ZINBUN 2001/2002 No.36 (1)

A historiographical study of the so-called *Aḥwāl-i Asad Bīg*

MASHITA Hiroyuki

1. Introduction

The history of the Mughal emperor Akbar by Abū al-Faḍl (*Akbar Nāmah*), the most comprehensive historical source of the reign, finds its conclusion with the beginning of the 47th regnal year (Mar.1602. AN,iii,803), due to the sudden assassination of its author. The period from that time onward to the end of the reign of Akbar (1605) is, compared with the days previous, quite lacking in contemporary sources with regard to both quality and quantity.

For this period, therefore, we have to rely on, apart from sporadic retrospections in Ǧahāngīr's memoirs (*Ǧahāngīr Nāmah*, henceforth JN), Persian dynastic chronicles of later days,[1] histories of Islamic India,[2] general histories,[3] other local history,[4] accounts of Jesuit missionaries and their compila-

[1] *Iqbāl Nāmah-i Ǧahāngīrī* (INJ); the supplements (so-called *Takmilah*) of *Akbar Nāmah*. There are three versions of the supplements. Two of the three versions were compiled in Šāh Ǧahān's reign, but the exact dates are yet to be established. The first version (TAN1) heavily depends on INJ. The unpublished second version (TAN2) has completely different text from that of TAN1. The text of the third version is, according to Beveridge, different from that of TAN1 and TAN2 (ANtr,1204). An abridged translation of the third version is made by Lieut. Chalmers. The unpublished manuscript of the translation is preserved in the library of the Royal Asiatic Society. I could not make use of this version. The manuscript upon which it is based is not known. E&D uses this version (E&D,vi,103-115).

[2] *Gulšan-i Ibrāhīmī* (GI); *Zubdat al-Tawārīḫ* (ZT)

[3] *Rawḍat al-Ṭāhirīn*; *Muntaḫab al-Tawārīḫ*; *Ma'dan-i Aḫbār-i Aḥmadī*; the so-called *Tārīḫ-i Ḥaydarī*; *Anfa' al-Aḫbār*.

[4] *Tadhkirat al-Mulūk* (TM) has aspects not only of a local history of the 'Ādil Šāhī kingdom of Bīǧāpūr but also of a contemporary history of the Islamic regions both within and beyond the borders of India. It includes a history of the Mughal empire as well as that of the Safawids and the Ottomans. A critical edition by Abū Naṣr Khālidī is under preparation. A recent study based on the draft of the edition is [Ernst (2000)].

tions,[5] and other European reports.[6]

Given such limited availability of contemporary sources, the memoirs of Asad Bīg Qazwīnī (henceforth AAB) have come to be regarded as an important testimonial by a contemporary of that period.

However, historiographical study of the memoirs is insufficient. We only have brief descriptions ([Rieu (1879-83)],iii,979b; E&D,vi,150-154) and short remarks to the work in papers on other topics ([Joshi (1950)]; [Joshi (1969)]; [Alam & Subrahmanyam (2000)]). Although a short note which focuses on the memoirs appeared in 1941 ([AhmadMA (1941)]), since it was based on a manuscript copied in modern times, we cannot acknowledge its significance as a historiographical study. Of course, a critical edition of the memoirs is yet to be published.

As for translations, there is one in English in the form of manuscripts. It was done by B. W. Chapman of the Bengal Civil Service around 1853-4 for the collective materials of Indo-Islamic history organized by H. M. Elliot. The English manuscript (Add. 30776) originally belonged to Elliot's collection and was purchased by the British Library in 1878 together with the English and Oriental manuscripts of the collection. The well-known English translation of E&D is an extracted version based on Chapman's translation (E&D, vi, 154-174) . Chapman's work is defective due to the manuscript upon which it is based (Or.1837ii), since the latter is a modern copy of another manuscript, as we will see later. From the viewpoint of a critical study of the text, the translation is of little significance. Judging from the extracted sentences of E&D, Chapman's translation is not very faithful to the original Persian.

For its value as a source of Akbar's reign, see [Khan (1980)].

[5] A number of letters preserved in Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu of Rome should be thoroughly scrutinized. One of the letters I have indirectly made use of in this paper. A collection of letters written by Geronimo Xavier is preserved as a manuscript of Add. 9854 in the British Library and published in vol. 3 of *Documentação Ultramarina Portuguesa*. Lisboa, 1963, pp.1-291. A history of the Jesuit missions by Guerreiro is based on the letters of Xavier for northern India of our period.

[6] Mildenhall's relation, though interesting, is too inconsequential to supplement the lack of our historical information. The very important Pelsaert K will be discussed later. The unpublished relations of the Florentine brothers Vecchietti, Giovan Battisita and Gerolamo, who were at Akbar's court, may contain relevant details, but I could not consult them. For their travels and their relations, see [Almagià (1956)]. [Maclagan (1932)] gives a brief mention to them in connection with Geronimo Xavier's Persian translation of the Psalter.

We should refer to [Joshi (1950)], [Joshi (1969)] and [Alam & Subrahmanyam (2000)] as studies based mainly on the memoirs. There we find English citations from the memoirs, which may be regarded partial translations. However the manuscripts upon which they are based were copied in modern times as I will describe below. [Joshi (1950)] is based on the S ms. but at that time, he read the Persian text with the help of an informant. [Joshi (1969)] is based on the B1 ms. and Chapman's translation, while [Alam & Subrahmanyam (2000)] is based on the B1 ms. and the more legible but less valuable AMU ms. Their translations are all too often not faithful and sometimes even omit difficult passages without any notation. In other words, we must consider them to be free translations.

There have been no attempts so far to confirm the historical value of the memoirs as a historical source for the later years of Akbar. Therefore it is indispensable to establish a critical text of the memoirs we can rely on and to examine the historical authenticity of its testimonies.

Our study will be comprised of two parts: first, a textual criticism of the memoirs to give the principles for preparing a critical edition which is to be published as a separate work; and second, a historical criticism of its contents through comparison with other histories.

This paper is a part of the joint research project of the memoirs by Dr. W. H. Siddiqi and the present author. Our aim is to publish a monograph, which contains a critical edition of the memoirs. This paper aims to be an introduction to that critical text.

In this paper, however, the deciphering of the manuscripts and the criticism from the textual and historical standpoints are, up to this point, my own responsibility. Therefore, all the mistakes and the faults of the present paper rest with me.

2. Author

Concerning the author's career, we have a brief remark by Rieu, based mainly on a note attached to the end of some of the manuscripts of the memoirs. [Nabi Hadi (1995)] gives an entry concerning our author, which, however, does not surpass Rieu's description ([Nabi Hadi (1995)], 88-89). The most significant contribution for our purposes is the footnotes attached to the edition of the *Mayḫānah* (MKh), where the editor assembles some of the references to our author which appeared in the biography collections of Persian poets (MKh,748-757).

To my own knowledge, in the Persian chronicles, there is no reference to him. Therefore direct information concerning our author is limited to that found in his own memoirs and in biographical anthologies.

His name is Asad bun Muḥammad Murād as it appears in his memoirs.[7] He sometimes called himself Asad Bīg. He never affixed the nisbah of Qazwīnī, which appears in few of biographical anthologies of Persian poets, to his name. The date and the place of his birth are unknown. However his own words as well as other biographical works of Persian poets evidence his familial relation to the Iranian city. HI places his biography under the description of the city (HI,iii,181-183). A biographical work says that he was from a noble stock of Qazwīn (akābir zādah-i Qazwīn).[8] This explains his link to the city as it appears in his nisbah, although it does not necessarily permit us to conclude that his birthplace was Qazwīn. We may conclude that it is reasonable to call him Asad Bīg Qazwīnī with the nisbah as practiced by many modern scholars.

As for his family, he mentioned the proper names of only his father Muḥammad Murād or Murād Bīg[9] and his brother Mīrzā Ibrāhīm Bīg.[10] We find reference to his children, when he came back to Āgrah from Deccan in 1602, and met them (farzandān) there since they had remained in the capital city (AAB,9v/6). Their names are not specified and nothing is known about their later lives.

As for his father, a biographical work mentions using the honorific title of Ḫwāǧah that "he was a wealthy man who was well-informed of the world, traveled through the world, and experienced the bitter and the sweet" (MKh,748).

Asad Bīg gives an account of his father, referring to his familial origin through the words of Āṣaf Ḫān, when the latter spoke to introduce Asad Bīg to the Emperor Akbar: "Asad Bīg is our close relative. And his father is called Murād Bīg-i Āqā ḂLAḂY بلای. They [Asad and his father] belong to the esteemed good people of Qazwīn."[11]

---

[7] AAB,2r/4. The below references of AAB follow the A manuscript.

[8] MKh,748. The account in the eighteenth century biographical work that Asad Bīg belongs to the house of Tīmūr (Āl-i Tīmūr) is out of the question (*Safīnah-i Ḫūsgū*, as quoted in a footnote to MKh,748).

[9] AAB,2r/4; AAB,8v/14.

[10] AAB,16v/13; 34r/8; 36r/2; 36r/8; 41v/1; 42r/2; 44r/17; 46v/8 ; 50r/15; 50r/17.

[11] AAB,8v/13-15. There is a clerical problem in ḂLAḂY, because other manuscripts of AAB have a form of Mullā'ī ملائی (R ms., 6v/19; B1 ms.: 8/16). Murād Bīg-i Āqā

If we trust the statement of Āṣaf Ḫān, Asad Bīg shared ancestrage with the noble Iranian family and was a cousin of Āṣaf Ḫān. This has never been pointed out by previous studies.[12]

However we should be cautious in adding him to the eminent family. It is true that Āṣaf Ḫān immigrated to Mughal India from Qazwīn, and belonged to the notable family, from which influential Mughal nobles appeared one after another, maintaining matrimonial relations with the other eminent Iranian family of I'timād al-Dawlah.[13] Nevertheless, other than the words of Āṣaf Ḫān, biographical accounts of Asad Bīg do not mention any relation between the family and Asad Bīg or his father Murād Bīg. Even Asad Bīg himself does not claim such a relationship except for the statement by Āṣaf Ḫān. The fact that he cites the statement in the third person may reflect his understanding of his own actual relation with Āṣaf Ḫān. He seems to imply that he is not responsible for the authenticity of the statement cited in the direct narration.

Therefore the words of Āṣaf Ḫān, which Asad Bīg deliberately quoted, should be seen as a kind of tactic for giving a fellow from the same place of origin a more favorable introduction with the emperor.

ḂLAḂY (or Mullā'ī) must mean Murād Bīg, belonging to the family of Āqā ḂLA (or Mullā). It is established by collecting sporadic information in the sources that Āqā Mullā is the grandfather of Āṣaf Ḫān (Āqā Mullā as the father of Ġiyāṯ al-Dīn ([AhmadKM (1932)], 23-25, plate XIV-XV); Ġiyāṯ al-Dīn as a paternal uncle of Āṣaf Ḫān (DhKh,i,187); Āqā Mullā as the father of Muḫtār Bīg (AA,i,229, 231); Muḫtār Bīg as a paternal uncle of Āṣaf Ḫān (AAB,10r/16; JN,11; JN Al,7; JNtr1, 16; JNtr2, 29. JN and JNtr2 are wrong when they read Muḫtār مختار as Mumtāz ممتاز)). Therefore, if the original form is Mullā'ī and the Āqā Mullā as the grandfather of Āṣaf Ḫān is identical with the Āqā Mullā as the relative of Asad Bīg, it lends logicality to the above cited words of Āṣaf Ḫān. If it was the case, the person who appears in TAAA as the father of Badī' al-Zamān, the father of Āṣaf Ḫān must be identical with the above mentioned Āqā Mullā. Consequently, the variously spelled name of the person (Āqā TLA ﻻﻄ (TAAA,165) or Āqā NLA ﻻﻥ (TAAA,166)) can be reasonably regarded as a clerical error for Āqā Mullā ﻣﻼ. To return to the form of Āqā ḂLAḂY in the A ms., if we suppose that the person named Āqā ḂLA is the grandfather of Āṣaf Ḫān, the same clerical error (ﻼﻟﻯ for ﻣﻼﺋﻯ) may be true of this case. In any case, at this present stage, I can draw no conclusions concerning this point. Because no positive evidence for the identification of Āqā ḂLA or Mullā of AAB with the grandfather of Āṣaf Ḫān is found in the sources except the above mentioned words of Āṣaf Ḫān. Moreover the supposed clerical error in TAAA is yet to be established through the scrutiny of manuscripts.

[12] [Habib (1969)] does not list Asad Bīg in the family lineage.

[13] For the details, see [Habib (1969)].

If this is the case, we can acknowledge only the fact that Asad Bīg and Asaf Ḫān share the same place of origin Qazwīn, and not any familial connection.

Recent studies of Iranian immigrants to Islamic India show some patterns of emigration, one of which was to search for connections with fellows from their same place of origin. It is true that at that time, many years had passed since Asad Bīg's migration as we will see below. However, what made Āṣaf Ḫān offer such an advantage to him might have been sentiment for a common homeland. A biographical account of Asad Bīg says: "He was known as Asad Bīg Abū al-Faḍlī and [after the assassination of Abū al-Faḍl] was at Mīrzā Ǧa'far Āṣaf Ḫān for some time."[14] Āṣaf Ḫān's patronage of Asad Bīg recounted here seems to reflect such a sentiment.

Now let us turn to Asad Bīg's life and career.

When he was young, Asad Bīg came to Hirāt and became an inkpot-holder (dawāt-dār) under Ḫwāǧah Afḍal, the wazīr of the city.[15] Although his activity in Hirāt is unknown from the sources, the above passage informs us of his literary ability as a clerk by which he earned his livelihood. If his grandfather was identical with Āqā TLAY dawātdār-i Qazwīnī, his activity in the same office may reflect a familial background in administration.

It was from the Khurasanid city that he proceeded to India (Hindūstān) (MKh,748), but the reason why Asad Bīg left Hirāt is unknown. We do not know whether he was accompanied by some of his family members. Concerning whether or not his brother Ibrāhīm Bīg, who was clearly active with him during the later years of Akbar, left together with him, there is no evidence.

As for the date of his arrival in India, his own statement should be the key: he had served his master Abū al-Faḍl for seventeen years, when the latter was assassinated in RabI. 1011 AH /Aug.1602 (AAB,9r). Then he must have begun his service in 994 (1586/7). We do not find any evidence of Asad Bīg's Indian career before this term of service. This fact may show that he began his life in India with this service to Abū al-Faḍl. However, what we can confirm at the present stage is that Asad Bīg arrived in India not later than that year.[16]

When Abū al-Faḍl was dispatched to Deccan in January of 1599, Asad

[14] *'Arafāt al-'Arifīn*, quoted in a footnote to MKh,749.

[15] MKh,748. For Ḫwāǧah Afḍal Iṣfahānī, see TAAA, 285, 303, 305.

[16] The statement of *Maḫzan al-Ġarā'ib* (compiled 1803/4) that Mīrzā Asad Bīg Qazwīnī came to India in the days of Ǧahāngīr is out of the question.

