

# The discrepancy of chronology of *Ṭabaqāt-i Akbarī*: An introduction to a survey of manuscripts

Hiroyuki MASHITA

## 1. Introduction

The importance of *Ṭabaqāt-i Akbarī* (hereafter TA) as a historical source of Islamic India during Akbar's period is beyond question. The work became a model of the history of Islamic India as a compendium of histories of Islamic regions in India<sup>1</sup>.

As a historical source of Akbar's reign in the modern historiographies, however, it has been less utilized than *Muntahab al-Tawārīḥ* of Badā'unī (hereafter MT) which, as we will see later, basically depends on TA. This methodological reverse must be caused by MT's interesting (for some scholars, "richly gossipy" (Athar Ali 1995, 369)) independent information concerning Akbar's religious policies. It has served in the modern historiographies as evidence of Akbar's liberal and heterodox standpoint for religious affairs. However as a more principal historical source, TA should be more closely scrutinized and better utilized.

The present paper, in this connection, aims to analyze a quite basic problem of TA. It is the disagreement between TA and other contemporary histories over the chronology of some specific events. The problem has already been pointed out by the present author with a hypothesis which will be proved below<sup>2</sup>. Some scholars had already noted on this problem<sup>3</sup>. They, however, never treated the discrepancy with any serious concern.

---

<sup>1</sup> As examples which followed the model, we can refer to *Tārīḥ-i Ḥaqqī* of 'Abd al-Ḥaqq Dihlawī, *Zubdat al-Tawārīḥ* of Nūr al-Ḥaqq Dihlawī, *Gulshan-i Ibrāhīmī* of Firištah and so on.

<sup>2</sup> Mashita 1999, 43, n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> For example, see Prashad 1938, 773–4, n. 3; TAttr, ii, pp. 480–1, n. 2; p. 497, n. 2; p. 510, n. 2; p. 526, n. 1; p. 544, n. 1; pp. 554–5, n. 3; p. 559, n. 1; p. 596, n. 2; p. 600, n. 1; p. 612, n. 1; p. 620, n. 1.

This paper wishes to accomplish the following purposes: one, to establish the existence of the discrepancy and its background; two, to seek a way to modify the discrepancy; three, to explain the necessity for surveying of manuscripts of TA and a new critical edition; four, to show, in support of the previous purpose, some of the problematic points of variants among the manuscripts; and five, in the final part, to solve some of the chronological problems of Akbar's reign by applying the theory for modifying the discrepancy.

### 1.1. On the Calcutta edition

The more popular edition (Calcutta, 1913–41; hereafter *TAcl*), in my opinion, should be replaced by a new critical edition for two reasons. One is the existence of many variants of the text which are not collated in the edition. This textual point will be explained later. For convenience of discussion, first we shall look at the other defect which comes from the methodological point of view.

*TAcl* is based on three manuscripts and one lithographed edition published in Lakhnaw, 1875. The manuscripts are, according to the editors, as follows: one, MS., Asiatic Society of Bengal (formerly in the College of Fort William); two, MS., Asiatic Society of Bengal (formerly the property of Mr. E. Fell of the 10th Regiment Punjab Infantry); and three, MS., Palace Library of the Nawab Bahadur of Murshidabad.

The third manuscript above can not be identified with any known manuscripts. On the other hand, we know four manuscripts of TA from the catalogues of the Asiatic Society (Calcutta, former Asiatic Society of Bengal), two belonging to the main collection of the society and the other two to the Curzon collection, of which two can be identified with the first and second manuscripts above. But due to a lack of descriptions by the editors about the manuscripts, we can not identify these two manuscripts specifically with any of the four. Moreover the editors' statement that the first manuscript had formerly belonged to the library of the College of Fort William is puzzling. Ivanow 1924 refers to, if any, registration dates of the library of the college from which some of the oriental manuscripts of the main collection (not of the Curzon collection) of the society derived (for example, see Ivanow 1924, 24, No. 74 or *do.* 39, No. 122; cf. Ivanow 1924, xxxi). But neither of the two manuscripts of TA of the society's collection have the mark 'Ex libris' of the college. Thus the edition is based on unidentified manuscripts. This is a

serious methodological defect in the preparation of the Calcutta edition.

In addition, the edition does not enumerate any variants of the text except in the third volume. The editor does not indicate any reason for this omission. This fact seriously diminishes the scientific value of the edition. Thus the methodological defects of the Calcutta edition are clear.

## 2. Discrepancy of the chronology

This section aims to establish the fact of the discrepancy and to consider its context.

TA records the history of Akbar in the form of annals by the *Ilāhī* calendar, a Persian solar calendar which begins with Akbar's accession and whose New Year's Day falls on the vernal equinox. Each annal has a heading which tells *Ilāhī* year and its beginning date in the *Hijrī* calendar. For example,

A narrative of the events of *Ilāhī* 36. The beginning of this year was on Thursday, the 24th of Jumādā al-Awwal, 999. [*TAcl*, ii, 412]

Therefore we should be able to settle the date of a given event according to its location under an annal. However, when we compare the dates of TA with those of other contemporary histories like *Akbar Nāmāh* (hereafter AN), etc., the former don't necessarily tally with the latter.

In Table 1, I select one event of each *Ilāhī* year from TA in order to compare its chronology with that found in AN.

Table 1.

Event	TA ( <i>Ilāhī</i> )	ref. ( <i>TAcl</i> )	AN ( <i>Ilāhī</i> )	ref. (AN)
Execution of Tardī Big.	1	ii, 131	1	ii, 32–33
Arrival of Maryam Makānī.	2	ii, 133–134	2	ii, 54–56
Conquest of Guwāliyār.	3	ii, 140–1	3	ii, 77–8
Arrival of Šayḥ Muḥammad Ġawṭ.	4	ii, 141–142	4	ii, 88–89
Downfall of Bayrām Ḥān.	5	ii, 143–	5	ii, 91–
Conquest of Mālwah.	6	ii, 151–153	6	ii, 134–138
Death of Pīr Muḥammad Ḥān.	7	ii, 157	7	ii, 168
Shooting of Akbar in Delhi.	8	ii, 167	8	ii, 201–2
Death of Ḥwāḡah Mu'azzam.	9	ii, 176	9	ii, 219 <sup>4</sup>
Revolt of 'Alī Qulī Ḥān.	10	ii, 180–183	10	ii, 249–254
Death of Yūsuf Muḥammad Khān.	11	ii, 195	11	ii, 272 <sup>5</sup>
Conquest of Čitūr.	12	ii, 214–219	12	ii, 300–324

<sup>4</sup> AN refers to its date as the middle of 971 AH.

<sup>5</sup> AN refers to its date as 15 Ḥurdād = 05. DhQ. 973 AH/25 May 1566.

HIROYUKI MASHITA

Revolt of Ibrāhīm Ḥusayn Mīrzā and his attack on Mālwah.	13	ii, 221–222	13	ii, 330–331
Birth of Salīm.	14	ii, 226–227	14	ii, 342–348
Birth of Murād.	15	ii, 228	15	ii, 352–355
Strife in Sind and Ākbar's intervention.	16	ii, 233–234	16	ii, 361–363
Birth of Dāniyāl.	17	ii, 236	17	ii, 373
Death of Ibrāhīm Ḥusayn Mīrzā.	18	ii, 260	18	iii, 62
Death of Ḥwāḡah-i Ġahān.	19	ii, 302	19	iii, 109
Departure of Gul-badan Bīgim to Ḥiḡāz.	20	ii, 312	20	iii, 145
Departure of Mīrzā Sulaymān to Ḥiḡāz.	21	ii, 318	20	iii, 163
Appointment of Šāh Manšūr Šīrāzī as Dīwān.	22	ii, 327	21	iii, 193
Appearance of a comet.	23	ii, 335	22	iii, 221–224
Return of Sulṭān Ḥwāḡah from Ḥiḡāz.	24	ii, 341	23	iii, 263
Departure of the envoy of ‘Ādil Ḥān.	25	ii, 343	24	iii, 266–267
Death of Šuḡā‘at Ḥān.	26	ii, 353	25	iii, 312–314
Campaign to Kābul against Mīrzā Muḥammad Ḥakīm.	27	ii, 357–363	26	ii, 347–374
Return of Gul-badan Bīgim from Ḥiḡāz.	28	ii, 366	27	iii, 385
Arrival of Burhān al-Mulk.	29	ii, 379–370	28	iii, 407–408
Death of Sulṭān Ḥwāḡah.	30	ii, 392	29	iii, 436
Death of Mīrzā Muḥammad Ḥakīm.	31	ii, 395	30	iii, 466
Departure of the envoy of ‘Abd Āllāh Ḥān.	32	ii, 404	31	iii, 496–501
Birth of Sulṭān Ḥusraw.	33	ii, 406	32	iii, 523–524
Death of Mīr Faṭḥ Allāh Šīrāzī.	34	ii, 408	34	iii, 558
Appointment and despatch of Sulṭān Murād to Mālwah.	36	ii, 413	36	iii, 598–600
Dispatch of Zayn Ḥān Kūkah to Suwād, Baḡawr.	37	ii, 415	37	iii, 625–626
Return of Šayḡ Fayḏī from Dakan.	38	ii, 423	38	iii, 639

From the table, we can easily find that the dates of the events in TA from the years *Ilāhī* 21 to *Ilāhī* 33 are discrepant with those in AN. In the table, the beginning and the end of those years are marked with lines. Curiously enough, each event in TA during the period belongs to one year

previous in AN. This fact leads us to suppose that the discrepancies are not independent of each other but the dates of the period in one of the two histories mechanically slide one year after or before the correct dates of the other.

In order to prove the supposition, we have to settle the correct line of chronology among these two histories. To clarify this problem, we should fix the absolute dates of events from sources which are independent of the two histories.

