‘im al-Daulah Qudrat-Jang, and was for a time Qal’ah-dār of Bīdar. He was in his 47th year when he wrote his Sawānīḥ i Dakan.

Sawānīḥ i Dakan, an account of the six sūbahs of the Deccan and a history of the Nizāms to A.H. 1197/1783 followed by notices of prominent amūrs of Nizām-‘Ali’s reign, of Māḍ’hava Rāū and Rag’hujī Bhōslah with a khātimah containing an account of the author and his ancestors: Rieu i 322b (late 18th cent.), iii 1039b (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850), 1040a (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850), Āṣafiyyah i p. 242 no. 604, Êthé 2836 (lacks most of the khātimah), I.O. 3888.

1031. Of unknown authorship is

A short history of the Nizāms to the accession of Mir Nizām-‘Ali Khān in 1175/1761 written apparently in 1198/1784, but without preface or author’s name (beginning Asl i nasab i sharīf i ḥaḍrat i Nawwāb i mustaṭāb i mu‘allā-algāb): Rieu i 323a (53 foll. Late 18th cent.).

1032. Shāh Tajalli ‘Ali was a disciple and pupil of the saint and calligraphist Shāh Mu‘īn Tajalli and became distinguished himself

---

1 He claimed descent from the well-known Naqshbandī saint Khwājah Yūsuf Hamadānī.

2 His grandfather settled in Aurangābād.
as a mystic, a calligraph, a poet, a prose-writer, and a painter. He was a constant companion of Nizām-‘Alī Khān (Nizām of Ḥaidarābād 1175/1761–1218/1803), of A‘zam al-umarā’ Arasṭū-Jāh and of Shams al-umarā’. When he wrote the Tuzuk i Āṣafiyyah A‘zam al-umarā’ procured for him a gift of fifty thousand rupees from the amūrs of Ḥaidarābād. For a portrait of Nizām-‘Alī Khān he received a reward of five thousand rupees.

According to the Gulzār i Āṣafiyyah he died in 1215/1800–1. According to Rieu iii 1037a “In a copy [of the Tuzuk i Āṣafiyyah] belonging to Mīr Akbar ‘Alī Khān, of Ḥaidarābād, the history is brought down to Shavvāl a.h. 1206, and it is stated at the end that it was cut short by the death of the author”.

Tuzuk i Āṣafi, or Tuzuk i Āṣafiyyah, or Āṣaf-nāmah, or Tadhkīrāh i Āṣafi, a history of the Nizāms and especially Nizām-‘Alī Khān to Shawwāl 1206/1792: Ethé 467 (a.h. 1226/1811), Āṣafiyāh i p. 234 nos. 526 (a.h. 1260/1844), 732 (a.h. 1298/1881), Bānkīpur vii 616 (extending to a.h. 1217/1802? 19th cent.), Rieu iii 1037a (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850), 1039a (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850), perhaps also R.A.S. P. 79 = Morley 67 (“Tārīkh i Nizām-‘Alī Khān u Nāṣir-Jang”. Defective at end).


[Gulzār i Āṣafiyyah pp. 382–3; Sprenger p. 294.]

1033. Lachhmi Narāyan “Shafiq” Aurangābādī (see pp. 476–8 supra).

(1) Ma‘āthīr i Āṣafi, a history of the Nizāms, completed 1 Rabi‘ ii 1208/6 Nov. 1793: Ethé 468, Ivanow 196 (defective at end. Early 13th cent. H.), Rieu iii 1039a (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850).

(2) “A description of the city of Ḥaidarābād, its mosques, palaces and gardens with a sketch of its history and an account of the neighbouring provinces of Muḥammadābād (Bidar) and Aurangābād,” written a.h. 1214/1799–1800 (beg. Ba‘d i ḫamā i Parvārdghār): Rieu i 327a (early 19th cent.).

1034. Abū ʻl-Qāsim b. Raḍī al-Dīn al-Ḥūṣawī, surnamed
(al-mulagqab) Mīr-ʿĀlam, as he calls himself in the preface to the Ḥadīqat al-ʿālam, i.e. Mīr Abū ʿl-Qāsim Mūsawī Shūstāri, was born at Ḥaidarābād in 1166/1752–3, his father having migrated to the Deccan from Persia (az wilāyat, Gulkūr i Āṣafīyah p. 305?) in the time of Āṣaf-Jāh I (d. 1161/1748). He became the confidential agent of Nizām-ʿAli Khān (Nizām of Ḥaidarābād 1175/1761–1218/1803) and was repeatedly entrusted with important missions. In 1201/1786–7 (Gulkūr i Āṣafīyah p. 306) he was sent to Calcutta for the purpose of negotiating a treaty with Lord Cornwallis, and on his return he received the title of Mīr-ʿĀlam (ba-khiyāb i Mīr-ʿĀlam Bahādur mashhūr i āṣaf shud, Gulkūr i Āṣafīyah p. 307?). In 1206/1792 he took a prominent part in the conclusion of peace with Tīpū Sulṭān. At the siege of Seringapatam in 1213/1799 he was in command of the Nizām’s contingent. In Rabī’ ii 1219/1804 Sikandar-Jāh (Nizām of Ḥaidarābād 1218/1803–1244/1829) appointed him Divān and Mādar al-mahāmm (Gulkūr i Āṣafīyah p. 213). After holding this office for four years and a half he died on 23 Shawwal 1223/12 Dec. 1808 (Gulkūr i Āṣafīyah p. 315), and, according to the Qāmūs al-mashhūr, he lies buried in the Dā’irah i Mīr Mūmin at Ḥaidarābād.

(1) Ḥadīqat al-ʿālam,1 a history of the Quṭb-Shāhs and the Nizāms in two maqālahs ((1) the Quṭb-Shāhs in seven bābs, (2) the Nizāms in a muqaddimah (Ṣubah-dārs of the Timūrids) and four bābs ((1) Āṣaf-Jāh, d. 1161/1748, (2) Nāṣir-Jang, d. 1164/1750, (3) Ṣalābat-Jang, d. 1177/1763, (4) Nizām-ʿAli, to 1209/1794–5 with a few lines on the 2nd Mysore War and Tīpū’s death in 1213/1799), a fifth bāb (on Sikandar-Jāh) and an

---

1 According to S. Ḥusain Bilgrāmī A memoir of Sir Salar Jung, Bombay 1883, p. 12, the Ḥadīqat al-ʿālam was really written by ‘Abd al-Laṭif Shūstāri, the author of the Tuhfat al-ʿĀlam (for which see Rue i 383 etc.), and in the B.M. MS. Add. 26,259 (Rue i 324b) there is a preamble in which M. Abū Turāb b. S. Ahmad al-Riḍāwī claims the authorship. Similarly in Ethé 465 there is a preamble in which Mīr Abū Turāb says that at Mīr-ʿĀlam’s request be wrote in 1221/1806 a history of the Quṭb-Shāhs entitled Quṭb-numāy i ʿālam and divided into a muqaddimah, seven bābs and a khātimah (on Mīr-ʿĀlam’s life). For a copy see Ethé 2840 mentioned below. A work by Abū Turāb entitledFarhāt al-ʿālam of which an edition (?) was published (where ?) in 1221/1806 is mentioned in Āṣafīyah ii p. 880 no. 133.
khātimah (on the author’s life) having apparently remained unwritten: Ethé 465 (Maqālah i), 466 (a fragment (40 foll.) of a history of Nizām-‘Ali from his birth A.H. 1146/1733–4 to A.H. 1171/1758, “no doubt a part of the first original sketch, out of which the second makālah of the work has been expanded.” A.D. 1785), 2839 (Maqālah i), 2840 (Mīr Abū Turāb’s Qubnumāyī ʿalām virtually identical with the Ḥadīqat al-ʿalam. A.H. 1222/1807), Rieu i 323b (Maqālah i only. Early 19th cent.), 324b (Maqālah ii, slightly defective at end. Eealy 19th cent.), 325b (5 foll., supplying the defect at end of the preceding. Early 19th cent.), Suppt. 84 i (both maqālahs, A.H. 1258/1842), R.A.S. P. 81 (Maqālah i. A.H. 1258/1842).


