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THE MEMOIRS OF BABUR

SECTION III. HINDÜSTAN

932 A.H.—OCT. 18TH 1525 TO OCT. 8TH 1526 A.D.¹

(a. Fifth expedition into Hindūstān.)

(Nov. 17th) On Friday the 1st of the month of Ṣafar at the date 932, the Sun being in the Sign of the Archer, we set out for Hindūstān, crossed the small rise of Yak-langa, and dismounted in the meadow to the west of the water of Dih-i-ya‘qūb.² ‘Abdu’l-malûk the armourer came into this camp; he had gone seven or eight months earlier as my envoy to Sulṭān Sa‘īd Khān (in Kāshghar), and now brought one of the Khān’s men, styled Yāngī Beg (new beg) Kūkūldāsh who conveyed letters, and

¹ Elph. MS. f. 205b; W.-i-B. I.O. 215 f. 199b omits the year’s events on the ground that Shaikh Zain has translated them; I.O. 217 f. 174; Mem. p. 290; Kehr’s Codex p. 1084.

A considerable amount of reliable textual material for revising the Hindūstān section of the English translation of the Bābur-nāma is wanting through loss of pages from the Elphinstone Codex; in one instance no less than an equivalent of 36 folios of the Haidarābād Codex are missing (f. 356 et seq.), but to set against this loss there is the valuable per contra that Kehr’s manuscript throughout the section becomes of substantial value, losing its Persified character and approximating closely to the true text of the Elphinstone and Haidarābād Codices. Collateral help in revision is given by the works specified (in loco p. 428) as serving to, fill the gap existing in Bābur’s narrative previous to 932 A.H. and this notably by those described by Elliot and Dowson. Of these last, special help in supplementary details is given for 932 A.H. and part of 933 A.H. by Shaikh Zain [Khwāfī]’s Tābāqāt-i-bābūrī, which is a highly rhetorical paraphrase of Bābur’s narrative, requiring familiarity with ornate Persian to understand. For all my references to it, I am indebted to my husband. It may be mentioned as an interesting circumstance that the B.M. possesses in Or. 1999 a copy of this work which was transcribed in 998 A.H. by one of Khwānd-amir’s grandsons and, judging from its date, presumably for Abū’l-fażl’s use in the Akbar-nāma.

Like part of the Kābul section, the Hindūstān one is in diary-form, but it is still more heavily surcharged with matter entered at a date later than the diary. It departs from the style of the preceding diary by an occasional lapse into courtly phrase and by exchange of some Turki words for Arabic and Persian ones, doubtless found current in Hind, e.g. fauj, dīrā, manzil, khail-khāna.

² This is the Logar affluent of the Bārān-water (Kābul-river). Masson describes this haltingplace (iii, 174).
small presents, and verbal messages\(^1\) from the Khānīms and the Khān.\(^2\)

**(Nov. 18th to 21st)** After staying two days in that camp for the convenience of the army,\(^3\) we marched on, halted one night,\(^4\) and next dismounted at Bādām-chashma. There we ate a confection (**ma'jūn**).

**(Nov. 22nd)** On Wednesday (**Safar** 6th), when we had dismounted at Bārik-āb, the younger brethren of Nūr Beg—he himself remaining in Hindūstān—brought gold **ashrafīs** and **tankas**\(^5\) to the value of 20,000 **shāhrukhīs**, sent from the Lāhor revenues by Khwāja Ḥusain. The greater part of these moneys was despatched by Mullā Aḥmad, one of the chief men of Balkh, for the benefit of Balkh.\(^6\)

**(Nov. 24th)** On Friday the 8th of the month (**Safar**), after dismounting at Gandamak, I had a violent discharge;\(^7\) by God’s mercy, it passed off easily.

\(^1\) **muḥaqqaq saughāt** u **biḥā** or **tiḥāt**. A small verbal point arises about **biḥā** (or **tiḥāt**). **Biḥā** is said by Quatremerè to mean a gift (**N. et E. xiv, 119 n.**) but here **muḥaqqaq saughāt** expresses gift. Another meaning can be assigned to **biḥā** here, [one had also by **tiḥāt**] viz. that of word-of-mouth news or communication, sometimes supplementing written communication, possibly secret instructions, possibly small domestic details. In **biḥā**, a gift, the root may be **bīl**, the act of knowing, in **tiḥāt** it is **tīl**, the act of speaking [whence **tīl**], the tongue, and **tūl tānūk**, to get news. In the sentence noted, either word would suit for a verbal communication. Returning to **biḥā** as a gift, it may express the **nuance** of English **token**, the maker-known of friendship, affection and so-on. This differentiates **biḥā** from **saughāt**, used in its frequent sense of ceremonial and diplomatic presents of value and importance.

\(^2\) With Sa’īd at this time were two Khānīms Sultān-nīgār and Daulat-sultān who were Bābur’s maternal-aunts. Erskine suggested Khūb-nīgār, but she had died in 907 AH. (f. 96).

\(^3\) Humāyūn’s non-arrival would be the main cause of delay. Apparently he should have joined before the Kābul force left that town.

\(^4\) The halt would be at Būt-khāk, the last station before the Adīnapūr road takes to the hills.

\(^5\) Discussing the value of coins mentioned by Bābur, Erskine says in his History of India (vol. i, Appendix E.) which was published in 1854 AD. that he had come to think his estimates of the value of the coins was set too low in the Memoirs (published in 1826 AD.). This sum of 20,000 **shāhrukhīs** he put at L1,000. Cf. E. Thomas’ Pathan Kings of Dīlī and Resources of the Mughal Empire.

\(^6\) One of Masson’s interesting details seems to fit the next stage of Bābur’s march (iii, 179). It is that after leaving Būt-khāk, the road passes what in the thirties of the 19th Century, was locally known as Bābur Padshāh’s Stone-heap (cairn) and believed piled in obedience to Bābur’s order that each man in his army should drop a stone on it in passing. No time for raising such a monument could be fitter than that of the fifth expedition into Hindūstān when a climax of opportunity allowed hope of success.

\(^7\) **resāndālīk**. This Erskine translates, both here and on ff. 253, 254, by defluxion, but de Courteille by **rhume de cerveau**. Shaikh Zain supports de Courteille by writing, not **resāndālīk**, but **nuzūf**, catarrh. De Courteille, in illustration of his.
(Nov. 25th) On Saturday we dismounted in the Bāgh-i-wafa. We delayed there a few days, waiting for Humāyūn and the army from that side. More than once in this history the bounds and extent, charm and delight of that garden have been described; it is most beautifully placed; who sees it with the buyer's eye will know the sort of place it is. During the short time we were there, most people drank on drinking-days and took their morning; on non-drinking days there were parties for ma'jūn.

I wrote harsh letters to Humāyūn, lecturing him severely because of his long delay beyond the time fixed for him to join me.

(Dec. 3rd) On Sunday the 17th of Ṣafar, after the morning had been taken, Humāyūn arrived. I spoke very severely to him at once. Khwāja Kalān also arrived to-day, coming up from Ghaznī. We marched in the evening of that same Sunday, and dismounted in a new garden between Sūltānpur and Khwāja Rustam.

(Dec. 6th) Marching on Wednesday (Ṣafar 20th), we got on a raft, and, drinking as we went reached Qūsh-gūmbaz, there landed and joined the camp.

reading of the word, quotes Burnes' account of an affection common in the Panj-āb and there called nūsla, which is a running at the nostrils, that wastes the brain and stamina of the body and ends fatally (Travels in Būkhara ed. 1839, ii, 41).

1 Tramontana, north of Hindū-kush.
2 Shaikh Zain says that the drinking days were Saturday, Sunday, Tuesday and Wednesday.
3 The Elph. Codex (f. 208b) contains the following note of Humāyūn's about his delay; it has been expunged from the text but is still fairly legible:—"The time fixed was after ʿAshūrā (10th Muharram, a voluntary fast); although we arrived after the next-following 10th ('āshūr, i.e. of Ṣafar), the delay had been necessary. The purpose of the letters (Bābur's) was to get information; (in reply) it was represented that the equipment of the army of Badakhshān caused delay. If this slave (Humāyūn), trusting to his [father's] kindness, caused further delay, he has been sorry."

Bābur's march from the Bāgh-i-wafa was delayed about a month; Humāyūn started late from Badakhshān; his force may have needed some stay in Kābul for completion of equipment; his personal share of blame for which he counted on his father's forgiveness, is likely to have been connected with his mother's presence in Kābul.

Humāyūn's note is quoted in Turki by one MS. of the Persian text (B. M. W.-1-B. 16,623 f. 128); and from certain indications in Muḥammad Shīrāzi's lithograph (p. 163), appears to be in his archetype the Udaipur Codex; but it is not with all MSS. of the Persian text e.g. not with I. O. 217 and 218. A portion of it is in Kehr's MS. (p. 1086).

4 Bird's-dome [f. 145b, n.] or The pair (qūsh) of domes.
(Dec. 7th) Starting off the camp at dawn, we ourselves went on a raft, and there ate confection (ma'jūn). Our encamping-ground was always Qirīq-āriq, but not a sign or trace of the camp could be seen when we got opposite it, nor any appearance of our horses. Thought I, "Garm-chashma (Hot-spring) is close by; they may have dismounted there." So saying, we went on from Qirīq-āriq. By the time we reached Garm-chashma, the very day was late; we did not stop there, but going on in its lateness (kichisū), had the raft tied up somewhere, and slept awhile.

(Dec. 8th) At day-break we landed at Yada-bir where, as the day wore on, the army-folks began to come in. The camp must have been at Qirīq-āriq, but out of our sight.

There were several verse-makers on the raft, such as Shaikh Abū'l-wajd, Shaikh Zain, Mullā 'Alī-jān, Tārdī Beg Khāksār and others. In this company was quoted the following couplet of Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ:

(Persian) With thee, arch coquette, for a sweetheart, what can man do? With another than thou where thou art, what can man do?

Said I, "Compose on these lines"; whereupon those given to versifying, did so. As jokes were always being made at the expense of Mullā 'Alī-jān, this couplet came off-hand into my head:

(Persian) With one all bewildered as thou, what can man do? . . . . . . . , what can man do?

1 gūn khūd kīch bālūb aīdī; a little joke perhaps at the lateness both of the day and the army.
2 Shaikh Zain's maternal-uncle.
3 Shaikh Zain's useful detail that this man's pen-name was Sharaf distinguishes him from Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ the author of the Shaibānī-nāma.
4 gosha, angle (cf. gosha-i-kār, limits of work). Parodies were to be made, having the same metre, rhyme, and refrain as the model couplet.
5 I am unable to attach sense to Bābur's second line; what is wanted is an illustration of two incompatible things. Bābur's reflections (infra) condemned his verse. Shaikh Zain describes the whole episode of the verse-making on the raft, and goes on with, "He (Bābur) excised this choice couplet from the pages of his Acts (Wāqiātār) with the knife of censure, and scratched it out from the tablets of his noble heart with the finger-nails of repentance. I shall now give an account of this spiritual matter" (i.e. the repentance), "by presenting the recantations of his Solomon-like Majesty in his very own words, which are weightier than any from the lips of Aesop." Shaikh Zain next quotes the Turkī passage here translated in b. Mention of the Mubīn.
(b. Mention of the Mubīn.\(^1\))

From time to time before it,\(^2\) whatever came into my head, of good or bad, grave or jest, used to be strung into verse and written down, however empty and harsh the verse might be, but while I was composing the Mubīn, this thought pierced through my dull wits and made way into my troubled heart, "A pity it will be if the tongue which has treasure of utterances so lofty as these are, waste itself again on low words; sad will it be if again vile imaginings find way into the mind that has made exposition of these sublime realities."\(^3\) Since that time I had refrained from satirical and jesting verse; I was repentant (\(tālīb\)); but these matters were totally out of mind and remembrance when I made that couplet (on Mullā ‘Ali-jān).\(^4\) A few days later in Bīrām when I had fever and discharge, followed by cough, and I began to spit blood each time I coughed, I knew whence my reproof came; I knew what act of mine had brought this affliction on me. "Whoever shall violate his oath, will violate it to the hurt of his own soul; but whoever shall perform that which he hath covenanted with God, to that man surely will He give great reward" (\(Qūrān\) cap. 48 v. 10).