Bīg must have followed his master (AN,iii,748). Due to the death of his master, he entered into Akbar's service. Asad Bīg was assigned the rank (manṣab) 100 of sawār 25 with an adequate ğāgīr and was appointed as a night-guard (yatāq) (AAB,10r/1-10v/6). In 1603, he was sent to investigate for negligence in the unsuccessful siege on the fort of Īrač by Rāy-i Rāyān's troops (AAB,10v/13 ff.). From 1603 to 1604, he was working as an envoy to Bīğāpūr of Deccan (AAB,15r/1 ff.). When he returned from that mission, he was promoted to the manṣab 200 of sawār 50 (AAB,38v/15-16). He was appointed to succeed to the service of Ḫwāğah Amīn al-Dīn, namely as an intermediary for subjects calling upon the emperor.[17]

In 1605, he was again dispatched as an ambassador to the four provinces of Deccan (AAB,40r/12-17). However, due to the sudden death of the emperor, his mission was not completed. After staying in Burhānpūr with Ḫān-i Ḫānān 'Abd al-Raḥīm, he was recalled to Āgrah by the succeeding emperor Ğahāngīr.[18]

Asad Bīg remained a manṣab-dār in Ğahāngīr's regime, although his rank is not known.[19] He was appointed a baḫšī in Kābul, but the date of the appointment is not clear. On the other hand, Asad Bīg also stayed in Āgrah, since Taqī Awḥadī says that he met Asad Bīg in Āgrah when he was preparing his work *'Arafāt al-'Ārifīn* (compiled during 1613 to 1615).[20]

The author of another biography collection says that he met Asad Bīg in Mandū when he arrived there in 1026 AH (1617-8) (MKh,750). The reason for Asad Bīg's stay in Mandū is not mentioned in the sources. Furthermore, Asad Bīg is reported to have accompanied Mahābat Ḫān to Bangaš in the same year (MKh,750). Mahābat Ḫān's dispatch to Kābul and Bangaš is established by Ğahāngīr's testimony (JN,226), although the appointment of Asad Bīg is not referred to in any of the sources.

The biographical note following the colophon of some of the manuscripts of AAB says that he was conferred the title of Pīšraw Ḫān in the later years of Ğahāngīr. However, in connection with the date of his death, this is open

---

[17] AAB,39r/1-9. Ğahāngīr says that Amīn al-Dīn held the office of the chief imperial night-guard (yātaš bīg) in the later years of Akbar (JN,9), while Asad Bīg does not specify Amīn al-Dīn's office. For yātaš, see [Doerfer (1963-75)], iv, 53.

[18] A biographical work mentions his mission to Deccan, although it is not clear which of the two missions it refers to (MKh,749).

[19] *'Arafāt al-'Ārifīn*, as quoted in MKh,749.

[20] *'Arafāt al-'Ārifīn*, as quoted in MKh,749-750.

to question.[21]

There are two options for the date. The first alternative of 1030 AH (1620-1) is reported by the biography collection of *Mirāt-i Ğahān Numā* compiled in Awrangzīb's reign. If this information is true, the conferment of that title in the later years of Ğahāngir, who died in 1627, should be doubted. Secondly, a biographical note of some manuscripts of AAB indicates that Asad Bīg died in 1041 AH (1631-2). This information is in accord with another report that he died in the early days of Šāh Ğahān in Tūrān.[22] In any event, there is no conclusive evidence concerning this problem, so we shall have to wait for some as yet unpublished materials to settle this issue.

Regarding his literary works, the *'Arafāt al-'Ārifīn* completed in 1615 reports that Asad Bīg compiled a dīwān containing two thousand couplets. On the other hand, the MKh completed in 1619 records the number differently as eight thousand for the couplets.[23] The discrepancy in number may reflect the progress of Asad Bīg's literary production.[24]

What is most important is the fact that none of the sources mentions his memoirs of AAB. As we have already seen, sources other than the biographical works, namely annalistic histories, do not mention Asad Bīg at all. This fact reflects his evaluation by the society to which he belonged. He was recognized as a poet rather than a politician or an administrative officer.

The biographical works naturally focus on his eloquence and talent for writing as a poet. His appointment as inspector of the failed siege of Īrač and as ambassador to Deccan must have been due to his skill as a negotiator backed by his eloquence. His ready tact and judgment gave him opportunities to express that eloquence, although his own depiction should be accepted with due regard for his dramatization. Talking one obvious example, when he reported the inspection results to Akbar, he explained away that though the officers were negligent, they were not at fault, and in fact no one was responsible for the loss. The emperor and the courtiers admired his quick tact (AAB, 11r/10-11v/3).

On the other hand, his official career was supported by his skill at writing. As we have seen, Asad Bīg, before his migration to India, served as secretary

[21] The reference found in the modern biography collection of *Šam'-i Anğuman* (compiled 1875) might be based on the note.

[22] *Safīnah-i Ḫūšgū*, as quoted in MKh,748.

[23] MKh,750. *'Arafāt al-'Ārifīn*, as quoted in MKh,750.

[24] His sāqī nāmah of 121 couplet including the panegyric for Ğahāngīr and other poems are found in MKh,750-757.

(dawātdār) to a wazīr and was an army clerk (baḫšī) during Ǧahāngīr's reign. Such ability was always found hand in hand with poetic skill in the pre-modern literary society of the Perso-Indian milieu.

However, his social status as it appeared in his manṣab was quite low. When he entered Akbar's service, he was appointed to the manṣab 100. Even after the mission to Bījāpūr, which was accomplished with great success after much hardship, he was only promoted to the manṣab of 200. Under the system of manṣabdār, only the holders of rank of the 500 or more were designated as nobles (umarā'. sg. amīr). The list of manṣabdārs, which had been prepared by 1594, omits the names of manṣabdārs holding a manṣab lower than 200.[25] These facts explain the low official status of Asad Bīg, as compared with his brilliant activities which Asad Bīg himself described concerning his imperial service.

Therefore, it is not difficult to discern his less favorable circumstances under Gahangir's regime. Asad Bīg long served for Abū al-Faḍl whom Ǧahāngīr regarded with enough hostility to assassinate. In the later years of Akbar, whom Asad Bīg served, Ǧahāngīr confronted his royal father at every opportunity. The murder of Abū al-Faḍl was the result of the antagonism (JN,15). Therefore it is possible to think that such a background of his could have been an obstacle to his official success under Ǧahāngīr. He recounted in his memoirs the complications he faced in which he was recalled by Ǧahāngīr and was on the verge on being punished by death for his long delay in presenting himself to the new emperor. He was narrowly saved from this trial by Amīr al-Umarā' (Šarīf Ḫān) to enter into the service of Ǧahāngīr. This procession of events probably brought about in him the most important conversion in his life. Although his activities of that period cannot be fully detailed, his absence in the contemporary chronicles would seem to indicate that he did not gain any official recognition worthy of notice. His appointment to the baḫšī of Bangaš where time and again Afghan tribes had risen up in revolt does not seem to have been a favorable promotion for him. The office of baḫšī in Kābul to which he was appointed as mentioned above is most probably not identical with that of the provincial baḫšī of Kābul. It should be interpreted as a lower baḫšī of an contingent posted in Kābul.

Summing up these circumstances, it seems that Asad Bīg gained a certain measure of fame as a poet but was an obscure official all his life in India.

[25] For the date of the list and the comparison with the list of *Ṭabaqāt-i Akbarī*, see [Mashita (1999)].

According to the memoirs, when he was appointed to the second mission to Deccan, Akbar promised to grant him the manṣab of 1000 on his return. We are not in the position to judge whether or not this was historically accurate. However, at the very least we can suppose Asad's intention to claim a status suitable to his service by referring to this promise, which was not fulfilled due to Akbar's death.

3. Criticism at the text

There are six manuscripts of the memoirs known to exist. The author's autographical manuscript has not been discovered. The text in the work and the historical settings of the author's time do not permit us to assume the existence of multiple autograph copies. Therefore we have to reconstruct the original text from the six manuscripts described hereafter.

3.1. Physical description of the manuscripts

First, we shall describe the physical aspects of the manuscripts. An asterisk placed beside an item indicates my own description, not to be found in the catalogues.

A ms.

Andhra Pradesh Government Oriental Manuscripts Library
Fann-i Ṣawāniḥ-i 'Umrī 41 ([Āṣafiyyah (1332-3)],ii, 848, no. 41)
ff. 56 *
ll. 17 *
Size: 21 by 12 cm *
Script: Šikastah *
Not dated *

There is no colophon.

On f.1r, there are five notes and four seals. One of the notes says that the manuscript was purchased during the reign of 'Ālamgīr II, who ruled from 1167 to 1173 AH (1748-1759). The date on the seal of a certain 'Abd al-Qādir, also affixed to the same note, is 1157 AH. And yet another seal is dated 1120 AH / 1708-9. Taking into consideration the nature of dating found on seals, 1120 AH is not necessarily the date of the manuscript. At any rate, we can conclude from these facts that the manuscript was copied

not later than the first half of the eighteenth century. This means that this manuscript is the oldest among all of the known manuscripts.

However, the physical condition of the manuscript is poor. Due to worm-eaten holes and crumbling, many parts of the text are defective. Patches papered on the recto sides all too often hinder our deciphering the letters under them. Furthermore, there is mistaken pagination. Folios 11 and 14 are interchanged, and folio 31 should be placed between the present folios 25 and 26.

R ms.

Rampur Raza Library
No. 1739 m ([Rāmpūr (1996)],i, 616, no. 2069 b)
ff. 36
ll. 21 *
Size: 13.5 by 25.5 cm *
Script: Nasta'līq-i Šikastah Āmīz *
Copied DhQ. 22, 1199 AH /Sep. 26, 1785 by Tulsī Dās.

An oval seal of the copyist Tulsī Dās dated 1181 AH is found on f.36v. On the red leather cover, the seal of the State Library of Rampur has been stamped in gold leaf. We know that it has been re-bound, because parts of some of the marginal notes are cut off. In its present state, this manuscript has come to be viewed as a single codex devoted only to the memoirs. However it was originally a part of a larger manuscript, as the note on f.1r relates, "Together with [the manuscript of] *Ǧahāngīrī*, Number 64 (hamrāh-i nambar 64 ǧahāngīrī)". According to the earliest catalogue of the Rampur Raza Library prepared in 1889 (now kept by the deputy librarian),[26] manuscript no. 64 is described as the one volume *Tārīẖ-i Tuzuk-i Ǧahāngīrī*. The manuscript is identified with that of *Tuzuk-i Ǧahāngīrī* (No. 1737 m) preserved in the same library. In its present state, this manuscript contains Ǧahāngīr's memoirs and the supplement by Muḥammad Hādī. However, a note on f.1r of this manuscript lists the following contents of the manuscript in its original form, in which we find Asad Bīg's work. The numerical characters in the list are written in the Siyāqat script.

[26] For this catalogue, see [ḤānHAA (1998)], 231.

496 folios
Copy of *Ǧahāngīr Nāmah*, 235 folios.
Copy of *Aḥwāl-i Asad Bīg Qazwīnī*, 36 folios.
Copy of *Aḥwāl-i Šāh Šuǧā'* and others, 44 folios.
Copy of *Aḥwāl-i Fatḥ-i Mulk al-Šām*, 53 folios.

The first and the second components are definitively identical with manuscripts no. 1737 m and no. 1739 m respectively. The third manuscript has been identified as that of *Tārīḫ-i Šāh Šuǧā'ī* (No. 5478 m) preserved in the same library, while the fourth cannot be found in the library collection.

The colophon of manuscript no. 1737 m dated Saf. 27, 1197 AH / Feb. 1, 1783 indicates that it was copied in Āgrah ("dār al-ḫilāfah Akbarābād") by the same Tulsī Dās of no. 1739 m. Moreover, the colophon of manuscript no. 5478 m dated DhQ.1200 AH / Aug.-Sep.1786 records the scribe as this Tulsī Dās. The two manuscripts bear the same oval seal of Tulsī Dās dated 1181 AH, which is also found within the manuscript of AAB. The number of lines is twenty one, equal to that of the no. 1739 m. The writing paper used is also identical.

These facts lead us to surmise that first, manuscript no. 1739 m was originally a part of the larger collective manuscript of historical works; second, each part of the manuscript was copied by Tulsī Dās; third, the copying was completed during a short period in the later years of the twelfth century AH with the same format on the same paper; and fourth, the copying was done in Āgrah.

AMU ms.

Maulana Azad Library, Aligarh Muslim University
'Abd al-Salam Collection, no. 270/40.
pp. 139
ll. 14
Size: 27.9 by 17.8 cm
Copied Muh. 29, 1319 AH / May 18, 1901 by Mohd. Naziruddin.

This manuscript is copied from the above manuscript of Rampur (R ms.) for Sahibzada Abdus Salam Khan.

S ms.

National Library, Calcutta
Sir Jadunath Sarkar Collection
Catalogue no. 7.
pp.185.

This manuscript is included in the collection of the eminent historian Jadunath Sarkar (1879-1958), who made about two hundred copies of Persian manuscripts concerning Indo-Islamic history for his research, which have been preserved in various libraries in India for his research. This manuscript is "a copy of the original preserved in Rampur" ([Hasan (1966)], 185), which must refer to the R ms.

B1 ms.

British Library
Or. 1996 ([Rieu (1879-83)],iii,979a)
pp.55
ll.21
12'1/4 by 9 in.
Šikastah-Āmīz
Copied RabI. 25, 1211 AH/ Sep. 27, 1796 by Kišān Dās.

This manuscript originally belonged to the collection of Henry Miers Elliot (1808-1853), the compiler of the eight volume source-book of Indo-Islamic history (E&D).[27]

The date the manuscript entered his collection is not known. However it should fall between 1840 and 1852 when he was collecting manuscripts, intending to cover all the material bearing on the history of Muslim India.[28]

[27] For his career and works, see [Rieu (1879-83)],iii, pp. xxii-xxiv. [Wahi (1990)]'s reappraisal of his works is informative on many points. It sidelights the relationship between Elliot and Aloys Sprenger, the Principal of the Muhammadan College in Delhi from 1844 to 1847.

[28] [Sprenger (1854)] gives a brief list of his collection of manuscripts in the year after his death. Our manuscript Or.1996 must be identical with manuscript no. 103 of the list ([Sprenger (1854)],245, no. 103), whose description corresponds to the above details of Or.1996. The collected manuscripts were to be deposited in the College Library of Āgrah ([Blochmann (1869)],107-8).

B2 ms.

British Library
Or. 1837ii ([Rieu (1879-83)],iii,1029a)
ff.113-259
ll.13
5'3/4 by 3'1/2 in.
Nasta'līq
Not dated.

Though it is not dated, Rieu apparently assumes the copy to be dated around 1850. I regard this figure as appropriate as I will explain below.

This text is bound together with another work titled *Mir'āt-i Mas'ūdī*, the life of Sālār Mas'ūd Ġāzī, being copied on the same paper in the same format by the same hand. At the head of the manuscripts, a letter by [B.] W. Chapman addressed to a certain Charles Allen in Calcutta dated Oct. 18, 1854 is attached. In the letter, Chapman explains his delay in translating the two works, the "History of Maçūd" and the "life of Asad Beg", in the manuscript and inquires about the deadline to submit his translation. This leads us to think that it was this manuscript that was used as the base for Chapman's translation of AAB (Add. 30776). This conclusion is supported by the coincidence of the above details with those of "Sir H. M. Elliot's MS.", used for the translation given by Dowson (E&D, vi, 154). At the death of Elliot in 1853,[29] this manuscript seems to have been kept by Chapman. This is the reason why the manuscript is not listed in [Sprenger (1854)].

3.2. Analysis of textual variants

I intend to analyze textual variants from the viewpoint of the textual framework and the elements in the sentences of each manuscript compared with the other manuscript(s).

R ms.

For convenience of discussion, we shall begin with analysis of the R ms.

[29] He died on Dec. 20, 1853 in Simonstown, Cape of Good Hope on his way home from India. See the article of DNB by S. Lane-Poole. Rieu is wrong in placing the date at the beginning of the year 1854 ([Rieu (1879-83)], iii, pp. xxii).

The distinctive features of the R ms. text in contrast with that of the A ms. can be enumerated as follows: first, the rubrics of the chapter titles; second, the existence of a postscript; and third, the addition of a biographical note by a later writer concerning the author Asad Bīg. The R ms. does not share these three features with the A ms. The content of the postscript of the second variant does not permit us to conclude whether this is the author's own work or a later addition.

Concerning sentence elements, there are some errors in the Persian words, as follows: the past stem شکشت or the past participle شکشه (that must have meant شکشته) should be read as شکست or شکسته [30]; آعظم should be read as اعظم [31]; and the past stem نششت or the past participle نششته or the infinitive نششتن should be read as نشست, نشسته, نشستن respectively.[32]

It is clear that the scribe was not well acquainted with Mongolian and Turkic, because he fails to copy some words in their exact form, as follows: چنڈاول should be read as چنداول "rear guard" [33]; تقور نفور نعور نقّور نمور نفور نفور should be read as تقوز "a gift comprising nine articles" [34]; and سحاق should be read as تپچاق "a well-fed and beautiful horse from the western lands" [35].