As for the campaign to Kābul (see Table 1), we have the information of Monserrate whose chronology is independent of the histories. During the campaign, Akbar dispatched Šāh Murād to Pišāwar with advanced troops, which is recorded in Monserrate's report and in both histories. According to Monserrate,

The King [Akbar] made his son [Šāh Murād] whom, the Priest was educating, leader of the vanguard, since the soothsayers and sorcerers had declared that the stars foretold a great future for the boy (what nonsense). He associated with him Calichumcanus [Qilič Ḥān], governor [*præfectus*] of Surat, an experienced and stalwart old man with corps of *Mongols*, and Nourancanus [Nawrang Ḥān] (whose father was the prince's tutor), governor of Champanelium [Čanpānīr] in Gedrosia with four thousand cavalry of *Xacattæ*, and Mancinus [Mān Singh], an active and energetic chieftain [*regulis*], by race an Indian and a worshipper of idols, with his own troops. Associated with these were other subordinate leaders with their forces, which, though in small detachments, amounted in all to at least a thousand cavalry. The King added five hundred elephants to this force of cavalry. He paid great attention, with undue superstition, to the army's setting out at exactly the right time. He accompanied his son to the door of the royal headquarters [*aula*], and embraced him, after he had bidden him God-speed after the Muslim fashion [*more Agarenico*<sup>6</sup>]. He then dismissed him with his attendant nobles, who followed him to his boat. The prince embarked, crossed the Indus, and set out on his march with his forces on the day after the feast of St. John the Baptist, 1581 [27 Jun. 1581]. [MLC, 603; MLCtr, 124–5 is slightly modified by the author.]

AN says Sulṭān Murād's corps departed on 11 Tīr *Ilāhī* 26 (Jul. 1581) from the coast of the Indus; Sulṭān Murād was leading the middle of the army; the one who lead the right flank of the army was Qilič Ḥān; Rāḡah Mān Singh and Nawrang Ḥān were appointed to lead the vanguard (AN, iii, 353). On the other hand, according to TA, Akbar's corps arrived at the coast of the Indus in RabII. of *Ilāhī* 27. The *Ilāhī* year begins in Saf. 990 AH, so the month RabII. must belong to the *Hiğrī* year (Apr.–May 1582). This

---

<sup>6</sup> For the word *Agarenus*, see MLCtr, 3, note 12.

date contradicts AN's. After that, by 15 JumII. (7 Jul. 1582), when Akbar himself left the camp on the coast of the Indus, he despatched a corps lead by Kunwar Mān Singh, Nawrang Ḥān and others to Paršwar (= Pišāwar) which was followed by Šāh Murād's and Qilīč Ḥān's troops (*TAcl*, ii, 359).

Thus, except for the date, the details of the despatch coincide, although there are slight variations among the three sources. Therefore it can not be doubted that each source focuses on the same event. The date 26 Jun. 1581 reported by Monserrate supports AN's date. This fact leads us to a conclusion that AN's line of chronology is the correct one.

We have other supporting evidence for this conclusion. Many references to the appearance of a huge comet (see Table 1) are found in historical sources all over the world. A chronicle of the Šafawids mentions the appearance of the comet just a little preceding the death of Ismā'il II who expired on 13 Ram. 985 AH/24. Nov. 1577 (TAA, i, 217–8). A Japanese source refers to the comet as an event in Nov. 1577, which supports AN's chronology (Kanda 1935, ii, 597–600). In actual fact, the enormous comet whose tail covered the angle of 22 degrees was observed by the Danish astronomer Tycho Brahe on 13 Nov. 1577 in the western sky. It disappeared in the end of Jan. 1578.

Here we arrive at a conclusion that the annals of TA from the years *Ilāhī* 21 to 33 erroneously slide one year ahead of the correct chronology. This leads us further into a consideration of the annals of TA for *Ilāhī* 20–21 years and *Ilāhī* 33–34 years to explain the slide.

In Table 2, the events mentioned in TA under *Ilāhī* 20–22 are enumerated. In its second column, *Ilāhī* year to which each event actually belongs is shown. The actual chronology of every event is fixed as firmly as possible by referring to other independent sources.

Table 2.

Event	Actual <i>Ilāhī</i>	Ref.
<i>The beginning of Ilāhī 20</i>	—	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 302.
Occupation of Tāndāh by Ḥān-i Ḥānān Mun'im Ḥān.	19–20	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 302; AN, iii, 122–3.
Flight of Dā'ud Ḥān to Ūḍisah.	20	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 302–10; AN, iii, 129–131; TAK, 201–3.
Pursuit of Dā'ud Ḥān to Ūḍisah and reconciliation.		
Return of Ḥān-i Ḥānān to Tāndāh and his arrival on 10 Saf. 983.	20	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 310; TAK, 204; AN, iii, 131.

The discrepancy of chronology of *Ṭabaqāt-i Akbarī*

Construction of the <i>‘Ibādat Ḥānah</i> in DhH. 982 and <i>maḡlis</i> there.	19–20	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 310–2; MT, ii, 198 <sup>7</sup> .
Departure of Gul-badan Bīgim to Ḥiḡāz.	20	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 312; AN, iii, 145.
Advent of Mīrzā Sulaymān from Badaḡsān to Lāhūr and the circumstances.	20	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 313–3; AN, iii, 148–157.
Recall of Ḥān-i Ā‘zam and his arrival in front of Akbar on 04 Raj. 983. His dismissal.	20	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 315; AN, iii, 147.
Arrival of Mīrzā Sulaymān at Fathpūr in front of Akbar on 15 Raj. 983.	20	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 315; AN, iii, 148–157.
Death of Ḥān-i Ḥānān at Gawr in Raj. 983.	20	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 317; AN, iii, 160.
<i>The beginning of Ilāhī 21</i>	—	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 318.
Departure of Mīrzā Sulaymān to Ḥiḡāz.	20	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 318–9; AN, iii, 163.
Akbar’s visit to Aḡmīr.	20	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 319–20; AN, iii, 164 <sup>8</sup> .
<i>The beginning of Ilāhī 22</i>	—	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 320.
Ḥān-i Ḡahān’s defeat of the troops of Dā’ud to kill the latter.	21	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 321; AN, iii, 180–3.
Dispatch of Kunwar Mān Singh against Rānā KYKA.	21	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 321; AN, iii, 166.

It is clear that in TA and/or its base manuscript(s), the heading of *Ilāhī* 21 is erroneously inserted, after which year the heading of each year represents an increase of one over the actual number of the year.

In Table 3, the events referred to in TA under *Ilāhī* 33–4 are enumerated.

Table 3.

Event	Actual <i>Ilāhī</i>	Ref.
<i>The beginning of Ilāhī 33</i>	—	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 405.
Dispatch of ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib Ḥān with Muḥammad Qulī Bīg Turkmān, Ḥamzah Bīg Turkmān, Aḥmad Bīg Kābulī to Bangaś.	32	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 405; AN, iii, 520.
Birth of Sulṭān Ḥusraw b. Sulṭān Salīm.	32	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 406; AN, iii, 523.

<sup>7</sup> MT gives the date as DhQ. 982 which covers the end of *Ilāhī* 19 to the beginning of *Ilāhī* 20. Taking TA’s date into consideration, the event probably belongs to *Ilāhī* 20.

<sup>8</sup> Akbar did not visit Aḡmīr in *Ilāhī* 21.

Attack of Muḥammad Ṣādiq Ḥān against Thatah and compromise. Arrival of ambassador from the ruler of Thatah and his return.	31–32/3	TAcl, ii, 406; AN, iii, 495, 509 <sup>9</sup> .
--	---------	--

<sup>9</sup> These events are placed under the annal of 31 *Ilāhī* (which begins in March, 1586) in AN. On the one hand, in TA they are under the annal of 33 *Ilāhī* (by our theory of the slide, it should be taken as 32 *Ilāhī*, which begins in March, 1587). TA provides a *Hīgrī* dating but doesn't specify the year. An independent source is *Tārīḥ-i Ma'sūmī* (hereafter TM), a regional history of Sind, compiled around 1600–1 AD. Prashad erroneously identified “*Tārīḥ-i Sind*”, referred to in TA as its source, with this *Tārīḥ-i Ma'sūmī* (Prashad 1938, 788). Its author, however, refers to his present time as 1009 AH/1600–1 AD (TM, 124). TA's author, who died in 1594 AD, can not have consulted the history. Then the “*Tārīḥ-i Sind*”, mentioned in TA may have been the other then existing Sind history, the so-called *Čač Nāmāh*, and this helps to fix this point. According to it, Muḥammad Ṣādiq Ḥān, who had been appointed, arrived at Bhakar 12 Rabl. 994/3 March, 1586. From there he made a sally against Sīwistān in DhH. 994/November, 1586–. By this information, we can safely take these events as of *Ilāhī* 31, which supports AN's chronology. In other words, TA erroneously places these events into the annal of 32 *Ilāhī*. Then we face another difficulty, that of the chronology of the exchange of ambassadors. The arrival of the ambassador Sayyid Ġalāl from Thatah is on 28 Ābān *Ilāhī* 31 (end of November, 1586) (AN, iii, 509), and his return with Akbar's ambassador, Ḥakīm 'Ayn al-Mulk, is on 25 DhQ. of an unspecified year (TAcl, ii, 406). We don't have any other direct information on the chronology of the return. Then looking at the state of affairs in Thatah, the return can be fixed in context. When Ṣādiq Ḥān was yet to arrive in Sīwistān, Akbar sent a *farmān* requiring the subjugation to Ġānī Bīg, ruler of Thatah. The latter sent a person to Ṣādiq Ḥān to show his intention to swear allegiance to Akbar. But ignoring this offer, Ṣādiq Ḥān proceeded to Sīwistān (TT, 169–171). This was in November, 1586, slightly after which the ambassador arrived at the court. At an unspecified time during the prolonged siege of Sīwistān, another *farmān* from Akbar arrived which informed Ṣādiq Ḥān of the already sworn allegiance of Ġānī Bīg and the assignment of Thatah to Ġānī Bīg and ordered Ṣādiq Ḥān to stop the attack and to withdraw (TAcl, ii, 406; TM, 248–9; TN, 69–70). Judging from the course of events, Akbar and his executives at the court may have been watching the development of the campaign led by Ṣādiq Ḥān, keeping the ambassador in the court without any diplomatic decision. Thus we can specify the year when the ambassador from Thatah left the court. It can not have happened before the end of November, 1586. Therefore 25 DhQ, the date of the dispatch of Ḥakīm 'Ayn al-Mulk can not be 994 which falls on 7 November, 1586, but it must be 995 or some later year. If our conclusion is accepted that TA's chronology for 34 *Ilāhī* is generally correct, the date of the return of Ḥakīm 'Ayn al-Mulk from Thatah would be in the beginning of 34 *Ilāhī*/1589. 03–. In this context, the return of the Thatah ambassador with Ḥakīm 'Ayn al-Mulk would have to have been before that. Thus it can be fixed as on 25 DhQ. 995/27 October, 1587 belonging to *Ilāhī* 32 or 25 DhQ. 996/16 October, 1588 belonging to *Ilāhī* 33. From the available



The discrepancy of chronology of *Ṭabaqāt-i Akbarī*

Appointment of Zayn Ḥān Kūkah to Kābul and recall of Mān Singh.	32	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 406; AN, iii, 517; MT, ii, 358.
Arrival of Ḥān-i Ḥānān from Guḡarāt.	32	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 406; AN, iii, 517.
Arrival of Muḥammad Ṣādiq Ḥān from Bakar.	32	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 406–7; AN, iii, 519.
Arrival of Mān Singh.	32	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 407; AN, iii, 525; MT, ii, 363.
Appointment of Mīrzā Yūsuf Ḥān to Kaśmīr and recall of Muḥammad Qāsim Ḥān from there.	32	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 407; AN, iii, 523, 528; MT, ii, 364; THA, 369.
Despatch of Muḥammad Ṣādiq Ḥān to Suwād and Baḡawr and recall of Ismā‘īl Qulī Ḥān from there to be appointed to Guḡarāt in place of Qilīḥ Ḥān. Recall of Qilīḥ Ḥān.	32–33	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 407; AN, iii, 525–6, 528, 531; THA, 368; MT, ii, 364; MR, i, 917 <sup>10</sup> .

information, we can not accept either of them as the conclusion. Akhtar, 1990, 61 seems to take the latter chronology without any reasons. However, what is to be noted is that these events cover more than one year in any case. This may be the reason for TA's erroneous placement of these events.