(Turkī) What is it I do with thee, ah! my tongue?
My entrails bleed as a reckoning for thee.
Good once\(^5\) as thy words were, has followed this verse
Jesting, empty,\(^6\) obscene, has followed a lie.
If thou say, "Burn will I not!" by keeping this vow
Thou turnest thy rein from this field of strife.\(^7\)

\(^1\) The Mubīn (\(q.v.\) Index) is mentioned again and quoted on f. 351b. In both places its name escaped the notice of Erskine and de Courteille, who here took it for \(mīn\), I, and on f. 351b omitted it, matters of which the obvious cause is that both translators were less familiar with the poem than it is now easy to be. There is ampiest textual warrant for reading Mubīn in both the places indicated above; its reinstatement gives for the English and French translations what they have needed, namely, the clinch of a definite stimulus and date of repentance, which was the influence of the Mubin in 928 AH. (1521-2 AD.). The whole passage about the peccant verse and its fruit of contrition should be read with others that express the same regret for broken law and may all have been added to the diary at the same time, probably in 935 AH. (1529 AD.). They will be found grouped in the Index \(s.n.\) Bābur.

\(^2\) mūndīn būrūn, by which I understand, as the grammatical construction will warrant, before writing the Mubin. To read the words as referring to the peccant verse, is to take the clinch off the whole passage.

\(^3\) i.e. of the \(Qūrān\) on which the Mubin is based.

\(^4\) Dropping down-stream, with wine and good company, he entirely forgot his good resolutions.

\(^5\) This appears to refer to the good thoughts embodied in the Mubin.

\(^6\) This appears to contrast with the "sublime realities" of the \(Qūrān\).

\(^7\) In view of the interest of the passage, and because this verse is not in the Rāmpūr \(Dīwān\), as are many contained in the Hindūstān section, the Turkī original is
"O Lord! we have dealt unjustly with our own souls; if Thou forgive us not, and be not merciful unto us, we shall surely be of those that perish" ¹ (Qorân cap. 7 v. 22).

Taking anew the place of the penitent pleading for pardon, I gave my mind rest ² from such empty thinking and such unlawful occupation. I broke my pen. Made by that Court, such reproof of sinful slaves is for their felicity; happy are the highest and the slave when such reproof brings warning and its profitable fruit.

(c. Narrative resumed.)

(Dec. 8th continued) Marching on that evening, we dismounted at ‘Ali-masjid. The ground here being very confined, I always used to dismount on a rise overlooking the camp in the valley-bottom.³ The camp-fires made a wonderful illumination there at night; assuredly it was because of this that there had always been drinking there, and was so now.

(Dec. 9th and 10th) To-day I rode out before dawn; I preferred a confection (ma‘jûn) ⁴ and also kept this day a fast. We dismounted near Bigrâm (Peshâwar); and next morning, the camp remaining on that same ground, rode to Karg-awi.⁵ We crossed the Siyâh-âb in front of Bigrâm, and formed our hunting-circle looking down-stream. After a little, a person brought quoted. My translation differs from those of Mr. Erskine and M. de Courteille; all three are tentative of a somewhat difficult verse.

\[\text{Nî qîlâ mîn sînîng bîlâ āf tîl?} \\
\text{JÎhâshîng dîn mîning aÎchîm qân dâr.} \\
\text{Nîcîhâ yabhshî dîsâng bî hâsîl aîla shîr} \\
\text{Bîrî-sî fâhashî bîrî yâlghân dûr.} \\
\text{Gar dîsâng kûînâ mîn, bû jasm bîl} \\
\text{Jâlûîngûî bû 'arûa dîn yân dûr.}\]

¹ The Qorân puts these sayings into the mouths of Adam and Eve.
² Hai. MS. ãндûrûb; Ilminsky, p. 327, ãндûrûb; W.-i-B. I.O. 217, f. 175, sard sôkhta.
³ Of ‘Ali-masjid the Second Afsghân War (official account) has a picture which might be taken from Bâbur’s camp.
⁴ Shaikh Zain’s list of the drinking-days (f. 252 note) explains why sometimes Bâbur says he preferred ma‘jûn. In the instances I have noticed, he does this on a drinking-day; the preference will be therefore for a confection over wine. December 9th was a Saturday and drinking-day; on it he mentions the preference; Tuesday Nov. 21st was a drinking day, and he states that he ate ma‘jûn.
⁵ presumably the karg-khâna of f. 222b, rhinoceros-home in both places. A similar name applies to a tract in the Rawalpindi District,—Bâbur-khana, Tiger-home, which is linked to the tradition of Buddha’s self-sacrifice to appease the hunger of seven tiger-cubs. [In this Bâbur-khana is the town Kacha-kot from which Bâbur always names the river Hârû.]
word that there was a rhino in a bit of jungle near Bigrām, and that people had been stationed near-about it. We betook ourselves, loose rein, to the place, formed a ring round the jungle, made a noise, and brought the rhino out, when it took its way across the plain. Humāyūn and those come with him from that side (Tramontana), who had never seen one before, were much entertained. It was pursued for two miles; many arrows were shot at it; it was brought down without having made a good set at man or horse. Two others were killed. I had often wondered how a rhino and an elephant would behave if brought face to face; this time one came out right in front of some elephants the mahauts were bringing along; it did not face them when the mahauts drove them towards it, but got off in another direction.

(d. Preparations for ferrying the Indus.)

On the day we were in Bigrām, several of the begs and household were appointed, with pay-masters and diwāns, six or seven being put in command, to take charge of the boats at the Nil-āb crossing, to make a list of all who were with the army, name by name, and to count them up.

That evening I had fever and discharge which led on to cough and every time I coughed, I spat blood. Anxiety was great but, by God's mercy, it passed off in two or three days.

(Dec. 11th) It rained when we left Bigrām; we dismounted on the Kābul-water.

(e. News from Lāhor.)

News came that Daulat Khān and (Apāq) Ghāzī Khān, having collected an army of from 20 to 30,000, had taken Kilānūr, and intended to move on Lāhor. At once Mumin-i-'āli the commissary was sent galloping off to say, "We are advancing march by march; do not fight till we arrive."

1 This is the first time on an outward march that Bābur has crossed the Indus by boat; hitherto he has used the ford above Attock, once however specifying that men on foot were put over on rafts.

2 f. 253.

3 In my Translator’s Note (p. 428), attention was drawn to the circumstance that Bābur always writes Daulat Khān Yusuf-khail, and not Daulat Khān Lūdī. In doing this, he uses the family- or clan-name instead of the tribal one, Lūdī.

4 i.e. day by day.
(Dec. 14th) With two night-halts on the way, we reached the water of Sind (Indus), and there dismounted on Thursday the 28th (of Safar).

(f. Ferrying the Indus.)

(Dec. 16th) On Saturday the 1st of the first Rabì', we crossed the Sind-water, crossed the water of Kacha-kot (Hārū), and dismounted on the bank of the river. The begs, pay-masters and diwāns who had been put in charge of the boats, reported that the number of those come with the army, great and small, good and bad, retainer and non-retainer, was written down as 12,000.

(g. The eastward march.)

The rainfall had been somewhat scant in the plains, but seemed to have been good in the cultivated lands along the hill-skirts; for these reasons we took the road for Siālkot along the skirt-hills. Opposite Hāti Kakar's country we came upon a torrent the waters of which were standing in pools. Those pools were all frozen over. The ice was not very thick, as thick as the hand may-be. Such ice is unusual in Hindūstān; not a sign or trace of any was seen in the years we were (aīdūk) in the country.

We had made five marches from the Sind-water; after the sixth (Dec. 22nd—Rabì' I. 7th) we dismounted on a torrent in the camping-ground (yūrt) of the Bugīāls below Balnāth Jogi's hill which connects with the Hill of Jūd.

1 daryā, which Bābur's precise use of words e.g. of daryā, rūd, and sū, allows to apply here to the Indus only.

2 Presumably this was near Parhāla, which stands, where the Sūhān river quits the hills, at the eastern entrance of a wild and rocky gorge a mile in length. It will have been up this gorge that Bābur approached Parhāla in 925 AH. (Rawalpindi Gazetteer p. 11).

3 i.e. here, bed of a mountain-stream.

4 The Elphinstone Codex here preserves the following note, the authorship of which is attested by the scribe's remark that it is copied from the handwriting of Humāyūn Pādshāh:—As my honoured father writes, we did not know until we occupied Hindūstān (932 AH.), but afterwards did know, that ice does form here and there if there come a colder year. This was markedly so in the year I conquered Gujār (942 AH.—1535 AD.) when it was so cold for two or three days between Bīlpūr and Guāllār that the waters were frozen over a hand's thickness.

5 This is a Kakar (Gakkhar) clan, known also as Baragowah, of which the location in Jahāngīr Pādshāh's time was from Rohtās to Hātya, i.e. about where Bābur encamped (Memoirs of Jahāngīr, Rogers and Beveridge, p. 97; E. and D. vi, 309; Provincial Gazetteers of Rawalpindi and Jihlam, p. 64 and p. 97 respectively).
(Dec. 23rd) In order to let people get provisions, we stayed the next day in that camp. 'Araq was drunk on that day. Mullā Muḥ. Pargharī told many stories; never had he been so talkative. Mullā Shams himself was very riotous; once he began, he did not finish till night.

The slaves and servants, good and bad, who had gone out after provisions, went further than this and heedlessly scattered over jungle and plain, hill and broken ground. Owing to this, a few were overcome; Kīchkīna tūnqīṭār died there.

(Dec. 24th) Marching on, we crossed the Bihat-water at a ford below Jīlam (Jihlam) and there dismounted. Wali Qīzīl (Rufus) came there to see me. He was the Siālkot reserve, and held the parganas of Bīmrūkī and Akriāda. Thinking about Siālkot, I took towards him the position of censure and reproach. He excused himself, saying "I had come to my pargana before Khusrau Kūkūldāsh left Siālkot; he did not even send me word." After listening to his excuse, I said, "Since thou hast paid no attention to Siālkot, why didst thou not join the begs in Lāhor?" He was convicted, but as work was at hand, I did not trouble about his fault.

(h. Scouts sent with orders to Lāhor.)