As each mistake occurs on multiple occations in a methodical manner, this fact can neither be attributed to the author who originated from Iran nor to orthographical variance. Therefore these failings must be attributed to the inferiority of the scribe.

AMU ms.

The AMU ms. was copied from the R ms. in modern times as we have already seen. Therefore its value in reconstructing the original text cannot surpass that of the R ms.

---

[30] R ms., 1v/18, 8r/3, 35v/4

[31] R ms., 1v/14, 5r/20, 6r/10, 6r/11, 26r/1, 34v/15, 34v/20

[32] R ms., 4v/11, 7r/12, 8r/17, 10v/14, 13r/15, 16r/19, 17r/18, 18r/17, 18v/21, 19r/1, 19r/2, 28v/20.

[33] R ms., 28r/20, 28v/1

[34] R ms., 10r/9, 10r/13, 11v/17, 14r/14, 17r/14, 17r/15, 21v/1, 26v/1

[35] R ms., 10r/12

S ms.

The same is true of the S ms. Since it was copied from the R ms. in modern times, it has no value for our purposes.

B1 ms.

The B1 ms. shares the distinctive features of the R ms., namely the chapter titles, a postscript and a biobraphical note not found in the A ms. The commonality in textual framework and variants leads us to conclude that tha R ms. and the B1 ms. belong to the same line in the manuscript lineage, which is different from that of the A ms.

As for the sentence elements, collating the three manuscripts (R ms., B1 ms. and A ms.) reveals a marked frequency of commonality between the R ms. and the B1 ms. in comparison with the A ms. On the other hand, textual differences between the B1 ms. and the R ms. are quite few. While failing to provide the number of variants here, the commonality is beyond doubt even after a brief survey.

Having established these points, we shall proceed to a comparison of variants between the R ms. and the B1 ms. Excluding simple errors and the differences in orthography, we can classify the variants as follows: first, usage of alternative words or phrases; second, change in word order; and third, insertion and deletion of words or phrases.

The first type of variant can be sub-classified as follows:
proper nouns variants;

R	B1
کوپال (2r/8)	کوپالداس (2/9)
مولانا ملک (15r/12)	مولانا ملک قُمی (20/14)
رامجی (20v/1)	رامجی مل (28/10)
خان خانان (21r/14)	خانخان (29/13)
مهدی قلی سلطان (28v/5,28v/11,29v/19)	مهدی علی سلطان (41/8, 41/13, 43/15)
مرزا [sic.] ابراهیم (31r/5)	مرزا [sic.] ابراهیم بیک (45/16)

synonymous variants;

B1	R
روان میشدند (9/7)	روانه میشدند (7r/5)
قبول کردند (38/12)	قبول نمودند (26v/18)
سفارش فرمودند (40/17)	سفارش نمودند (28r/12)
رخصت نموده (43/11)	رخصت کرده (29v/14)
شکفتکی (49/17)	آشفتکی (33r/20)

conjugational variants;

B1	R
آمده اند (6/6)	آمدند (4v/17)
درامدند (6/20)	در آمد (5r/16)
نمیبود (8/6)	نبود (6r/15)
کفت (13/5)	میکید (9v/15)
نکیرم (12/12)	نمیکیرم (9r/16)
می آمد (20/4)	می آید (14v/20)
نرفتند (43/7)	نرفتید (29v/9)
میفرمایند (45/8)	میفرمودند (30v/16)

and variants that result in differences of meaning.

B1	R
تیار شده (11/21)	سوار شده (8v/19)
نکنیم (19/16)	کنیم (14v/8)
مضمون (48/7)	مصون (32v/4)

Demonstrating word order variants, here are a few examples;

B1	R
نقاره و علم (3/15)	علم و نقاره (3r/3)
ناله و آه (6/20)	آه و ناله (5r/16)
خاطر جمع من شود (54/6)	خاطر من جمع شود (36r/2)

Cases of insertion and elimination are numerous. Here we shall list some of the obvious examples;

B1	R
این فقیر بی تقصیر است (8/6)	این فقیر تقصیر نکرده (6r/15)
حضرت شیخ مرحوم (9/13)	حضرت مرحومی (7r/13)
چیزی لایق فرستادن نمانده (26/17)	چیزی لایق نمانده (19r/17)

دیکر مرتکب نساء نشاط کردید (44/7-8)　　دیکر مرتکب نساء نشاط و متوجه بهجت و انبساط کردید (30r/13)

In summary, these variants are beyond differences in the idiosyncratic styles of copyists, such as variations in orthography. Therefore we should suppose the existence of not less than one inferior copy in the manuscript lineage to which the R and B1 mss. belong.

Since we inferred the existence of two distinct lines, with the A ms. belonging to one and R and B1 belonging to the other, we can suppose the existence of a common manuscript for the two lines.

Then if we collate the texts of the three manuscripts above, excluding the unique variants in the A ms. as we saw above, the frequency of unique variants in the B1 ms. is much more remarkable than that of the R ms. This fact is clearly demonstrated by the examples I have shown above. Therefore we can conclude that in relation to the supposed common manuscript, the B1 ms. is far more inferior to the R ms.

At a secondary level of evidence, contextual and historical mistakes peculiar to the variants in the B1 ms. support its inferiority. For example,

فردا اورا دستکیر کرده خواهیم کرد (10/18)
(should read فردا اورا دستکیر خواهیم کرد as in the other two mss.)
بادشاه مغفور مسرور (44/1)
(should read بادشاه مغفور مبرور)
مهدی علی سلطان (41/2, 41/8, 41/13)
(should read مهدی قلی سلطان)[36]

Furthermore, slips in spelling found only in the B1 ms. are favorable for this conclusion. For example,

[36] Mahdī Qulī Sulṭān appears in AAB in the narration of the second mission to Deccan in 1605. While the name of Mahdī 'Alī Sulṭān does not appear in any contemporary sources, Mahdī Qulī Sulṭān is referred to in MR as one of the persons who had served 'Abd al-Ra.hīm (MR,iii,1638-42). According to MR, when he migrated from Iran, Mahdī Qulī first entered the service of Prince Salīm, who was in Ilāhābās. After serving Akbar, he was sent to Ḫān-i Ḫānān. There, he exhibited his poetic and musical ability (MR,iii,1640-1). This account coincides with that of AAB, where he is referred to as a fellow traveller of Asad Bīg and is reported to have joined the banquet of 'Abd al-Ra.hīm (AAB,46v).

دوکان (24/5, 24/10, 24/11) for دکان
خانخان (29/13) for خانخانان
دوعا (35/15, 38/17) for دعا
دولتخاهان (40/4) for دولتخواهان

However there is no decisive information concerning the relationship between the R ms. and the B1 ms. We are not sure whether the two manuscripts were copied separately from a common parent manuscript or the B1 ms. was copied from the R ms. by a careless scribe. What we do know at the present stage is that in the manuscript lineage to which the R and B1 mss. belong, not less than one inferior transcription was produced.

B2 ms.

The textual framework of the B2 ms. has the same distinctive features as the R ms. and the B1 ms. And its textual variants, in almost all cases, follow the unique cases found in the B1 ms. From these facts, we can safely suppose a direct relation between the B2 ms. and the B1 ms. In fact, the B2 ms. is apparently quite modern.[37] Therefore I believe, along with Rieu, that the B2 ms. was most probably copied from the B1 ms.

However there is some evidence to rebut this theory, although it is indirect and circumstantial. As mentioned above, the B2 ms. is bound with another manuscript of the *Mir'āt-i Mas'ūdī* (Or. 1837 i, ff.4-112) written in the same hand on the same paper. In other words, the B2 ms. was copied at the same time as Or. 1837 i. If we suppose that the B2 ms. was copied from the B1 ms. which was then in the Elliot collection, then also the parent manuscript of Or. 1837 i should have been in the collection. Among the Persian manuscripts now preserved in the British Library, which were formerly assembled in the Elliot collection, we find two manuscripts of the *Mir'āt-i Mas'ūdī*: the first, Or. 1747 ii (ff. 149-168), copied from June 1850 to May 1851; and the second, Or. 2014 v (ff.75-91), copied around 1850. However, on the basis of the date of copying as well as the quantity of the folios, neither of the two manuscripts could be the parent of Or. 1837 i. Therefore we should infer the existence of a parent manuscript of Or. 1837 i outside of the Elliot collection. The same should be true of the B2 ms. Therefore it should be possible to suppose that the B2 ms. was not copied from the B1 ms. but from another manuscript, which was outside the collection and has yet to be recovered.

[37] Rieu dates the copy around 1850 ([Rieu (1879-83)],iii,1029a).

However we can not accept this disproof. The absence of the parent manuscript of Or. 1837 i does not logically result in the absence of the supposed parent manuscript of B2. In fact, according to [Sprenger (1854)], Elliot made use of many manuscripts, which were on loan from their owners. In this way, we can explain the absence of the parent manuscript of Or. 1837 i based on this fact. The parent manuscript of Or. 1837 i must have been returned to its owner. The absence of the parent manuscript for the first part of Or. 1837 and the presence of that for the second part of the same manuscript thus do not contradict.

On the other hand, the supposed transcription of the B2 ms. from the B1 ms. may in itself be counter-evidence against our theory, because the English translator could borrow the B1 ms. from Elliot for his translation work, without making a new copy. However, although we can not fully exclude that possibility, we can explain the reason a new copy was needed. The B2 ms. is written in much more legible nasta'līq. Many of the undotted strokes of the B1 ms. written in šikastah are restored to their original spellings. A more legible copy seems to have been necessary for the translator who was an English official working for the Bengal Civil Service. To read a Persian manuscript written in šikastah was a more difficult task for an English official than one written in nasta'līq. Some pages in a Persian manual for English writers give weight to this supposition. There identical Persian texts are typed in both nasta'līq and šikastah styles together with their English translations. The pages were practices for reading texts in šikastah style with reference to the nasta'līq style.[38]

A ms.

Since we have clarified the inferiority of the B1 ms. to the R ms., we now have to analyze the position of the A ms. in comparison with the latter.

Concerning the textual framework, as we have already seen in the R ms., the A ms. differs on the following three major points: first, the A ms. lacks chapter titles and the space for titles stands blank; second, it does not include the postscript; and third, it lacks the biographical note concerning the author by a later writer.

We can classify the textual variants found in the A ms. and the R ms., which are beyond slight clerical errors or minor orthographical alternations,

[38] [Gladwin (1801)], 93ff. "Specimens of Shekustámeiz".

as follows: first, the use of alternative words or phrases; and second, the insertion and deletion of words or phrases.

The first type of the variant can be sub-classified as follows:
proper nouns variants, i.e.[39],

R	A
بورس (24r/19, 24r/20)	نورس (34r/16, 34v/1)
بولقلی بیک انیسی (30r/2-3)	یولقلی بیک (44v/7)
میر ضیا الملک قزوینی (34r/10-1)	میر ضیا قزوینی (53r/9)
اکبراباد (35v/11)	اکره (54v/17)

synonymous variants, i.e.,

R	A
نیزه (2v/9)	برچه (3r/14)
و قمچی بر اسپ خود زده (3v/11)	و چابک بر اسپ خود زده (4v/14)
آهنکران (4r/16)	مسکران (5v/10)
آنحضرت برامداس فرمودند (5r/21)	آنحضرت برامداس کفتند (7r/9)
جمیع امرا آمدند (9v/5)	جمیع امرا جمع بودند (13r/4)

conjugational variants, i.e.,

R	A
شد (1v/18)	شده باشد (2r/11)
فرود آمد (3r/16)	فرود می آیند (4r/11)
سر براه خان همراه بود (5r/11)	سر براه خان همراه بودند (6v/14)

compound sentences variants, i.e.,

R	A
بمنزل فقیر تشریف آوردند و (11v/20)	بمنزل فقیر تشریف آورده (16r/7)
بخدمت میر و فقیر فرستاد و (21v/19)	بخدمت میر و فقیر فرستاده (29r/3)
در بیرون شهر رفته فرود آمده (29r/2)	در بیرون شهر رفته فرود آمد و (42v/9)

other variants that produce differences in meaning, i.e.,

R	A
تا روز چهاردهم که روز ملاقات بود (15r/15)	تا روز هفدهم که روز ملاقات بود (20v/14)
بر راسته بازاری (17v/6)	بر آراسته بازاری (24r/9)

[39] For the last variant, see infra.

در تهیه طلب فقیر شدند که به بیجاپور برند (14r/18)	در تهیه طلب فقیر شدند که از بیجاپور بردند (19v/4)
آنها فراشان جمع کردند سیصد هون و پانصد دانه مروارید بود (16r/2)	آنها را فراشان جمع کردند سیصد هون و پانصد دانه مروارید جمع کردند (21v/12)

and changes of word order, i.e.,

R	A
چوکی پیش ایشان آمده (3r/16)	چوکی بایشان پیش آمده (4r/11)
حضرت واهمه و اضطراب فقیر را دریافتند (8r/19)	حضرت اضطراب و واهمه فقیر را دریافتند (14r/17)
در مقام کیر و کرفت انها میشود (29v/8)	در مقام کرفت و کیر اینها میشود (44r/1)
فغان و فریاد از جهان و جهانیان بر آمد (35r/21)	فریاد و فغان از جهان و جهانیان بر آمد (54v/1-2)

Cases of insertion and deletion are numerous. Here we shall list some of the obvious examples.[40]:

R	A
فقیر پیش دروازه باولی هزار پاره ایستاده نکذاشت که ببرند (2v/20)	فقیر پیش دروازه باولی هزار پاره ایستاده علم و دمامه را نکذاشت که ببرند (3v/8-9)
از اتفاقات لکشوی بارو که داماد راجه کوالیار بود و پانصد سوار داشت از کوالیار باردوی رای رایان نمیتوانست بسلامت رفت (8v/13)	از اتفاقات کیسو مارو که داماد راجه کوالیار بود و پانصد سوار داشت دو سه روز بود که از** قلعه برآمد بکومک راجه میرفت و اکر فقیر پانصد سوارخود میداشت از کوالیار اردوی رای رایان نمیتوانست بسلامت رفت (14v/16-12r/2)
و بهر کدام اسپان خوب داده بود و مبلغها بطریق مساعده و انعام رسانیده شب دیکر قرار نمودند (29r/16)	و بهر کدام اسپان خوب داده بود شب دیکر قرار نمودند (43r/12)
بساختن برج و باره قلعه پرداخت (4v/10)	بساختن برج و باره قلعه سرونجه که بر تبر بود پرداخته (6r/8)

[40] Two asterisks indicate that the part of a word is illegible. Three asterisks mean that the part of the text for approximately one word is illegible. And the text between square brackets shows my restoration of the preceeding word.

فرمان بنام ملک بیدر صادر شد که تو قلعه را باسد بسپار و هر قلعه که بجهت ملک برید بطلبد شما خالی کرده (27v/19)	فرمان بنام ملک بیدر صادر شد که تو قلعه را باسد بسپار و هر *** که در برابر میخواسته باشی باسد فرمودیم که بجهه تو از خانخانان گرفته خالی کرده بشما بدهد و بهمین مضمون فرمانی بخانخانان هم صادر شد که چون اسد بتو *** هر قلعه که بجهة ملک برید بطلبد شما خالی کرده (40v/3-6)
و آن بدبختان قباحتی خواهند کرد (29v/1)	و آن بابحان [بدبختان] نمک حرام قرار دادند که چون بدخشیان ج **ا شوند روز هم می توانیم اورا زده همین هزده اسپ که در کوتل ایشان میرود خود می توانیم بدر برد دکهنیان بما چه می توانند کرد **ن [چون] این خبر بفقیر رسید **انست [دانست] که آن بدبختان قباحتی خواهند کرد (43v/5-7)

It is true that cases of insertional variants occur much more frequently in the A ms. than in the R ms. However insertion and deletion are not unilateral, as the above third case shows. This fact is additional evidence in favor of our supposition of distinctive lines for the A ms. and the R and B1 mss.