<sup>10</sup> TA records the events as if they have occurred in succession within a very short time. This impression is corrected by referring to other sources. The chronology of the first event, the dispatch of Ṣādiq to Suwād and Baḡawr can be decisively fixed by MT, ii, 364 which in this point is independent of TA (MT, ii, 364. 12 Saf. 996/12 January 1588, belonging to *Ilāhī* 32). MR, i, 917 says the same date. The date 12 Saf. 996 doesn't contradict any other information available to us (AN, iii, 526 records his dispatch under the annal of *Ilāhī* 32, and THA, 368, referring to the event, mentions "in the next year" or 996 AH next to "the next year" referred to in the same page or 995 AH when Mān Singh was appointed to Bihār; see the next event below). AN records the campaign against Ġalālah Tārīkī under the leadership of Zayn Ḥān Kūkah in which Ṣādiq Ḥān and Ismā‘īl Qulī engaged. Ismā‘īl Qulī was recalled to the court on the grounds of his tactical failure by which Ġalālah Tārīkī escaped (AN, iii, 525–6). We don't know the exact date when Ismā‘īl Qulī was appointed to Guḡarāt. THA, 368 mentions the appointment as in 996 AH (from 2 December, 1587) and AN, iii, 531 records his dispatch to Guḡarāt and the recall of Qilīḥ Ḥān as occurring in the middle of *Ilāhī* 33 (from March 1588). The two dates don't contradict. Thus TA's description of the chain of events ranges many months from the later parts of *Ilāhī* 32 to the first half of *Ilāhī* 33.

HIROYUKI MASHITA

Appointment of Kunwar Mān Singh to Bihār and Bangālah and his dispatch.	32	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 407; AN, iii, 525; MT, ii, 363; THA, 368 <sup>11</sup> .
<i>The beginning of Ilāhī 34</i>	—	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 407.
Arrival of Qilīc Ḥān from Guḡarāt.	33/34	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 407; AN, iii, 531, 537; MT, ii, 365; THA, 368 <sup>12</sup> .
Return of Ḥakīm ‘Ayn al-Mulk from Thatah.	—	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 407 <sup>13</sup> .
Departure of Akbar from Lāhūr to Kaśmīr.	34	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 407; AN, iii, 537.
Order for Šāh Murād to stay in Ruhtās during the rainy season.	34	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 407–8; AN, iii, 538, 550 <sup>14</sup> .
Death of Amīr Faṭḥ Allāh Šīrāzī.	34	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 408; AN, iii, 558.
Departure of Akbar to Kābul from Kaśmīr.	34	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 409; AN, iii, 552.
Death of Ḥakīm Abū al-Faṭḥ.	34	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 409; AN, iii, 560.

<sup>11</sup> AN, iii, 525 narrates his earlier appointment in *Ilāhī* 32 and later dispatch on 6 Day *Ilāhī* 32/January 1588 with a break referring to another event. This separation of narrations may explain the difference in the date between MT, ii, 363 (996 AH, from 2 December 1587) and THA, 368 (995 AH). TA’s information that Mān Singh was appointed to Bangālah is an error. This point can not be supported by any other sources which all say his new post was in Bihar. According to AN, iii, 525 Bangālah was assigned to Sa’id Ḥān.

<sup>12</sup> We don’t have any decisive information on the date of his arrival. MT’s narration that it was around RabII. 996 (March 1588) is not reliable. According to AN and THA, his recall was ordered in the middle of *Ilāhī* 33 (which begins in March 1588) (AN, iii, 531; THA, 368). Just after Akbar started to Kaśmīr on 16 Urdībiḥst *Ilāhī* 34 (May, 1589), Qilīc Ḥān was assigned *ḡāḡīr* in Sanbal and was ordered to remain in Lāhūr (AN, iii, 537). Therefore he must have met Akbar in Lāhūr before that. Thus we can only set the date of his arrival sometime before the Akbar’s departure to Kaśmīr in May, 1589. It is impossible to decide whether it was in *Ilāhī* 33 or *Ilāhī* 34.

<sup>13</sup> We have no other independent information which tells the date of his return. MT and MR, which mention his return as in 34 *Ilāhī*, appear to depend on TA.

<sup>14</sup> AN, iii, 538 says that on leaving from Bhinbar, Akbar ordered Šāh Murād to stay in the royal tent (*humāyūn urdū*) with the munition corps (*agrūg*; for this word, see Doerfer 1965, 76–7 and Kawamoto 2000, 44, note 33.). This agrees with TA’s narration (*TAcl*, ii, 407). After the arrival of the transport corps in Srīnagar from Šāh Murād, Akbar ordered Zayn Ḥān to bring to Ruhtās the main camp (*urdū-yi buzurg*) which was perhaps with Šāh Murād (AN, iii, 550).

The discrepancy of chronology of *Ṭabaqāt-i Akbarī*

Joining of Šāh Murād with Akbar at Aṭak Banāras.	34	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 409; AN, iii, 565.
Dispatch of Šahbāz Ḥān Kanbū to subdue Yūsuf-zays.	34	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 409; AN, iii, 565.
Arrival of Akbar in Kābul.	34	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 409; AN, iii, 566.
Return of Ḥakīm Humām from Mā warā' al-Nahr.	34	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 409; AN, iii, 566.
Report of death of Rāḡah Tūdar Mal and Rāḡah Bhagwān Dās.	34	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 409; AN, iii, 569, 570.
Departure of Akbar from Kābul.	34	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 410; AN, iii, 569.
Appointment of Muḥammad Qāsim Ḥān to Kābul.	34	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 410; AN, iii, 569, 573.
Appointment of A'zam Ḥān to Guḡarāt.	34	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 410; AN, iii, 571.
Summon of the author, Niẓām al-Dīn Aḥmad to the Court.	—	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 410 <sup>15</sup> .
<i>The beginning of Ilāhī 35</i>	—	<i>TAcl</i> , ii, 410.

We can easily find that the events placed under *Ilāhī* 33 are those of *Ilāhī* 32 and the events of *Ilāhī* 34 are correctly placed. At the same time, it can be safely concluded that almost all the events of actual *Ilāhī* 33 are omitted. Here we find the end of the discrepancy in question. This omission leads us to a surmise that the annal of *Ilāhī* 33 was left out for some reason and this was the cause of the insertion of the header of *Ilāhī* 21 into an unnecessary place.

Here a problem remains to be solved: whether the author of TA made the dates discrepant intentionally or not. If the discrepancy was not intentional, the author made mistakes by his carelessness or the text was intentionally or unintentionally revised by some other person(s). From the following evidence, it is concluded that the discrepancy was not the author's intention.

In the campaign to Kābul of 1581 mentioned above, when Akbar crossed the Indus after Sulṭān Murād departed from him, the author of TA was sent to Sulṭān Murād to convey Akbar's order to him to proceed to Kābul. Our author traveled over 75 *kurūhs* in one night and day to reach Murād in Ġalālābād. Thus he personally took part in the campaign. In view of these circumstances, TA's narration depends on the author's own experience in

<sup>15</sup> There is no other independent source referring to this event.

the campaign. Therefore it can not be likely that the author made mistakes about the dates of the events in the same campaign.

We have internal evidence in the text to support our supposition. It is the accuracy of dates in the *Hiğrī* calender in the narrative text of the annals. To specify dates of events in the annals, TA almost always uses the *Hiğrī* calender. By scrutinizing such *Hiğrī* dates of the period in question, we can find their accordance to the actual chronology even when the *Ilāhī* dating of the year to which the events belong doesn't match it.

For example, TA quotes the *maḥḍar* dated Raj. 987 AH. This date is established by MT which also quotes it (MT, ii, 272). TA, however, places its account under *Ilāhī* 25 (Muh. 988 to Saf. 989 AH). As we settled earlier, TA's *Ilāhī* 25 should be *Ilāhī* 24 (Muh. 987 to Muh. 988 AH). Therefore we can find the accuracy of the *Hiğrī* date in this case. We have another example. It is the arrival of A'zam Ḥān from Bihār. In TA, his arrival is placed under *Ilāhī* 27 and is dated 9 Muh. 990 AH/3 Feb. 1582. TA's *Ilāhī* 27 should actually be taken as *Ilāhī* 26 (Saf. 989 to Saf. 990 AH) which includes the above date. Thus we can find that the date is set in the correct line of chronology.

Here we can safely say that dates in the *Hiğrī* calender in the narrative text of the annals of TA basically accord to the actual line of chronology independent of their position in the *Ilāhī* calendar to which each of them belong. When we consider the events of the period referred in TA, it is necessary to take them as of one year previous to the year indicated in the heading of the annal to which they belong. For example, the events mentioned under the annal of *Ilāhī* 25 in TA should be basically taken as the events of *Ilāhī* 24.