(Dec. 25th) Sayyid Ṭūfān and Sayyid Lāchīn were sent galloping off, each with a pair-horse, to say in Lāhor, "Do not join battle; meet us at Siālkot or Parsrūr" (mod. Pasrūr). It was in everyone's mouth that Ghāzī Khān had collected 30 to 40,000 men, that Daulat Khān, old as he was, had girt two swords to his waist, and that they were resolved to fight. Thought I, "The proverb says that ten friends are better than nine; do you not make a mistake: when the Lāhor begs have joined you, fight there and then!"

(Dec. 26th and 27th) After starting off the two men to the begs, we moved forward, halted one night, and next dismounted on the bank of the Chīn-āb (Chan-āb).

1 āndin aūṭāb, a reference perhaps to going out beyond the corn-lands, perhaps to attempt for more than provisions.
2 qūsh-āt, a led horse to ride in change.
As Buhlulpūr was *khalṣa,* we left the road to visit it. Its fort is situated above a deep ravine, on the bank of the Chīn-āb. It pleased us much. We thought of bringing Siālkot to it. Please God! the chance coming, it shall be done straightway!

From Buhlulpūr we went to camp by boat.

(i. *Jats and Gujūrs.*)

(Dec. 29th) On Friday the 14th of the first Rabī‘ we dismounted at Siālkot. If one go into Hindūstān the Jats and Gujūrs always pour down in countless hordes from hill and plain for loot in bullock and buffalo. These ill-omened peoples are just senseless oppressors! Formerly their doings did not concern us much because the country was an enemy’s, but they began the same senseless work after we had taken it. When we reached Siālkot, they fell in tumult on poor and needy folks who were coming out of the town to our camp, and stripped them bare. I had the silly thieves sought for, and ordered two or three of them cut to pieces.

From Siālkot Nur Beg’s brother Shāham also was made to gallop off to the begs in Lāhor to say, “Make sure where the enemy is; find out from some well-informed person where he may be met, and send us word.”

A trader, coming into this camp, represented that ‘Ālam Khān had let Sl. Ibrāhim defeat him.

---

1 According to Shaikh Zain it was in this year that Bābur made Buhlulpūr a royal domain (B.M. Add. 26,202 f. 16), but this does not agree with Bābur’s explanation that he visited the place because it was *khalṣa.* Its name suggests that it had belonged to Buhlūl Lūdī; Bābur may have taken it in 930 AH. when he captured Siālkot. It never received the population of Siālkot, as Bābur had planned it should do because pond-water was drunk in the latter town and was a source of disease. The words in which Bābur describes its situation are those he uses of Akhsī (f. 49); not improbably a resemblance inclined his liking towards Buhlulpūr. (It may be noted that this Buhlulpūr is mentioned in the *Ayīn-i-akbarī* and marked on large maps, but is not found in the G. of I. 1907.)

2 Both names are thus spelled in the *Bābur-nāma.* In view of the inclination of Turki to long vowels, Bābur’s short one in Jat may be worth consideration since modern usage of Jat and Jāt varies. Mr. Crooke writes the full vowel, and mentions that Jats are Hindūs, Sikhs, and Muḥammadans (*Tribes and Castes of the North-western Provinces and Oude*, iii, 38). On this point and on the orthography of the name, Erskine’s note (*Memoirs* p. 294) is as follows: “The Jets or Jats are the Muhammadan peasantry of the Panj-āb, the bank of the Indus, Siwīstān etc. and must not be confounded with the Jāts, a powerful Hindū tribe to the west of the Jamma, about Agra etc. and which occupies a subordinate position in the country of the Rājpūts.”
(j. 'Ālam Khān's action and failure.\textsuperscript{1})

Here are the particulars:—'Ālam Khān, after taking leave of me (in Kābul, 931 AH.), went off in that heat by double marches, regardless of those with him.\textsuperscript{2} As at the time I gave him leave to go, all the Aūzbeg khāns and sultāns had laid siege to Balkh, I rode for Balkh as soon as I had given him his leave. On his reaching Lāhor, he insisted to the begs, “You reinforce me; the Pādshāh said so; march along with me; let us get (Apāq) Ghāzī Khān to join us; let us move on Dīlī and Āgra.” Said they, “Trusting to what, will you join Ghāzī Khān? Moreover the royal orders to us were, ‘If at any time Ghāzī Khān has sent his younger brother Ḥāji Khān with his son to Court, join him; or do so, if he has sent them, by way of pledge, to Lāhor; if he has done neither, do not join him.’ You yourself only yesterday fought him and let him beat you! Trusting to what, will you join him now? Besides all this, it is not for your advantage to join him!’ Having said what-not of this sort, they refused 'Ālam Khān. He did not fall in with their views, but sent his son Sher Khān to speak with Daulat Khān and with Ghāzī Khān, and afterwards all saw one another.

'Ālam Khān took with him Dilāwar Khān, who had come into Lāhor two or three months earlier after his escape from prison; he took also Maḥmūd Khān (son of) Khān-i-jahān,\textsuperscript{3} to

\textsuperscript{1} The following section contains a later addition to the diary summarizing the action of 'Ālam Khān before and after Bābur heard of the defeat from the trader he mentions. It refutes an opinion found here and there in European writings that Bābur used and threw over 'Ālam Khān. It and Bābur's further narrative shew that 'Ālam Khān had little valid backing in Hindūstān, that he contributed nothing to Bābur's success, and that no abstention by Bābur from attack on Ibrāhīm would have set 'Ālam Khān on the throne of Dīlī. It and other records, Bābur's and those of Afghān chroniclers, allow it to be said that if 'Ālam Khān had been strong enough to accomplish his share of the compact that he should take and should rule Dīlī, Bābur would have kept to his share, namely, would have maintained supremacy in the Panjāb. He advanced against Ibrāhīm only when 'Ālam Khān had totally failed in arms and in securing adherence.

\textsuperscript{2} This objurgation on over-rapid marching looks like the echo of complaint made to Bābur by men of his own whom he had given to 'Ālam Khān in Kābul.

\textsuperscript{3} Maḥmūd himself may have inherited his father's title Khān-i-jahān but a little further on he is specifically mentioned as the son of Khān-i-jahān, presumably because his father had been a more notable man than he was. Of his tribe it may be noted that ʻIllīdārābād MS. uniformly writes Nuhānī and not Luhānī as is usual in European writings, and that it does so even when, as on f. 149b, the word is applied to a trader. Concerning the tribe, family, or caste vide G. of I. s.n. Lohānas and Crooke l.c. s.n. Pathān, para. 21.
whom a pargana in the Lāhor district had been given. They seem to have left matters at this:—Daulat Khān with Ghāzī Khān was to take all the begs posted in Hindūstān to himself, indeed he was to take everything on that side;¹ while ‘Ālam Khān was to take Dilāwar Khān and Ḥāji Khān and, reinforced by them, was to capture Dihlī and Āgra. Ismā‘īl jilvānī and other amīrs came and saw ‘Ālam Khān; all then betook themselves, march by march, straight for Dihlī. Near Indrī came also Sulaimān Shaikh-zāda.² Their total touched 30 to 40,000 men.

They laid siege to Dihlī but could neither take it by assault nor do hurt to the garrison.³ When Sl. Ibrāhīm heard of their assembly, he got an army to horse against them; when they heard of his approach, they rose from before the place and moved to meet him. They had left matters at this:—“If we attack by day-light, the Afghāns will not desert (to us), for the sake of their reputations with one another; but if we attack at night when one man cannot see another, each man will obey his own orders.” Twice over they started at fall of day from a distance of 12 miles (6 kurohs), and, unable to bring matters to a point, neither advanced nor retired, but just sat on horseback for two or three watches. On a third occasion they delivered an attack when one watch of night remained—their purpose seeming to be the burning of tents and huts! They went; they set fire from every end; they made a disturbance. Jalāl Khān Jig-hat ⁴ came with other amirs and saw ‘Ālam Khān.

Sl. Ibrāhīm did not bestir himself till shoot of dawn from where he was with a few of his own family ⁵ within his own enclosure (sarācha). Meantime ‘Ālam Khān’s people were busy with plunder and booty. Seeing the smallness of their number, Sl. Ibrāhīm’s people moved out against them in rather small

¹ i.e. west of Dihlī territory, the Panj-āb.
² He was of the Farmul family of which Bābūr says (f. 139b) that it was in high favour in Hindūstān under the Afghāns and of which the author of the Wāqi‘at-i-muṣhāqī says that it held half the lands of Dihlī in jagīr (E. and D. iv, 547).
³ Presumably he could not cut off supplies.
⁴ The only word similar to this that I have found is one “Jaghat,” said to mean serpent and to be the name of a Hindī sub-caste of Nats (Crooke, iv, 72 & 73). The word here might be a nick-name. Bābūr writes it as two words.
⁵ khaṣa-khai, presumably members of the Sāhū-khai (family) of the Lūdī tribe of the Afghān race.
force with one elephant. ‘Ālam Khān’s party, not able to make stand against the elephant, ran away. He in his flight crossed over into the Miān-dū-āb and crossed back again when he reached the Pānīpat neighbourhood. In Indī he contrived on some pretext to get 4 laks from Miān Sulaimān.1 He was deserted by Ismā’īl Jilwānī, by Biban 2 and by his own oldest son Jalāl, who all withdrew into the Miān-dū-āb; and he had been deserted just before the fighting, by part of his troops, namely, by Daryā Khān (Nūhānī)’s son Saif Khān, by Khān-i-jahān (Nūhānī)’s son Maḥmūd Khān, and by Shaikh Jamāl Farmulī. When he was passing through Sihrīnd with Dīlawar Khān, he heard of our advance and of our capture of Milwāt (Malot).3 On this Dīlawar Khān—who always had been my well-wisher and on my account had dragged out three or four months in prison,—left ‘Ālam Khān and the rest and went to his family in Sultānpūr. He waited on me three or four days after we took Milwāt. ‘Ālam Khān and Ḥājī Khān crossed the Shatlut (sic)-water and went into Gingūta,4 one of the strongholds in the range that lies between the valley and the plain.5 There our Afgān and Hazārā6 troops besieged them, and had almost taken that strong fort when night came on. Those inside were thinking of escape but could not get out because of the press of horses in the Gate. There must have been elephants also; when these were urged forward, they trod down and killed many horses. ‘Ālam Khān, unable to escape mounted, got out on foot in the darkness. After a lak of difficulties, he joined Ghāzī Khān, who had not gone into Milwāt but had fled into the

1 Erskine suggested that this man was a rich banker, but he might well be the Farmulī Shaikh-zāda of f. 256b, in view of the exchange Afgān historians make of the Farmulī title Shaikh for Miān (Tarikh-i-sher-shāhī, E. & D. iv, 347 and Tarikh-i-daudi ib. 457).

2 This Biban, or Bībān, as Bābur always calls him without title, is Malik Bībān Jilwānī. He was associated with Shaikh Bāyzād Farmulī or, as Afgān writers style him, Miān Bāyzād Farmulī. (Another of his name was Miān Bībān, son of Miān Ātā Sāḥīb-khālī (E. & D. iv, 347).)