The next problem is, then, the superiority of one of the two manuscripts to the other from the point of view of text transmission. However, the superiority of one manuscript to the other can not, in theory, be deduced by textual collation. Therefore we have to consider the manuscripts, taking into account the historical or grammatical correctness of the texts. It is true that such criteria are not intrinsic to the authenticity of texts, but if there are a number of good strong cases, then correctness could serve as secondary evidence to reveal our base manuscript.

Perusing the text, we find improper variants of the like in the R ms. as well as the A ms. Let us refer to the following as an example from the latter. This passage shows a historical error found in the A ms., which is not found in the R ms.

R	A
و در اثنای جنک فیلان میانه ملازمان شاه سلیم و سلطان خسرو سخنان خشونت آمیز مذکور میکردد (34r/21-34v/1)	و در اثنای جنک فیلان میانه ملازمان شاه اسمعیل و سلطان خسرو سخنان خشونت آمیز مذکور میکردد (52v/13-14)

The text surrounding this passage records the conflict between two factions: that of Akbar's son, Salīm and his grandson, Ḫusraw. Here, we find that the A ms. wrongly mentions Šāh Ismā'īl instead of Šāh Salīm as in the R ms.

Nevertheless, the cases are much less frequent in the A ms., while the cases found in the R ms. are much more serious. In the analysis of the R ms., we mentioned the errors in the Persian, Mongolian and Turkic words شکست, اعظم, نشست, چنداول, تقوز, تپچاق. The correct forms of these words found in the A ms. give evidence to the superiority of the A ms. to the R ms.

Many examples of a specific form of conjugation are found in the R ms., as follows:

R	A
شما بهتر میدانند (5v/6)	شما بهتر میدانید (7r/15)
شما پیش ازین جواهر خوب فرستاده باشند (19r/15)	شما پیش ازین جواهر خوب فرستاده باشید (31v/10)

I do not know of such use of the third person plural for the honorific second person singular in other Indo-Persian writings.

Misquotation of the Qur'ān (sūra ii,156) in the R ms. cannot be attributed to Asad Bīg, who had a Perso-Islamic intellectual origin. If so, the error is caused by a clerical error.

R	A
انا الله راجعون (2v/14)	انا الله و انا الیه راجعون (3v/2)

Moreover, the following case shows the contextual superiority of the A ms. to the R ms.:

R	A
و در ته آن دالان پائین شهنواز خان و انتو پندت و لکهو پنڈت و کفشدار خان که	و در ته آن دالان پائین شهنواز خان و عنبر خان و انتو پندت و لکهو پندت و کفشدار

بحضر باشند از مقربان ایستاده و (18v/6-7)　　خان که پنجنفر باشند از مقربان ایستاده (25v/8-10)

The mention of five persons in the A ms. is much more logical than the description found in the R ms., which fails to refer to the second person عنبر خان 'Anbar Ḫān.

These examples lead us to conclude the superiority of the A ms. to the R ms. from the viewpoint of historical and grammatical authenticity. And with this conclusion, we have a secondary reason to think that the A ms. is superior to the R ms. in the textual transmission.

If our conclusion is correct, we now find it possible to explain one of the variants found in the A ms. and the R ms. The R ms. uses kurūh کروه[41] as a measure of distance instead of gāw کاو found in the A ms. [42] The term gāw is very rare in Indo-Muslim literature composed in Northern India during that period. This is a measure of distance predominantly used in Southern India. The form of gau, noted by Della Valle, who traveled along the Malabar coast in 1623, must be a transcription of the term.[43] Dictionaries of both old and modern Marathi both contain the term.[44]

The special use of the term in Southern India explains this variant. Asad Bīg must have heard the word during his travels and recorded his itinerary faithfully using this measure. However the scribe of the R ms., while copying the text in Āgrah of Northern India, did not know this measure of distance and changed it into a more understandable word. As the A ms. uses not only gāw but also kurūh [45] as measures of distance, it is not possible to suppose the reverse theory that the scribe of the A ms., who was supposed to have transcribed in Deccan, standardized the form of kurūh to that of gāw.

Thus we should recognize the A ms. as superior to the R ms. although the former contains a greater number of physical defects.

However the A ms. is only relatively adequate as a base manuscript for our study on account of the secondary reasons.

---

[41] R ms., 12v/7, 13v/16, 22r/7

[42] AAB, 17r/4, 18v/9, 29v/8

[43] Gaù or gau, as quoted in [Dalgado (1919-21)],i,440. See also Della Valle, ii, 230, 294 ("one Gau consists of two Cos, and is equivalent to two Portugal Leagues"), 295, 296

[44] gāwa: [Tulpule & Feldhaus (1999)],201a-b; gāw: Molesworth, 244b. Platts mentions the word gāw as a usage of Dakhni Urdu ([Platts (1884)],921a). See also [Deloche (1968)], 78.

[45] 6r/4, 16r/3, 24r/10, 25r/3, 44v/10

We should keep in mind that, although it may be an inferior manuscript, the R ms. should be located at an equal level in the lineage of the manuscripts as the A ms. Therefore, there is yet room for, according to the R ms., modifying improper passages found in the A ms.

The above analysis leads us to a framework in which to reconstruct the text, as follows. First, we must use the A ms. as a base manuscript; second, we have to fill up the minor physical lacunae of the A ms. according to the R ms., as far as the treatment is textually acceptable; third, we may fill up the physical lacunae with blank space, in case the authenticity of the text of the R ms. for the parts is not guaranteed; fourth, we must modify the historically or grammatically obvious mistakes of the A ms. according to the R ms., as far as the treatment is textually reasonable; and fifth, we add the titles of the chapters, which the A ms. does not bear, in accordance with the R ms. For the last three treatments, we have to provide annotations.

4. Historical criticism

This chapter deals with considerations on the original title of the memoirs and the date of its completion, while also analyzing its contents and historical value in comparison with contemporary sources.

4.1. Title

While the author does not mention a title of his own memoirs, the scribes of the manuscripts and modern scholars have provided various titles for the work.

[Storey (1927-39)] mentions the memoirs under the title of (*Ḥālāt-i Asad Bēg*) or (*Aḥwāl-i Asad Bēg*) in parentheses, which might indicate that they were meant to be taken tentatively. The former is found in a note on the title leaf of the collective manuscript to which the B2 ms. belongs. The latter appears in a note on the flyleaf of the first work contained in the former collective manuscript to which the R ms. had belonged,[46] and in the colophon of the B1 ms. Rieu applied the latter title. The older handlist of the late nineteenth century and the other handlist of the Rampur Raza Library recently published in a facsimile form ([ḤānŠ (1995)]) refer to the memoirs under the title of *Tārīẖ-i Asad Bīg*. A slight variation of this is *Risālah-i*

[46] The note adds the author's nisbah to the title as *Aḥwāl-i Asad Bīg Qazwīnī*

Tārīḫ-i Asad Bīg as it appears in a note on the flyleaf of the B1 ms. On the other hand, an endorsement on the A ms. calls the memoirs *Sawāniḥ-i Asadī*. All the titles are noted in manuscripts of the later period, therefore we should not suppose one of them to be the original title. The other titles, *Wikáya-i Asad Beg* by E&D, *Waq'ea-i-Asad Beg* by Joshi, and *Tarikh-i-Moghul* by [AhmadMA (1941)], do not seem to be based on any grounds, and in as much, should be regarded as modern inventions by scholars. However, despite the abundance of possibilities, there is no evidence to clarify the original title. This study follows Storey and Rieu as a tentative option, applying the title of *Aḥwāl-i Asad Bīg* in my system of transliteration.

4.2. Date of its completion

As we saw above, none of the contemporary sources mentions AAB. Therefore we have to look for internal evidence to specify the date of its completion.

The first evidence is the standardization of the place name of the site of Akbar's mausoleum. It is called, in AAB, Bihištābād (AAB, 54v/17). In the early years of Ǧahāngīr, the site was called Sikandrah as it is today, although its first appearance in the sources is yet to be established (JN,31). The first appearance of Bihištābād is in the account of Ǧahāngīr's visit to the mausoleum in Sep. 1613 (JN,141). The mention of the mausoleum as Bihištābād in the inscription dated 1022 AH (1613/4) on the northern face of the southern gateway of the mausoleum indirectly supports the date.[47] On his previous visit in Oct. 1608, Ǧahāngīr had been dissatisfied with the construction of his father's tomb, already requiring three or four years, and ordered it to be redesigned in some places. Both William Hawkins, who must have seen the construction between 1609 and 1611, and William Finch, who must have visited the site between 1610 and 1611, reported the ongoing construction (Hawkins, 120-1; Finch,186-7). Therefore it is reasonable to think that around 1613 the construction work of the complex reached a certain stage, and as a result of the progress, the site of Sikandrah was given its name as a befitting title[48] for the sepulcher of the last emperor.[49]

[47] [Smith (1909)], 32

[48] Bihištābād means "city of Paradise".

[49] Hawkins estimated the term of construction at seven years. This prevents us from thinking that the year of 1613 marks the conclusion of the construction (Hawkins, 120). The statement of Mundy, who probably visited the site in 1632, that "the garden and the other gates were not yett finished" supports Hawkins' estimate (Mundy, ii, 211).

Thus the use of the name of Bihištābād in AAB leads us to suppose the upper limit of its dating as 1613. The wide use of the name after the date is evidenced by the nearly contemporary information in *Kroniek* of Pelsaert (Pelsaert K, 122 (Bestibaed), 225 (Bistabaed)).

The date is also supported by other evidence. Asad Bīg, in his memoirs, mentions Naqīb Ḫān as deceased (marḥūmī Naqīb Ḫān (AAB, 9r/9). As a matter of historical fact, Naqīb Ḫān died in May 1614 (JN, 150). Therefore the completion of the memoirs could not extend back beyond this date. Thus we may safely say that the memoirs were compiled in or after 1614.

On the other hand, we may surmise the upper limit of its completion on the basis of the mention of Ḫān-i Ḫānān twice in the memoirs. The invocations for Ḫān-i Ḫānān show that the latter was alive at that time: "May the exalted Lord protect from all the misfortunes that [person as a] source of generosity and liberality and that [person as an] origin of loyalists. And may He [the exalted Lord] allow him to accomplish and obtain his wishes in the present and future life (dārayn)" (49r/12-13); "May the exalted God allow him to obtain his wishes" (32r/13). The tenor of the optative sentences should be directed only to a living person. Therefore at the compilation of the memoirs, Ḫān-i Ḫānān was still alive. Since Ḫān-i Ḫānān died in 1627,[50] the compilation cannot be subsequent to this date.

If our chronology is admitted, we now may judge the authenticity of the imperial capital place name variants, namely Āgrah in the A ms. and Akbarābād in the R and B1 mss.

As far as I know, none of the sources written during Akbar's and Ǧahāngīr's reigns including the European sources uses the name of Akbarābād for Āgrah. According to the narration in BNL, the renaming of the capital city from Āgrah to Akbarābād was first hit upon by Akbar and was actually brought about just after Šāh Ǧahān's accession (BNL,i,155-6). However, neither the sources from Akbar's time nor those from Ǧahāngīr's reign refer to the plan.

Moreover, numismatic evidence rejects the use of Akbarābād before Šāh Ǧahān. Wright and Whitehead agree that the name of Akbarābād for the

---

As Foster notes, the buildings other than the mausoleum and the south gate were probably completed after some years (Hawkins, 120, n.2).

[50] INJ, 287 (BI); MJ,473-4. Both of the sources place his death in the twenty-first regnal year of Ǧahāngīr (Mar. 1626 - Mar. 1627). MJ specifies the time of his death as the middle of 1036 AH, which begins in Sep. 1626. Therefore the death should fall at the end of the regnal year.

site of a mint is first observed in 1038 AH.[51] As far as I know, the earliest known example of the mint is a silver coin issued in the month of Urdībihišt of the year of 1038 AH.[52] The hiǧrī year began on Aug. 31, 1628 and the solar month basically begins late in April. Therefore the coin must have been struck in April/May of 1629. On the other hand, there is a gold coin bearing the name of Āgrah issued in 1038 AH bearing the mark of the first regnal year.[53] As the first regnal year of Šāh Ǧahān covers the period from JumII. 8, 1037 AH to JumII. 1, 1038 AH (Jan. 26, 1629), we can deduce that the change in the city name fell between the end of January and the end of April of 1629. We can safely say that the name of Akbarābād became used only after Šāh Ǧahān's accession.

We can not say anything about Akbar's intentions as reported in BNL. However a reference to the intentions of the emperor's late grandfather must have given him a reasonable motive to rename the city Akbarābād and not Ǧahāngīrābād or Salīmābād after his father, whom he revolted against during his princedom. Nonetheless, the forced link between the renaming and the great grandfather of the new emperor has in later times resulted in some ahistorical explanations concerning the origin of the new name. Bernier, in his memoirs, says that the city of Āgrah was built and named Akbarābād by Akbar (Bernier, 284). The explanation found in *Ḥadīqat al-Aqālīm* of late eighteenth century Northern India that Āgrah was named Akbarābād in the reign of Akbar (HA, 161) reflects the spread of this anachronistic understanding.

Since the name of Akbarābād could not have occurred before the accession of Šāh Ǧahān (1628), the original text, which was completed by 1627, could not have born this new name. Therefore we should conclude that the variant of Akbarābād witnessed in the R and B1 mss. can not be found in the original. They are the results of standardization by later scribe(s). This conclusion strengthens our theory of the superiority of the A ms. to the R and B1 mss.

A collection of copies of Mughal edicts to foreigners, especially to Englishmen ([Sachau & Ethé (1889)], no. 267), seems at the first sight to give evidence rebutting our conclusions. One of the copies of the edicts of Ǧahāngīr's reign, bears the date of the 29th of Ramaḍān in the 22nd year of his reign, 1035 AH. that falls on Jun. 24, 1626 (f.17v). The edict orders the officials on

[51] [Wright (1908)],xvii; [Whitehead (1934)], xlvii.

[52] [Rode (1969)], 96, no. 561 / 5167.

[53] [Whitehead (1934)], 173, no. 1213.

route to Sūrat from the capital city of Akbarābād (dār al-ḫilāfat Akbarābād) to exempt Englishmen (angrīzān).

However the text is, I believe, not authentic. This is because the collection contains edicts not only by Ǧahāngīr but also by later emperors, namely Šāh Ǧahān, Awrangzīb, Bahādur Šah and so on. Therefore it is likely that the occurrence of Akbarābād in the edict is the result of standardization by a scribe of a later period. Otherwise, we should hold the copy to be a later fabrication.

Thus we can fix the date of the completion of the memoirs between 1614 and 1627. This conclusion does not contradict our two choices for the date of our author's death (1620/1 or 1631/2).

This date would explain Asad Bīg's circumstances during the time of his writing. The memoirs were written at least nearly ten years after the events described, by our obscure administrator/Persian poet, who may have been disfavorably received under Ǧahāngīr's regime.

4.3. The contents and historical value of the memoirs

4.3.1. Outline of the memoirs

First of all, we shall take a look at the outline of the text, which has never been furnished by previous scholars. The folio numbers follow those of the A ms. The titles of the chapters in italic letters are based on the rubric entries found in the R ms.

01v
: Beginning of the text. Account of the murder of Abū al-Faḍl by Bar Singh Dīw.

06v *Account of the preparation of the humble one [the author, Asad Bīg] to enter the presence of His Exalted Ḫāqānī Highness.*
: Arrival of Asad Bīg at court. Akbar's censure of Asad for murder. Intercession by Ḫān-i A'ẓam and the pardoning of Asad.

10v *Account of the appointment of the humble one to [be sent] to the army of Rāy Rāyān in order to inquire about the negligence of Amīrs.*
: Escape of Bar Singh Dīw from the fort of Īrač, which was besieged by the imperial army led by Rāy-i Rāyān. Dispatch of Asad Bīg to inspect the mistake.