1035. Khwājah ʿAbd al-Ḥakīm was educated at Farrukhābād and was a pupil of M. Rahm-ʿAli Khān and of Muftī S. M. Wali Allāh [Farrukhābādī, for whom see pp. 25 and 694 supra]. At the time when he wrote the Tuhfat i Akbarī he had been for nine years in the service of the government of Haidarābād, having obtained
employment there through Munshi Mir ‘Aziz Allah, Mir Munshi to the darbar, and had received the titles of Khan and Bahadar and a mansab.


1036. ‘Abd al-Razzāq b. ‘Abd al-Nabi, an inhabitant of the district of Nāndīr (on the Gōdāvari, 145 miles N. of Ḥaidarābād) was employed as Munshi i dākh by Sir John Malcolm, who reached Nirmal in September 1817 during his campaign against the Pindāris.

Tadhkirah i Nirmal, a history of the fortress of Nirmal to 1198/1783 (so Rieu, but Ethé 469 goes down to 1231/1816) written at Sir J. Malcolm’s request: Rieu i 327a (circ. A.D. 1817), Ethé 469 (A.D. 1851), Āṣafīyah i p. 232 no. 461 (A.H. 1288/1871–2), iii p. 98 no. 996 (A.H. 1247/1831–2), Ivanow 197 (A.H. 1316/1898–9).


1037. Faid i Ḩaqq Šiddīqī Qādirī Chishti commonly called M. Fa'id Allāh spent many years under the protection and patronage of the Nawwāb Muntāz al-umarā' Bahādur and Rājah Shām Rāj Bahādur. He is no doubt identical with the Faid i Ḩaqq who in 1252/1836–7 composed the Risālah i fawā'id mentioned under the heading Mawā'īz i fārisī in the Āṣafīyah Library catalogue vol. ii p. 1606 no. 204. It was in 1236/1820 that he wrote the Waqā'ī i Dakan.

(1) Waqā'ī i Dakan, a history of the Nizāms to A.H. 1233/1817: Bānkīpur vii 617 (A.H. 1241/1826).

(2) Tārīkh i Gauhar i shāhswār, a history of which the precise subject is not stated in Āṣafīyah i p. 230 no. 442 (A.H. 1299/1881–2).
1038. Ghulām-Ḥusain Khān "Jauhar" became in 1190/1776 secretary to the Dīwān of Haidarābād Aʿẓām al-umāraʾ Ghulām-Sayyid Khān (d. 1219/1804-5). Subsequently he retired to Muḥammadābād (Bidar) and wrote his 'Ard i Jauhar, a collection of poems and letters, as well as works on astrology, geometry, and medicine. In 1225/1810 he returned to Haidarābād and made the acquaintance of Rājah Chandū Lāl "Shādān" (who became Dīwān in 1818 and died in 1845) and the poetess Chandā Bibi, called Māh-liqā Bāṭī. In 1238/1822-3 he again visited Haidarābād and saw much of Chandā, at whose request, in his seventieth year, he wrote his Tārikh i dīl-afrūz.

(1) Tārikh i dīl-afrūz, a history of the Nizāms to the accession of Sikandar-Jāh a.h. 1218/1803 divided into a mugaddimah (on the origin of the Nizāms), fourteen lamʿahs ((1) Āṣaf-Jāh, (2) Nāṣir-Jang, (3) Ṣalābat-Jang, (4) Nizām-ʿAlī Khān, (5) Nizām-ʿAlī’s younger brothers, esp. Basālāt-Jang and Mihr-ʿAlī, (6) famous men of Nizām-ʿAlī’s reign, (7) Sikandar-Jāh, (8) Chandā Bibi, (9) geography and history of the Six Šubāhs and of Hindūstān, (10) extent of the empire under Shāh-Jahān and Aurangzēb, (11) fortresses, princes, and officials under the same Emperors, (12) creation of the world, etc., (13) the Seven Climates, (14) rivers, mountains, etc.) and a khātimah (Hindi poems by Chandā): Rieu i 325b (lacks khātimah. 19th cent.), 326b (defective at both ends. Early 19th cent.).

(2) Māh-nāmah, a history (precise subject not ascertained, but perhaps identical with the preceding): Āṣafīyah i p. 230 no. 410 (a.h. 1238/1822-3), I.O. 4532 (portion relating to the Deccan).

[Tārikh i dīl-afrūz, near beginning (cf. Rieu i 325a).]

1039. S. Ilīfāṭ Ḩusain Khān b. ‘Azīz Allāḥ Khān was Mir Munḥā to the British Residency at Haidarābād in the time of Sir Henry Russell (1811–20).

1 For his life see Buckland Dictionary of Indian biography, p. 79, and the various works on the history of Haidarābād. Urdu, Hindi, and Persian dīwāns of his are extant.

2 For her Urdu dīwān see Blumhardt Catalogue of the Hindustani M.SS. in the Library of the India Office, no. 218, where some account of her is given.
Nigāristān i Āṣafī, a history of the Niẓāms written shortly after 1231/1816 by order of Sir H. Russell: Ivanow 1st Suppt. 764 ("Cond. hopeless." Mid 19th cent.).


1040. Makk’han La’l Shāhjahanpūri Ḥaidarābādī wrote his Yādgār i Makk’han La’l at the suggestion of Charles Metcalfe, British Resident at Ḥaidarābād (1820–5).

Yādgār i Makk’han La’l, a history of Ḥaidarābād: Āṣafīyah iii p. 112 no. 1094.

Edition: Tāriḵh i Yādgār, Ḥaidarābād (see Ḥaidarābād Coll. p. 38, where the date is not specified).

1041. M. Qādir Khān "Munshi" Bidarī has already been mentioned (p. 748 supra) as the author of a history of the Quṭb-Shāhs written in 1249/1833–4.

1. Tāriḵh i Āṣaf-fāhī, a history of the Niẓāms from their origin to the accession of Sikandar-Jāh (a.h. 1218/1803): Rieu iii 1037b (extracts only. Circ. A.D. 1850).

2. Tawāriḵh i ṭarkhundah, a short history of Ḥaidarābād to a.h. 1240/1824–5: Āṣafīyah i p. 234 no. 246 (a.h. 1240/1824–5).

1042. Khwājah Ghulām-Husain Khān, entitled (al-mukhāṭab bah) Khān i Zamān Khān, b. Ḥakīm al-Mamālik Māsīh al-Daulah Khwājah M. Bāqīr Khān was born in 1199/1784–5. He was appointed Ta‘alluq-dār i Dawā-khānah i khāṣṣ (Director of the Court Dispensary) by Sikandar-Jāh (Nizām of Ḥaidarābād 1803–29). His successor Nāṣir al-Daulah (1829–57) retained him and his brothers as court physicians, like their father and grandfather before them. In the Āṣafīyah catalogue (iii p. 109) the date of his death is given as 1260/1844, but this may perhaps be the date of composition placed in the wrong column.

Gulzār i Āṣafīyah, a history of the Quṭb-Shāhs and, more especially, the Niẓāms, with biographies of the notable persons
who flourished under the latter, statistics of the six provinces
of the Deccan, and other matters, completed on 4 Jumâdâ ii A.H. 1260/1844.1

Edition: Muhammadi Press [Bombay,2 Printed for S. Rustam

[Gulzâr i Ḡasâfiyâh, Muqaddimah.]

1043, ‘Abd al-‘Alîm M. Naṣr Allâh Khân “Qamar” b. Ḥâkîm ‘Umar Khân Ahmâdî Khwâshgi 4 Khûrijawî left his
birthplace Khûrijâh 5 at the age of ten on his father’s death and
went to live with his maternal uncle Fath Khân, who was then
tahsîldâr at Nižâmâbâd (A’zamgarh Dist.). The well-known
Maulâwî Ahmad ‘Alî Chirîyâkôtî (for whom see Râhmân ‘Alî)
was one of his teachers. He entered the service of Government,
and in 1838 became a Deputy Collector. In 1865, some years
after leaving the government service, he went to Ḥaidarâbâd,
and remained there for 15 years, serving first as Nâzîm (Chief
Judge) of the Faujdârî ‘Adâlat (Criminal Court) and subsequently
as a Šâdîr Ta’lluqâh-dâr (corresponding in many respects to a
Revenue Commissioner in British India, see Temple Journals
i p. 34). He died at Khûrijah on 27 Muḥarram 1299/19 Dec.
1881. He was held in much estimation as a Şüfî and as an official.