3 This name occurs so frequently in and about the Panj-āb as to suggest that it means a fort (Ar. maruzat?). This one in the Sīwāliks was founded by Tātār Khān Yūsuf-khālī (Lūdī) in the time of Buhūl Lūdī (E. and D. iv, 415).

4 In the Beth Jalandhār dī-āb.

5 i.e. on the Sīwāliks, here locally known as Katār Dhār.

6 Presumably they were from the Hazārā district east of the Indus. The Tabaqāt-i-akbarī mentions that this detachment was acting under Khaliq apart from Bābur and marching through the skirt-hills (lith. ed. p. 182).
hills. Not being received with even a little friendliness by Ghāzī Khān; needs must! he came and waited on me at the foot of the dale \(^1\) near Pehlūr.

\((k.\, Diary\, resumed.\))

A person came to Sīālkot from the Lāhor begs to say they would arrive early next morning to wait on me.

\((Dec.\, 30th)\) Marching early next day (Rabī' I. 15th), we dismounted at Parsūr. There Muḥ. 'Alī Jang-jang, Khwāja Ḥusain and several braves waited on me. As the enemy’s camp seemed to be on the Lāhor side of the Rāvī, we sent men out under Būjka for news. Near the third watch of the night they brought word that the enemy, on hearing of us, had fled, no man looking to another.

\((Dec.\, 31st)\) Getting early to horse and leaving baggage and train in the charge of Shāh Mīr Ḥusain and Jān Beg, we bestirred ourselves. We reached Kalānūr in the afternoon, and there dismounted. Muḥammad Sl. Mīrzā and 'Ādīl Sl.\(^2\) came to wait on me there, together with some of the begs.

\((Jan.\, 1st\, 1526\, AD.)\) We marched early from Kalānūr. On the road people gave us almost certain news of Ghāzī Khān and other fugitives. Accordingly we sent, flying after those fliers, the commanders Muḥammadādī, Aḥmādā, Qūtlūq-qadam, Treasurer Wālī and most of those begs who, in Kābul, had recently bent the knee for their begship. So far it was settled:—That it would be good indeed if they could overtake and capture the fugitives; and that, if they were not able to do this, they were to keep careful watch round Milwat (Malot), so as to prevent those inside from getting out and away. Ghāzī Khān was the object of this watch.

\((l.\, Capture\, of\, Milwat.\))

\((Jan.\, 2nd\, and\, 3rd)\) After starting those begs ahead, we crossed the Bīāh-water (Beas) opposite Kanwāhin \(^3\) and dismounted. From there we marched to the foot of the valley of Fort Milwat, making two night-halts on the way. The begs who

\(^1\) dun, f. 260 and note.
\(^2\) These were both refugees from Harāt.
\(^3\) Sarkār of Baṭāla, in the Bārī dū-āb (A.-i.-A. Jarrett, p. 110).
had arrived before us, and also those of Hindūstān were ordered to dismount in such a way as to besiege the place closely.

A grandson of Daulat Khān, son of his eldest son 'Alī Khān, Ismā'īl Khān by name, came out of Milwat to see me; he took back promise mingled with threat, kindness with menace.

(Jan. 5th) On Friday (Rabī' I. 21st) I moved camp forward to within a mile of the fort, went myself to examine the place, posted right, left and centre, then returned to camp.

Daulat Khān sent to represent to me that Ghāzī Khān had fled into the hills, and that, if his own faults were pardoned, he would take service with me and surrender Milwat. Khwāja Mīr-i-mīrān was sent to chase fear from his heart and to escort him out; he came, and with him his son 'Alī Khān. I had ordered that the two swords he had girt to his waist to fight me with, should be hung from his neck. Was such a rustic blockhead possible! With things as they were, he still made pretensions! When he was brought a little forward, I ordered the swords to be removed from his neck. At the time of our seeing one another he hesitated to kneel; I ordered them to pull his leg and make him do so. I had him seated quite in front, and ordered a person well acquainted with Hindūstān to interpret my words to him, one after another. Said I, "Thus speak:—I called thee Father. I shewed thee more honour and respect than thou couldst have asked. Thee and thy sons I saved from door-to-door life amongst the Balūchīs. Thy family and thy haram I freed from Ibrāhīm's prison-house. Three kārs I gave thee on Tātār Khān's lands. What ill sayest thou I have done thee, that thus thou shouldst hang a sword on thy either side, lead an army out, fall on lands of ours, and stir strife and trouble?" Dumbfounded, the old man

1 kūrūshār wāqīt (Index s.n. kūrūsh).
2 Bābūr's phrasing suggests beggary.
3 This might refer to the time when Ibrāhīm's commander Bihār (Bahādur) Khān Nūhān took Lāhor (Translator's Note in loco p. 441).
4 They were his father's. Erskine estimated the 3 kārs at £75,000.
5 shīq, what hangs on either side, perhaps a satirical reference to the ass' burden.
6 As illustrating Bābūr's claim to rule as a Timūrid in Hindūstān, it may be noted that in 814 AH. (1411 AD.), Khizr Khān who is allowed by the date to have been a Sayyid ruler in Dihli, sent an embassy to Shāhrukh Mirzā the then Timūrid ruler of Samarkand to acknowledge his suzerainty (Mafla'u's-sa'dāin, Quatremère, N. et Ex. xiv, 196).
Fol. 259. stuttered a few words, but he gave no answer, nor indeed could answer be given to words so silencing. He was ordered to remain with Khwāja Mir-i-mīrān.

(Jan. 6th) On Saturday the 22nd of the first Rabi‘, I went myself to safeguard the exit of the families and ḥarams \(^1\) from the fort, dismounting on a rise opposite the Gate. To me there came ‘Alī Khān and made offering of a few ashrafīs. People began to bring out the families just before the Other Prayer. Though Ghāzi Khān was reported to have got away, there were who said they had seen him in the fort. For this reason several of the household and braves \(^2\) were posted at the Gate, in order to prevent his escape by a ruse, for to get away was his full intention. \(^3\) Moreover if jewels and other valuables were being taken away by stealth, they were to be confiscated. I spent that night in a tent pitched on the rise in front of the Gate.

(Jan. 7th) Early next morning, Muḥammad, Aḥmadī, Sl. Junaid, ‘Abdu‘l-‘azīz, Muḥammad ‘Alī Jang-jang and Qāṭlūq-qadām were ordered to enter the fort and take possession of all effects. As there was much disturbance at the Gate, I shot off a few arrows by way of chastisement. Humāyūn’s story-teller (qiṣṣa-khwān) was struck by the arrow of his destiny and at once surrendered his life.

(Jan. 7th and 8th) After spending two nights \(^4\) on the rise, I inspected the fort. I went into Ghāzi Khān’s book-room; \(^5\) some of the precious things found in it, I gave to Humāyūn, some sent to Kāmrān (in Qandahār). There were many books of learned contents, \(^6\) but not so many valuable ones as had at first appeared. I passed that night in the fort; next morning I went back to camp.

(Jan. 9th) It had been in our minds that Ghāzi Khān was in the fort, but he, a man devoid of nice sense of honour, had

---

1 Firishta says that Bābur mounted for the purpose of preserving the honour of the Afghāns and by so doing enabled the families in the fort to get out of it safely (lith. ed. p. 204).
2 chūra; they will have been of the Corps of braves (yīgit; Appendix II. section c.).
3 kim kullī gharz aul aṣīrī; Pers. trs. ka gharz-i-kullī-i-au būd.
4 Persice, the eves of Sunday and Monday; Anglice, Saturday and Sunday nights.
5 Ghāzi Khān was learned and a poet (Firishta ii, 42).
6 mullayāna khūd, perhaps books of learned topic but not in choice copies.
escaped to the hills, abandoning father, brethren and sisters in Milwat.

See that man without honour who never
The face of good luck shall behold;
Bodily ease he chose for himself,
In hardship he left wife and child (Gulistan cap. i, story 17).

(Jan. 10th) Leaving that camp on Wednesday, we moved towards the hills to which Ghāzī Khān had fled. When we dismounted in the valley-bottom two miles from the camp in the mouth of Milwat,1 Dilāwar Khān came and waited on me. Daulat Khān, ‘Alī Khān and Ismā‘īl Khān, with other chiefs, were given into Kitta Beg’s charge who was to convey them to the Bhīra fort of Milwat (Malot),2 and there keep guard over them. In agreement with Dilāwar Khān, blood-ransom was fixed for some who had been made over each to one man; some gave security, some were kept prisoner. Daulat Khān died when Kitta Beg reached Sultānpūr with the prisoners.3

Milwat was given into the charge of Muh. ‘Alī Jang-jang who, pledging his own life for it, left his elder brother Arghūn and a party of braves in it. A body of from 200 to 250 Afghāns were told off to reinforce him.

Khwāja Kalān had loaded several camels with Ghaznī wines. A party was held in his quarters overlooking the fort and the whole camp, some drinking ‘arag, some wine. It was a varied party.

(m. Jaswān-valley.)

Marching on, we crossed a low hill of the grazing-grounds (arghā-dāl-līq) of Milwat and went into the dūn, as Hindūstānis

---

1 f. 257. It stands in 31° 50’ N. and 76° E. (G. of I.).
2 This is on the Salt-range, in 32° 42’ N. and 72° 50’ E. (Āyīn-i-akbārī trs. Jarrett, i, 325; Provincial Gazetteer, Jihlam District).
3 He died therefore in the town he himself built. Kitta Beg probably escorted the Afghan families from Milwat also; Dilāwar Khān’s own seems to have been there already (f. 257).

The Bābur-nāma makes no mention of Daulat Khān’s relations with Nānak, the founder of the Sikh religion, nor does it mention Nānak himself. A tradition exists that Nānak, when on his travels, made exposition of his doctrines to an attentive Bābur and that he was partly instrumental in bringing Bābur against the Afghāns. He was 12 years older than Bābur and survived him nine. (Cf. Dabīstān lith. ed. p. 270; and, for Jahāṅgīr Pādshāh’s notice of Daulat Khān, Tūzuk-i-jahāngīrī, Rogers and Beveridge, p. 87).
are understood to call a dale (julga).\(^1\) In this dale is a running-water\(^2\) of Hindūstān; along its sides are many villages; and it is said to be the pargana of the Jaswāl, that is to say, of Dilāwar Khān's maternal uncles. It lies there shut-in, with meadows along its torrent, rice cultivated here and there, a three or four mill-stream flowing in its trough, its width from two to four miles, six even in places, villages on the skirts of its hills—hillocks they are rather—where there are no villages, peacocks, monkeys, and many fowls which, except that they are mostly of one colour, are exactly like house-fowls.

As no reliable news was had of Ghāzī Khān, we arranged for Tardīka to go with Bīrīm Deo Malinhās and capture him wherever he might be found.

In the hills of this dale stand thoroughly strong forts; one on the north-east, named Kūtīla, has sides 70 to 80 yards (qārī) of straight fall, the side where the great gate is being perhaps 7 or 8 yards.\(^3\) The width of the place where the draw-bridge is made, may be 10 to 12 yards. Across this they have made a bridge of two tall trees\(^4\) by which horses and herds are taken over. This was one of the local forts Ghāzī Khān had strengthened; his man will have been in it now. Our raiders (chāpqūncī) assaulted it and had almost taken it when night came on. The garrison abandoned this difficult place and went off. Near this dale is also the stronghold of Ginguta; it is girt

\(^1\) I translate dūn by dale because, as its equivalent, Bābur uses julga by which he describes a more pastoral valley than one he calls a dara.