Summing up, we have the following facts on the discrepancy of the dates in TA: one, the erroneous insertion of the heading of *Ilāhī* 21; two, the mechanical and unintentional discrepancy of headings of each *Ilāhī* year from *Ilāhī* 22 to 33; and three, the lack of the annal for the actual *Ilāhī* 33. In other words, the discrepancy is caused not by the intention of the author but by some other external reason, i.e., an unintentional mistake of the author and/or damage to the original text which was followed by defective restoration and/or an unintentional error or intentional adaptation by a scribe.

It seems to be much more reasonable to think that the above third fact caused the second and resulted in the first than to think that the first caused the second resulting in the third. But we can not be decisive on this point now, because at the present stage, we do not know whether the text is pecu-

liar only to *TAcI* and/or its base manuscript(s) or not. This serious textual problem and its cause should be solved from the point of view of the transmission of the original text. The focal point is whether the archetype of TA contained the discrepancy.

We have just faced the necessity for a survey of the manuscripts of TA.

### 3. Introduction to a survey of manuscripts

By searching through libraries and by consulting bibliographical works and published catalogues of libraries, I have already confirmed the existence of sixty-six manuscripts (see Appendix) including fragments. This number can of course increase by future discoveries<sup>16</sup>.

Looking through manuscripts of TA shows us that the autograph has not been rediscovered. Therefore in order to edit an edition, textual criticism to reconstruct its archetype is necessary. Such a critical reconstruction of the archetype needs the methodological reconstruction of the stem of the manuscripts without applying unessential criteria like the age of the manuscripts or historical correctness of their texts. The reasonable way is to classify the manuscripts according to groupings of manuscripts which share a variant in a given point. These groupings will emerge by collation of manuscripts. By accumulating such groupings, we will have criteria to reconstruct the stem of the manuscripts.

I have consulted thirty-four of the manuscripts. Therefore the present study will not reach the final goal, the reconstruction of the stem of the known manuscripts. The following section will show some of the problematic variants. These points will provide us with valuable leads to help do a comprehensive survey of the manuscripts. In this sense, the current study is an introduction to such a survey.

#### 3.1. Headings of *Ilāhī* years

As far as the manuscripts which I consulted are concerned, none contain “correct” headings (which means annual headings consistent with actual occurrences) for the years *Ilāhī* 21 to 33. This fact leads us to think that the discrepancy of chronology in question and the lack of the annal for actual *Ilāhī* 34 were already present at a very early stage of the stem of the manuscripts.

---

<sup>16</sup> Curiously enough, no manuscript of TA has been found in catalogues of Iranian libraries I consulted.

### 3.1.1. Variant of *TA AMU*

Here the earliest known manuscript, copied in 1002 AH (the very year when the author died) by a scribe ‘Abd al-Ḥayy Qarṣī (No. 1 in the table of the Appendix; hereafter *TA AMU*), is worth scrutiny<sup>17</sup> because its headings of annals have great differences from those of *TAcl*. The differences are seen in Table 4<sup>18</sup>.

Table 4.

	Actual AD	Actual AH	<i>TAcl</i>	<i>TA AMU</i>
20	10.03.1575	27.DhQ.982	29.DhQ.982	17.DhQ.982
21	11.03.1576	09.DhH.983	09.DhH.983	23.DhQ.983
22	11.03.1577	20.DhH.984	20.DhH.984	09.DhH.983
23	11.03.1578	02.Muh.986	02.Muh.986 <sup>19</sup>	20.DhH.984
24	11.03.1579	12.Muh.987	13.Muh.987	02.Muh.986
25	11.03.1580	24.Muh.988	24.Muh.988	<i>no heading</i>
26	11.03.1581	05.Saf.989	05.Saf.989 <sup>20</sup>	( <i>n.d.</i> ).988
27	11.03.1582	15.Saf.990	15.Saf.990	<i>no heading</i>
28	21.03.1583	26.Saf.991	27.Saf.991	15.Saf.(990)
29	21.03.1584	08.RabI.992	09.RabI.992	( <i>n.d.</i> ).991
30	21.03.1585	19.RabI.993	19.RabI.993	20.RabI.992
31	20.03.1586	29.RabI.994	29.RabI.994	19.RabI.993
32	21.03.1587	11.RabII.995	11.RabII.995	29.RabI.(994)
33	21.03.1588	22.RabII.996	23.RabII.996	11.RabII.(995)
34	21.03.1589	04.JumI.997	04.JumI.997	01.RabII.( <i>n.d.</i> )
35	21.03.1590	14.JumI.998	14.JumI.998	14.JumI.(998)
36	20.03.1591	24.JumI.999	24.JumI.999	24.JumI.999
37	19.03.1592	05.JumII.1000	06.JumII.1000	05.JumII.1000
38	21.03.1593	17.JumII.1001	17.JumII.1001	15.JumII.1001

We can easily find that in *TA AMU*, to *Ilāhī* 34, the *Hiğrī* datings for the beginning of the *Ilāhī* years do not correspond to the actual beginning. The difference of the dates and actual dates is one year. In other words, in *TA AMU*, each *Hiğrī* dating is placed one year after its correspondent annal.

<sup>17</sup> For the fixing of the date of completion of *TA*, see Mashita 1999, 56–7.

<sup>18</sup> Some of the annals of *TA AMU* do not have the *Hiğrī* dating corresponding to the *Ilāhī* dating in the heading of each year. Some annals do not have their headings. These cases are indicated in the table. Moreover, for some of the headings, *TA AMU* does not specify the *Hiğrī* year, just giving “the above mentioned year” (*sāl-i madkūr*). It is possible to identify the year. I indicated my identification by setting the year number in brackets.

<sup>19</sup> *TAcl*, ii, 329 has 985 instead of 986. This must be corrected.

<sup>20</sup> *TAcl*, ii, 347 has 987 instead of 989. This is an easy clerical error of 7 (*tis’*) for 9 (*sab’*).

The discrepancy between the *Ilāhī* datings and the *Hiğrī* datings is a result of this placement. Perusing the narration of each annal reveals that, as another result of this placement, the *Hiğrī* dating of each heading gets consistent with the historical events under each annal, because the historical narration of each annal, in the case of *TAcl*, is placed under the annal of one year after the actual year as we saw in Table 1. For the convenience of explanation, I have written as if the text of *TA AMU* resulted from the discrepancy of datings of *TAcl*. But as yet we do not have any idea about their derivation.

Among the manuscripts which I consulted, only two manuscripts (IO 967 and IO 997) basically agree with *TA AMU* on these points. This reflects the peculiarity of *TA AMU* in the lineage of the manuscripts. On the other hand, though there are some slight textual variations in *TAcl*, the latter's *Ilāhī* datings correspond to each *Hiğrī* dating correctly but the dates are discrepant with the actual occurrences, as we saw above. We shall explain this textual difference between the two texts.

It is necessary for our purpose to propose two sub-archetypes of the manuscripts. One of these is the manuscript in whose text the datings of the headings were generated for the first time as they appear in *TAcl*, and the other is the manuscript in whose text the datings of the headings were generated for the first time as they appear in *TA AMU*. We hereafter call the former *TAclx* and the latter *TA AMUx*. Of course, one of the two can be the original archetype, but genealogically the two can never be identical.

There can be two stories about the generation of the variation of the datings: first, *TAclx* derived from the genealogy of *TA AMUx*; second *TA AMUx* derived from the genealogy of *TAclx*.

We can reconstruct the former story as follows: For the generation of *TA AMUx*, the annal for *Ilāhī* 33 was missing; it became necessary to add one annal somewhere before that; in order to meet the necessity, the heading of *Ilāhī* 21 with the *Hiğrī* dating of 23 DhQ. 983 AH was inserted into the annal of *Ilāhī* 20. We do not know the reason why this point was selected. By this disposal, the next annal of the actual *Ilāhī* 21 was forced to be treated as *Ilāhī* 22 without changing the *Hiğrī* dating. Thus occurred the discrepancy between the *Ilāhī* dating and the *Hiğrī* dating, and this discrepancy followed through the annals up to *Ilāhī* 33. Thus *TA AMUx* was generated. Then for the generation of *TAclx*, a copiest realized the discrepancy between the *Hiğrī* datings and the *Ilāhī* datings, and he tried to relate the *Hiğrī* datings to the *Ilāhī* datings by placing the former at the heading of the preceding year. By this disposal, the heading of *Ilāhī* 21 with 23 DhQ. 983 AH had to

be omitted.

On the other hand, we can also reconstruct the latter story as follows: For the generation of *TAcLx*, the annal for *Ilāhī* 33 was missing; it became necessary to add one annal somewhere before that; in order to meet the necessity, the heading of *Ilāhī* 21 with the correctly correspondent *Hijrī* dating of 09 DhH. 983 AH was inserted into the annal of *Ilāhī* 20. We do not know the reason why this point was selected. By this disposal, the next annal of the actual *Ilāhī* 21 was forced to be taken as *Ilāhī* 22 correctly correspondent to the *Hijrī* dating. Thus occurred the discrepancy between the datings and the historical events, and this discrepancy followed through the annals up to *Ilāhī* 33. Thus *TAcLx* was generated. Then for the generation of *TA AMUx*, a copiest realized the discrepancy between the two datings and the historical events. He tried to relate the datings to the events by placing the *Hijrī* datings at the heading of the following year. By this disposal, a void was created in the *Hijrī* dating for *Ilāhī* 21. In order to fill the void, the copiest was forced to take the desperate measure of inserting a *Hijrī* dating of 23 DhQ. 983 AH.

The core of the problem lies in the fact that *TA AMUx* contains a very forced discrepancy between the *Ilāhī* datings and the *Hijrī* datings. In the first story, we have explained that the discrepancy occurred in a mechanical manner. It is, however, quite unnatural that the copiest and/or the author made such an obvious failure just for a mechanical reason. In this respect, it is more natural, as in the second story, to suppose that the copiest aimed to maintain consistency between the *Hijrī* datings and the events. But the defect of this theory is that it does not explain the reason why the copiest selected the *Hijrī* datings, not the *Ilāhī* datings, to be consistent with the events.