Nineteen works of his are mentioned in the Bayâd i jân-fizâ
p. 21, including (1) Tuḥfat al-muṣallîn, a Persian translation of
Ṣâdî al-Dîn al-Kâshgharî’s Munyat al-muṣallî (Cawnpore
1299/1882°, Lahore [1882°]), (2) Sharh i Rubâ’iyât i Yūṣûfî, a
commentary on “Yūsûfî’s” metrical therapeutics (Āgra 1863°,
Cawnpore 1299/1882°), (3) Tîrjâk i Khûrijah, on antidotes to

1 On p. 152 Dhâ ‘l-Hijjah 1258 is mentioned as the date of completion.
2 In the Ḡasâfiyâh catalogue the place of printing is said to be Lucknow,
but this is evidently incorrect, since the work appears in the Bombay Quarterly
Catalogue for the 4th quarter of 1891.
3 No such date is traceable in the I.O. copy, which, however, seems to
have lost two preliminary pages after the first leaf.
4 This is the name of an Afgân clan.
5 Khûrijah is 10 miles S. of Bulandshahr, 30 miles N. of Aligarh, and 50 miles
S.E. of Delhi.
snake-poison (Meerut 1279/1862°), (4) Yumn i azfarî, a grammar of Eastern Turkish (Lucknow 1878°), (5) Bayād i dil-kushā, an anthology, as well as several works in Arabic and Urdu. His Jāmi' i Fath-Khānī, a biography of his uncle, will be mentioned in the section on biography.

Tarīkh i Dakan (a chronogram = 1285/1868–9), an account of Ḥaidarābād, its physical features, administration, inhabitants, distinguished men etc. and of the author’s journey thither in 1865 and his subsequent experiences there.

Editions: Lucknow 1870°*, 1879°.


Tarīkh i Amjadiyāh ("risālah i hādhā kih bāh Riyād al-Rahmān mulaqqab u Tawārīkh [sic] u Dakan ism i tārīkhī u bāh Tarīkh i Amjadiyāh mashhkūr ast", p. 81), a history of India with special reference to the Deccan and particularly to Berar and its one-time capital Ėlichpūr, begun in 1285/1868–9 (as is indicated by its chronogrammatic title Tarīkh i Dakan) in the time of Afḍal al-Daulah, but not completed until after his death, since the history of the Nizāms is brought down to Mīr Maḥbūb ʿAli Khān, and on p. 429 ult. the year 1286 [1869–70] is mentioned as the date of writing.

Edition: Maṭba‘ i Khwurshēdiyāh [Haidarabad ?], date ?

1 But Tarīkh on the title-page and at the head of the table of contents, and this is clearly correct since Tawārīkh i Dakan would indicate 1291.

2 The I.O. copy is defective, the last page being 722 (pp. 707–722 are mis-bound between 660 and 651). According to the table of contents, the khālimah i kitāb began on p. 725.
1045. Khān Bahādur Shams al-ʿUlamāʾ Ahmad ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz “Wilāʾ” Nāʿīṭī Madrāsī, entitled Nawwāb ʿAzīz-Jang Bahādur, was born at Nellore in 1855. In, or about, 1873 he and his father settled in Ḥaidarābād and he obtained a post as calligrapher to the Nizām’s government. Eventually he became a Ṣadr Taʿalluqdār, a member of the Legislative Council, and Vice-President of the Municipality. He died in 1342/1924 (see Āṣafiyah iii p. 616 no. 444). He is best known as the author of the enormous unfinished Persian dictionary entitled Āṣaf al-lughāt, of which seventeen volumes, extending to the word jarrār, were published between 1327/1909 and 1340/1921–2. Other works published by him are “Afṭiyāt i Sultānī, “a description of gifts, grants, assignments, stipends and allowances granted in the Deccan provinces” (Ḥaidarābād a.h. 1325/1907), Filāḥat al-naḵḥ (Ḥaidarābād 1313 Fāsī), Kāḵt i angūr (Ḥaidarābād a.h. 1323/1905), Kāḵt i tarkārī (Ḥaidarābād 1315 Fāsī), Siyāq i Dakan, on the system of account-keeping (Ḥaidarābād 1904) and Tārīkh al-Nawāʾīt, a history of the Nāʿīṭī or Nāʿīṭī tribe, who claim to be of Arab descent (Ḥaidarābād, date ?), all of these being in Urdu. In 1907 he presented to the Asiatic Society of Bengal a collection of over 500 works (described in the Author-catalogue of the Ḥaidarābād Collection of manuscripts and printed books, Calcutta 1913). Similar donations were made by him to two other Indian libraries.


Edition: Ḥaidarābād a.h. 1323/1905 (see Ḥaidarābād Coll., p. 19).

[C. Hayavadana Rao Indian biographical dictionary, p. 6 ; Author-catalogue of the Ḥaidarābād Collection pp. iii, 18–19; obituary notice by J. van Manen in J.ASB. vol. xxii (1925) p. clxxxvi; Portraits in the Maḥbūb al-sīyar, Āṣaf al-lughāt and other works.]

1046. Other works:

(1) Account, in florid and laudatory terms, of the death of Nawwāb Afḍal al-Daulah Nizām al-Mulk Āṣaf-Jāh on 13 Dhū


(3) Kaifīyat i aḥwāl i Ḍabīt-ṭang Mubāriz al-Mulk (an amūr in the time of Niẓām-ʿAlī Khān): Ethē 527 (10).

(4) Kaifīyat i aḥwāl i Tēgh-ṭang Bahādur: Ethē 527 (7).

(5) Kaifīyat i Nawwāb Ḥaidar-ṭang Bahādur: Ethē 527 (15).

(6) Kaifīyat i Mūṣī Bhusā (i.e. presumably Monsieur Bussy, for whom see Buckland Dictionary of Indian biography p. 64): Ethē 527 (11).


(8) Tārikh i binā i Ḥaidarābād: Aṣafiyyah i p. 222 no. 652.

(9) Tārikh i mukhtāṣar i Ḥaidarābād, translated from an English original by M. Fārūḍ al-Dīn Khān, entitled (al-mukhāṭāb bāḥ) Nawwāb Fārūḍ-Nawāz-Jang, son of Nawwāb Sultān al-Mulk Bahādur.

Edition: place? (Ḥaidarābād presumably) 1335/1916–17 (see Aṣafiyyah iii p. 98 no. 1342).


1 The subject of this history is not stated in the Aṣafiyyah catalogue. It is included here on the chance that it relates to Ḥaidarābād.
M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (qq) THE MARĀṬHĀS

1047. At present unidentified is the Persian original of the Translation of an account, of the Morattas, from the reign of Shaw Jehan, to the beginning of that of Shaw Allum, from a Persian MS. obtained at Allahabad, January 1769 (in A. Dalrymple’s Oriental Repertory, vol. i (London 1793) pp. 403–18).

1048. Between A.D. 1773 and A.D. 1777 an anonymous Hindu compiled the

\[\text{Tafṣīl i aḥwāl i ‘urūj u khurūj i rājahā u sardārān i Dak’han,}\]


1049. It was in 1190/1776–7 \(^1\) that Munshi Ḥusām al-Dīn wrote

\[\text{Sharḥ i aḥwāl i Marhattah dar zamān i sābiq u ḫāl bar sabīl i ṣijmāl,}\]

a short (13 foll.) account of the Marāṭhās from Shivājī to the death of Narāyan (A.H. 1188/1774) (beg. Awwal kashī kih bar sar i qaum i Marhattah nāmīvar u mashhūr gardīdaḥ Sīwā walad i Sambhā etc.): Rieu ii 861a (19th cent.).


1050. Probably in 1776 or soon after was compiled

An account of the Marāṭhā Pēshwās from the appointment of Bājī Rāo down to the negotiations of Rag’hūnāṭ’l h

\(^1\) This is an inference drawn by Rieu from the fact that Narāyan Rāo’s son, Mād’ham Rāo, who was born A.H. 1188, is spoken of as a child two years old.