\(^2\) bīr āqār-sū. Bābur's earlier uses of this term [q.v. index] connect it with the swift flow of water in irrigation channels; this may be so here but also the term may make distinction between the rapid mountain-stream and the slow movement of rivers across plains.

\(^3\) There are two readings of this sentence; Erskine's implies that the neck of land connecting the fort-rock with its adjacent hill measures 7–8 qārī (yards) from side to side; de Courteille's that where the great gate was, the perpendicular fall surrounding the fort shallowed to 7–8 yards. The Turkī might be read, I think, to mean which-ever alternative was the fact. Erskine's reading best bears out Bābur's account of the strength of the fort, since it allows of a cleft between the hill and the fort some 140–160 feet deep, as against the 21–24 of de Courteille's. Erskine may have been in possession of information [in 1826] by which he guided his translation (p. 300), "At its chief gate, for the space of 7 or 8 gez (qārī), there is a place that admits of a draw-bridge being thrown across; it may be 10 or 12 gez wide." If de Courteille's reading be correct in taking 7–8 qārī only to be the depth of the cleft, that cleft may be artificial.

\(^4\) yīghāch, which also means wood.
round by precipices as Kūtila is, but is not so strong as Kūtila. As has been mentioned 'Ālam Khān went into it.\(^1\) (n. Bābur advances against Ibrāhīm.)

After despatching the light troop against Ghāzi Khān, I put my foot in the stirrup of resolution, set my hand on the rein of trust in God, and moved forward against Sultan Ibrāhīm, son of Sultan Sikandar, son of Buhlūl Lūdī Afgān, in possession of whose throne at that time were the Dihlī capital and the dominions of Hindūstān, whose standing-army was called a lak (100,000), whose elephants and whose begging' elephants were about 1000.

At the end of our first stage, I bestowed Dībālpūr on Bāqī shaghāwval\(^2\) and sent him to help Balkh\(^3\); sent also gifts, taken in the success of Milwat, for (my) younger children and various train in Kābul.

When we had made one or two marches down the (Jaswān) dīn, Shāh 'Imād Shīrāzī arrived from Araish Khān and Mullā Muḥammad Mazhab,\(^4\) bringing letters that conveyed their good wishes for the complete success of our campaign and indicated their effort and endeavour towards this. In response, we sent, by a foot-man, royal letters expressing our favour. We then marched on.

\(^1\) f. 257.
\(^2\) chief scribe (f. 13 n. to 'Abdu'l-wahhab). Shaw's Vocabulary explains the word as meaning also a "high official of Central Asian sovereigns, who is supreme over all qāsīs and mullās.
\(^3\) Bābur's persistent interest in Balkh attracts attention, especially at this time so shortly before he does not include it as part of his own territories (f. 270).

Since I wrote of Balkh s.a. 923 AH. (1517 AD.), I have obtained the following particulars about it in that year; they are summarized from the Ḥabību's-siyar (lit. ed. iii., 371). In 923 AH. Khwānd-amīr was in retirement at Pasht in Ghūrjistān where also was Muḥammad-i-zamān Mīrzā. The two went in company to Balkh where the Mīrzā besieged Bābur's man Ibrāhīm chapūk (Slash-face), and treacherously murdered one Aūrdū-shāh, an envoy sent out to parley with him. Information of what was happening was sent to Bābur in Kābul. Bābur reached Balkh when it had been besieged a month. His presence caused the Mīrzā to retire and led him to go into the Darā-i-gaz (Tamarind-valley). Bābur, placing in Balkh Faqīr-i-'āli, one of those just come up with him, followed the Mīrzā but turned back at Aq-gumbaz (White-dome) which lies between Chāch-charān in the Herī-rād valley and the Ghūrjistān border, going no further because the Ghūrjistānīs favoured the Mīrzā. Bābur went back to Kābul by the Firūz-koh, Yaka-aūlāng (cf. f. 195) and Ghūr; the Mīrzā was followed up by others, captured and conveyed to Kābul.

\(^4\) Both were amīrs of Hind. I understand the cognomen Mazhab to imply that its bearer occupied himself with the Muḥammadan Faith in its exposition by divines of Islam (Hughes' Dictionary of Islām).
(O. Ālam Khān takes refuge with Bābur.)

The light troop we had sent out from Milwat (Malot), took Hurūr, Kahlūr and all the hill-forts of the neighbourhood—places to which because of their strength, no-one seemed to have gone for a long time—and came back to me after plundering a little. Came also Ālam Khān, on foot, ruined, stripped bare. We sent some of the begs to give him honourable meeting, sent horses too, and he waited (malāzamat qıldī) in that neighbourhood.¹

Raiders of ours went into the hills and valleys round-about, but after a few nights' absence, came back without anything to count. Shāh Mīr Ḥusain, Jān Beg and a few of the braves asked leave and went off for a raid.

(p. Incidents of the march for Pānī-pat.)

While we were in the (Jaswān) dūn, dutiful letters had come more than once from Ismā'īl Jilwānī and Biban; we replied to them from this place by royal letters such as their hearts desired. After we got out of the dale to Rūpar, it rained very much and became so cold that a mass of starved and naked Hindūstānis died.

When we had left Rūpar and were dismounted at Karal,² opposite Sihrind, a Hindūstānī coming said, “I am Sl. Ibrāhīm’s envoy,” and though he had no letter or credentials, asked for an envoy from us. We responded at once by sending one or two Sawādī night-guards (tunqīṭār).³ These humble persons Ibrāhīm put in prison; they made their escape and came back to us on the very day we beat him.

After having halted one night on the way, we dismounted on the bank of the torrent⁴ of Banūr and Sanūr. Great rivers

¹ These incidents are included in the summary of Ālam Khān’s affairs in section 1 (f. 255b). It will be observed that Bābur’s wording implies the “waiting” by one of lower rank on a superior.
² Elph. MS. Karnāl, obviously a clerical error.
³ Shaikh Sulaimān Effendi (Kunos) describes a tunqīṭār as the guardian in war of a prince’s tent; a night-guard; and as one who repeats a prayer aloud while a prince is mounting.
⁴ ūrd, which, inappropriate for the lower course of the Ghaggar, may be due to Bābur’s visit to its upper course described immediately below. As has been noted, however, he uses the word ūrd to describe the empty bed of a mountain-stream as well as the swift water sometimes filling that bed. The account, here-following, of his visit to the upper course of the Ghaggar is somewhat difficult to translate.
apart, one running water there is in Hindūstān, is this⁠¹; they call it the water of Kakar (Ghaggar). Chitr also is on its bank. We rode up it for an excursion. The rising-place (ṣīk) of the water of this torrent (rūḍ) is 3 or 4 kurohs (6–8 m.) above Chitr. Going up the (Kakar) torrent, we came to where a 4 or 5 mill-stream issues from a broad (side-)valley (dāra), up which there are very pleasant places, healthy and convenient. I ordered a Chār-bāgh to be made at the mouth of the broad valley of this (tributary) water, which falls into the (Kakar-) torrent after flowing for one or two kurohs through level ground. From its infall to the springs of the Kakar the distance may be 3 to 4 kurohs (6–8 m.). When it comes down in flood during the rains and joins the Kakar, they go together to Sāmāna and Sanām.²

In this camp we heard that Sl. Ibrāhīm had been on our side of Dīlī and had moved on from that station, also that Ḥaṃūd Khān khāṣa-khail,³ the military-collector (ṣiqdār) of Ḥiṣār-fīrūza, had left that place with its army and with the army of its neighbourhood, and had advanced 10 or 15 kurohs (20–30 m.). Kitta Beg was sent for news to Ibrāhīm’s camp, and Mumin Āṭaka to the Ḥiṣār-fīrūza camp.

(q. Humāyūn moves against Ḥaṃūd Khān.)

(Feb. 25th) Marching from Ambāla, we dismounted by the side of a lake. There Mumin Āṭaka and Kitta Beg rejoined us, both on the same day, Sunday the 13th of the first Jumāda.

We appointed Humāyūn to act against Ḥaṃūd Khān, and joined the whole of the right (wing) to him, that is to say, Khwāja Kalān, Sl. Muḥammad Dūldāī, Treasurer Wali, and also some of the begs whose posts were in Hindūstān, namely, Khusrāu, Hindū Beg, ‘Abdu’l-azīz and Muḥammad ‘Ali Jang-jang, with also, from the household and braves of the centre, Shāh Maṃṣūr Barlās, Kitta Beg and Muḥibb-i ‘alī.

⁠¹ Hindūstāndā daryālārdīn bāṣha, bīr āgār-sū kīm bār (dār, is added by the Elph. MS.), bā dār. Perhaps the meaning is that the one (chief?) irrigation stream, apart from great rivers, is the Ghaggar. The bed of the Ghaggar is undefined and the water is consumed for irrigation (G. of I. xx, 33; Index s.n. āgār-sū).

² Presumably he was of Ibrāhīm’s own family, the Sāhū-khail. His defeat was opportune because he was on his way to join the main army.
Biban waited on me in this camp. These Afghāns remain very rustic and tactless! This person asked to sit although Dilāwar Khān, his superior in following and in rank, did not sit, and although the sons of ‘Ālam Khān, who are of royal birth, did not sit. Little ear was lent to his unreason!

(Feb. 26th) At dawn on Monday the 14th Humāyūn moved out against Ḥamīd Khān. After advancing for some distance, he sent between 100 and 150 braves scouting ahead, who went close up to the enemy and at once got to grips. But when after a few encounters, the dark mass of Humāyūn’s troops shewed in the rear, the enemy ran right away. Humāyūn’s men unhorsed from 100 to 200, struck the heads off one half and brought the other half in, together with 7 or 8 elephants.

(March 2nd) On Friday the 18th of the month, Beg Mīrak Mughūl brought news of Humāyūn’s victory to the camp. He (Humāyūn?) was there and then given a special head-to-foot and a special horse from the royal stable, besides promise of guerdon (juldū).

(March 5th) On Monday the 25th of the month, Humāyūn arrived to wait on me, bringing with him as many as 100 prisoners and 7 or 8 elephants. Ustād ‘Alī-qiūlī and the matchlockmen were ordered to shoot all the prisoners, by way of example. This had been Humāyūn’s first affair, his first experience of battle; it was an excellent omen!

Our men who had gone in pursuit of the fugitives, took Ḥiṣār-fīrūza at once on arrival, plundered it, and returned to us. It was given in guerdon to Humāyūn, with all its dependencies and appurtenances, with it also a kror of money.

We marched from that camp to Shāhābād. After we had despatched a news-gatherer (ṭīl-ṭūṭār kīshī) to Sl. Ibrāhīm’s camp, we stayed a few days on that ground. ṭāḥmat the foot-man was sent with the letters of victory to Kābul.

(r. News of Ibrāhīm.)

(March 13th) On Monday the 28th of the first Jumāda,1 we being in that same camp, the Sun entered the Sign of the Ram.