15r *Appointment of the humble one to Dakhan to bring back Mīr Ǧamāl al-Dīn Ḥusayn.*

The delay in return of Mīr. Arrival of Asad at Burhānpūr. Asad's interview of Asad with Malik 'Anbar at Bīr on the way to Bīǧāpūr. Asad's meeting with Ǧamāl al-Dīn in Mangalbīrah.

20r *The humble one's visit to Bīǧāpūr and the interview with 'Ādil Ḫān.*

Departure to Bīǧāpūr. Interview with 'Adil Ḫān on Shab. 17, [1012 AH] (Jan. 20, 1604). Description of the city and the fort of Bīǧāpūr. Šaṣt-i murīdī of Asad. Departure from Bīgāpūr on Ram. 2, [1012 AH](Feb. 3, 1604).

27v *The return from Bīǧāpūr.*

Joining Ǧamāl al-Dīn in Mangalbīrah. Encounter with 'Ināyat Allāh dispatched by Akbar. Arrival in Aḥmadnagar.

32v *The departure of the humble one from the presence of Prince Dāniyāl.*

Arrival in Burhānpūr. Asad's serious fever on the way to Āgrah. Audience with Akbar. Asad's tonsure while mourning over the death of the Queen Mother. Presentation of rarities brought from Bīǧāpūr. Tobacco (tanbākū) and pipe of Āčīn. Asad's dispute with Ḥakīm 'Alī about smoking. Increase of Asad's manṣab. Taking over the duties of Ḫwāǧah Amīn al-Dīn to remain at this post for about one year.

39r *Coming of the news of the death of Prince Dāniyāl.*

The news of the death of Dāniyāl. Akbar decided to dispatch Asad to the four regions of Deccan. Arrival of Asad in Uǧayn. The news of the death of Akbar. Confusion of Asad's party. Arrival in Burhānpūr. Banquet with Mīrzā Rustam. Meeting with Ḫān-i Ḫānān. The festival of Dīwālī (Nov. 11, 1605).

49r *Arrival of the farmān of Ǧahāngīr and recall of the humble one without paying any attention and regard.*

Circumstances of the recall. Ǧahāngīr's resentment of Asad. Audience with Ǧahāngīr in Āgrah and his pardon with the intercession of Šarīf Ḫān.

51r *The circumstances of the demise of the heaven-nestling His Highness and those related to that.*

Recollection of the arrival of the news of Akbar's death. The last days of Akbar: anomaly in Akbar's health; Ḫān-i A'ẓam and Mān Singh support Ḫusraw as the succeeding emperor; objection by some amīrs in favor of Salīm; Salīm's audience with Akbar; Death and burial of Akbar.

55v *Account of the enthronement of His Highness Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad Ǧahāngīr Bādšāh on the ancestral throne.*

"Chain of Justice" (zanǧīr-i 'adālat). Arrival of Mahābat Ḫān and Šarīf Ḫān.

56r

Concluding eight couplets.

4.3.2. Characteristics of the content

The contents of the Asad Bīg's writing clearly show us his inclination. He broadly records only five events of a period covering four years. In other words, his writing is characterized by descriptions based on the author's own knowledge and/or observations, which focuses mostly on the author's personal activities. In this sense, there is no obstacle to our qualifying, as done by previous studies, his writing as a memoir and not as a history. This explains the fact that AAB does not give as comprehensive an account of events as other chronicles.

On the other hand, as memoirs the text does give quite detailed and vivid account of the events occurring around the author. The accounts provide an abundance of helpful information not only for reconstructing historical events but also for considering social aspects of the period.

For example, his graphic description of Bijapur is notable: the festival at šab-i barāt and the fireworks; Asad's accommodations and the bāzār; the fort and the palace of Bīǧāpūr.[54]

And his first-hand observations concerning the Persian language of Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Ḫān, the Sultan of the Bīǧāpūr kingdom, provides quite suggestive information about the language life of the Deccan literati.

> And I began [delivering] the message and the matters. I informed him ['Ādil Ḫān] of all of what His Exalted Majesty had said from beginning to end. And he understood Persian well, but he could not reply [in kind]. His speaking [in Persian] was a little broken (AAB,22v/1-2).

[54] AAB, 20v/14-21r/11; 24r/6-24v/10; 25r/3-25v/17 and 31r/1-8 (The original 26th folio is mispaged as the 31st folio.).

However, according to Firištah, in 1003 AH (1594-5), when Šāh Nawāz Ḫān, an Iranian immigrant from Šīrāz, was conferred "the office of administrative affairs", all the reports were read by the king in person. He shortly got so acquainted with reading that he could read even corrupted scripts (ḫaṭṭhā-yi maġšūš) without any help. Books both in verse and in prose were brought to his assembly. He studied the books and became a Persian reader (fārsī ḫwān). He spoke Persian so well that he did not speak in "Hindūstānī. Those, who knew [only] a language other than Persian, could not understand [what he said]" (GI,ii,154-6z). If his Persian language ability had not deteriorated, the two accounts may partly contradict each other.[55]

The Sultan ordered Ẓuhūrī and Malik Qummī to prepare a Persian translation of the *Kitāb-i Nawras*, his collection of Indian songs in the Dakhni language, which was completed in the year of 1597 to 1599, that is, after his alleged improvement in Persian.[56] In addition to this, the two Persian poets separately composed introductions to the collection in Persian.[57] These facts may reflect the Sultan's actual ability in the language. If this was the case, Firištah's statement can be taken as flattery to his master Sultan, who had reportedly attained admirable improvement with the higher language.

In any case, it is clear from these narrations that the Sultan of Bīǧāpūr and the Iranian immigrant Asad Bīg did communicate in Persian, if not in a perfect way. This fact does not contradict the higher prestige of Persian in pre-modern Indian courtly and administrative life, as established again by

[55] On this point, see [AhmadN (1956)], 12, n.1.

[56] For the date of the completion of the *Kitāb-i Nawras*, see [AhmadN (1956)], 56-7. [AhmadN (1956)] is not inclined to identify the Persian translation by Ẓuhūrī and Qummī with the Persian translation in prose contained in a manuscript preserved in the Khuda Bakhsh Library ([AhmadN (1956)], 60). An edition both in Arabic and Devanāgarī scripts along with an English translation have been published as [AhmadN (1956)].

[57] Ẓuhūrī's introduction is contained in his collective work Sih Naṯr-i Ẓuhūrī, while Qummī's is included in his Kulliyāt. See [AhmadN (1956)], 58-9. [AhmadN (1956)] does not pay any attention to the narration of TAAA, which reports the joint composition of the *Kitāb-i Nawras* by the two poets. Each of them reportedly composed four hundred and fifty couplets in the Sultan's name to complete a work titled the *Kitāb-i Nawras* comprising nine hundred couplets. They received nine thousand rūpiyyah from the Sultan (TAAA,1069). It is hardly likely that they composed in the Dakhni language as we find in the present form of the *Kitāb-i Nawras*. Their joint work may possibly be identical with the Persian translation from the Dakhni original referred to above.

recent studies on Iranian elements in Islamic India.[58]

At the same time, the existence of the *Kitāb-i Nawras* gives evidence for his proficiency in the Dakhni language. In addition, Asad Bīg says that 'Ādil Ḫān spoke to his courtier in "the language of Maratha (zabān-i marathah)" (AAB, 21v/15, 23v/7). If that language is identical with modern Marathi and not with modern Dakhni, the Sultan used at least three languages in his daily life.[59]

As a result of such detailed accounts, Asad Bīg provides us with independent information, which is not found in other sources.

From this viewpoint, the account of the introduction of tobacco to Akbar's court is very important. It is the earliest known literary evidence of its use in South Asia.[60] It gives us valuable suggestions about not only the method

[58] For example, see [Aubin (1991)]; [Robinson (1991)]; [KhanMA (1992)]; [Subrahmanyam (1992)]; [Shakeb (1995)]; [Haneda (1997)]; [Alam (1998)]; [Losensky (1998)]; [Alam & Subrahmanyam (1999)]; [Gulčīn Ma'ānī (1369 Sh)]; [Barzegar (2000)]; [Kondo (2000)]; [Shakeb (2000)].

[59] Although there is not any literary evidence, circumstantial conditions permit us to suppose the use of a Turkic language in the Deccan court. For a general discussion on this problem, see [Schimmel (1981)]. As for the Sultans of Deccan, the Bahmanids Muğāhid (1375-1378) and Tāğ al-Dīn Fīrūz (1397-1422) are reported to speak a Turkic language (zabān-i Turkī: GI,i,564; [Hollister (1953)], 106; [Sherwani (1953)], 146; [Schimmel (1981)], 157). In the sources, we can observe many references to the supply of the Turkic slaves (ġulām-i atrāk) into the Deccan kingdoms, of which the most distinct example is the progenitor of 'Ādil Šāhī dynasty, Yūsuf 'Ādil Šāh. From the fanciful story of his descent from the Ottoman dynasty as a son of Murād II (GI,ii,1ff.) and the other story of his maternal relation to Qara Qoyunlu dynasty (TM,19r ff.), as well as a slightly different variation found in the *Futūḥāt-i 'Ādil Šāhī*, we can extract the following common elements concerning his origin: he is Turkish in a wide sense; his distress at the early age; and his migration as a slave soldier to Deccan by sea route through the hands of a slave merchant. For the narration of the *Futūḥāt* on the pedigree of the dynasty, see [Joshi & Nadeem (1979)]. We find references to the Turkish immigrants to Deccan as "gente branca" in the Portuguese sources of the sixteenth century. For a short but important remark on the migration, see [Aubin (1973)], pp.175ff. A glossary attached to a treatise of hunting and fishing, which was written at the order of Sulṭān Muḥammad of Quṭbšāhids, the neighboring kingdom to Bīğāpūr, contains Arabic, Persian, Turkic and Dakhni names of animals. See [Schimmel (1981)], 157, [Ethé (1937)], 29-30, no. 3055. The existence of such a work may reflect the current use of Turkic in the Deccanid states.

[60] [Gokhale (1975)], acknowledging the narration of AAB, says "if the crop was important enough to be noticed by 1605 it must have been first introduced at least by 1595, if not earlier" ([Gokhale (1975)], 485). I have no idea whether the period of ten years for

of its use (smoking with a pipe (ḥuqqah), while not chewing or snuffing) but

diffusion is fair or not.

Evidence in support of the use of tobacco in South Asia earlier than Asad Bīg's mission exists. According to [Matthee (EI2)], a commentary to the *Mīnā Bāzār* reports of the year of 914 AH. (1508/9) as the date of the introduction of tobacco in India. I have not seen the printed edition of the commentary. However, I found a marginal note of an edition of the *Mīnā Bāzār*, which contains the same date as follows, "The author of *Dārā Šukūhī* writes that it [tobacco] came to Hindūstān around the year of nine hundred and fourteenth of hiǧrī in the end of the reign of Ǧalāl al-Dīn Akbar Pādšāh from the part of Farang and now it is well-known everywhere" (MB,31, note 16). This note may be identical with that mentioned by [Matthee (EI2)]. I have no idea concerning the work named *Dārā Šukūhī*. At any event, the date of 914 in the commentary does not historically agree with the end of the reign of Akbar, who ruled from 966 to 1014 AH. Therefore we should reserve making conclusions before establishing the authenticity of Matthee's evidence. [Floor (EIr)], based on [Elgood (1970)], refers to a Persian physician in India, Abū al-Fatḥ Gīlānī as a the first to pass the smoke of tobacco through a bowl of water to purify and cool it ([Floor (EIr)], 258; [Elgood (1970)], 41). The physician arrived at Akbar's court in the 21st regnal year (1575-6) and died in the journey from Kašmīr on 7.Šahrīwar of the 34th regnal year, or on Thursday of Shaw. 19, 997 / Aug. 31, 1589 (IAF,i,44; AN,iii,560). If the information is authentic, it is the earliest known reference to the use of tobacco in South Asia. However, as [Elgood (1970)] does not give its source, we are not confident as to its authenticity. Otherwise his supposed invention of hookah at so early a time can not be fairly positioned within the historical conditions as evidenced by our information above. On the other hand, there is a couplet by Ahlī Šīrāzī, who was active in Iran and died in 942 / 1535-6, containing a reference to tobacco. If this couplet is genuine, the arrival of tobacco in Iran should be traced back. The date may require reconsidering that of Southern India. However, literary records of not only South Asia but also of Turkey and even of Persia do not date back to such an early year. Therefore we should hesitate to acknowledge the authenticity of the couplet.

For tobacco in Bijapur, Ẓuhūrī, who was an immigrant from Persia and entered the service of Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Šāh about 1004 AH/1596 and died there in 1024 AH/1615-6 or 1025 AH/1616-7, mentions a tobacco seller in the description of the market of the capital city in his prose work, the *Mīnā Bāzār* (MB,31-36). However that does not document the existence of tobacco there in his days. Because the *Mīnā Bāzār* is likely attributed to a later writer ([Losensky EI2], xi, 566b).

Johan van Twist, who traveled to Bīǧāpūr in 1637, disembarking in Dabhol, does not mention the use of tobacco. On the other hand, tax on tobacco existed at least in the late forties of the seventeenth century in a district of the kingdom ([Suehiro (2001)], 379). A decree of Muḥammad 'Ādil Šah (1626-56) seems to have referred to a sort of tax on tobacco ([Ghauri (1970)], 102-3).

By not later than the second decade of the seventeenth century, tobacco seems to have widely spread in India. In 1611, the English fleet led by Nichoals Downton received two "Bannians" from Surat, who brought tobacco to sell to them (Purchas,iii,256).

also the course of its diffusion into South Asia. His account may reflect the fact that tobacco was first introduced to Southern India then spread to the Northern India. Moreover, the discussion given in AAB between Asad Bīg and a court physician in front of Akbar, who in Asad's favor decided to try tobacco, is remarkable evidence of the social response to a newly brought thing from the so-called New World.

As for the arrival of tobacco into South Asia, AAB gives implicit information. It informs us of Ḫān-i A'ẓam's account of the earlier arrival and widespread use of tobacco in Makkah and Madīnah. When the weed was presented to Akbar, Ḫān-i A'ẓam spoke to the emperor about it, saying that it was popular in the two cities (AAB, 36v/8). Ḫān-i A'ẓam had stayed there for ḥağğ approximately from 1593 to 1594 (AN,iii,638-9, 654, 655). This circumstantial evidence permits us to imagine an eastward route of diffusion of tobacco to South Asia.[61]

In 1613, the English tried to procure tobacco in the suburb of Surat with help of an English mariner who had skill in growing tobacco (LR, i, 299-300, 304). These accounts reflect the tobacco cultivation in the western part of India at that time. The practice of smoking tobacco seems to spread rapidly to Northern India under the Mughal domination. In 1617, Ğahāngīr placed a ban on the use of tobacco (JN,211). On the occasion, however, Ḫān-i 'Ālam could not restrain himself from smoking. For his smoking on his mission to Šāh 'Abbās Ṣafawī at the latter's court, see Falsafi, i & ii, 658-659. Terry, who traveled in the northern and western parts of India from 1616 to 1619, observed the abundant cultivation of tobacco (Terry, 299). A VOC record of the year of 1623 tells about private trade of English factors of Surat, which is planned to export products including tobacco to Persia ([Om Prakash (1984)], 286). In the same year, the Portuguese assigned contracts for the territories of Goa, Salcete and Bardes for each certain annual contractual amount ([Nardi (1989)], 165-6). Some of the Portuguese domains in the western coast of India (Damão, Baçaim, Chaul, Goa and so on) were estimated in the 1630's to have taken a certain amount of their revenues in tobacco (Bocarro, ii, 89, 110, 125, 158-9. For the older edition of Bocarro, see APO (Nova ediçāo), Tome IV, Vol. II, Parte I, pp. 140, 178, 203, 267-268). For the eastern coast of India, Methwold, who stayed from 1618 to 1622 in Masulipatnam, observed the export of tobacco westward to Mocha and eastward to Arakan (Methwold, 36-8). A VOC record of the year of 1623 tells about arrest of a Dutch factor by the Golconda authority on a charge of smuggling out tobacco to Arakan ([Om Prakash (1984)], 276-6). For the English export of tobacco from India, see [Gokhale (1975)], 488ff.