\(^2\) This is the Persian title given to the work in the Asiatick miscellany.
with Col. Upton at Purand’har in 1776 (beginning Mādhūr Rāo pisar i Nārāyan Rāo walad i Bālā Rāo): Rieu ii 801b.

1051. Not later than 1782 was written

Anonymous history of the Marāṭhās to the Battle of Pāṇīpat (beginning: Wīsōjī Pant kih jadd i sīwum i Bālājī Rāo Peskwā būd naukar i Yāqūt Khān Ḥabashī Ṣāḥib i Rājpūrī būd): Glasgow 1 (see JRAS. 1906, p. 597, no. 6).

English translation: A short historical narrative of the rise and rapid advancement of the Mahrattah State, to the present strength and consequence it has acquired in the East. Written originally in Persian; and translated into English by an Officer in the East India Company’s service [James Kerr], London 1782*.


1053. In 1197/1783 was compiled

An account of the Marāṭḥā empire (beginning Mahārājah Rājah Sāhū Bhōsūlah dar Satārah suhūnat dāshī): Rieu ii 801b (18th cent.).

1054. Nawwāb Aṁīn-al-Daulah ‘Azīz al-Mulk ‘Āli Ḥirāḥim Khān Bahādur Nasīr-Jang has already been mentioned (pp. 700–2 supra) as the author of an account of Rājah Chait Sing’h’s rebellion.

History of the Marāṭḥā wars in Hindūstān from 1171/1757–8 to 1199/1784–5, especially Visvāsa Rāo’s attempt to

1 “The history is preceded by a list of the Mogul Emperors and their sons and by four folios containing an account of Ghāzī al-Dīn Khān, the wazir of Ahmad Shāh and ‘Ālamgīr II.”
seize the throne of the Timūrids, completed at Benares in 1201/1786–7: Berlin 15 (4) (A.H. 1204/1790), I.O. 3957 (late 18th or early 19th cent.), 4033 (A.D. 1896), Éthé 491 (defective at end and damaged. Not later than A.D. 1818), Rieu i 328a (A.H. 1229/1814), 328a (early 19th cent.), iii 968b (circ. A.D. 1850), 969a (circ. A.D. 1850), Lindesiana p. 121 no. 452 (“Ahwāl i jang i Marhaṭṭah”). A.D. 1863), Ivanov Curzon 47 (19th cent.).

English translation by Major A. R. Fuller: B.M. MS. Add. 30,784.

Description and 40 pp. of extracts from Fuller’s translation (nearly the whole work apart from the account of the Battle of Pānīpat): Elliot and Dowson History of India viii pp. 257–97.


Extract: Waqā‘i‘ i jang i Ahmad Shāh i Abdālī bā Wiswās Rāō etc., the account of the Battle of Pānīpat extracted from ‘Alī Ibrāhīm Khān’s work at the request of the Governor-General Lord Cornwallis by Munṣī M. Muḥsin al-Dīn, who was for seven years Governor of Benares in the time of Lord Cornwallis (1786–93 and 1805) and who added some information from his own experiences during the Marāṭhā war: Bodleian ii 2355.

1055. It was for Captain (afterwards Sir) John Kennaway (the first Resident at Ḥaidarābād, 1788–94) that an anonymous author wrote

A history of the Poona State from the reign of Narāyan Rāō (A.D. 1773) to the peace of 1787 between the Peshwā and Tipū Sulṭān (beg. Savaṇīk i manṣalakat i Dakhan): Rieu i 328a (early 19th cent.).

1056. Lāchhmi Narāyan “Shāfiq” Aurangābādī (see pp. 476–8).

Bisāt al-ghanā‘īm, a history of the Marāṭhās to their defeat by Ahmad Shāh Abdālī at Pānīpat in 1174/1761, written at the request of Captain (afterwards Sir John) Malcolm and


Urdu translation (?): Bisāt al-ghanā'im [described as “A history of the Marhattas in Urdu” by Ghulām Ṣamdānī Khān Gauhar without mention of Lāchhmī Narāyan], Nizām al-maṭābī, Ḥaidarābād (see Ḥaidarābād Coll. p. 27, where the date is not specified).

1057. It was by order of the British Resident that Sītā-Rām, the Akhbār-nawīs, translated from Marāṭhī originals and completed in July 1824 the work which in the B.M. MS. has the heading—

Tarjamah i kaifīyat i nasab-nāmah i Rājah i Satārah-walāh qaum Marhattah Bhōsleh, a history of the Marāṭhās to the reinstatement of Bājī Rāo by Wellesley in May 1803: Rieu i 329b (A.D. 1824).

1058. For the Makhzan al-futūḥ of Bhagwān-Dās Shīvpūrī see p. 644 supra.

1059. Wājīd ‘Alī Khān, a grandson of Nawwāb ‘Alī Mardān Khān, left Ḥaidarābād in the time of Sikandar-Jāh (acc. 1218/1803, d. 1244/1829) and went to Poonah, where he entered the service of Bājī Rāo. After serving him for four years and taking an active part in his wars against the British he returned home.

Gulshan i jang, a history of Bājī Rāo’s wars against the British from 1230/1815 to 1233/1818: Rieu iii 969 (19th cent.).

1060. Sāfīdar ‘Alī Shāh “Munṣīt” was, according to W. Erskine (see Rieu ii 726a), originally named M. Muḥyī al-Dīn but changed his name on renouncing the world just as his father Muẓaffar-Jang had taken the name of Qandār ‘Alī Shāh. He belonged apparently to a noble family of the Nizām’s Dominions, but that he lived for a time at least in Bombay may be inferred
from the eulogies of W. Erskine, his special patron, and Dr. [John] Taylor, who had restored him to health, which occur in the Jirjis i razm.

Jirjis i razm, a mathnavi on the wars of General Wellesley against Tipu Sultan (A.D. 1799–1802) and the Marat'hās (A.D. 1803): Rieu ii 725a (autograph, A.H. 1229/1814).

Continuation (on the war with Holkar, A.D. 1804): Rieu ii 725b (autograph).

Further continuation (on the Bharatpūr campaign, A.D. 1804–5): Rieu ii 726a (autograph).

1061. Of unknown authorship is

Muntakhab i tawārikh i khānādān i Bhōnshah Rājahā-yi Nāgpūr, annals of the Bhōnshah rājahs of Nāgpūr from A.D. 1659 to A.D. 1818 compiled from seven Persian and twenty-five Marat'hā sources in December 1823 for Richard Jenkins, British Resident at Nāgpūr: Ethē 489.

1062. Other works:

1. Aḥwāl i Bhāo Marhattah u sabab i āmadan i uthay ba-Hindūstān u kushtah shudan i uth bā tamām i hamrāhi-yān dar muhārabah i Aḥmad Shāh i Abdāli bah ḥudūd i Pānpat: Ethē 527 (12 and 13. Circ. A.D. 1808 (?)).

2. Aḥwāl i ḥasab u nasab i Ḥanūbiyān u kaistiyat i ayy u ḥashmat i ān-hā (the opening words) or, as in the colophon, Aḥwāl i āmadan i Marhattah-hā dar Hindūstān: I.O. 3959a (A.D. 1794), Ethē 488 (n.d.).

3. Aḥwāl i Rag'hunāṭ'h Rāō: Ethē 527 (4) (foll. 39a–41b, a few pages relating to the year 1187).

4. Dhikr i aḥwāl u ibtidā i binā i fasād i Siwā i bad-nihād etc., a chronicle of the Bhōnshah family from its origin to the operations against Rājah Rām after the capture of his capital Rāygarh in 1101/1689–90 or 1102/1690–1: Ethē 486 (incomplete).

5. Extracts relating to the Marat'hās from the Khizānah i 'āmirah, the 'Ālamgūr-nāmah, the Tārīkh i Rāhēlah (author not
stated) followed by the history of the Marāṭhās mentioned on p. 760 supra: Ēthē 490 (quite modern), Ivanow 198 (late 19th cent.).

(6) Ḥaqīqat i binā u ‘urūj i daulat i rājahā i Satārah, a short history (8 foll.) of the Rājahs of Satārah from the origin of the family to the time of Rām Rājah, when the government became vested in the Pēshwā: R.A.S. P. 69 (4) = Morley 79, P. 69 (5) = Morley 80.