Unpopularity of the *Ilāhī* calendar may explain the last point. The calendar was founded in 992 AH by the order of Akbar. The beginning of the 30th regnal year was the first entrance into an *Ilāhī* year after the introduction of the calendar (AN, ii, 10; Bendrey 1972, 3–4), and it was ordered that the New Year's day of the year of Akbar's accession (28 RabII. 963 AH) be the beginning of the *Ilāhī* calendar. This newly introduced calendar seems to have been difficult to understand for the people of that time. For example, the author of *Badā'unī* makes an obvious misunderstanding of the calendar, as we will see later (MT, ii, 342). Moreover, other histories like *TA* and *THA*, which were completed after the introduction of the calendar, in almost all cases use the *Hijrī* calendar to date events of Akbar's reign. Of course, this



is not true of AN which was compiled by Abū al-Faḍl, a leading ideologue of Akbar's polity. In addition, the calendar was also one of the objects of religious criticism (MT, ii, 306). Such practical and religious unpopularity could have made the copiest negligent in the accuracy of *Ilāhī* datings. However by this circumstantial evidence we should not draw a decisive conclusion in selecting one of the above alternatives.

There is a supporting evidence in favour of the second story. It is found out of the *Hiğrī* datings in the text of the historical narrations (not of the headings of annals). By the perusing *Hiğrī* datings in the historical narrations of Akbar's reign, we can find four cases in which the datings of *TA AMU* are different from those of *TAcl*: a. 10. JumI. 979 (*TAcl*, ii, 235) for 10. JumI. 980 (*TA AMU*, 190r); b. 7ḌhQ. 984 (*TAcl*, ii, 319) for 7ḌhQ. 983 (*TA AMU*, 218v); c. 20. Muh. 985 (*TAcl*, ii, 321) for 20. Muh. 984 (*TA AMU*, 219r); d. 3. JumII. 987 (*TAcl*, ii, 338-9) for 3. JumII. 986 (*TA AMU*, 225v)<sup>21</sup>.

These variants are common to some of the manuscripts (Case a.: IO 967, Add. 5615, IO 3289, Eton 18.7, SOAS 24950; b.: Ind. Inst. Pers. 16, Add. 5615, IO 967, IO 997, SOAS 23950; c.: Add. 5615, Ind. Inst. Pers. 16, IO 3289, IO 967, IO 997, SOAS 24950; d.: Add. 5615, Add. 6543, Fraser 136, IO 2943, IO 3289, IO 731, IO 967, IO 997, Eton 18.1, SOAS 24950). In other words, these variants are not isolated in the genealogy of the manuscripts.

It is obvious that each dating of *TA AMU* is just one year earlier than that of *TAcl*. It must be the reflection of the discrepancy of *Hiğrī* datings in the headings of annals between *TAcl* and *TA AMU*. As we saw above, the copiest of *TA AMU*x made the *Hiğrī* datings of the headings consistent to the actual chronology of the historical events, as the result of which the *Hiğrī* datings of the headings of *TA AMU* became one year earlier than those of *TAcl*. As these four cases of discrepancy clearly show unnatural and forced alteration of existing datings, the copiest seems to have adjusted some of the *Hiğrī* datings of the historical narrations with the datings of the headings. This surmise leads us to think that *TA AMU*x was copied from a manuscript which had same pattern of the datings as of *TAcl*x. Thus these four cases incline us to think that *TA AMU*x originated from a manuscript which belongs to the line of *TAcl*x.

<sup>21</sup> There are some other cases of difference which are not mentioned here. Because they are easy clerical errors.

### 3.1.2. Comparing with near-contemporary sources

Now we shall turn to confirming some facts concerning relations of TA with two other near-contemporary sources which themselves say that they depend on TA. This procedure may be helpful for our purpose because such sources may reflect the text of early manuscripts of TA.

The sources are histories whose narrations for Delhi Sultāns and Mughuls largely depend on TA. Both record the history of Akbar in the form of annals of *Ilāhī* years whose beginnings are indicated by headings accompanied with *Hiğrī* dates which correspond to the *naw-rūzs* of the *Ilāhī* years. The first one, MT, completed in 1004 AH/early in 1596 (MT, ii, 406–7; MT, iii, 398), frequently refers to TA as its principal source. Another history, *Ma’ātir-i Raḥīmī* (hereafter MR), completed in the reign of Jahāngīr, also refers to TA as one of its sources.

Here we shall focus on the heading of each *Ilāhī* year in question. Perusing the headings and their *Hiğrī* dates, we find some variations among the sources.

MT, in some places, shows different dates from TA although it partly adopts the latter. At the beginning of *Ilāhī* 30, one such date, the author of MT states,

And on Thursday, 19 RabI. 993 AH, the scouts of the army of spring and the advance-guard of the royal New-Year’s Day (*nawrūz-i sultānī*) came up, and according to the writing of Mirzā Nizām al-Dīn Aḥmad, who has preserved the dates in his history, the thirty-first year from the Accession began [on the very day]<sup>22</sup>. But the fact is that the beginning of the second [thirty-year] cycle from the Accession started in Aṭak Banāras from 25 RabI. 994 AH as shall be related hereafter if God, He be exalted, wills. (MT, ii, 342; translation of MTtr, ii, 352–3 is slightly modified by the author.)

In another place, MT mentions the beginning of *Ilāhī* 31 on 25 RabI. 994 AH referring to the TA’s alleged information of the beginning of *Ilāhī* 32 on the same day (MT, ii, 351). In the same way, MT, speaking of the beginning of an *Ilāhī* year on 22 RabII. 996 AH, refers to two alternatives, *Ilāhī* 33 and

---

<sup>22</sup> Text of *TAcl* reads here “the thirtieth year (*sāl-i sīyūm*)”. This, however, must be an error for “the thirty-first year” into which I altered in my translation. Because the latter is entirely consistent with the context. From the view of MT’s author, “the second cycle” begins with the thirty-first regnal year. At least four manuscripts of MT including the earliest one (Supplément 247, Bibliothèque Nationale; IO 1139, British Library; King’s 77, Cambridge University Library; Eton 17.12, Cambridge University Library) which read this part as “the thirty-first year” support my treatment for the text.

*Ilāhī* 34. Judging from the case above, the former must be the opinion of MT's author and the latter TA's information (actually *Ilāhī* 33 began on 22 RabII. 996 AH) (MT, ii, 365). Same is true of the case of *Ilāhī* 30 mentioned above, whose beginning was 19. RabI. 993 AH, according to MT's author. The author makes an alternative reference to the beginning of the same year in another place (MT, ii, 338), stating that the year began on 08. RabI. 992 AH, which must depend on TA's information. By referring both opinions on the correspondence of 22 RabII. 996 AH to an *Ilāhī* year, MT was apparently at a loss for reasonable handling of the heading of the next year which is *Ilāhī* 35, rightly identified by TA (that omits the events of actual *Ilāhī* 34). To clear up this contradiction, MT was compelled to omit the heading of *Ilāhī* 34. After the heading for *Ilāhī* 33 year in his opinion, we don't find any heading before the heading of *Ilāhī* 35 (MT, ii, 372).

It is clear that MT doubts TA's dates due to the discrepancy. After mentioning the two opinions of TA and its own about the correspondence of 19 RabI. 993 AH to the *Ilāhī* calendar, MT states,

Let it not be concealed that at this juncture, a doubt enters into my mind as to the passage (*mamarr*) for settling the beginning of the year from the Accession. (MT, ii, 352; MTtr, ii, 363 is slightly modified by the author.)

Based on that doubt, MT's author ascribes the contradiction to TA's mishandling of the intercalation.

And in this case, the origin of the misunderstanding (*wahm*) is the neglect (*ḡuhūl*) of Mīrzā [Nīzām al-Dīn] on the fact that, on account of the intercalated days, which, every three years, makes a difference of one lunar month, there is a difference of a whole year in each [thirty-year] cycle between the solar and the lunar years. And I, as I had no almanac with me, allowed myself necessarily to follow the Mīrzā, and the responsibility rests on him. Verily God knows the best. (MT, ii, 342; MTtr, ii, 353 is slightly modified by the author.)

Here MT tries to show a logical settlement of the discrepancy, but it fails. If its theory were correct, the discrepancy would have occurred only near *Ilāhī* 30. But as we saw previously, the discrepancy is observed as early as in the events of actual *Ilāhī* 20.

The evidence shown above supports our supposition that the discrepancy of the headings of TA existed in so early a stage of the genealogy of manuscripts that the contemporary writer of MT, who wrote less than two years after TA's completion, was perplexed by it.

With these points in mind, we shall look at Table 5 which compares the *Hijrī* datings of the beginning of each *Ilāhī* year as found in *TAcl*, *TA AMU*

Table 5.

	<i>TAcl</i>	<i>TA AMU</i>	MT
20	27.DhQ.982	17.DhQ.982	<i>no heading</i>
21	09.DhH.983	23.DhQ.983	<i>do.</i>
22	20.DhH.984	09.DhH.983	09.DhH.(983)
23	02.Muh.986	20.DhH.984	( <i>n.d.</i> ).DhH.(984)
24	12.Muh.987	02.Muh.986	01.Muh.986
25	24.Muh.988	<i>no heading</i>	<i>no heading</i>
26	05.Saf.989	( <i>n.d.</i> ).988	<i>do.</i>
27	15.Saf.990	<i>no heading</i>	<i>do.</i>
28	26.Saf.991	15.Saf.(990)	15.Saf.(990)
29	08.RabI.992	( <i>n.d.</i> ).991	25.Saf.991
30	19.RabI.993	20.RabI.992	19.RabI.993
31	29.RabI.994	19.RabI.993	25.RabI.(994)
32	11.RabII.995	29.RabI.(994)	11.RabII.995
33	22.RabII.996	11.RabII.(995)	22.RabII.996
34	04.JumI.997	01.RabII.( <i>n.d.</i> )	<i>no heading</i>
35	14.JumI.998	14.JumI.(998)	14.JumI.998
36	24.JumI.999	24.JumI.999	24.JumI.999
37	05.JumII.1000	05.JumII.1000	05.JumII.1000
38	17.JumII.1001	15.JumII.1001	17.JumII.1001

and MT. In the column of MT, I referred the date given according to the author's opinion.

MT's author does not tell all the beginnings of the *Ilāhī* years. However, curiously enough, from *Ilāhī* 22 to 30, the *Hiğrī* datings of MT are generally concomitant to those of *TA AMU*, not of *TAcl*. Perusing MT's narration of the years reveals a discrepancy between an *Ilāhī* dating and the actual chronology of the events under the annal. In other words, the historical narration of each annal of these years is about one year before the annal of the actual *Ilāhī* year. This is the same phenomenon that we have just seen in *TA AMU*. It is true that this can not be adopted for the years *Ilāhī* 31 to 33. But this phenomenon leads us to think that after *Ilāhī* 31, MT's author exercised his own judgement in fixing the *Hiğrī* dates of the beginning of each *Ilāhī* year without depending on TA, because according to his theory, the discrepancy was to be ascribed to TA's mishandling of the intercalation for the very year, as we saw above. It is clear that the text of TA which was consulted by MT's author belongs to the genealogy of *TA AMUx*, not to that of *TAclx*.