1 At this place the Elphinstone Codex has preserved, interpolated in its text, a note of Humāyūn’s on his first use of the razor. Part of it is written as by Bābur:—
News had come again and again from Ibrāhīm's camp, "He is coming, marching two miles" or "four miles", "stopping in each camp two days," or "three days". We for our part advanced from Shāhābād and after halting on two nights, reached the bank of the Jūn-river (Jumna) and encamped opposite Sarsāwa. From that ground Khwāja Kalān's servant Ḥaidar-qulī was sent to get news (tīl tūtā).

Having crossed the Jūn-river at a ford, I visited Sarsāwa. That day also we ate maʃjūn. Sarsāwa has a source (chashma) from which a smallish stream issues, not a bad place! Tardi Beg khāksār praising it, I said, "Let it be thine!" so just because he praised it, Sarsāwa was given to him!

I had a platform fixed in a boat and used to go for excursions on the river, sometimes too made the marches down it. Two marches along its bank had been made when, of those sent to gather news, Ḥaidar-qulī brought word that Ibrāhīm had sent Daud Khān (Lūdī) and Ḥātim Khān (Lūdī) across the river into the Mīān-dū-āb (Tween-waters) with 5 or 6000 men, and that these lay encamped some 6 or 7 miles from his own.

(April 1st) On Sunday the 18th of the second Jumāda, we went, to ride light against this force, Chīn-tīmūr Sulṭān,²

"Today in this same camp the razor or scissors was applied to Humāyūn's face." Part is signed by Humāyūn:—"As the honoured dead, earlier in these Acts (wāqī'āt) mentions the first application of the razor to his own face (f. 120), so in imitation of him I mention this. I was then at the age of 18; now I am at the age of 48, I who am the sub-signed Muhammad Humāyūn." A scribe's note attests that this is "copied from the hand-writing of that honoured one". As Humāyūn's 48th (lunar) birthday occurred a month before he left Kābul, to attempt the re-conquest of Hindūstān, in November 1554 AD. (in the last month of 961 AH.), he was still 48 (lunar) years old on the day he re-entered Dihli on July 23rd 1555 AD. (Ramzān 1st 962 AH.), so that this "shaving passage" will have been entered within those dates. That he should study his Father's book at that time is natural; his grandson Jahāngīr did the same when going to Kābul; so doubtless would do its author's more remote descendants, the sons of Shāh-jahān who reconquered Transoxiana.

(Concerning the "shaving passage" vide the notes on the Elphinstone Codex in JRAS. 1900 p. 443, 451; 1902 p. 653; 1905 p. 754; and 1907 p. 131.)

² This ancient town of the Sahāranpūr district is associated with a saint revered by Hindūs and Muḥammadans. Cf. W. Crooke's Popular Religion of Northern India p. 133. Its chashma may be inferred (from Bābur's uses of the word q.v. Index) as a water-head, a pool, a gathering place of springs.

² He was the eighth son of Bābur's maternal-uncle Sl. Ahmad Khān Chaghatāī and had fled to Bābur, other brothers following him, from the service of their eldest brother Manṣūr, Khāqān of the Mughūls (Ṭārīkh-i-rashīdī trs. p. 161).
Mahdi Khwāja, Muḥammad Sl. Mīrzā, ‘Ādil Sulṭān, and the whole of the left, namely, Sl. Junaid, Shāh Mīr Ḥusain, Qūṭlūq-qadam, and with them also sent ‘Abdu'l-lāh and Kitta Beg (of the centre). They crossed from our side of the water at the Mid-day Prayer, and between the Afternoon and the Evening Prayers bestirred themselves from the other bank. Biban having crossed the water on pretext of this movement, ran away.

(April 2nd) At day-break they came upon the enemy;¹ he made as if coming out in a sort of array, but our men closed with his at once, overcame them, hustled them off, pursued and unhorsed till they were opposite Ibrāhīm’s own camp. Ḫātim Khān was one of those unhorsed, who was Daud Khān (Lūdī)’s elder brother and one of his commanders. Our men brought him in when they waited on me. They brought also 60–70 prisoners and 6 or 7 elephants. Most of the prisoners, by way of warning, were made to reach their death-doom.

(t. Preparations for battle.)

While we were marching on in array of right, left and centre, the army was numbered;² it did not count up to what had been estimated.

At our next camp it was ordered that every man in the army should collect carts, each one according to his circumstances. Seven hundred carts (arāba) were brought³ in. The order given

---

¹ farz-wagīt, when there is light enough to distinguish one object from another.
² dīm kūrūltī (Index s.n. dīm). Here the L. & E. Memoirs inserts an explanatory passage in Persian about the dīm. It will have been in one of the Wāghi‘āt-i-bāburi MSS. Erskine used; it is in Muh. Şirāzi’s lithograph copy of the Udaipur Codex (p. 173). It is not in the Turki text or in all the MSS. of the Persian translation. Manifestly, it was entered at a time when Bābur’s term dīm kūrūltī requires explanation in Hindustan. The writer of it himself does not make details clear; he says only, “It is manifest that people declare (the number) after counting the mounted army in the way agreed upon amongst them, with a whip or a bow held in the hand.” This explanation suggests that in the march-past the troops were measured off as so many bow- or whip-lengths (Index s.n. dīm).
³ These arāba may have been the baggage-carts of the army and also carts procured on the spot. Erskine omits (Memoirs p. 304) the words which show how many carts were collected and from whom. Doubtless it would be through not having these circumstances in his mind that he took the arāba for gun-carriages. His incomplete translation, again, led Stanley Lane-Poole to write an interesting note in his Bābur (p. 161) to support Erskine against de Courteille (with whose rendering mine agrees) by quoting the circumstance that Humāyūn had 700 guns at Qanauj in 1540 A.D. It must be said in opposition to his support of Erskine’s “gun-carriages” that there is no textual or circumstantial warrant for supposing Bābur to have had guns, even if
to Ustād Ḥusainī was that these carts should be joined together in
Ottoman fashion, but using ropes of raw hide instead of
chains, and that between every two carts 5 or 6 mantelets should
be fixed, behind which the matchlockmen were to stand to fire.
To allow of collecting all appliances, we delayed 5 or 6 days in
that camp. When everything was ready, all the beggs with such
braves as had had experience in military affairs were summoned
to a General Council where opinion found decision at this:—
Pani-pat\(^2\) is there with its crowded houses and suburbs. It
would be on one side of us; our other sides must be protected
by carts and mantelets behind which our foot and matchlockmen
would stand. With so much settled we marched forward, halted
one night on the way, and reached Pani-pat on Thursday the
last day (29th) of the second Jumāda (April 12th).

\((u. \text{ The opposed forces.})\)

On our right was the town of Pani-pat with its suburbs; in
front of us were the carts and mantelets we had prepared; on
our left and elsewhere were ditch and branch. At distances of
an arrow's flight\(^3\) sally-places were left for from 100 to 200
horsemen.

Some in the army were very anxious and full of fear. Nothing
recommends anxiety and fear. For why? Because what God
has fixed in eternity cannot be changed. But though this is so,
it was no reproach to be afraid and anxious. For why? Because
those thus anxious and afraid were there with a two or three
months' journey between them and their homes; our affair was
made in parts, in such number as to demand 700 gun-carriages for their transport.
What guns Bābur had at Pani-pat will have been brought from his Kabul base; if he
had acquired any, say from Lāhor, he would hardly omit to mention such an important
reinforcement of his armament; if he had brought many guns on carts from Kabul, he
must have met with transit-difficulties harassing enough to chronicle, while he was
making that long journey from Kabul to Pani-pat, over passes, through skirt-hills and
many fords. The elephants he had in Bīgām may have been his transport for what
guns he had; he does not mention his number at Pani-pat; he makes his victory a
bow-man's success; he can be read as indicating that he had two guns only.

\(^1\) These Ottoman (text, Kūmī, Roman) defences Ustād 'Ali-qulī may have seen at
the battle of Chaldirān fought some 40 leagues from Tabriz between Sl. Salim Kūmī
and Shāh Ismā'īl Safawī on Rajab 1st 920 AH. (Aug. 22nd 1514 AD.). Of this battle
Khwānd-amīr gives a long account, dwelling on the effective use made in it of chained
carts and palisades (Habībī's-siyar iii, part 4, p. 78; Akbar-nāma trs. i, 241).

\(^2\) Is this the village of the Pani Aghāns?

\(^3\) Index s.n. arrow.
with a foreign tribe and people; none knew their tongue, nor did they know ours:—

A wandering band, with mind awander;  
In the grip of a tribe, a tribe unfamiliar.  

People estimated the army opposing us at 100,000 men; Ibrāhīm’s elephants and those of his amirs were said to be about 1000. In his hands was the treasure of two forbears.  

In Hindūstān, when work such as this has to be done, it is customary to pay out money to hired retainers who are known as b:d-hindi.  

If it had occurred to Ibrāhīm to do this, he might have had another lak or two of troops. God brought it right! Ibrāhīm could neither content his braves, nor share out his treasure. How should he content his braves when he was ruled by avarice and had a craving insatiable to pile coin on coin?  

He was an unproved brave; he provided nothing for his military operations, he perfected nothing, nor stand, nor move, nor fight.

In the interval at Pānī-pat during which the army was preparing defence on our every side with cart, ditch and branch, Darwish-i-muḥammad Sārbān had once said to me, “With such precautions taken, how is it possible for him to come?” Said I, “Are you likening him to the Aūzbeg khāns and sultāns?

These two lines do not translate easily without the context of their original place of occurrence. I have not found their source.

As to the form of this word the authoritative MSS. of the Turkī text agree and with them also numerous good ones of the Persian translation. I have made careful examination of the word because it is replaced or explained here and there in MSS. by s:ęb:ndi, the origin of which is said to be obscure. The sense of b:d-hindi and of s:ęb:ndi is the same, i.e. irregular levy. The word as Bābur wrote it must have been understood by earlier Indian scribes of both the Turki and Persian texts of the Bābur-nāma. Some light on its correctness may be thought given by Hobson Jobson (Crooke’s ed. p. 136) s:n. Byde or Bede Horse, where the word Byde is said to be an equivalent of pindari, loot, and gāssqāg, raider, plunderer, so that Bābur’s word b:d-hindi may mean gāssqāg of Hind. Wherever I have referred to the word in many MSS. it is pointed to read b:d, and not p:d, thus affording no warrant for understanding pad, foot, foot-man, infantry, and also negating the spelling bid, i.e. with a long vowel as in Byde.

It may be noted here that Muh. Shīrāzī (p. 174) substituted s:ęb:ndi for Bābur’s word and that this led our friend the late William Irvine to attribute mistake to de Courtetille who follows the Turkī text (Army of the Mughuls p. 66 and Mémoires ii, 163).

bī tajraḥa yīgīt aīdī of which the sense may be that Bābur ranked Ibrāhīm, as a soldier, with a brave who has not yet proved himself deserving of the rank of beg. It cannot mean that he was a youth (yīgīt) without experience of battle.
In what of movement under arms or of planned operations is he to be compared with them?" God brought it right! Things fell out just as I said!