(7) A history, incomplete and unidiomatic, of the rise of the Bhōslah family probably translated from a Marāṭhā chronicle by a certain Daulat Sing’h, who is described as the author in an inscription on the fly-leaf: Ēthē 487.

(8) Shammah-ī az aḥwâl i Marhaṭṭah Siwā-jī Rājah Satārā-wālah, as it is inappropriately headed, a very brief account of events from the accession of Bājī Rāo II to the end of his reign, by Mīr Badr al-Dīn, a resident of Chichōnd (near Āḥmadnagar): Bombay Univ. 160 (probably autograph).

(9) A short account (5 foll.) of Mād’hau Rāo Pēshwā, comprising the events which took place between 1174/1760 and 1187/1773: R.A.S. P. 69 (6) = Morley 82.

For works relating to the Battle of Pānīpat see also pp. 398–9 and 620–1 supra.

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (rr) BĀLĀ-G’HĀT

1063. Mīr Ḥusain ‘Alī Khān b. S. ‘Abd al-Qādir Kirmānī, the author of the Nishān i Ḥaidari (see p. 774) and the Bādī al-ma’ānī, a life of the saint Bābā Fakhr al-Dīn Ḥusainī, was successively in the service of Ḥaidar ‘Alī, the ruler of Mysore (d. 1782), his son Ṭīpū Sultān (d. 1799) and Lieut.-Col. Colin Mackenzie (for whom see Buckland Dictionary of Indian biography, p. 263).

Tadhkirat al-bilād wa-’l-ḥukkām, a history of some of the Bālā-g’hāṭ principalities to 1215/1800–1, the date of completion, in twelve aurangs, viz. (1) Penukonda (Anantapur District, Madras) and Bijainagar (Vijayanagar) or Āṇigundī (Anagundi),
(2) Sarā (in Mysore), (3) Ad'hōnī (Bellārī Dist., Madrās), (4) Afghāns of Sāvanūr (D'hārwār Dist., Bombay), (5) Khāns of Karapah (“Cuddapah”, Madrās), (6) Kandanūl (Karnūl, Madrās), (7) Pāligārs (“Poligars”) of Harpanahalli (Bellārī Dist., Madrās), (8) Rāidrug (Bellārī Dist.), (9) Bālapūr (Mysore), (10) Kinchan Gaddah (Bellārī Dist.), (11) Gutī (Bellārī Dist.), (12) Sirhattī (Sāngli Dist., Bombay): Rieu i 331 (early 19th cent.), I.O. 3744 (early 19th cent.).

English translation of Aurang 4: An historical sketch of the Patan Principality of Shānnoor (in W. Kirkpatrick’s Select letters of Tipu Sūltān, London 1811*, Appendix D (pp. xi–xxxii)).

English translations, or summaries, of Aurang 6 (Karnūl) and Aurang 12 (Sirhattī): Select letters of Tipu Sūltān…, Appendix G (pp. ii–lxii) and note 19 at the foot of pp. xviii–xx.

1064. Munshī M. ‘Aẓīm al-Dīn b. M. Faid al-Dīn DLWY,¹ a native of Arkāt (Arcot), was for fifteen years in the service of the East India Company as munshī to Saiyid Diwā’ al-Dīn Principal Ṣadr Amin (Chief Indian judge) at Sīrī (Kanara Dist.). He then went to Sāvanūr (an Indian State of circ. 70 square miles in the D’hārwār District of the Bombay Presidency), and entered the service of the ruling Nawwāb Dilēr Khān Bahādur Dilēr-Jang (acc. 1834, d. 1862), at whose request he wrote the

Tārikh i Dilēr-Jangi, a history of the Sāvanūr State completed in 1262/1846.


1065. Other works:

(1) Aḥwāl-nāmah i Karnūl: Ethé 527 (3) (foll. 23a–38a).

¹ This is probably Dalawī. Cf. Wahīd Mīrza The life and works of Amīr Khusrau p. 102, where it is said that the Rājāh of Tilang sent “his ‘dalawi’ or commander” to help Malik Kāfūr’s army and where the word is explained in a note as being “From Karn [sic, apparently meaning Kanarese] dal = an army” and meaning “a commander-in-chief and hence the prime-minister under the Hindu rulers of Mysore (cf. Aiyangar, p. 92) ”.

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (ss) MYSORE

1066. An anonymous author (Munshi Amir, according to a note on the fly-leaf of Ethé 516), who after serving for two years under Captain (afterwards Sir) John Kennaway left his service on the last day of Dhū 'l-Qa'dah 1196/6 Nov. 1782 and then returned to Haidarābād, wrote


1067. In 1196/1782 an anonymous author wrote

Ahwāl i Nāwawāb Haidar ‘Ali Khān Bahādur (beginning: Chū īn tūzah-tar niḥālīst), a history of Haidar ‘Ali Khan from his birth to 1196/1782 completed with a brief statement concerning his death on 1 Muḥarram 1197/7 Dec. 1782: Rieu ii 802a (18th cent.).

1068. Lālah Bud Sing’h “Munshi”, possibly identical with Bud’h Sing’h K’hātri, who wrote the Risālah i Nānak Shāh (see p. 666 supra), spent three years in the compilation of his Tawārīkh i Haidarī, probably soon after Haidar ‘Ali’s death.

Tawārīkh i Haidarī, a life of Haidar ‘Ali Khān from his birth in 1125/1713 [so] to his death and the accession of Tipū Sultān in 1197/1782: Ethé 518 (A.H. 1217/1802), 519 (n.d.), 520 (fragment only).

1069. At the request of Richard Johnson1 an anonymous author wrote his


1070. Tipū Sultān was born at Devanhalli on the 20th of Dhū

1 For an account of Richard Johnson see an article by Sir T. Arnold in Rupam, no. 6 (Calcutta, April 1921).
'l-Ḥijjah 1163/20 Nov. 1750. At the death of his father, Ḥaidar ʿAli Khān, on 7 Dec. 1782 he became ruler of Mysore and continued the war which his father had been waging against the British. Having defeated General Matthews at Bednūr and forced Colonel Campbell to surrender after a prolonged siege at Mangalore in 1783, he made peace in 1784. Soon afterwards he sent an embassy to the Sublime Porte in the vain hope of enlisting the Ottoman Sultān’s support against the British. In 1786 he assumed the title of Pādshāh. In the same year his territory was invaded jointly by the Marāṭhās and by a contingent from Ḥaidarābād. After some successes against them he made peace early in 1787. In this year he sent an embassy to Paris, but he obtained only empty promises of future support. In December 1789 he invaded Travancore. In February 1792 he was besieged in Seringapatam by Lord Cornwallis, and agreed to cede half of his dominions, pay an indemnity and surrender two of his sons as hostages. In 1797 he renewed his efforts to obtain help from the French and sent envoys to Mauritius. This action, together with other evidences of hostile intension, caused Lord Mornington, who became Governor-General in 1798, to declare war. In March 1799 Ṭīpū was defeated at Malvalli by General Harris and on the 4th of May he was killed in the course of General Baird’s storm of Seringapatam.

A report on the correspondence and other documents found

1 Niẓḥān i Ḥaidarī p. 1917-18. Other dates are given elsewhere, e.g. 1749 (Stewart) and 1753 (Bowring). Kirkpatrick says “In a loose paper in my possession, containing directions for the military salutes on various occasions[18], [Footnote “(18) I have since met with the same regulations in the Futhūl Mīḏāḵiḍen”] there is a note, or memorandum, purporting, that the Sultan was born on the 14th of Tūlūnay of the year of the Hijār 1165” (Select letters p. 217, where the 14th of Tūlūnay [i.e. Ṭulā‘ī, the 9th month in Ṭīpū’s first reformed calendar] in a solar year corresponding to 1785 is equated with the 20th of December).