The same is true of MR even more clearly. In Table 6, the *Hiğrī* dates

Table 6.

	<i>TAcl</i>	<i>TA AMU</i>	MR
20	27.DhQ.982	17.DhQ.982	17.DhQ.982
21	09.DhH.983	23.DhQ.983	23.DhQ.983
22	20.DhH.984	09.DhH.983	09.DhH.983
23	02.Muh.986	20.DhH.984	20.DhH.984
24	12.Muh.987	02.Muh.986	02.Muh.986
25	24.Muh.988	<i>no heading</i>	<i>no heading</i>
26	05.Saf.989	( <i>n.d.</i> ).988	( <i>n.d.</i> ).988
27	15.Saf.990	<i>no heading</i>	15.Saf.989
28	26.Saf.991	15.Saf.(990)	28.Saf.990
29	08.RabI.992	( <i>n.d.</i> ).991	09.RabI.991
30	19.RabI.993	20.RabI.992	08.RabI.993
31	29.RabI.994	19.RabI.993	19.RabI.993
32	11.RabII.995	29.RabI.(994)	29.RabI.994
33	22.RabII.996	11.RabII.(995)	11.RabII.995
34	04.JumI.997	01.RabII.( <i>n.d.</i> )	01.RabII.996
35	14.JumI.998	14.JumI.(998)	14.JumI.998
36	24.JumI.999	24.JumI.999	24.JumI.999
37	05.JumII.1000	05.JumII.1000	05.JumII.1000
38	17.JumII.1001	15.JumII.1001	15.JumII.1001

of the headings in MR are enumerated. The dates never correspond to the actual dates of *naw-rūzs* and their difference is nearly one year. When we compare MR's *Hiḡrī* datings with those of *TA AMU*, it is clear that MR follows *TA AMU*'s text for the datings.

This reflects the fact that MR's author consulted a manuscript(s) which belongs to the genealogy of *TA AMUx*, not of *TAclx*. Moreover it is obvious that MR depends on the former without critical verification of the datings.

Summing up these facts, we can conclude that the discrepancy existed in a very early stage of the genealogy of manuscripts and that the discrepancy is preserved in MT and MR through the text of a manuscript(s) which belongs to the genealogy of *TA AMUx*. This is very interesting, because as we saw above, the variants of the discrepancy as seen in *TA AMU* are much less frequently succeeded than those of *TAcl* in the manuscripts of TA. Just two known manuscripts share the common variants with *TA AMU*.

Now we should turn again to the reference in MT quoted above. There MT mentions a revision to TA (*Tārīḡ-i Nizāmī*) by Nizām al-Dīn's son.

Let it not be concealed that at this juncture, a doubt enters into my mind as to the passage (*mamarr*) for settling the beginning of the year from the Accession.

And the excuse for it has been related above. As a matter of fact, it must be seen that the son of the *Mīrzā* [Nizām al-Dīn Aḥmad], named Muḥammad Šarīf, investigated the dates (*tanqīḥ-i sanawāt*) in the *Tārīḥ-i Nizāmī* after the death of his father, would become the remover of the errors. (MT, ii, 352; MTtr, ii, 363 is slightly modified by the author.)

From this passage, we know at least two facts: first, the author of MT informs us of the possibility of the existence of a recension of TA; second, the author of MT did not consult the assumed recension.

Taking these points into consideration with the above concluded fact that the author of MT consulted a manuscript which belongs to the genealogy of *TA AMUx*, there is no obstacle for us to think that the above passage reflects the first story above; namely, that *TAcLx* derived from the genealogy of *TA AMUx*. Even by this surmise, however, we can not reach an conclusion, because the assumption of the existence of the recension is no guarantee of the identification of the recension with *TAcLx*. Moreover this surmise contradicts the above conjecture at which we arrived in the section 3.1.1. The decision on this point should be made after the comprehensive collation of the manuscripts.

### 3.2. Other major variants

Here we should point out some of the other major variants which are significant for grouping the manuscripts.

In some of the manuscripts, the part with the biographies of Akbar's *amīrs*, which is placed at the end of the *Ṭabaqah* of Dihlī *sultāns*, is shorter than other manuscripts'. In *TA AMU*, IO 967 and IO 997, the biographies end with the account of Mīr Abū al-Muẓaffar (*TA AMU*, 257b) and the following part which contains biographies of 33 *amīrs* is wanting (*TAcL*, ii, 452–6). On the other hand, *TAcL* and the other manuscripts that I consulted contain that part. This fact may reflect the peculiarity of *TA AMU* in the lineage of manuscripts.

Another point is the placement of the *Ṭabaqah* of Mālwah *sultāns*. The manuscripts are largely divided in two groups. One places the *Ṭabaqah* as the fourth *Ṭabaqah* (IO 3320; Add. 26208 & 26209; Morley, No. 46; IO 2943; Or. 297; Add. 6543; Elliot 380; Th. Hyde 47; Eton 18.1). On the other hand, another group places it as the sixth (Or. 2274; Ind. Inst. Pers. 16; Add. 5615; IO 997; Or. 1901; Elliot 379; Fraser 136; IO 731; IO 967; Eton 18.7). (Some of the manuscripts which are not enumerated here are fragments which do

not contain the *Ṭabaqah*.) IO 997, IO 967 and *TAcl* belong to the latter group. *TA AMU* unfortunately doesn't contain the chapter. The foreword of TA contains the outline of itself. According to it, the *Ṭabaqah* of Mālwah *sultāns* is placed as the fourth *Ṭabaqah*. But this is not a guarantee that the *Ṭabaqah* of Mālwah *sultāns* would have originally been the fourth. Because the statement of the foreword does not seem to reflect the actual order of the *Ṭabaqahs*. In the foreword, the *Ṭabaqah* of Kašmīr *sultāns* is placed between the *Ṭabaqahs* of Sind and Multān. In spite of that, the *Ṭabaqah* is, in any manuscripts, placed before the *Ṭabaqahs* of Sind and Multān.

As for the biographies of poets (*TAcl*, ii, 484–520), there are too many variants to look through here. Not only the spelling of the names of poets, but also the order of reference varies among the manuscripts. Some manuscripts, in some places, even lack biographies which are contained in other manuscripts.

Here for example, we shall see just one portion which obviously shows such variations. From Yādgār Ḥālatī to Mīrzā Ḥasan *TAcl*, ii, 492–493 refers to four poets, Qāsim Arslān, Muḥammad Mu'min Gang, ANQAMA, Mīrzā Ḥasan. Some of the manuscripts lack the biography of Qāsim Arslān. Some of the manuscripts lack the biographies of the last three poets. One manuscript lacks only ANQAMA of the four. ANQAMA is spelled in some manuscripts as Ulfatī. Mīrzā Ḥasan appears in other manuscripts as Mīr Ḥusaynī or Mīr Aḥsan.

Such diverse variants contained in the biographies will serve us in reconstructing the stem of manuscripts in the future.

### 3.3. Need for a new critical edition of TA

From the above discussion on the variants, it is obvious that the original text of TA remains to be critically reconstructed. *TAcl* will be replaced by this process.

In the introduction, we already saw the necessity of a new critical edition of TA by criticizing *TAcl* from the point of view of methodology. Here *TAcl* is criticized from the textual point of view. The reason is that *TAcl* and/or its base manuscripts contains very peculiar textual variants.

In the bibliography of Zayn Ḥān Kūkah, *TAcl* has an apparent later interpolation which reads,

Late in his life, by imperial command, he became [one of] the *panḡ-hazārī amīrs* and the *ḥākim* of the district of Kābul and Ġaznīn. He engaged in big

battles between the Afġāns in the environs and made all of them obedient and submissive. After some time, according to the royal order, he went to kiss the threshold of the sign of *halīfah*. Within some days of attaining great prosperity, he got ill and died. His bequest to his children, on which he by himself had written [a will], was valued at nine *kurūrs*. And it was known to His Exalted Highness and entered into the Great Exchequer. And the rest of the bequest was compassionately given to his heir. (*TAcl*, ii, 431)

Zayn Ḥān Kūkah, in fact, died at the end of Sep. 1601 (AN, iii, 796). The original text of TA which was completed in 1594 cannot have included this statement. This incorporation is found only here in this edition. But according to the translators, one of the base manuscripts, which they don't identify, has in biographies of other amīrs such later incorporated passages (TAttr, ii, 656, n. 1; 657, n. 5; 669, n. 5). In none of the manuscripts I consulted are such incorporations found. Therefore we must say that the incorporation is a highly isolated variant in the textual transition.

To go back to the methodological problems, if the translators' statement above about the incorporations can be trusted, the editors are supposed to have arbitrarily chosen the text without any indication the reason. It goes without saying that such handling of a text is not critical.

The edition has another isolated variant. For the conquest of Sind and its capital Thattah in 999 AH, Fayḍī composed a chronographic phrase, *qaṣad-i Thatah*, whose numerical value is 1004 (*TAcl*, ii, 412). Thatah can be spelled in medieval Persian sources without indicating the aspiration as Tatah. Almost all the manuscripts I consulted adopt the latter form whose value is correctly 999.

For another example, the heading of *Ilāhī* 11 says that the year began on 20 Shab. 993 AH. Here 993 must be an error for 973 within which *sab'īna* (seventy) can be easily misspelled as *tis'īna* (ninety). Similarly the heading of *Ilāhī* 20 says that the year began on 29 DhQ. 902. This 902 is an error for 982 missing eighty (*tamānīna*).

The existence of these isolated variants makes us believe that the edition was based on a peculiarly isolated text(s). Even if this is not true, it is true that the edition was prepared in a highly careless way by the editors.

#### 4. Solving problems by the modified chronology

By adopting the above theory to modify the chronology in TA, many dates of events in Akbar's reign can be revised. This section aims to show



some examples of the revision.