[61] If [Matthee (EI2)]'s view that the people of the southern shores of the Arabian peninsula were familiar with tobacco in the 1590s is true ([Matthee (EI2)],x,753b), it is possible that he had observed its use there in person, meaning that the testimony of Ḫān-i A'ẓam can be considered historical. It would be significant to point out the ac-

On the other hand, Asad Bīg qualifies the weed brought to Akbar as of Āčīn, Aceh of I. Sumatra (tanbākū-yi a'lā-yi Āčīn (AAB, 36v/2)). This passage leads us to think that tobacco (at least, the particular weed brought to Akbar) was brought westward to South Asia from Southeast Asia. In another place, Asad Bīg refers to a chintz from the place of MǴATBN مجاتبن used for canopies (šāmiyānah) found at Malik 'Anbar's place in Bālāġāt on his way to Bīǧāpūr (AAB, 17v/7). If we can read the place name *Mačlīpatan مچلیپتن for Masulipatnam,[62] the inflow of the product from the port city of the Coromandel coast, which had prosperous trade with Southeast Asia at that time, should be a supporting condition for this view. That reasonably accords with the known history of tobacco in Southeast Asia.[63] Due to the shortage of evidence, we are not now in a position to draw any conclusions concerning this problem.

For another example of information not mentioned in sources other than AAB, we can refer to the arrival of the envoy from Malik Barīd at Akbar (AAB, 40r). The sources record only the arrival of the envoy from Quṭb Šāh, to which AAB does not refer.[64] Asad Bīg thereafter left the court for the four provinces of Deccan, namely "Bīǧāpūr, Gulkundah, Bīdar and Karnātak" (AAB, 40r/3), in which both the realm of Malik Barīd and that of Quṭb Šāh are included in accounts. The difference does not necessarily imply a contradiction. We could consider the dispatch of Asad Bīg as a result of, at least, the two missions from Dekhan rulers. At any rate, we should regard the passage as an important anecdote on Mughal diplomacy of those days.

As another example, AAB describes the quarrel between the factions of Šāh Salīm (later Ǧahāngīr) and Sulṭān Ḫusraw (Salīm's son) because of an elephant fight at the imperial inspection in the last days of Akbar, which provoked the emperor's anger and caused his physical condition to worsen.[65]

---

count in a Yemenite chronicle written during the reing of 'Uṯmān (1618-1622), which refers to the arrival of tobacco in Yemen in the beginning of the year of 1013 AH / 1604-5 (IY, 70).

[62] The R and B1 mss. read the word mačhlī bandar, which has the same meaning as Mačlīpatan (R, 13r/3; B1, 17/11).

[63] Tobacco seems to have been brought from Mexico to the Philippines by the Spaniards around 1575. A Java chronicle sets its arrival in Central Java in the Saka year 1523 (1601/2) ([Reid (1985)], 535). These dates do not exclude our second alternative.

[64] INJ, 509; TAN1,838; TAN2,672.

[65] The A ms. has Šāh Ismā'īl (52v/13-4) for Šāh Salīm as in the R and B1 mss. The text of Ismā'īl is not acceptable as we saw above.

This information is important because it foreshadows the coming strife between the two factions in the early days of Ǧahāngīr. However our sources, with the exception of MJ, do not mention this event. MJ, which was completed in the early part of Šāh Ǧahān's reign informs us of different details from those of AAB. According to the latter, the match took place between the royal elephant Čančal brought by Asad Bīg from Bīǧāpūr and Salīm's elephant Girānbār. On the other hand, MJ tells that it was fought between Girānbār and Ḫusraw's elephant Āprūp. A royal elephant Ran Mathan was prepared to intervene and pacify the fight (MJ, 47-8). AAB does not recount the details of the quarrel, but MJ fully narrates the particulars of the event: In the fight, Girānbār overwhelmed Āprūp and Ran Mathan set out to pacify the fight. Salīm's men tried to stop the intervention and threw stones and clods of earth at the driver of the royal elephant. One of the stones hit the keeper's temple hard enough to draw blood. Ḫusraw exaggeratedly reported the affair to Akbar. Akbar sent his grandson Ḫurram (later Šāh Ǧahān), who was watching the fight sitting next to Akbar, to Salīm to inquire about the cause. The inquiry revealed that Salīm did not participate in his men's misconduct and that Ḫusraw had exaggerated the affairs. It is clear that in MJ, the quarrel between the two factions is not directly reported. The exaggerated report of Ḫusraw would seem to reflect a kind of strain between the two factions. As a historical work written during Šāh Ǧahān's reign, the author seems to focus on the imperial grandson's actions to control the trouble.

For another example, the narrative of the plot of Ḫān-i Aʿẓam and Rāǧah Mān Singh to put Ḫusraw on the throne against Salīm and its subsequent failure contains important details about the supporters of the new regime, not found in other sources. Almost all of the persons in support of Salīm mentioned in AAB are found in other sources to have been promoted after the accession, as shown below. This fact also proves the historical accuracy of the information in AAB.

As Asad Bīg was not present at the events of the last days of Akbar in Āgrah, his account must be based on some contemporary report, as in the above mentioned case of the trouble at the elephant fight.

When Akbar's condition got worse, Ḫān-i Aʿẓam met with Rāǧah Mān Singh and agreed to support Sulṭān Ḫusraw. They planned to arrest Salīm when he came for his usual visit with the emperor. When Salīm approached the court by boat, Mīr Ḍiyā' Qazwīnī informed him of their plot and Salīm

turned back without entering the court.[66] After the failure of the plan, Ḫān-i A'ẓam and Rāǧah Mān Singh met with amīrs to discuss the affairs. The two claimed to support Ḫusraw in obeyance with the emperor's will, but Sa'īd Ḫān, in support of Salīm, raised an objection and Qilīč Ḫān sided with Sa'īd Ḫān. A dispute broke out at the meeting.[67] Rāǧah Rām Dās Kačhwāhah led his men to protect the treasury.[68] Murtaḍā Ḫān left the fort to return to his guard-house. Sayyids of Bārhah and Mīrzā Šarīf Mu'tamad Ḫān agreed to support Salīm. At Salīm's residence a hasty report arrived that the enemy had installed Ḫusraw as emperor and was planning to fire cannons. Šayḫ Rukn al-Dīn Ruhīlah advised Salīm to wait and watch the situation develop. At Salīm's residence Mu'tamad Ḫān, Qarā Bīg Kurd, Murtaḍā Ḫān and Sayyids of Bārhah arrived one after another and people came to pledge their allegiance to Salīm.[69] Toward the evening, Ḫān-i A'ẓam came to submit to Salīm and was warmly received, while on the other hand, Rāǧah Mān Singh accompanied Ḫusraw to his residence and departed to Bengal by boat.[70] Salīm entered the court with Murtaḍā Ḫān and other

---

[66] AAB, 52v/17-53r/12. The plot for the confinement of the prince is not related in any other sources. Mīr Ḍiyā' (or Mīr Ḍiyā' al-Dīn) was appointed to the rank of 1000 after the accession of Salīm (JN,15).

[67] AAB, 53r/16-53v/8. Pelsaert K reports that the meeting was held in Ḫān-i A'ẓam's residence. It lists the nobles who were present at the meeting: Mortasa Chan [Murtaḍā Ḫān], Sayet Chan [Sa'īd Ḫān], Coulij Mamhet Chan [Qilīǧ Muḥammad Ḫān], Radsia Ram Daes [Rāǧah Rām Dās], Radsia Mant Singh [Rāǧah Mān Singh] (Pelsaert K, 113-4). Sa'īd Ḫān was awarded with the governorship of Panǧāb just after Salīm's enthronement (JN,8) and Qilīǧ Ḫān was appointed to the governor of the province of Guǧarāt (JN,13).

[68] AAB, 53v/9. This information agrees with that of Pelsaert K (Pelsaert K,114). Rām Dās was promoted from the rank of 2000 to 3000 after the accession of Salīm (JN,13).

[69] AAB, 53v/9-54r/8. 'Alī Asġar, one of the sayyid of Bārhah was given the title of Sayf Ḫān (JN,19). I do not know why [Husain (1999)] specifies his rank as 3000 at this time ([Husain (1999)], 111). Pelsaert K records only the submission of Murtaḍā Ḫān, who was guarding the main gate (Pelsaert K, 114). Šayḫ Rukn al-Dīn was promoted from the rank of 1500 to 3500 (JN,11) just after the accession. Murtaḍā Ḫān, that is, Šayḫ Farīd Buḫārī was appointed to Mīr-i Baḫšī and promoted from the rank of 4000 to 5000 (JN,9,13). As he received his title Murtaḍā Ḫān in 1606 (JN,40), AAB is anachronistic when it uses the title in describing the events of the year 1605. The same kind of anachronism is also true of Muḥammad Šarīf, the author of the supplement of the emperor's memoirs and of INJ, who received the title Mu'tamad Ḫān in the third regnal year of Ǧahāngīr (MU,iii,431).

[70] AAB, 54r/10-13. This mainly agrees with Pelsaert K. The latter adds the submission of

amīrs and saw the dying emperor. Akbar ordered the honorary dress, the royal sword and the turban be prepared for the prince. Then Akbar died.[71]

Summing up these accounts, AAB contains a consderable amount of independent information, which is not found in other sources. And we can generally regard such information as in accord with the historical context. The above considerations lead us to the estimation that, as a historical source, AAB includes content that is valuable, detailed and independent when compared with other sources, although it is devoid of comprehensive narration.

4.3.3. Relations with other works

Let us proceed to the next stage, where we consider AAB's relationship with other sources. AAB does not mention any other works as its source. And likewise, other contemporary sources do not refer to AAB as their source, as we saw above. Therefore it is necessary for us to compare AAB's accounts of particular events with those of other sources and verify the accuracy.

For that purpose, we shall take up the case of the assassination of Abū al-Faḍl. This is due to the fact that almost all the sources contain accounts about the event, which make it possible to discern relationships by comparing accounts. We have to keep in mind the fact that Asad Bīg was not at the site of the murder and the account must have been based on some other source.

Framework of the narration

In regard to the date of the event, AAB contains independent information. It gives RabI. 7, 1011 AH/Aug. 25, 1602, while three of the other sources give RabI. 1, 1011 AH/Aug. 19, 1605 (AAB,2r/6; INJ,487; TAN1,811; TAN2,622).

A letter from Jerónimo Xavier in Āgrah to Father Francisco de Vergara, Rector of Damão, dated Aug. 24, 1604 reports the murder of Abū al-Faḍl.[72] If we trust the date of the letter, AAB's date of the event must be ruled out.

Nabab Sayet Chan [Sa'īd Ḫān] and "his son" Coulij Mamhet Chan [Qilīğ Ḫān] (Actually he was not a son of Sa'īd Ḫān). And the latter does not specify the destination of Sulṭān Ḫusraw (Pelsaert K, 114).

[71] AAB,54r/14-54v/2. According to Pelsaert K, the death of Akbar precedes the above dispute among the amīrs. However other sources place the death after the troubles (ZT, 248r-249v; DUP,iii,64-5).

[72] Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu, Goa 33 I, ff.77v-78. Mentioned in [Camps (1957)],44.

Here we have to draw attention to the consistency of the two dates with the day of the week. Both the alternatives agree only in placing the day of the week as Friday (AAB,4r/14-15). However, AAB's hiğrī date actually falls on Sunday, not Friday, while the other date lies on a Monday.

If we give prominence to the consistency of the day of the week, the true date must fall on RabI. 5, 1011 AH/Aug. 23, 1602.[73] If this is the case, Xavier must have learned the news of the murder in Āgrah within a day after the event. It is possible that the information was, within a day, brought from the site about 150 kilometers distant from the capital city. The murder of the court magnate must have been reported promptly.

AAB's account concerning the participation of Salīm is unique compared with other sources. As the prince himself relates in his memoirs, he ordered Bar Singh Dīw to kill Abū al-Faḍl on his way to Āgrah.[74] While other sources state clearly that Salīm ordered the murder, AAB does not clarify the participation of the prince. It just reports the words of Bar Singh Dīw to the mortally wounded Abū al-Faḍl, "His majesty the world-conqueror (ḥaḍrat-i ğahāngīrī) has called you for the sake of your favor[75]".

Apart from the historical fact, the text does not testify concerning the direct relationship between the murder and the prince.[76] The narration of GI, which reports this incident as a robbery of the Rāğpūts, is out of the question (GI,i,516).

The itinerary of Abū al-Faḍl varies from source to source. Many of the sources begin their narration by specifying the site where Abū al-Faḍl arrived on his way from Deccan. AAB says that he first arrived in Sirūnğah (AAB,2r/16, 2v/3, 2v/11), where he left Asad Bīg to remain (AAB,2v/2-

[73] MTS gives RabI. 4, 1011 AH, the closest to this date (MTS,579a).

[74] JN, 15. The text of the edition of JN, which I used, as well as that of the Aligarh edition reads the killer's name as Nar Singh Dīw, which I changed according to the form of other sources (Aligarh ed.,10). For this treatment, see JNtr2, 33, n.47. JNtr1 gives the form Bīr Singh without note (JNtr1, 24).

[75] AAB,5r/15-16; Guerreiro,i,307; Pelsaert K, 107; INJ,486-487; TAN1,811.

[76] Also TAN2 is obscure about the prince's order to Bar Singh, saying "Bar Sing (sic.) Dīw Bundīlah, who, in those environs, has attained the honor of credibility by way of his grandsires' greatness and regarded the auspicious mind of His Imperial Highness as more important than he [Abū al-Faḍl?] (ازو کران دانسته. The Rampur ms. includes different text, which I did not follow ازرونکردان.) and in order to show his own pure intention, showed these signs of enmity and the hatred in the bosom was exposed on his forehead," (TAN2,622; British Library ms., IO 2853 (another manuscript of TAN2), 509v).

4r/6), and reached Sarā-yi Bar (AAB,4r/11), where he dismissed the report of Bar Singh's coming (AAB,4r/11-14) and was suddenly assaulted and killed by the latter's contingent (AAB,4v/5-5v/4). AAB's mention to Sirūnğah is a unique narration, not found in any other sources. On the other hand, GI simply places the site in the suburbs (ḥawālā) of Narwar. INJ and TAN1 give a much more detailed narration. Both of the sources say that Abū al-Faḍl first arrived in Uğayn, neglected the advice of an attendant to follow a different route by way of Ghātī Čāndā and was attacked by the party of Rāğah Bar Singh Dīw between Sarā-yi Bar and Antarī (GI,i,516; INJ,487; TAN1,811-2). Pelsaert K relates that Abū al-Faḍl arrived in Calabaeg (Kālā Bāġ), passing the village of Zoor,[77] and was attacked and killed by Radsia Bert Sing Bondela (Rāğah Bar Singh Bundīlah). TAN2, without relating the foregoing affairs, first mentions Sarā-yi Bar, where Abū al-Faḍl arrived and attendants advised him to proceed to Antarī which he declined and was attacked (Pelsaert K, 108; TAN2, 622).

On the other hand, the site of murder is placed by AAB in Sarā-yi Bar, while INJ and TAN1 placed it between Sarā-yi Bar and Antarī. TAN2 is obscure with regard to the exact location. At any event, we can say that all the narrations seem to indicate the same specific location with different wordings, because the distance between Sarā-yi Bar and Antarī must be less than fifteen kilometers.[78]

In other words, the particular mention to Sirūnğah and the different word-

[77] I could not identify this place.