(Author's note on the Aūzbeg chiefs.) When I reached Hisâr in the year I left Samarkand (918 AH.-1512 AD.), and all the Aūzbeg khâns and sultâns gathered and came against us, we brought the families and the goods of the Mughuls and soldiers into the Hisâr suburbs and fortified these by closing the lanes. As those khâns and sultâns were experienced in equipment, in planned operations, and in resolute resistance, they saw from our fortification of Hisâr that we were determined on life or death within it, saw they could not count on taking it by assault and, therefore, retired at once from near Nûndâk of Chaghâniân.

(v. Preliminary encounters.)

During the 7 or 8 days we lay in Pâñi-pat, our men used to go, a few together, close up to Ibrâhîm's camp, rain arrows down on his massed troops, cut off and bring in heads. Still he made no move; nor did his troops sally out. At length, we acted on the advice of several Hindustânî well-wishers and sent out 4 or 5000 men to deliver a night-attack on his camp, the leaders of it being Mahdî Khwâja, Muhammad Sl. Mîrzâ, 'Ādîl Sultan, Khusrau, Shâh Mir Êhusain, Sl. Junaid Barlâs, 'Abdu'l-azîz the Master of the Horse, Muḥ. 'Ali Jang-jang, Qûtlûq-qadam, Treasurer Wâlî, Khalîfa's Muḥîbb-i-'âli, Pay-master Muḥamnad, Jân Beg and Qârâ-qûzi. It being dark, they were not able to act together well, and, having scattered, could effect nothing on arrival. They stayed near Ibrâhîm's camp till dawn, when the nagaret sounded and troops of his came out in array with elephants. Though our men did not do their work, they got off safe and sound; not a man of them was killed, though they were in touch with such a mass of foes. One arrow pierced Muḥ. 'Ali Jang-jang's leg; though the wound was not mortal, he was good-for-nothing on the day of battle.

On hearing of this affair, I sent off Humâyûn and his troops to go 2 or 3 miles to meet them, and followed him myself with the rest of the army in battle-array. The party of the night-attack joined him and came back with him. The enemy making no further advance, we returned to camp and dismounted. That night a false alarm fell on the camp; for some 20 minutes (one gârî) there were uproar and call-to-arms; the disturbance died down after a time.
(w. Battle of Pānī-pat.1)

(April 20th) On Friday the 8th of Rajab,2 news came, when it was light enough to distinguish one thing from another (fars-wagti) that the enemy was advancing in fighting-array. We at once put on mail,3 armed and mounted.4 Our right was Humāyūn, Khwāja Kalān, Sultan Muhammad Dūldār, Hindū Beg, Treasurer Wāli and Pir-quli Sīstānī; our left was Muhammad Sl. Mirzā, Mahdi Khwāja, ʿĀdil Sultan, Shāh Mir Ḥusain, Sl. Junaid Barlās, Qātluq-qadam, Jān Beg, Pay-master Muhammad, and Shah Ḥusain (of) Yāragī Mughūl Ghānchī (?).5 The right hand of the centre6 was Chin-timūr Sultan, Sulaimān Mirzā,7 Muḥammadī Kūkūldāsh, Shāh Manṣūr Barlās, Yūnas-i-ʿalī, Darwish-i-muḥammad Sārbān and ʿAbdu'l-lāh the librarian. The left of the centre was Khalīfa, Khwāja Mir-i-mīrān, Secretary Aḥmādi, Tārdī Beg (brother) of Qūj Beg, Khalīfa’s Muḥībb-i-ʿalī and Mirzā Beg Tarkhān. The advance was Khusrau Kūkūldāsh and Muḥ. ‘Alī jang-jang. ʿAbdu'l-ʿazīz

1 Well-known are the three decisive historical battles fought near the town of Pānī-pat, viz. those of Bābur and Ibrāhīm in 1526, of Akbar and Hīmān in 1556, and of Aḥmad Abdālī with the Mahratta Confederacy in 1761. The following lesser particulars about the battle-field are not so frequently mentioned: —(i) that the scene of Bābur’s victory was long held to be haunted, Badāyūnī himself, passing it at dawn some 62 years later, heard with dismay the din of conflict and the shouts of the combatants; (ii) that Bābur built a (perhaps commemorative) mosque one mile to the n.e. of the town; (iii) that one of the unaccomplished desires of Sher Shāh Sūr, the conqueror of Bābur’s son Humāyūn, was to raise two monuments on the battle-field of Pānī-pat, one to Ibrāhīm, the other to those Chaghatāi sultāns whose martyrdom he himself had brought about; (iv) that in 1910 AD. the British Government placed a monument to mark the scene of Shāh Abdālī’s victory of 1761 AD. This monument would appear, from Sayyid Ghulām-i-ʿalī’s Nigar-nāma-i-hind, to stand close to the scene of Bābur’s victory also, since the Mahrattas were entrenched as he was outside the town of Pānī-pat. (Cf. E. & D. viii, 401.)

2 This important date is omitted from the L. & E. Memoirs.

3 This wording will cover armour of man and horse.

4 ʿālāndūk, Pers. trs. ʿāsur ʿuddūn. Some later oriental writers locate Bābur’s battle at two or more miles from the town of Pānī-pat, and Bābur’s word ʿālāndūk might imply that his cavalry rode forth and arrayed outside his defences, but his narrative allows of his delivering attack, through the wide sally-ports, after arraying behind the carts and mantelets which checked his adversary’s swift advance. The Mahrattas, who may have occupied the same ground as Bābur, fortified themselves more strongly than he did, as having powerful artillery against them. Ahmad Shāh Abdālī’s defence against them was an ordinary ditch and abbattis, [Bābur’s ditch and branch.] mostly of dhāk trees (Butea frondosa), a local product Bābur also is likely to have used.

5 The preceding three words seem to distinguish this Shāh Ḥusain from several others of his name and may imply that he was the son of Yāragī Mughūl Ghānchī (Index and I.O. 217 f. 184b l. 7).

6 For Bābur’s terms vide f. 209b.

7 This is Mirzā Khān’s son, i.e. Wais Mirūn-shāhī’s.
the Master of the Horse was posted as the reserve. For the turning-party (tulghuma) at the point of the right wing, we fixed on Red Wali and Malik Qasim (brother) of Baba Qashqa, with their Mughuls; for the turning-party at the point of the left wing, we arrayed Qarah-quez, Abu'l-muhammad the lance-player, Shaikh Jamal Baring Saikh 'Ali, Mahndi (?) and Tingri-birdi Bashaghi (?) Mughul; these two parties, directly the enemy got near, were to turn his rear, one from the right, the other from the left.

When the dark mass of the enemy first came in sight, he seemed to incline towards our right; 'Abdu'l-aziz, who was the right-reserve, was sent therefore to reinforce the right. From the time that Sl. Ibrahims blackness first appeared, he moved swiftly, straight for us, without a check, until he saw the dark mass of our men, when his pulled up and, observing our formation and array, made as if asking, "To stand or not? To advance or not?" They could not stand; nor could they make their former swift advance.

Our orders were for the turning-parties to wheel from right and left to the enemy's rear, to discharge arrows and to engage in the fight; and for the right and left (wings) to advance and join battle with him. The turning-parties wheeled round and began to rain arrows down. Mahdi Khwaja was the first of the left to engage; he was faced by a troop having an elephant with it; his men's flights of arrows forced it to retire. To reinforce the left I sent Secretary Ahtmadi and also Quj Beg's Tardi Beg and Khalifa's Muhibbi-'ali. On the right also there was some stubborn fighting. Orders were given for Muhammad Kukuldash, Shah Mansur Barlas, Yunas-i-'ali and 'Abdu'l-lah to engage those facing them in front of the centre. From that same position Ustad 'Ali-qiuli made good discharge of firingi shots; 3

1 A dispute for this right-hand post of honour is recorded on f. 100b, as also in accounts of Culloden.
2 tartib u yasal, which may include, as Erskine took it to do, the carts and mantelets; of these however, Ibrahims can hardly have failed to hear before he rode out of camp.
3 f. 217b and note; Irvine's Army of the Indian Mughuls p. 133. Here Erskine notes (Mems. p. 306) "The size of these artillery at this time is very uncertain. The word firingi is now (1826 AD.) used in the Deccan for a swivel. At the present day, sarb-san in common usage is a small species of swivel. Both words in Babur's time
Mustafa the commissary for his part made excellent discharge of *sarb-san* shots from the left hand of the centre. Our right, left, centre and turning-parties having surrounded the enemy, rained arrows down on him and fought ungrudgingly. He made one or two small charges on our right and left but under our men’s arrows, fell back on his own centre. His right and left hands (*güł*) were massed in such a crowd that they could neither move forward against us nor force a way for flight.

When the incitement to battle had come, the Sun was spear-high; till mid-day fighting had been in full force; noon passed, the foe was crushed in defeat, our friends rejoicing and gay. By God’s mercy and kindness, this difficult affair was made easy for us! In one half-day, that armed mass was laid upon the earth. Five or six thousand men were killed in one place close to Ibrāhīm. Our estimate of the other dead, lying all over the field, was 15 to 16,000, but it came to be known, later in Agra from the statements of Hindūstānis, that 40 or 50,000 may have died in that battle.¹

The foe defeated, pursuit and unhorsing of fugitives began. Our men brought in amīrs of all ranks and the chiefs they captured; *mahauts* made offering of herd after herd of elephants.

Ibrāhīm was thought to have fled; therefore, while pursuing the enemy, we told off Qismatāī Mīrzā, Bābā *chuhra* and Būjka of the *khaṣa-tābin* ² to lead swift pursuit to Agra and try to take him. We passed through his camp, looked into his own enclosure (*sarācha*) and quarters, and dismounted on the bank of standing-water (*qarā-sū*).

appear to have been used for field-cannon.” (For an account of guns, intermediate in date between Bābūr and Erskine, see the *Āyīn-i-akbarī*. Cf. f. 264 n. on the carts (*ārabā*).)

¹ Although the authority of the *Tārikh-i-salāṭīn-i-afaghāna* is not weighty its reproduction of Afghan opinion is worth consideration. It says that astrologers foretold Ibrāhīm’s defeat; that his men, though greatly outnumbering Bābūr’s, were out-of-heart through his ill-treatment of them, and his amīrs in displeasure against him, but that never-the-less, the conflict at Pānī-pat was more desperate than had ever been seen. It states that Ibrāhīm fell where his tomb now is (*i.e.* in circa 1602 AH.–1594 AD.); that Bābūr went to the spot and, prompted by his tender heart, lifted up the head of his dead adversary, and said, “Honour to your courage!” ordered brocade and sweetmeats made ready, enjoined Dilāwar Khān and Khalīfa to bathe the corpse and to bury it where it lay (E. & D. v. 2). Naturally, part of the reverence shewn to the dead would be the burial together of head and trunk.

² f. 209b and App. H. section c. Bābā *chuhra* would be one of the corps of braves.
It was the Afternoon Prayer when Khalifa’s younger brother-in-law Tāhir Tibrī ¹ who had found Ibrāhīm’s body in a heap of dead, brought in his head.

(x. Detachments sent to occupy Dihlī and Agra.)