#### 4.1. Date of the arrival of Faṭḥ Allāh Šīrāzī at Akbar's court

MT, ii, 315 informs us of the date as RabII. without specifying the year. However we can suppose the year which MT's author means by the position where the narration is placed. MT refers to the event under the annal of *Ilāhī* 28. As we saw above, each of MT's annals from *Ilāhī* 22 to *Ilāhī* 29 should be *Ilāhī* 21 to *Ilāhī* 28. Therefore the annal of *Ilāhī* 28 must be taken as actually containing the events of *Ilāhī* 27. Thus we see that the RabII. in question belongs to *Ilāhī* 27 (Saf. 990–Saf. 991 AH). Supporting this, MT, ii, 316 reports a phrase of chronogram of the arrival whose *abḡad* amounts to 990 AH<sup>23</sup>. Thus from the internal evidence, we should conclude that MT means the date RabII. 990 AH/May 1582.

However, AN, iii, 401 reports a contradicting date, 25 Urdībihišt Ilāhī 28/May 1583. As far as I know, no serious attempt has been made to fix the contradiction.

Here TA's information and our theory of the modification leads us to a solution. *TACL*, ii, 368 places the arrival of Faṭḥ Allāh under the annal of *Ilāhī* 29. By our theory, the events under the annal must be taken as those of *Ilāhī* 28. This result supports AN's information. Moreover *TACL*, ii, 368 gives the date of the arrival as 22 RabII. of an unspecified year which we should take as 22 RabII. 991 AH belonging to *Ilāhī* 28. MT's reference to RabII. of some year reflects its dependency on this passage of TA. If so, we can conclude that MT erroneously mixed the reference to the event among other events of *Ilāhī* 27.

Moreover the inaccuracy of MT now supposed by us is evidenced by an acknowledgement of MT's author. He, at the end of the annal of *Ilāhī* 28 (actually *Ilāhī* 27) admits the following:

The compiler of the pages (may God forgive him!) begs [to the readers] not to reproach him if he doesn't even record the chronology and doesn't look attentively at the sequence (*taqdīm wa ta'hīr*) [of the chronology] in the events of this year, which was written down [by him] from a motive (*ḡaraḍ*) in ways of digression and summary with a rapid pen. (MT, ii, 321; MTtr, ii, 331 is modified by the author).

---

<sup>23</sup> *Šāh Faṭḥ Allāh imām-i awliyā*. It is true that this evidence is a little bit weak, because in some other places MT carries phrases of chronograms which don't agree with the annals.

## 4.2. Date of the order to translate *Mahābhārata*

Akbar ordered the translation of *Mahābhārata*, the Indian epic of “*Hindī*” language. The translation was edited by Naqīb Ḥān, Badā’unī (the author of MT), Šayḥ Sultān Thānīsārī, Mullā Šīrī and Šayḥ Fayḍī with the preface by Abū al-Faḍl (AA, i, 115; MT, ii, 320–1).

In MT, the event is placed under the annal of *Ilāhī* 28 (MT, ii, 319–321). In the same way as the case of the arrival of Faṭḥ Allāh, we should think that MT must have considered this event as occurring actually in *Ilāhī* 27 which begins Saf. 990 AH. Based on this information, scholars have fixed the date of Akbar’s order of compilation of the work at 990 AH<sup>24</sup>. But this date is equally doubtful for the same reason as the date of Faṭḥ Allāh’s arrival.

It should be added that TA gives us a different chronology for the order. In TA, the reference to it is placed under the annal of *Ilāhī* 29 (*TAcl*, ii, 369). By our theory of modification, the events under the annal must be taken as those of *Ilāhī* 28.

As far as I know, no other reference to the order is found in contemporary sources. The Last Book of AN (so-called *Ā’in-i Akbarī*) doesn’t specify its date although it refers to the translation project (AA, i, 115).

In the Persian *Mahābhārata*, one of the translators, Naqīb Ḥān, writes about his own translation. At the end of the 18th chapter (*parwa*), he says he worked for the translation in collaboration with some *brahmans* for one year and a half (MaBh, iv, 503). According to Rizvi, a manuscript (preserved in the Former Lytton Library, now Maulana Azad Library, Aligarh Muslim University; Rizvi doesn’t state its call number) which he consulted bears a different statement; namely, that Naqīb Ḥān completed the translation on 27 Shab. 992 AH after one year and a half (Rizvi, 1952, 198). The date of the completion, Shab. 992 AH, is found also in a manuscript which Rieu describes (Rieu i, 57b). If these statements are genuine, we can think that Naqīb Ḥān began his translation around the end of Saf. 991 AH. This supports our doubt about the date of 990 AH. But unfortunately this date is not decisive because it falls at the end of *Ilāhī* 27 and/or the beginning of *Ilāhī* 28. Then if we consider the inaccuracy of MT on the dates of this year, as in the above case of Faṭḥ Allāh’s arrival, it is highly reasonable for us to take TA’s chronology.

It is necessary, at this point, to consider the background of the inaccuracy on the chronology of this year in MT about which the author of MT hints in the above quotation, excusing the disarrangement of the sequence ‘from a

<sup>24</sup> Rieu i, 57a; Ivanow 1924, 770; Richard 1989, 38; Piemontese 1989, 284.

motive (*ğaraḍ*). About his ‘motive’, we can deduce a supposition from MT’s narrations. In the annal of *Ilāhī* 28 (actual *Ilāhī* 27), MT’s author enumerates Akbar’s heretical policies which he narrates in a highly reproaching tone. He begins the enumeration with the reference to Akbar’s order to mint coins with the chronogram of *alf* and also to compile *Tārīḥ-i Alfī* because the end of the first millennium from the demise of the Prophet was then approaching (MT, ii, 301). Following the narration of this order, MT’s author mentions Akbar’s heretical policies like the regulation of *zamīn-būs*, legitimization of liquor under some conditions, prohibit of beef eating and so on. Then historical narrations follow, after which the author again enumerates Akbar’s heretical policies and some related episodes which seemed to be heretical from his religious point of view.

It is possible that he aimed at a literary effect by accumulating heretical episodes to blame Akbar’s socio-religious policies. This is his ‘motive’. In the process of accumulating the references the sequence of the events must have been ignored.

## 5. Conclusion

This paper has proved the following points.

In the text of *TAcl*, there is a series of discrepancies between the heading of an annal and the historical narration under it for *Ilāhī* 21 to 33. This is a result of: one, the erroneous insertion of the heading of *Ilāhī* 21 into the narration of *Ilāhī* 20; and two, the omission of the historical narration for the events of *Ilāhī* 33. For those years, the heading of each annal slides one year afterwards and is coupled with the historical narration for the events of the next year. We should handle the chronology of events of this period keeping this fact in mind.

Collating the manuscripts reveals that such discrepancies are found in all the manuscripts. Therefore this is not a variant which is peculiar only to *TAcl*. However the earliest known manuscript, *TA AMU*, which was copied in the year when TA was completed, handled the the discrepancy in a different way. We do not conclude whether this variant is closer to the archetype or not, because the evidence which are now available to us contradicts itself. This point should be solved in the future studies to reconstruct the stem of the manuscripts. However, a very valuable discovery for the reconstruction of the original text of TA would be that this kind of discrepancy is not transmitted to other manuscripts of TA, except two, but is transmitted to

the near-contemporary histories which acknowledge their dependence on TA's information. This fact may reflect a peculiar position of the earliest known manuscript in the genealogy of the manuscripts.

The existence of such a variant of headings and other major variants would clarify the necessity for a survey of the manuscripts of TA and the creation of a new edition accompanied with a critical reconstruction of the genealogy of the manuscripts.

This study sidelights the relationship between the histories of Akbar's time. TA's influence in content and form on later histories is revealed. At the same time, we see, in the case of MT, an example of an independent estimation of its information by a posterior historian. These facts reveal the necessity for a valuation of all information in each of the histories. We should be careful about the degree of reliability of all information on each given event from the view of the mutual relationship of the histories.

For this purpose, the study of the history of histories should neither be confined to basic studies nor studies presenting problems in support of revisionists' interests. It is, as a part of the history of intellectuals, open to all historians who are engaged in related scientific studies.

## Bibliography

### Primary sources

- AA** Abū al-Faḍl, *Ā'in-i Akbarī*. H. Blochmann (ed.), 2 vols., 1867–77.
- AN** Abū al-Faḍl, *Akbar Nāmah*. Mawlawī Āgā Aḥmad 'Alī & Mawlawī 'Abd al-Raḥīm (eds.), 3 vols., Calcutta, 1877–86.
- MaBh** Naqīb Ḥān et al., *Mahābhārat*. Sayyid Muḥammad Riḍā Ġalālī Nā'inī & N. S. Šūklā (eds.), 4 vols., Tihrān, 1358–9.
- MLC** Anthonio Monserrate, *Mongolicae Legationis Commentarius*. H. Hosten (ed.), Jesuit letters and allied papers on Mogor, Tibet, Bengal and Burma, Part I: Mongolicae Legationis Commentarius. *Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 3–9, 1914, pp. 513–704. **MLCtr**: J. S. Hoyland (tr.), *The commentary of Father Monserrate, S. J. on his journey to the court of Akbar*. London, 1922.
- MR** 'Abd al-Bāqī Nihāwandī, *Ma'āṭir-i Raḥīmī*. Muḥammad Hidāyat Ḥusayn (ed.), 3 vols., Calcutta, 1910–1931.
- MT** 'Abd al-Qādir Badā'unī, *Muntaḥab al-Tawārīḥ*. Mawlawī Aḥmad 'Alī & Kabīr al-Dīn Aḥmad (eds.), 3 vols., Calcutta, 1864–69. **MTtr**: G. S. A. Ranking, W. H. Lowe & T. W. Haig (trs.), 3 vols., Calcutta, 1884–1925.