2 For the diary of Ghulām-ʿAli Khān, an envoy who travelled to Iṣṭānbūl in 1200-1, see Ivanow 1678 (Waqā‘ī i manāzīl i Rūm). A report by Ṭīpū’s envoys to Ḥaidarābād dated 1217 Manlūlī and dealing chiefly with the expenses incurred on the journey is also preserved at Calcutta (Ivanow 1680, Rāz-nāmāh i wukalā i Ḥaidarābād).
in the palace at Seringapatam was submitted to the Governor-General on 27 July 1799 by Colonel William Kirkpatrick, and is printed, almost in full, on pp. 180–95 of Lt.-Col. A. Beaton's *View of the origin and conduct of the war with Tippoo Sultaun* (London 1800*). From the mass of these papers certain documents were selected by the Governor-General for examination by N. B. Edmonstone, the Persan Translator to the Government (for whom see Buckland's *Dictionary of Indian biography*, p. 132), and were published in translation (with the text of the French, but not the Persian, documents) in a volume entitled *Official documents, relative to the negotiations carried on by Tippoo Sultaun, with the French nation, and other foreign states, for purposes hostile to the British nation; to which is added, Proceedings of a Jacobin club, formed at Seringapatam, by the French soldiers in the corps commanded by M. Dompart: with a translation...* (Calcutta: printed at the Honorable Company's Press. 1799*). Some of the translations reappear in *Copies and extracts of advices to and from India, relative to the cause, progress, and successful termination of the war with the late Tippoo Sultaun, Chief of Mysore; the partition of his dominions in consequence thereof; and the distribution of the captured property found in Seringapatam. Printed for the use of the proprietors of East-India Stock, [London?] 1800*, and in the appendix to the afore-

1 In the same year (before the Calcutta publication?) appeared at Fort St. George [Madras] a volume of which there is a copy in the British Museum (see Edwards col. 577), but not in the India Office Library, and which bears on the title-page the words *Copies and translations of official documents relative to the negotiations carried on by Tippoo Sultaun with the French nation and other foreign states... prior to the commencement of the war between the English and that prince in Feb. 1799... Fort St. George 1799*. This cannot differ much from the Calcutta publication.

2 Almost identical with the documents contained in this publication are those printed in *The Asiatic Annual Register... for the year 1799* (2nd ed., London 1801*), State papers, pp. 41–100 (Heading: *Papers presented to the House of Commons, relating to the late War in the East Indies with Tippoo Sultaun. (Ordered to be printed 26th September 1799)*), and, Supplement to the state papers, pp. 201–300.
mentioned work of Lt.-Col. Beatson. An unofficial second edition\(^1\) of the Fort St. George publication mentioned in the note on this the previous page is A review of the origin, progress, and result of the decisive war with the late Tippoo Sultaun, in Mysore: with notes; by James Salmond, Esq. of the Bengal military establishment. To which are added, Some account of Zamaun Shah—The Proceedings of a Jacobin Club, formed at Seringapatam—Official advices to India on the subject of the War—An abstract of the forces employed—Letters from Generals Stewart and Harris, containing the accounts of the engagements on the 6th March and 7th May 1779; and Major General Baird’s Report of the storming of Seringapatam;—And an appendix, containing translations of the principal state papers found in the Cabinet of Tippoo Sultaun; and other important official papers... (London 1800\(^*\). Pp. xxxii, 88: Appendix, pp. 300, unpaginated).

The letters and other documents mentioned above are quite different from the Select letters translated by W. Kirkpatrick (see below).

(1) Ṭārīkh i ḫuddā-dādī,\(^2\) a brief autobiography extending to the termination of the Marāṭhā War, i.e. Feb. 1787, which "evidently formed, as far as it went, the ground-work of the

\(^1\) On p. xix is a "preface to second edition", which begins as follows: "Several very important Papers on the subject of the Mysore War having been received from India since the publication of the Quarto edition of this Work, and others then published having by means of the Papers printed for the use of the Proprietors of India Stock, and through the medium of the public prints, been since very generally communicated, it is presumed that a new edition, in the present form, will not be unacceptable to the Public. Such documents antecedent to the capture of Seringapatam, as are already sufficiently known, have been omitted. The orthography of the whole of the original French Papers is so extremely incorrect, that the authenticated Translations only are preserved in this edition. With this exception, all the Papers found in the Palace of Seringapatam, which were originally published by the Authority of the Governor General in Council at Madras, have been republished."

\(^2\) This title, not mentioned by Ethé, is recorded by Kirkpatrick, Select letters, preface p. xviii: "The copy with which that gentleman" [i.e. Colonel Ogg] "favored me was entitled Tareekhe Khodadādy, i.e. the Khodadādy Annals, or History of the Khodadādy Sircar." Sarkār i Khuddā-dād was the official title of Ṭipū Sultaun’s government and was, for example, stamped on the bindings of books belonging to his library."
more diffuse and elaborate history of Zynûl Aabideen Shoostry...”
(Kirkpatrick): Ethé 2990 (45 foll., defective at both ends.¹
See also W. Kirkpatrick’s account of this MS. in his Select letters

Translated extracts (amounting to “a considerable portion”
of the whole): Select letters of Tippoo Sultan ... arranged and
translated by W. Kirkpatrick, London 1811, pp. 18–21, 57–9,
and appendix pp. iii–xi.

(2) Letters (see also pp. 768–70 above): Ethé 525 (vol. i
only, covering the years 1198–1201/1784–7 and containing all
the letters of which translations were published in the Select
letters of Tippoo Sultan as well as more than 600 others. A.D. 1800).

English translation of selections: Select letters of Tippoo Sultan
... arranged and translated by William Kirkpatrick ... London
1811*.

(3) Register of Ṭipū Sultan’s dreams with their
cit. infra, pp. 196–7).

English translation of six dreams: A view of the origin and
conduct of the war with Tippoo Sultan ... by Lieutenant-Colonel

Various official manuals and collections of documents relating
to the administration of Mysore in Ṭipū’s time have been pre-
served.² They include (1) hukm-nāmahs, instructions and regula-
tions intended for different departments and officials, Ivanow
1645–9, 1676–7, 1679, 1681, 1684–93, Berlin 68 (3), 68a, 516,
531 (11), 531 (25), Ethé 526, R.A.S. P. 167–70, (2) Ḍawābī
t i sullāmī, regulations for the proper shape and form of royal
insignia, the orbs or disks at the top of banners, seals, official

¹ The first three pages, accidentally destroyed while the MS. was in Col.
Kirkpatrick’s possession, “were occupied chiefly with an account of the Sultan’s
ancestors.”

² Cf. Government and administrative system of Tipu Sultan by Surath Charan
Sen Gupta (in the Journal of the Department of Letters (University of Calcutta),
von. xix (Calcutta 1929)).
signatures, etc., Ethé 2761, 2762 (a portion only. Dated 1226
Maulūdī 1), Ivanow 1642 (probably the same portion as Ethé
2762), (3) Risūlah i padak-hā, on medals, decorations, flag-
tops, seals, brands, etc., Ivanow 1640, 1641, (4) "A description
of the Seals, Flags, Standards, a Inscriptions, etc. used by Tippū
Sultān" (perhaps identical with (2) or (3) above). R.A.S. P. 171,
(5) various other documents, Ivanow 1643, 1682–3, R.A.S. P. 88
= Morley 78, P. 172.

A manuscript of this kind must be the original of The Mysorean
Revenue Regulations. Translated by B. Crisp from the original
Persian, under the seal of Tippoo Sultaun (Calcutta 1792*). For
the Fatḥ al-mujāhidin which contains regulations for Tippū's
army see p. 773 infra.

[Biographical Anecdotes of the late Tippoo Sultaun; together
with an Account of his Revenues, Establishment of his Troops, etc.
Taken from the information of one of Tippoo's Officers, written in
the year 1790 and Translated from the Persian by Capt. J. A.
Kirkpatrick (in The Asiatic Annual Register... for the Year
1799 (2nd ed., London 1801*), Characters, pp. 1–5); Lt.-Col.
A. Beatson A view of the origin and conduct of the war with Tippoo
Sultaun... , London 1800 (portrait frontispiece); C. Stewart
Memoirs of Futteh Aly Khan Tippo Sultaun (in C. Stewart A
descriptive catalogue of the oriental library of the late Tippoo
Sultan of Mysore, Cambridge 1809, pp. (43)–(94)); M. Wilks
Historical sketches of the South of India, in an attempt to trace the
history of Mysoor, London 1810–17, 2nd ed. Madras 1869;
Lewin B. Bowring Haidar Ali and Tippū Sultaun, Oxford 1893
(Rulers of India series); Buckland Dictionary of Indian biography
pp. 424–5; Ency. Isl. under Tīpū Sultaun (Haig), and many other
works.]