[78] The grounds for the distance of fifteen kilometers is as follows. Both Sarā-yi Bar and Antarī are situated on the route from Narwar to Gwāliyār, which was major at least in the first half of the seventeenth century. Unfortunately I could not find the two places on any of the maps available to me. Vogel, in his note for the journal of Ketelaar, locates Sarā-yi Bar as 25"59' N.L., 78"11' E.L. (Ketelaar, 256, n.7 for Bar kī sarāī.). As for literary sources, John Jourdain, who traveled on this route in February, 1611, left Nerva (Narwar) and proceeded to Autro (Antarī) by way of Gullica (?). Between the last two "is a faire sarraye for travelours", although he does not specify the name of the place. From Aurto to Gullier (Gwāliyār) is "six coses" (Jourdain,152). Mundy, who traveled in Dec.1630, left Nurware (Narwar) and proceeded to Burre Ka Sarae (Bar kī Sarāy, a hindī form for Sarā-yi Bar) by way of Pelacha. From the Sarae to Gualleere (Gwāliyār) was "nine courses (=coses)" (Mundy,ii,59-60). Tavernier, who traveled probably in 1640, left "Nader (Narwar) for Barqui-sera (Bar kī Sarāy) 9 coss, Barqui-sera to Trie (Antarī), 3 coss; Trie to Gouäleor (Gwāliyār), 6 coss" (Tavernier,i, 51). Mundy and Tavernier agree in stating the distance from Sarā-yi Bar to Guwāliyār via Antrī as nine coses. Therefore the distance of 3 coses between Sarā-yi Bar and Antarī can be trusted.

ing concerning the site of the murder prove the independence of AAB's information from the others. This fact means that each account can not be produced by relying on other sources or by deducing and supplementing other information.

Summing up the above three cases of the dates of murder, the participation of the prince and Abū al-Faḍl's itinerary, we can safely conclude that AAB narrates the event in a totally different framework from those of other sources.

Common details in the narration and differing points

It is true that we can find some cases in the details, where the account of AAB coincides with that of other sources. For example, AAB refers to, as Abū al-Faḍl's attendants, Gadā'ī Ḫān Afġān, Ǧalāl Ḫān, Salīm Ḫān, Šīr Ḫān, Manṣūr Čābuq, Mīrzā Muḥammad Qūrbīgī, ḤBA (?) Ḫāṣṣ-ḫayl and Mīrzā Muḥsin Badaḫšī. INJ and TAN1 agree with AAB, when they mention Gadā'ī Ḫān Afġān (INJ,487; TAN1,811).

For another example, concerning the fatal wounding of Abū al-Faḍl, AAB reports that "a rāǧpūt overtook him and the (rāǧpūt's) lance caught Šayḫ in the back and went through his chest" (AAB,5r/6-7). INJ and TAN1 agree on the lance as the fatal weapon. INJ reports that "Šayḫ received a lance wound to his chest and tumbled back off his saddle onto the ground" (INJ, 487). Also on the point of being wounded in the chest, the information agrees with AAB.

We can find interesting examples of commonality between AAB and Pelsaert K. For example, according to AAB, when Abū al-Faḍl was at Sarā-yi Bar on that Friday morning, the very day he was murdered, some people arrived with cavalry, but Abū al-Faḍl dismissed them and remained without sufficient guard. Among these people, we find Šayḫ Muṣṭafā, the fawǧdār of Kālābāġ (AAB,4r/17).

Reference to this person in this context is found only in Pelsaert K. According to the account, when Abdul Fasel (Abū al-Faḍl) arrived at Calabaeg (Kālābāġ), Sijdij Mostapha, the governor (gouverneur) of that place came to see him with four hundred horsemen and accompanied him to the village of Soor.[79] After a meal, they obtained leave from Abdul Fasel and returned again to his place (Pelsaert K, 108). A variant of Pelsaert K reads the per-

[79] It is most probably the same as Zoor above.

son's name as Tzeid Mortafa. The editors of and the translator of Pelsaert K agree in reconstructing the original form as Sayyid Muṣṭafā (Pelsaert K, 108, n.368; Pelsaert tr, 29). The form of Sijdij Mostapha may permit us to guess the original form as Sīdī Muṣṭafā. In any case, it is most probable that Sijdij Mostapha in Pelsaert K is identical with Šayḫ Muṣṭafā.

As another example, let us turn to the situation of the wounded Abū al-Faḍl just before he was killed with the sword. When Abū al-Faḍl received a lance wound and fell to the ground, his follower ḤḆA Ḫāṣṣah Ḫayl took him off the road. At the moment, the contingent of Bar Singh arrived at the site and ḤḆA hid himself behind a tree. When Bar Singh found Abū al-Faḍl's horse, the elephant-keeper of Abū al-Faḍl's accompanying female elephant pointed to his dying master, who was lying off the road. On the other hand, Pelsaert K says that at this time Abdul Fasel (Abū al-Faḍl) had already received twelve wounds and stood by his horse under a tree. One of the elephants of Abū al-Faḍl, on which he commonly made it habit to ride, had in the meantime been given to Bar Singh's men by its pellowan or driver. He showed that his master lay seriously wounded under a tree (AAB,5r/7-12; Pelsaert K, 108).

According to Pelsaert K, Abū al-Faḍl was under a tree at the moment when he was killed. AAB does not exclude the same situation that Abū al-Faḍl lay under a tree, although it does not narrate clearly. As for the indication by the elephant-keeper of Abū al-Faḍl, AAB's narrative is in accord with Pelsaert K's.

However, in spite of the common points referred to above, the sources other than AAB generally contain only parts of this quite detailed narration in AAB. In the case of the mention of Gadā'ī Ḫān, we should lay emphasis on the point that the other attendants' names are not referred to in the other sources. Concerning the fatal wound of Abū al-Faḍl, INJ does not describe the piercing of the lance. TAN1 reports that "he, by the lance wound, which reached his chest, got separated from the bright bay horse (gulgūn) of life and dropped on to the earth of death" (TAN1,812) . Without the account found in the narration of AAB, it is impossible for us to understand from this passage that the lance blow to his chest was dealt from behind.

As we have just seen, some of the details coincide between AAB and Pelsaert K as in the case of the Muṣṭafā of Kālābāġ and the moment of the murder. This fact leads us to think that AAB was one of the sources of Pelsaert K. As a fact, in the end of Pelsaert K, the author suggests that on account of the carelessness of Indian historians, he had to "translate" what

had occurred before his days. As Kolff and Van Santen acknowledge, the "translation" can have various meanings, not only the personal consultation of Persian chronicle(s) by Pelsaert using his knowledge of the language[80] , but also the oral transmission from a clerk or the conversion of a difficult Persian text to an easy one.

We are not in position to decide this point. In any case, if Kolff and Van Santen's estimate of the independence of Pelsaert K on Jesuit records is true, it is reasonable for us to think that Pelsaert based his account on local informants. As the editor of the English translation of Pelsaert says, the use of Indian terms in Pelsaert K supports this supposition (Pelsaert tr, 3) . The use of the hiğrī calendar in the narration is strong evidence in favor of this point. Our chronology of the compilation of AAB (1614 to 1627) and the period of Pelsaert's stay in Āgrah (1621 to 1627) does not exclude the possibility. The coincidence of some of the details seen above gives additional support for us to suppose a relationship between AAB and Pelsaert K.

However the many examples of difference in narrative between the two force us to reserve making a conclusion. We have already taken a look at the different information given in AAB from Pelsaert K in the case of the participation of Salīm in the murder and in the itinerary of Abū al-Faḍl.

For other examples, we shall mention two cases. At the moment of the murder of Abū al-Faḍl, AAB says that Bar Singh arrived in person at the site and talked with Abū al-Faḍl before the killing, while the wording of Pelsaert K does not clearly state whether Bar Singh was present or not at the murder and does not report about the talk. For another example, AAB only reports the beheadal of Abū Faḍl by the men of Bar Singh, while Pelsaert K says that Bar Singh immediately wrapped up and packed (bewonden ende beslooten) the head, and sent it to Elhabas (Ilāhābās) for the prince Cha Chalim (Šāh Salīm). There it was handed (behandicht) to the prince on the third day (AAB,5v/3; Pelsaert K, 108-9). The delivery of the head is reported in Guerreiro, JN, INJ, TAN1 and TAN2, though not in AAB, but the packing by Bar Singh and the arrival on the third day are a unique account found only in Pelsaert K.

Summing up these cases, there are so far no grounds to support the interesting supposition of a relationship between AAB and Pelsaert K, although we can not completely exclude it. The partial overlaps in narration can neither give evidence to the relationship nor exclude the existence of some other

[80] There is no conclusive proof of Pelsaert's knowledge of Persian.

contemporary eyewitnesses, who were acquainted with Pelsaert in Āgrah. Even granting the relation to be true, we could only say that AAB had little influence on Pelsaert K.

Given the above discussion, in spite of the existence of common information concerning a few points, AAB is neither based on nor provides a basis for the other sources concerning the case of Abū al-Faḍl's murder. Although we should withhold judgement about the particular case of Pelsaert K, it is safe to say that AAB's information is independent of the other sources and on account of this independence, it can be treated as a source of contemporary historical value.

5. Conclusion

The above discussion has revealed that AAB, full of much detailed information, has independent historical value as a source of the later years of Akbar. However, AAB's sharp focus on his personal matters yields a shortage of systematic and comprehensive description of those years. It should be clear that we have to rely in a basic sense on the sources compiled under Šāh Ǧahān such as INJ, TAN1 and TAN2 in reconstructing the general framework of the period. As a subject of future research, we must keep in mind that most of the sources of Šāh Ǧahān's reign have yet to be studied from historiographical viewpoints. The position of each of the works and their mutual relations have not been fully examined.

As another problem, let us take up the motive of Asad Bīg's writing. He does not mention anything concerning this point in his memoirs. However, the fact that he wrote during Ǧahāngīr's reign when he was assumed to have lived in ill fortune, leads us to believe that his aim was to claim appropriate treatment for his previous services. His reference to Akbar's promise to promote him to the rank (manṣab) of 1000 can be interpreted to bear such an implicit message. If so, this explains why he wrote over ten years after the events.

Yet more important is the fact that his memoirs were not utilized by later histories and were neglected by his contemporaries. Under the present condition of the sources, we are now not able to discuss why it was not read. In fact, it would be more productive to speculate on the perceptions of his contemporaries toward the same kind of literary works as AAB. It is true that the genre of "memoirs" is conceptual and should be duly placed in the perspective of Persian literary history. But we know of many writings, which

could be characterized as memoirs, produced in Islamic India.[81] What the social meaning of the self-expression of a man of letters in the Indo-Islamic milieu was and what the reading, transcription and circulation of his work meant in that society requires thorough examination.

Bibliography

Primary sources

AA Abū al-Faḍl, *Ā'īn-i Akbarī.* H. Buluḫman (Blochmann) (ed.), 2 vols., Kalkatah, 1867-77 [Reprint: Frankfurt am Main, 1993].

AAB Asad Bīg, *(Aḥwāl-i Asad Bīg).* Ms. Fann-i Ṣawāniḥ-i 'Umrī 41. Andhra Pradesh Government Oriental Manuscripts Library.

AN Abū al-Faḍl, *Akbar Nāmah.* Mawlawī Āġā Aḥmad 'Alī & Mawlawī 'Abd al-Raḥīm (eds.), 3 vols., Kalkatah, 1877-86. **ANtr**: H. Beveridge, *The Akbarnāma.* Calcutta, 1902-1939 [Reprint: New Delhi, 1989]

APO A. B. de Bragança Pereira (ed.), *Arquivo Português Oriental.* Nova edição. 11 vols., Bastorá, 1937-40.

Bernier François Bernier, *Voyages de Françcois Bernier ....* Archibald Constable (tr.), *Travels in the Mogul Empire, A.D. 1656-1668.* Second edition. London, 1934 [Reprint: Delhi, 1989].

BNL 'Abd al-Ḥamīd Lāhawrī, *Bādšāh Nāmah.* Mawlawī Kabīr al-Dīn aḤmad & Mawlawī 'Abd al-Raḥīm (eds.), 2 vols., Kalkatah, 1867-68 [Reprint: Osnabrück, 1983].

Bocarro António Bocarro, *O livro das plantas de todas as fortalezas, cidades e povoações do Estado da Índia Oriental.* Isabel Cid (ed.), 3 vols., [Lisboa], n.d.

Della Valle Pietro della Valle, *Viaggi di Pietro della Valle il Pellegrino ....* Edward Gray (tr.), *The travels of Pietro della Valle in India,* 2 vols., London, 1892. [Reprint: New Delhi, 1991].

DhKh Šayḫ Farīd Bhakkarī, *Ḏaḫīrat al-Ḫawānīn.* Syed Moinul Haq (ed.), 3 vols., Karachi, 1961-74.

DUP Antonio da Silva Rego et al. (eds.), *Documentação Ultramarina Portuguesa,* 8 vols., Lisboa, 1960-85.

Finch William Finch, (Observations of William Finch, Merchant, ...). William Foster (ed.), *Early travels in India, 1583-1619,* London, 1921 [Reprint: New Delhi, 1985], pp.125-187.

GI Muḥammad Qāsim Firištah, *Gulšan-i Ibrāhīmī.* 2 vols., Munba'ī & Pūnah, 1832.

[81] For examples, the so-called *Risālah-i Sālār Ǧang* of Dargāh Qulī Ḫān, *Taḏkirah-i Ānand Rām Muḫliṣ* and the so-called *Tahmās Nāmah* of Tahmās Ḫān Miskīn.

Guerreiro Fernão Guerreiro, *Relação anual das coisas que fiearam os padres da Companhia de Jesus nas suas missões.* Autur Viegas (ed.), 3 vols., Coimbra & Lisboa, 1930-42.

HA Murtaḍā Ḥusayn Bilgrāmī, *Ḥadīqat al-Aqālīm.* Lakhnaw (Munšī Nawal Kišūr).

Hawkins William Hawkins, (Captaine William Hawkins, his Relations of the Occurents ...). William Foster (ed.), *Early travels in India, 1583-1619*, London, 1921 [Reprint: New Delhi, 1985], pp.70-121.

HI Amīn Aḥmad Rāzī, *Haft Iqlīm.* Ǧawād Fāḍil (ed.), 3 vols., Tihrān, n.d.

IAF Abū al-Faḍl, *Inšā'-yi Abū al-Faḍl.* Lakhnaw, 1299 AH.

IY Šams al-Dīn 'Abd al-Ṣamad al-Mawza'ī, *al-Iḥsān fī Duḫūl Mamlakat al-Yaman taḥta Ẓill 'Adālat Āl 'Uṯmān.* Fre'de'rique Soudan (ed.), Le Caire, 1999.

INJ Mu'tamad Ḫān, *Iqbāl Nāmah-i Ǧahāngīrī.* (Munšī Nawal Kišūr), 1870.

JN Ǧahāngīr, *Ǧahāngīr Nāmah.* Muḥammad Hāšim (ed.), Tihrān, 1359 Sh. **JN Al**: Syud Ahmud (ed.), Ally Gurh (Aligarh), 1864. **JNtr1**: Alexander Rogers & Henry Beveridge (trs.), *The Tūzuk-i-Jahāngīrī or Memoirs of Jahāngīr.* 2 vols., London, 1909-14 [Reprint: New Delhi, 1978]. **JNtr2**: Wheeler M. Thackston, *The Jahangirnama: Memoirs of Jahangir, Emperor of India.* New York, 1999.

Jourdain John Jourdain, *(The Journal of John Jourdain).* William Foster (ed.), Cambridge, 1905 [Reprint: New Delhi, 1992].

Ketelaar Joan Josua Ketelaar, *(Journaal).* J. Ph. Vogel (ed.), *Journaal van J. J. Ketelaar's Hofreis naar den Groot Mogol te Lahore, 1711-1713*, 's-Gravenhage, 1937.

LR Frederic Charles Danvers (ed.), *Letters received by the East India Company from its servants in the East transcribed from the 'Original Correspondence' Series of the India Office Records*, 6 vols., London, 1896-1902 [Reprint: Amsterdam, 1968].

MB Ẓuhūrī, *Mīnā Bāzār.* (Munšī Nawal Kišūr), n.d.

MJ Kāmgār Ḥusaynī, *Ma'āṯir-i Ǧahāngīrī.* Azra Alavi (ed.), Bombay, 1978.