## The discrepancy of chronology of *Ṭabaqāt-i Akbarī*

- TAcl** Nizām al-Dīn Aḥmad, *Ṭabaqāt-i Akbarī*. B. De & Muḥammad Hidāyat Ḥusayn (eds.), 3 vols., Calcutta, 1913–41. **TAtr**: Brajendranath De & Baini Prashad (trs.), 3 vols., Calcutta, 1911–40.
- TAk** Muḥammad ‘Ārif Qandahārī, *Tārīḥ-i Akbarī*. Mu‘īn al-Dīn Nadwī, Aẓhar ‘Alī Dihlawī (eds.), Rāmpūr, 1962.
- TAA** Iskandar Bīg, *Tārīḥ-i ‘Ālam-Ārā-yi ‘Abbāsī*. 3 vols., Tihrān, 1350.
- THA** Bāyazīd Bayāt, *Tadkirah-i Humāyūn wa Akbar*. Muḥammad Hidāyat Ḥusayn (ed.), Calcutta, 1941.
- TM** Muḥammad Ma‘šūm Bakkarī, *Tārīḥ-i Ma‘šūmī*. ‘Umar b. Muḥammad Dā’udpūtah (ed.), Poona, 1938.
- TN** Mīr Muḥammad Tattawī, *Tarḥān Nāmah*. Ḥusām al-Dīn Rāšidī (ed.), Ḥaydarābād-i Sind, 1965.
- TT** Ṭāhir Muḥammad Nisyanī, *Tārīḥ-i Ṭāhirī*. Nabī Baḥš Ḥān (ed.), Ḥaydarābād-i Sind, 1964.

## Secondary sources

- Akhtar 1990** M. Saleem AKHTAR, *Sind under the Mughuls*. Karachi, 1990.
- Athar Ali 1995** M. ATHAR ALI, The use of sources in Mughal historiography. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Series 3*, 5-3, 1995, pp. 361–73.
- Bendrey 1972** V. S. BENDREY, *Tarikh-i-Ilahi*. Aligarh, 1972.
- Doerfer 1965** Gerhard DOERFER, *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*. Band II: Türkische Elemente im Neupersischen. *alif bis tā*. Wiesbaden, 1965.
- Kanda 1935** KANDA Shigeru (ed.), *Japanese historical sources on astronomical phenomena*. (in Japanese) 2 vols., Tokyo, 1935.
- Kawamoto 2000** KAWAMOTO Masatomo, “Tümän” as regional district in Central Asia. (in Japanese) *Seinan Ajia Kenkyū (Bulletin of the Society for Western and Southern Asiatic Studies, Kyoto University)*, 53, 2000, pp. 24–60.
- Mashita 1999** MASHITA Hiroyuki, Akbar Nāmah and Ṭabaqāt-i Akbarī: A preliminary study of manṣab system. (in Japanese) *Seinan Ajia Kenkyū (Bulletin of the Society for Western and Southern Asiatic Studies, Kyoto University)*, 51, 1999, pp. 43–74.
- Piemontese 1989** Angelo Michele PIEMONTESE, *Catalogo dei manoscritti persiani conservati nelle biblioteche d’Italia*, Roma, 1989.
- Prashad 1938** Baini PRASHAD, Life and work of Khwājah Nizāmuddīn Aḥmad Bakhshī. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. Letters*, 4, 1938, pp. 769–94.
- Richard 1989** Francis RICHARD, *Catalogue des manuscrits persans, I: Ancien fonds*. Paris, 1989.
- Rieu** Charles RIEU, *Catalogue of the Persian manuscripts in the British Museum*. 3 vols. London, 1879–1883.

HIROYUKI MASHITA

**Rizvi 1952** Saiyid Athar Abbas RIZVI, Abu'l Fazl's preface to the Persian translation of the Mahabharat. *Proceedings: Indian History Congress (Nagpur, 1950)*, 13, 1952, pp. 197–201.

## Appendix

The manuscripts, whose call numbers are not known, are referred to by the numbers in the catalogues as “*Cat. No.*” in the column. For the bibliographical information of the catalogues, see C. A. Storey, *Persian literature: A bio-bibliographical survey*, vol. 1, London, 1927–39, pp. ix–xxiii.

	Location	Call no., etc.	Folios	Date	Details
1	Maulaza Azad Library, Aligarh	Subhan Allah 954/3	405	1594–5	Wanting <i>Ṭabaqah</i> of Malwa.
2	do.	University F. A. 55	535	1682	
3	Mulla Firuz Library, Bombay	<i>Cat. No.</i> 54			
4	Asiatic Society, Calcutta	D 231		17 C.	
5	do.	D 229	637	17 C. beg.	Slightly defective.
6	do.	Curzon II 361	351	18 C. beg.	Incomplete.
7	do.	Curzon I 643	167	18 C. beg.	Fragment. Ending with <i>Ilāhī</i> 24.
8	National Library, Calcutta (Buhar Coll.)	<i>Cat. No.</i> 60	579	1781–2	Wanting Conclusion.
9	Asafiya	Fann Tarikh 732	pp. 454	1881	Abridgement.
10	do.	Fann Tarikh 720	348	1602	Fragment. From <i>Ṭabaqah</i> of Deccan to the end.
11	Salar Jung Museum	Hist. 321	459	17 C. late	Fragment. Up to <i>Ṭabaqah</i> of Kashmir.
12	do.	Hist. 319&320	329, 206	17 C. mid.	
13	Nadwat al-‘Ulamā’, Lucknow	66	1304 (pp.?)		
14	Raja Mehmudabad Library, Lucknow	447	652 (pp.?)		Fragment. Preface and a part of <i>Ṭabaqah</i> of Delhi.
15	do.	448	298 (pp.?)		
16	Palace Library of Nawab Bahadur of Murshidabad				One of the base manuscripts of the Calcutta edition.
17	Khuda Bakhsh Library	535	529	17 C.	Wanting <i>Ṭabaqah</i> of Malwa.
18	Rampur Raza Library	1826M	226	1631	
19	do.	1916M	262	n.d.	Fragment. Wanting the beginning, the end and the greater part of <i>Ṭabaqah</i> of Delhi.
20	Punjab Univ. Library	Pe I 22A/638	502	16. Rabl.?	
21	do.	A Pe I 10A/51	415	1675	Fragment. <i>Ṭabaqah</i> of Delhi.

## HIROYUKI MASHITA

22	Cambridge Univ. Library	Eton 18.1	455	1598– 9/1599– 1600 <sup>25</sup>	
23	<i>do.</i>	Eton 18.7	416	1649	
24	Edinburgh Univ. Library	<i>Cat.</i> No. 77	752		
25	John Rylands Univ. Library	<i>Cat.</i> No. 934		1750 c.	
26	<i>do.</i>	<i>Cat.</i> No. 405		1780–1830 c.	
27	British Library	Or. 2274	447	16 C. close	Wanting the beginning.
28	<i>do.</i>	Add. 26208 & 26209	321, 310	1639	
29	<i>do.</i>	Add. 6543	473	17 C.	
30	<i>do.</i>	Or. 161	83	17 C. later part	Fragment. A part of <i>Ṭabaqah</i> of Delhi.
31	<i>do.</i>	Add. 5615	782	18 C.	Wanting <i>Ṭabaqah</i> of Multan and Conclusion.
32	<i>do.</i>	Or. 1901	667	1854	Copied from Or. 2274.
33	<i>do.</i>	Add. 26302	38	n.d.	Fragment. History of Bābur and Humāyūn. The paper is of 1802 AD.
34	<i>do.</i>	IO 3320	579	1622	
35	<i>do.</i>	IO 1585	105	1636	Fragment. History of Šīr Šāh.
36	<i>do.</i>	IO 3289	415	1656	Fragment. Preface and <i>Ṭabaqah</i> of Delhi.
37	<i>do.</i>	IO 2943	530	1659	Fragment. Preface and <i>Ṭabaqah</i> of Delhi. Ending with <i>Ilāhī</i> 16.
38	<i>do.</i>	IO 3419	282	1691	
39	<i>do.</i>	IO 3595	127b– 274a	1876	Fragment. <i>Ṭabaqah</i> of Gujarat.
40	<i>do.</i>	IO 731	236	n.d.	
41	<i>do.</i>	IO 967	409	n.d.	
42	<i>do.</i>	IO 997&998	280, 162	n.d.	Copied in Muḥammad Šāh's reign.
43	Royal Asiatic Society	<i>Cat.</i> No. 46	517		
44	SOAS	24950	372		Fragment. Preface and <i>Ṭabaqah</i> of Delhi.
45	Bodleian	Th. Hyde 47	541	07. Shab.?	
46	<i>do.</i>	Elliot 380	265	02. Shab.?	
47	<i>do.</i>	Elliot 379	547	08. JumII.?	Wanting part of <i>Ṭabaqah</i> of Multan and Conclusion.
48	<i>do.</i>	Elliot 381	453	1639	
49	<i>do.</i>	Bodl. 297	568	1677	
50	<i>do.</i>	Ind. Inst. Pers. 16	554	1719	
51	<i>do.</i>	Th. Hyde 30	508	n.d.	

<sup>25</sup> The colophon which abruptly ends bears the date “*dar tārīḥ-i čihīl wa sih-i Ilāhī bi-tārīḥ-i hiḡrat-i hazār wa hašt*”. The cataloguer describes the date as 1020 AH/1611–2 which is perhaps a mis-reading of *hašt* (eight) for *bīst* (twenty). Because Akbar's reign ends in 1013 AH. However this date 1008 AH is puzzling, because *Ilāhī* 43, beginning on 13 Shab. 1006 AH, does not cover that year.



The discrepancy of chronology of *Ṭabaqāt-i Akbarī*

52	do.	Fraser 136	666		
53	do.	Ouseley Add. 116	287		Fragment. Preface and part of <i>Ṭabaqah</i> of Delhi.
54	Bibliothèque Nationale	Supplément 284	313	1678	Fragment. Preface and <i>Ṭabaqah</i> of Delhi.
55	do.	Supplément 283	577	17 C.	Wanting <i>Ṭabaqah</i> of Multan and Conclusion.
56	do.	Supplément 286	255	17&18C.	Fragment. <i>Ṭabaqahs</i> of Deccan, Gujarat, Bengal, Malwa and Kashmir.
57	do.	Supplément 285	417	17 C. end	Fragment. Preface and <i>Ṭabaqah</i> of Delhi.
58	Universtäts-Bibliothek, Leipzig	SS. 325	557		
59	do.	SS. 237	653		
60	Staatsbibliothek, Berlin	Sprenger 220	741	1809	
61	Staatsbibliothek, München	Cat. No. 235		1670-1	
62	Kongelige Bibliotek, Copenhagen	Cat. No. 56		1702-3	Fragment. History of Akbar.
63	Sanktpeterburg-skii Univ.	Cat. No. 269			
64	Berunii Instituti	1535	752	1617	
65	do.	3673	622	1716-7	
66	do.	3341	1, 517, 1	1818	

\* This paper is a part of the results of the research on the Grant-in-Aid for Encouragement of Young Scientists from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (Government of Japan).