1 For the Maulūdī era (an era of solar years from Muḥammad's birth) introduced by Tippū see J. R. Henderson Coins of Haidar Āli and Tippū Sultaun, Madras 1921, p. 9 seqq. The account given by Kirkpatrick in his Select letters, pp. xxvi–xxxvii, needs correction in the light of Henderson's statements.

1071. A certain Ghulām-Ḥasan¹ wrote at Tipū’s request and completed in 1198/1784 his

Tipū-nāmah or Fath-nāmah i Tipū Sultan, a mathnawī in 49 dāstāns on Tipū’s wars: Ethē 1719 (A.H. 1221/1807), 1720 (n.d.), 1721 (n.d.).

1072. S. Zain al-ʿābidīn b. S. Raḍī [al-Dīn] Mūsawī Shūshtarī was a younger brother of Mīr-ʿĀlam (for whom see pp. 750–2 supra). According to S. Ḥusain Bilgrāmī, A memoir of Sir Salar Jung, Bombay 1883, p. 10, he “left Haidarābād at an early age, and resided for the rest of his life at Tipu’s court”. According to Sprenger (Catalogue . . . of the libraries of the King of Oudh, p. 591) “He lived long at Madras and was in the service of Nawāb Aḥaf-jāh, subsequently he went to Balāghāt [sic] and entered the service of Ḥaydar ‘alīyy Khān, and finally he became a courtier of Tipū Sultan, . . . He died at Ḥaydarābād (Subhe waṭn, p. 105).” According to H. G. Briggs, The Nizam vol. i, London 1861, p. 141, he died at Seringapatam during the siege in 1799.

His best-known work, written A.H. 1197/1783 at Tipū Sultan’s request and under his supervision, is the Fath al-mujāhidīn which contains rules and regulations for Tipū’s army (see Bodleian 1903, Ethē 2738–59, Rieu Suppt. 406). At the request of Tipū Sultan he wrote also the Muʿāʾiqīd al-mujāhidīn, a collection of metrical khubabhs (see Ethē 2619, Ivanow 882–3, Sprenger 571).

Sultan al-tawārīkh, a florid history of the Sultāns of Mysore compiled from materials dictated by Tipū himself and divided into two daftars ((1) Fath Nāʾīk and Ḥaidar ‘Alī, (2) Tipū’s reign to A.D. 1789) : Ethē 521 (apparently imperfect).

Description: Historical sketches of the South of India, in an attempt to trace the history of Mysoor . . . By Lieut.-Col. Mark Wilks, vol. i, London 1810, pp. xix–xxv.

[W. Kirkpatrick Select letters of Tippoo Sultan, London 1811, p. 163–4; Subh i waṭan p. 105; Sprenger 571.]

¹ There seems to be no good ground for Garcein de Tassy’s identification of this author with Ḥusain ‘Alī Khān Kirmānī.
1073. A certain Ḥamid Khan who accompanied Lord Cornwallis, the Governor-General and Commander-in-Chief, in his campaign against Tipu Sultan (Dec. 1790–Feb. 1792) wrote—

Tarīkh i Ḥamid Khan,¹ a history of Ḥaidar 'Alī and Tipu Sultan down to the peace of 1206/1792; Bānkīpur vii 619 (19th cent.).

1074. The Nasab-nāmah i rājahā i Maisūr was originally written in Canarese. By order of Tipu Sultan two Persian translations were made in 1212/1798 by Asad Anwar and Ghulām-Ḥusain. One of these is the work described below.

Nasab-nāmah (or Fihrist, or Akhwāl) i rājahā i Maisūr u Nagar, a list of the rulers of Mysore from the time of Timmarāj to that of Ḥaidar 'Alī, with the dates of their birth, the names of their wives and children and the countries over which they ruled: R.A.S. P. 86 = Morley 74, Morley 75, Morley 76, Ethé 514, 515, Ivanow 199 (19th cent.).

1075. Mīr Ḥusain 'Ali Khān b. S. 'Abd al-Qādir Kirmānī, the author of the Tadhkīrat al-bilād wa-l-ḥukkām, which he completed in 1215/1800–1 (see p. 765), and of the Badī' al-maʿānī, a life of the saint Bābā Fakhr al-Dīn Ḥusainī, was in the service of Ḥaidar ‘Alī and his son Tipu Sultan.

Nishān i Haidarī, a history of Ḥaidar 'Alī and Tipu Sultan completed a.h. 1217/1802; Browne Pers. Cat. 105 (a.h. 1231/1816), Ivanow 200 (a.h. 1231/1816 ?), Bānkīpur Suppt. i 1775 (a.h. 1233/1817–18). Āṣafiyah i p. 258 no. 297 (a.h. 1299/1881–2), Ethé 522, 523, 524 (small fragment), R.A.S. P. 87 = Morley 77.

Edition: Bombay 1307/1890°.

Translation: (a) The History of Hyder Naik . . . Nawab of the Karnatic Balaghat . . . Translated . . . by Colonel W. Miles.


1076. Not later than 1223/1808 was written

A history of the Rājahs of Seringapatam and of Haidar ‘Alī and Tīpū to the latter’s death in 1213/1799 (Dar ḍhikr i riqāṣat i rājahā-yi Sirāng-Patan u Nawwāb Haidar ‘Alī Khān Bahādūr jannat-makān u ḥadrat i Tīpū Sultan i shahīd etc., beginning Pas az ḥamd i Kirdgār i kārsāz rūzgār): [Oxford Ind. Inst. MS. Whinfield 62 (a.h. 1223/1808), Ethé 531 (foll. 57–112).]

1077. For Ṣafdar ‘Alī Shāh “Munṣīf’s” Jirjīs i razm, which contains a metrical account of Wellesley’s campaign against Tīpū Sultan, see p. 764 supra.

1078. Muḥammad Sultan (i.e. Prince M.), better known as H.H. Prince Ghulām Muḥammad, one of the youngest of Tīpū Sultan’s twelve sons, was born in March 1795 and was therefore only four years old when his father was killed. With other sons of Tīpū’s he was removed from Seringapatam to Vellore. In 1806, after the Vellore Mutiny, he was transferred to Calcutta and there he lived the rest of his long life. Highly respected for his amiability, hospitality, charity and toleration, he was a favourite in official circles. He visited England in 1855 and again in 1859, when he persuaded the Secretary of State, Sir Charles Wood, to make a special grant to the Mysore family. In February 1871 he was made a K.C.S.I. Certain charities were founded by him in perpetuity for the poor of all races at Calcutta and in Mysore. He died at Rasapagla, near Calcutta, on 11 August 1872. He “revised and corrected” *The History of Hyder Shah, alias Hyder Ali Khan Bahadur: and of his son, Tippoo Sultaun. [Written in London 1784] By M. M. D. L. T. [i.e. M. M. de la Touche ?], General in the Army of the Mogul Empire*, London 1855.

The Mosque of Prince Ghulām Muḥammad, the finest mosque
in Calcutta, near the intersection of Dharamtola St. and Chowringhee, was erected by him "in gratitude to God, and in commemoration of the Honourable Court of Directors granting him the arrears of his stipend in 1840".

*Kárńāma i Hydary*, or *Memoirs of the brave and noble Hyder Shah*, surnamed *Hyder Ally Khán Bahádur*. To which is annexed a sketch of the history of his illustrious son, Tippoo Sultan. Compiled from the different works written by English, French, and Oriental authors. *Calcutta* 1848**.

Urdu translation by Ahmad ‘Alí Gőpāmawī: *Ḥamalāt i Ḥaidārī, Russapuglāh* [i.e. Rasapagla, a southern suburb of Calcutta] 1849**.

[Kár-nāmah i Ḥaidārī pp. 931–8 (portrait facing p. 935); Correspondence and memorials of Prince Gholam Mahomed addressed to the Government of India and the Hon'ble Court of Directors (in Extracts from Capt. Colin Mackenzie's work regarding the dominions of the late Tippoo Sultaun 1854); *The Times* 20.3.1871 p. 6a, 11.9.1872 p. 6a, 19.9.1872 p. 10b; *The Englishman* (Calcutta) 13.8.1872 p. 2d; *The Indian Daily News* (Calcutta) 13.8.1872 p. 2d; *The Times of India* (Bombay) 14.8.1872 p. 2d; Lewin B. Bowring *Haidar Alí and Tipú Sultań* pp. 10, 201.]