MKh 'Abd al-Nabī Qazwīnī, *May Ḫānah.* Aḥmad Gulčīn Ma'ānī (ed.) 1363 Sh.

MR 'Abd al-Bāqī Nihāwandī, *Ma'āṯir-i Raḥīmī.* Muḥammad Hidāyat Ḥusayn (ed.), 3 vols., Kalkatah, 1910-31.

MTS Ḥasan Ḫākī Šīrāzī, *Muntaḫab al-Tawārīḫ.* Ms. Or.1649, British Library.

MU Šāh Nawāz Ḫān, *Ma'āṯir al-Umarā.* Mawlawī 'Abd al-Raḥīm & Ašraf 'Alī (eds.), 3 vols., Kalkatah, 1887-91.

Mundy Peter Mundy, *The travels of Peter Mundy in Europe and Asia, 1608-1667.* R. C. Temple & L. M. Anstey (eds.), 5 vols., London, 1907-36.

Persaelt K Francisco Pelsaert, *(Kroniek).* D. H. A. Kolff & H. W. van Santen (eds.), *De geschriften van Francisco Pelsaert over Mughal Indië, 1627 Kroniek en Remonstrantie.* 's-Gravenhage, 1979. *Pelsaelt tr*: B. Narain & S. R. Sharma (trs.), *A contemporary Dutch chronicle of Mughal India.* Calcutta, 1957.

TAAA Iskandar Munšī, *Tārīẖ-i 'Ālam Ārā-yi 'Abbāsī*. 3 vols., Tihrān, 1334-5 Sh. [Reprint: Tihrān, 1350 Sh].

TAN1 *(Takmilah-i Akbar Nāmah)*. Mawlawī Āġā Aḥmad 'Alī & Mawlawī 'Abd al-Raḥīm (eds.), vol.iii, pp. 803-843. Kalkatah, 1886.

TAN2 *(Takmilah-i Akbar Nāmah)*. Ms. Rampur Raza Library, 45m. pp.609-677.

Tavernier Jean Baptiste Tavernier. *Les six voyages de Jean-Baptiste Tavernier ecuyer, Baron d'Aubonne, ...* Valentine Ball (tr.), *Travels in India by Jean-Baptiste Tavernier, Baron of Aubonne*. Second edition, 2 vols., London, 1925. [Reprint: New Delhi, 1977].

TM Rāfi' al-Dīn Širāzī, *Taḏkirat al-Mulūk*. Ms. Supplément persan 189, Bibliothèque Nationale de France.

ZT Nūr al-Ḥaqq Dihlawī, *Zubdat al-Tawārīẖ*. Ms. Add. 10580, British Library.

Secondary sources

AhmadKM 1932 Khwajah Muhammad AHMAD, 'Inscriptions from Udgir, Bidar District', *Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica*, 1929-30 [Reprint: New Delhi, 1987], pp.18-31.

AhmadMA 1941 Mohammad Aziz AHMAD, 'Tarikh-i-Moghul of Asad Beg', *Proceedings: Indian Historical Records Commission (1940)*, 17, pp.87-90.

AhmadN 1953 Nazir AHMAD, *Zuhuri, life and works*, Allahabad.

AhmadN 1956 Nazir AHMAD, *Kitab-i-Nauras by Ibrahim Adil Shah II*, New Delhi.

Alam 1998 Muzaffar ALAM, 'The pursuit of Persian: Language in Mughal politics', *Modern Asian Studies*, 32-2, pp.317-349.

Alam & Subrahmanyam 1999 Muzaffar ALAM & Sanjay SUBRAHMANYAM, 'Empiricism of the heart: Close encounters in an eighteenth-century Indo-Persian text', *Studies in History*, 15-2, pp.261-291.

Alam & Subrahmanyam 2000 Muzaffar ALAM & Sanjay SUBRAHMANYAM, 'Witnessing transition: Views on the end of the Akbari dispensation', in K. N. Panikkar et al. (eds.), *The making of history. Essays presented to Irfan Habib*, New Delhi, pp.104-140.

Almagià 1956 Roberto ALMAGIÀ, 'Giovan Battista e Gerolamo Vecchietti viaggiatori in Oriente', *Atti della Accademia nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche. Rendiconti. Serie ottava*, 11, pp.313-345.

Āṣafiyyah 1332-3 Anonym, *Fihrist-i kutub-i 'arabī wa fārsī wa urdū maẖzūnah-i kutubẖānah-i Āṣafīyah-i sarkār-i 'ālī*, Ḥaydarābād.

Aubin 1973 Jean AUBIN, 'Le royaume d'Ormuz au début du XVI^{e} siècle', *Mare Luso-Indicum*, 2, pp.77-179.

Aubin 1991 Jean AUBIN, 'De Kūhbanān à Bidar: La famille ni'matullahī', *Studia Iranica*, 20-2, pp.233-261.

Barzegar 2000 K. N. BARZEGAR, *Mughal Iranian relations, during 16th century*, Delhi.

Blochmann 1869 H. BLOCHMANN, 'Badaoni and his works', *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. Part 1. History, Archaeology*, 38, pp.105-144.

Browne 1902-24 Edward G. BROWNE, *Literary history of Persia*, 4 vols., London, 1902-24 [Reprint: New Delhi, 1997].

Camps 1957 Arnulf CAMPS, *Jerome Xavier S.J. and the Muslims of the Mogul Empire*, Schöneck-Beckenried.

Dalgado 1919-21 Sebastião Rodolfo DALGADO, *Glossário Luso-Asiático*, 2 vols., Coimbra, 1919-21. [Reprint: New Delhi, 1988].

Deloche 1968 Jean DELOCHE, *Recherches sur les routes de l'Inde au temps des Mogols (Étude critique des sources)*, Paris.

DNB Leslie STEPHEN et al., *The dictionary of national biography*, London, 1882-.

Doerfer 1963-75 Gerhard DOERFER, *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung älterer neupersischer Geschichtsquellen, vor allem der Mongolen- und Timuridenzeit*, 4 vols., Wiesbaden.

E&D H. M. ELLIOT & John DOWSON (eds.), *The history of India as told by its own historians. The Muhammadan period*, London, 1867-77 [Reprint: New Delhi, 1990].

Elgood 1970 Cyril ELGOOD, *Safavid medical practice: or, The practice of medicine, surgery and gynaecology in Persia between 1500 A.D. and 1750 A.D.*, London.

Ernst 2000 Carl W. ERNST, 'Admiring the works of the ancients: The Ellora temples as viewed by Indo-Muslim authors', in David Gilmartin & Bruce B. Lawrence (eds.), *Beyond Turk and Hindu: Rethinking religious identities in Islamicate South Asia*, Gainesville, pp.98-120.

Ethé 1937 Hermann ETHÉ, *Catalogue of Persian manuscripts in the India Office Library. Volume II*, Oxford [Reprint: London, 1980].

Floor EIr Willem FLOOR, 'Čopoq, Čepoq', *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, 6, pp.258.

Ghauri 1970 Iftikhar Ahmad GHAURI, 'Central structure of the kingdom of Bijapur', *Journal of the Pakistan Historical Society*, 18-2, pp.88-109.

Gladwin 1801 Francis GLADWIN, *The Persian moonshee*, Calcutta.

Gokhale 1975 B. G. GOKHALE, 'Tobacco in seventeenth century India', *Agricultural history*, 48-4, pp.484-492.

Gulčīn Ma'ānī 1369 Sh Aḥmad GULČĪN MA'ĀNĪ, *Kārwān-i Hind*, Mašhad.

Habib 1969 Irfan HABIB, 'The family of Nur Jahan during Jahangir's reign', *Medieval India, a miscellany*, 1, pp.74-95.

ḤānŠ 1995 Šāyistah ḤĀN, *Fihrist-i maḫṭūṭāt-i fārsī, Rāmpūr, Raḍā Lā'ibrayrī*, Paṫnah.

ḤānHAA 1998 Ḥāfiẓ Aḥmad ḤĀN Šawq Rāmpūrī, *Tārīḫ-i Kitāb Ḫānah-i Raḍā*, Rāmpūr.

Haneda 1997 HANEDA Masashi, 'Emigration of Iranian elites to India during the 16-18th centuries', *Cahiers d'Asie centrale no 3-4. L'Héritage timouride. Iran - Asie centrale - Inde, XV^e-XVIII^e siècles*, , pp.129-143.

Hasan 1966 S. M. HASAN, *A Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts of Sir Jadunath Sarkar Collection*, Calcutta.

Hollister 1953 John Norman HOLLISTER, *The Shi'a of India*, London.

Husain 1999 Afzal HUSAIN, *The nobility under Akbar and Jahāngīr: A study of family groups*, New Delhi.

Joshi 1950 P. M. JOSHI, 'Asad Beg's mission to Bijapur, 1603-1604', in Surendra Nath Sen (ed.), *Mahāmahōpadhyāya Prof. D. V. Potdar Sixty-first commemoration volume. Studies in historical and Indological research presented to M. M. Prof. Datto Vaman Potdar, B.A. by his friends and old pupils in honour of his sixty-first birthday*, Poona, pp.184-196.

Joshi 1969 P. M. JOSHI, 'Asad Beg's return from Bijapur and his second mission to the Deccan', in V. D. Rao (ed.), *Studies in Indian History: Dr. A. G. Pawar Felicitation Volume*, Bombay, pp.136-155.

Joshi & Nadeem 1979 P. M. JOSHI & M. A. NAYEEM, 'Fuzuni Astarabadi's Futuhāt-i 'Adil Shahi - An unpublished Persian MS. in the British Museum - Some extracts', *Islamic Culture*, 53-3, pp.163-177.

KhanIA 1980 Iqtidar Alam KHAN 1980, 'The Tazkirat ul-Muluk by Rafiuddin Ibrahim Shirazi: As a Source on the History of Akbar's Reign', *Studies in History*, 2-1, pp.41-55.

KhanMA 1992 Muhammad Afzal KHAN, 'Immigration of Iranian Nobles during the Reign of Shahjahan', *Journal of West Asian Studies*, 8, pp.51-72.

Kondo 2000 KONDO Nobuaki, 'Iran, Turan, Hind: Cultural Exchanges in the World of Persian Language', in The Islamic World and the Indian Ocean Region from the Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries (Iwanami Lectures on World History, volume 14), Tokyo, 2000, pp.93-114 (in Japanese).

Losensky 1998 Paul Edward LOSENSKY, *Welcoming Figānī :Imitation and poetic individuality in the Safavid-Mughal Ghazal*, Mazda Publishers.

Losensky EI2 Paul Edward LOSENSKY, 'Ẓuhūrī Turshīzī', *Encyclopaedia of Islam. Second edition*, vol. xi, pp.566a-566b.

Maclagan 1932 E. D. MACLAGAN, *The Jesuits and the Great Mughals*, London [Reprint: Gurgaon, 1990].

Marshall 1967 D. N. MARSHALL, *Mughals in India: A Bibliographical Survey of manuscripts*, London [Reprint: London & New York, 1985].

Mashita 1999 MASHITA Hiroyuki, '*Akbar Nāmah* and *Ṭabaqāt-i Akbarī*: A preliminary study of the Man.sab system', *Bulletin of the Society for Western and Southern Asiatic Studies, Kyoto University*, 51, pp.43-74 (in Japanese).

Matthee EI2 Rudi MATTHEE, 'Tutun', *Encyclopaedia of Islam. Second edition*, vol. x, pp.753a-756b.

Nabi Hadi 1995 S. NABI HADI, *Dictionary of Indo-Persian literature*, New Delhi.

Nardi 1989 Jean-Baptiste NARDI, 'Le commerce du tabac vers l'Inde portugaise du XVII^{e} au début du XIX^{e} siècle', *Moyen Orient & Océan Indien*, 6, pp.165-176.

Om Prakash 1984 OM PRAKASH, *The Dutch factories in India 1617-1623: A collection of Dutch East India Company documents pertaining to India*, New Delhi.

Platts 1884 John T. PLATTS, *A Dictionary of Urdū, Classical Hindī and English*, Oxford [Reprint: New Delhi, 1993].

Rāmpūr 1996 Kitāb-ẖānah-i Raḍā, *Fihrist-i nusẖa-hā-yi ẖaṭṭī-i fārsī-i Kitāb-ẖānah-i Raḍā, Rāmpūr, ǧild-i awwal ('ulūm-i qur'āniyyah, taḏkira-hā)*, Rāmpūr.

Reid 1985 Anthony REID, 'From betel-chewing to tobacco-smoking in Indonesia', *Journal of Asian Studies*, 44, pp.529-547.

Rieu 1879-83 Charles RIEU, *Catalogue of the Persian manuscripts in the British Museum*, 3 vols., London [Reprint: London, 1966].

Robinson 1991 Francis ROBINSON, 'Perso-Islamic Culture in India from the Seventeenth to the Early Twentieth Century', in Robert L. Canfield (ed.), *Turco-Persia in Historical Perspective*, Cambridge, pp.104-131.

Rode 1969 V. P. RODE, *Catalogue of coins in the Central Museum, Nagpur: Coins of the Mughal emperors, Part I*, Bombay, 1969.

Rypka 1968 Jan Rypka, *History of Iranian literature*, Dordrecht.

Sachau & Ethé 1889 Ed. SACHAU & Hermann ETHÉ, *Catalogue of the Persian, Turkish, Hindūstānī, and Pushtū Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, Part I, The Persian Manuscripts*, Oxford.

Schimmel 1981 Annemarie SCHIMMEL, 'Türkisches in Indien', in Klaus Ro"hrborn & Horst Wilfrid Brands (eds.), *Scholia : Beiträge zur Turkologie und Zentralasienkunde : Annemarie von Gabain zum 80. Geburtstag am 4. Juli 1981 dargebracht von Kollegen, Freunden und Schülern*, Wiesbaden, pp.156-162.

Shakeb 1995 Mohd. Ziauddin Ahmed SHAKEB, 'Aspects of Golkonda-Iran Commercial Contacts', *Islamic Culture*, 69-2, pp.1-39.

Shakeb 2000 Mohd. Ziauddin Ahmed SHAKEB, 'The Currents of Persian Ideas in the Qutb Shahi Sultanate of Golconda', *Islamic Culture*, 74-3, pp.53-87.

Sherwani 1953 Haroon Khan SHERWANI, *The Bahmanis of the Deccan*, Hyderabad [Reprint: New Delhi, 1985].

Smith 1909 Edmund W. SMITH, *Akbar's Tomb, Sikandarah, near Agra*, Allahabad [Reprint: New Delhi, 1994].

Sprenger 1854 A. SPRENGER, 'Manuscripts of the late Sir H. Elliot, K.C.B.', *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 23, pp.225-263.

Storey 1927-39 C. A. STOREY, *Persian literature: A bio-bibliographical survey. Volume I: Qur'ānic literature; History and biography, Part 1: Qur'ānic literature; History*, London [Reprint: London, 1970].

Subrahmanyam 1992 Sanjay SUBRAHMANYAM, 'Iranis abroad: Intra Asian elite migration and early modern state formation', *Journal of Asian Studies*, 51-2, pp.340-363.

Suehiro 2001 SUEHIRO Akiko, 'The administrative system of the 'Ādilshāhī kingdom: With special reference to the Mu'āmala', *Journal of Oriental History, Nagoya University*, 25, pp.375-387 (in Japanese).

Tulpule & Feldhaus 1999 S. G. TULPULE & Anne FELDHAUS, *A dictionary of Old Marathi*, Mumbai.

Wahi 1990 Tripta WAHI, 'Henry Miers Elliot - A reappraisal', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, 1990-1, pp.64-90.

Whitehead 1934 R. B. WHITEHEAD, *Catalogue of Coins in the Punjab Museum, Lahore, vol.II, Coins of the Mughal Emperors*, Oxford [Reprint: Lahore, 1977].

Wright 1908 H. Nelson WRIGHT, *Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, including the cabinet of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. Volume III: Mughal Empirors of India*, Oxford.