1079. Other works:

(1) Accounts of the events of A.H. 1197–1200/1783–6: *Ethé* 528 (1–3).

(2) *Aḥwāl i rājaḥ i Sōlāpūr u rājaḥ i Srīrangpatan*: *Ethé* 527 (18).

(3) *Aḥwāl-nāmah i Ḥaidār Nā‘ik*, a very short biography of Ḥaidar ‘Alí (8 foll.): *Ethé* 527 (1) (not later than A.D. 1808).

(4) History of Tipū Sultan and his court, by Munshi M. Qāsim: no MSS. recorded.


(5) Short account of Dhundia Wagh, or, as he is called here, D’húndū-ji Wāg’h, the famous freebooter of Mysore, who
was at last killed by the British in 1800 (see Beale *Oriental biographical dictionary* p. 120): Ethé 859 (5).


(7) A similar work (*Kaiśrīyat i ri'āsat i Šrī-Rang-Patān etc.*): Ethé 530.

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (tt) COORG

1080. Of unknown authorship is

*Aḥwāl i mulk i Kurg*, a short account of the conquest of Coorg in 1187/1773-4 during Ḥaidar 'Alî's reign (beg.: *Qalam i raqam-sañj*): Ethé 532.

1081. It was at the request of Mahārājāh Vīra Rājendra Wodeyar (b. A.H. 1178/1764-5, acceded A.H. 1203/1788-9, deposed A.D. 1834) that Ḥusain Khān Lōhānī, one of his munshīs, began in 1211/1796-7 to translate from original Kanarese records his

*History of the Rājahs of Coorg* from A.H. 1047/1637-8 to A.H. 1222/1807: Rieu i 333 (A.D. 1807), Ethé 533 (A.H. 1240/1824), Ivanow 201 (late 19th cent.).

M. HISTORY OF INDIA: (uu) THE CARNATIC

1082. Jaswant Rāy b. Bhagwant Rāy b. Sundardās “Munshi” was a munshī by profession and the son of a munshī born at Lahore. In 1118/1706-7 he went to the Carnatic and obtained the patronage of the Governor, Saʿādat Allāh Khān, the ancestor of the Nawwābs of the Carnatic, by composing a qaṣīdah in his praise. An autograph copy of his diwān written A.H. 1124/1712 at Sarā in the province of Bījāpūr is in the possession of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (Ivanow 830, cf. Ethé 1695).
Sa'īd-nāmah, a pompously written biography of Sa'īdat Allāh Khān, entitled also M. Sa'īd (properly M. 'Alī b. Ahmad, d. 1145/1732, see Ma'āthīr al-umarā' ii 513), from his birth in 1061/1651 to 16 Ramadān 1135/1723: Rieu i 331a (early 18th cent.), Ethé 500. (much shorter. Damaged. A.H. 1229/1814), 2843 (complete. A.H. 1265/1849).

[Autobiography near the beginning of the Sa'īd-nāmah; Sprenger pp. 507, 508 (?); Rieu i 331; Ethé 500.]

1083. Mīr M. Ismā'īl Khān "Abjadi" was born at Chingleput. He was the tutor (ustād) of the Nawwāb 'Umdat al-Umarā' (ruled A.H. 1210/1795-1216/1801). On finishing the Anvar-nāmah in 1174/1760-1 he was rewarded by the Nawwāb Wālā-Jāh (M. 'Alī 'Umdat al-Mulk, who ruled A.H. 1163/1750-1210/1795) with 6,700 rupees. In 1189/1775-6 he received the title of Malik al-shu'ārā'.

For his Persian dīwān see Āṣafiyah i p. 716 no. 482, Ivanow 873, and Nadhir Ahmad 107 and for his Urdu dīwān Blumhardt's I.O. catalogue of Hindustani MSS. no. 137. A work of his entitled Tuhfah li-ṣibyān is mentioned by Garcin de Tassy, who possessed a MS.

Anvar-nāmah, a mathnawī on the exploits of the Nawwāb Anvar al-Dīn Khān (d. 1162/1749) with a summary of events under his successor to the date of completion, A.H. 1174/1760-1: Ivanov 872 (A.H. 1176/1762-3), As'ad 2077 = Tauer 553 (A.H. 1242/1826), Berlin 973 (slightly defective). Ethé 1716 (n.d.). 2904 (n.d.).

[Tāzuk i Wālā-Jāh, muqaddimah (see Ethé 501); Subh i waṭan 27-31; Sprenger nos. 64-5; Garcin de Tassy 98-9; Beale Oriental biographical dictionary p. 15.]

1084. Munshi Burhān Khān b. Ḥasan Hindī was commissioned in 1195/1781 by Nawwāb Wālā-Jāh 'Umdat al-Mulk (M. 'Alī, who ruled from 1162/1749 to 1210/1795) to compose [largely] on the basis of "Abjadi's" Anvar-nāmah (see § 1083 supra) a history of the rulers of the Carnatic from the time of their
ancestors in al-Madinah to his own time. He died on 27 Jumādā II 1240/1825. For his Ruhā'at see Āṣafiyah i p. 124.

Tūzuk i Wālā-Jāhī, a history of the Carnatic, especially of Anwar al-Dīn Khān [d. 1162/1749] and his son Wālā-Jāh, planned to consist of a muqaddimah, two daftars and a khātimah, but probably never continued beyond the first daftar:_ETHÉ_ 501 (only the Muqaddimah (in praise of "Abjadi") and Daftar i (completed in 1200/1786 and extending to Clive's capture of Pondicherry in 1761). _N.d._, Madras (ascribed to "Abjadi").

English translation: _Tūzak-i-Walājāhī of Burhān ibn Hasan. Translated... by S. Muḥammad Husayn Nainar... Part I. From the early days to the Battle of Ambur (1162 A.H.)... Madras 1934†, to be continued_ (Madras University Islamic Series No. 1).


_[Ḥadīqat al-maraḥ (in Arabic) p. 12.]

1085. An anonymous author (Sa'd-Allāh Khān? see _Ethé_ 2844) completed in 1218/1803 his

_Wagā'i' i saʿādat_, a short history of the Nawwabs of Arkāt (from Saʿādat-Allāh Khān to Ṣafdar 'Alī Khān (d.1155/1742)) and the Jāgirdārs of Vellore (from Ghulām-'Alī Khān to Ghulām-Murtaḍā Khān (d. 1176/1762–3)) in three faṣls: _Ethé_ 2844 (lacks Faṣl iii), 2845 (with an appendix containing the history of Vellore to 1803).

1086. M. Karīm Ḵhair al-Dīn Ḥasan Ghulām-Dāmin b. Iftikhār al-Daulah Ḥāfīz M. Nāṣir Khān Bahādūr Şamsām-Jang was born in 1194/1780, received the title of Şāhib al-Daulah Jalādat-Jang in 1210/1795–6, that of Khwursbēd al-Mulk in 1231/1816 and on his father's death in 1236/1820 that

1 The Nawwabs of the Carnatic belonged to the Nā'ītī tribe, who claim to be of Arab descent.
2 The names M. Karīm are omitted by _Ethé_, but they are given by Nainar in his preface to the _Tūzuk i Wālā-Jāhī_ p. xiii.
of Iftikhar al-Daulah M. Nasir Khan Bahadur Samsham-Jang. In Rajab 1249/1833, when living at Madras, he paid homage to ‘Azim-Jah, the Regent, and was requested by him to write a history of his ancestor ‘Umdat al-Umarah’, as “Abjadi” had done for Anwar al-Din Khan in his Anwar-namah (see p. 778 supra). He therefore wrote the Sawanihat i mumtaz, which he completed on 27 Dhul ’l-Hijjah 1252/4 April 1837.


English translation: “has been finished, and will be issued” (presumably in the Madras University Islamic Series).


1087. Other works :
(1) Asas i riysat i Karnatik, a history of the Carnatic by M. Khair al-Din Khan Mahmud-Jang.


1 See Haidarabad Coll. p. 48, where the location of the Fakhr i Nizami Press is given as Haidarabad.