On that very same day we appointed Humāyūn Mīrzā ² to ride fast and light to Agra with Khwāja Kalān, Muḥammadī, Shāh Manṣūr Barlās, Yūnas-i-‘ali, ‘Abdu’l-lah and Treasurer Walī, to get the place into their hands and to mount guard over the treasure. We fixed on Mahdī Khwāja, with Muḥammad Sl. Mīrzā, ‘Ādil Sulṭān, Sl. Junaid Barlās and Qūṭlūq-qadam to leave their baggage, make sudden incursion on Dihlī, and keep watch on the treasuries.³

(April 21st) We marched on next day and when we had gone 2 miles, dismounted, for the sake of the horses, on the bank of the Jün (Jumna).

(April 24th) On Tuesday (Rajab 12th), after we had halted on two nights and had made the circuit of Shaikh Nizāmu’d-dīn Auliya’s tomb ⁴ we dismounted on the bank of the Jün over against Dihlī.⁵ That same night, being Wednesday-eve, we made an excursion into the fort of Dihlī and there spent the night.

(April 25th) Next day (Wednesday Rajab 13th) I made the circuit of Khwāja Qūṭbu’d-dīn’s ⁶ tomb and visited the tombs and residences of Sl. Ghiyāṣu’d-dīn Balban ⁷ and Sl. ‘Alāu’u’d-dīn

¹ He was a brother of Muḥibb-i-‘ali’s mother.
² To give Humāyūn the title Mīrzā may be a scribe’s lapse, but might also be a nuance of Bābur’s, made to shew, with other minutaie, that Humāyūn was in chief command. The other minute matters are that instead of Humāyūn’s name being the first of a simple series of commanders’ names with the enclitic accusative appended to the last one (here Walī), as is usual, Humāyūn’s name has its own enclitic nī; and, again, the phrase is “Humāyūn with” such and such begs, a turn of expression differentiating him from the rest. The same unusual variations occur again, just below, perhaps with the same intention of shewing chief command, there of Mahdī Khwāja.
³ A small matter of wording attracts attention in the preceding two sentences. Bābur, who does not always avoid verbal repetition, here constructs two sentences which, except for the place-names Dihlī and Agra, convey information of precisely the same action in entirely different words.
⁴ d. 1325 AD. The places Bābur visited near Dihlī are described in the Reports of the Indian Archaeological Survey, in Sayyid Ahmad’s Asgar Sanādīd pp. 74–85, in Keene’s Hand-book to Dihlī and Murray’s Hand-book to Bengal etc. The last two quote much from the writings of Cunningham and Ferguson.
⁵ and on the same side of the river.
⁶ d. 1235 AD. He was a native of Aāsh [Ush] in Farghāna.
⁷ d. 1286 AD. He was a Slave ruler of Dihlī.
Khilji, his Minâr, and the Haúz-shamsî, Haúz-i-khaş and the tombs and gardens of Sl. Buhlûl and Sl. Sikandar (Lûdî). Having done this, we dismounted at the camp, went on a boat, and there ‘araq was drunk.

We bestowed the Military Collectorate (ṣîqdârlîghî) of Dihlî on Red Wali, made Dost Diwân in the Dihlî district, sealed the treasuries, and made them over to their charge.

(April 26th) On Thursday we dismounted on the bank of the Jûn, over against Tûghlûqâbâd.¹

(y. The khuţba read for Bâbur in Dihlî.)

(April 27th) On Friday (Rajab 15th) while we remained on the same ground, Maulâna Maḥmûd and Shaikh Zain went with a few others into Dihlî for the Congregational Prayer, read the khuţba in my name, distributed a portion of money to the poor and needy,² and returned to camp.

(April 28th) Leaving that ground on Saturday (Rajab 16th), we advanced march by march for Āgra. I made an excursion to Tûghlûqâbâd and rejoined the camp.

(May 4th) On Friday (Rajab 22nd), we dismounted at the mansion (mansîl) of Sulaimân Farrušî in a suburb of Āgra, but as the place was far from the fort, moved on the following day to Jalâl Khân ḟîg: hat's house.

On Humâyûn's arrival at Āgra, ahead of us, the garrison had made excuses and false pretexts (about surrender). He and his noticing the want of discipline there was, said, “The long hand may be laid on the Treasury”! and so sat down to watch the roads out of Āgra till we should come.

¹ 'Alâu'ud-dîn Muh. Shâh Khilji Turk d. 1316 AD. It is curious that Bâbur should specify visiting his Minâr (minârî, Pers. trs. I.O. 217 f. 185b, minâr-i-au) and not mention the Qütb Minâr. Possibly he confused the two. The ‘Alâi Minâr remains unfinished; the Qütb is judged by Cunningham to have been founded by Qâtâ'ud-dîn Aibak Turk, circa 1200 AD. and to have been completed by Sl. Shamsu'd-dîn Altamsh (Aîltîmîsh?) Turk, circa 1220 AD. Of the two tanks Bâbur visited, the Royal-tank (haş-i-khaţâ) was made by 'Alâu'ud-dîn in 1293 AD.

² The familiar Turkî word Tûghlûq would reinforce much else met with in Dihlî to strengthen Bâbur's opinion that, as a Turk, he had a right to rule there. Many, if not all, of the Slave dynasty were Turks; these were followed by the Khiljî Turks, these again by the Tûghlûqs. Moreover the Panj-âb he had himself taken, and lands on both sides of the Indus further south had been ruled by Ghaznawid Turks. His latest conquests were “where the Turk had ruled” (f. 226b) long, wide, and with interludes only of non-Turkî sway.

³ Perhaps this charity was the Khams (Fifth) due from a victor.
(2. The great diamond.)

In Sultan Ibrāhīm’s defeat the Rāja of Gūāliār Bikramājīt the Hindu had gone to hell.1

(Author’s note on Bikramājīt.) The ancestors of Bikramājīt had ruled in Gūāliār for more than a hundred years.2 Sikandar (Lūdī) had sat down in Āgra for several years in order to take the fort; later on, in Ibrāhīm’s time, ‘Āgīm Humayūn Sarwānī 3 had completely invested it for some while; following this, it was taken on terms under which Shamsābād was given in exchange for it.4

Bikramājīt’s children and family were in Āgra at the time of Ibrāhīm’s defeat. When Humayūn reached Āgra, they must have been planning to flee, but his postings of men (to watch the roads) prevented this and guard was kept over them. Humayūn himself did not let them go (bārghālī qāīmās). They made him a voluntary offering of a mass of jewels and valuables amongst which was the famous diamond which ‘Alāu’u’d-din must have brought.5 Its reputation is that every appraiser has estimated its value at two and a half days’ food for the whole world. Apparently it weighs 8 mísqāls.6 Humayūn offered it to me when I arrived at Āgra; I just gave it him back.

(aa. Ibrāhīm’s mother and entourage.)

Amongst men of mark who were in the fort, there were Malik Dād Karānī, Millī Sūrdūk and Firūz Khān Mīvātī. They, being convicted of false dealing, were ordered out for capital punishment. Several persons interceded for Malik Dād Karānī and four or five days passed in comings and goings before the

1 Bikramājīt was a Tūnūr Rājpūt. Bābur’s unhesitating statement of the Hindu’s destination at death may be called a fruit of conviction, rather than of what modern opinion calls intolerance.
2 120 years (Cunningham’s Report of the Archaeological Survey ii, 330 et seq.).
3 The Ṭārīkh-i-sher-shāhī tells a good deal about the man who bore this title, and also about others who found themselves now in difficulty between Ibrāhīm’s tyranny and Bābur’s advance (E. & D. iv, 301).
4 Gūāliār was taken from Bikramājīt in 1518 AD.
5 i.e. from the Deccan of which ‘Alāu’u’d-din is said to have been the first Muḥammadan invader. An account of this diamond, identified as the Koh-i-nūr, is given in Hobson Johnson but its full history is not told by Yule or by Streeter’s Great Diamonds of the World, neither mentioning the presentation of the diamond by Humayūn to Taḥmasp of which Abū’l-fażl writes, dwelling on its overplus of payment for all that Humayūn in exile received from his Persian host (Akbar-nāma trs. i, 349 and note; Asiatic Quarterly Review, April 1899 H. Beveridge’s art. Bābur’s diamond; was it the Koh-i-nūr?).
6 320 ratis (Erskine). The rati is 2.171 Troy grains, or in picturesque primitive equivalents, 8 grains of rice, or 64 mustard seeds, or 512 poppy-seeds,—uncertain weights which Akbar fixed in cat’s-eye stones.
matter was arranged. We then shewed to them (all?) kindness and favour in agreement with the petition made for them, and we restored them all their goods. A **pargana** worth 7 **laks** was bestowed on Ibrāhīm’s mother; **parganas** were given also to these begs of his. She was sent out of the fort with her old servants and given encamping-ground (**yūrt**) two miles below Āgra.

(May 10th) I entered Āgra at the Afternoon Prayer of Thursday (Rajab 28th) and dismounted at the mansion (**mansil**) of Sl. Ibrāhīm.

**EXPEDITIONS OF TRAMONTANE MUḤAMMADANS INTO HIND.**

(a. Bābur’s five attempts on Hindūstān.)

From the date 910 at which the country of Kābul was conquered, down to now (932 AH.) (my) desire for Hindūstān had been constant, but owing sometimes to the feeble counsels of begs, sometimes to the non-accompaniment of elder and younger brethren, a move on Hindūstān had not been practicable and its territories had remained unsubdued. At length no such obstacles were left; no beg, great or small (**beg begāt**) of lower birth, could speak an opposing word. In 925 AH. (1519 AD.) we led an army out and, after taking Bajaur by storm in 2–3 **gari** (44–66 minutes), and making a general massacre of its people, went on into Bhīra. Bhīra we neither over-ran nor plundered; we imposed a ransom on its people, taking from them in money and goods to the value

---

1 Bābur’s plurals allow the supposition that the three men’s lives were spared. Malik Dād served him thenceforth.
2 Erskine estimated these as **dams** and worth about £1750, but this may be an underestimate (**H. of I. i, App. E.**).
3 **‘These begs of his’** (or hers) may be the three written of above.
4 These will include cousins and his half-brothers Jahāngīr and Nāṣīr as opposing before he took action in 925 AH. (1519 AD.). The time between 910 AH. and 925 AH. at which he would most desire Hindūstān is after 920 AH. in which year he returned defeated from Transoxiana.
5 **kichī kārim**, which here seems to make contrast between the ruling birth of members of his own family and the lower birth of even great begs still with him. Where the phrase occurs on f. 295, Erskine renders it by “down to the dregs”, and de Courtelle (ii, 235) by “de toutes les bouches” but neither translation appears to me to suit Bābur’s uses of the term, inasmuch as both seem to go too low (**cf. f. 270b**).
of 4 *laks* of *shāhrukhīs* and having shared this out to the army and auxiliaries, returned to Kābul. From then till now we laboriously held tight\(^1\) to Hindūstān, five times leading an army into it.\(^2\) The fifth time, God the Most High, by his own mercy and favour, made such a foe as Sl. Ibrāhīm the vanquished and loser, such a realm as Hindūstān our conquest and possession.

(b. *Three invaders from Tramontana.*)

From the time of the revered Prophet down till now\(^3\) three men from that side\(^4\) have conquered and ruled Hindūstān. Sl. Maḥmūd *Ghāzi*\(^5\) was the first, who and whose descendants sat long on the seat of government in Hindūstān. Sl. Shihāбу’d-din of Ghūr was the second,\(^6\) whose slaves and dependants royally shepherded\(^7\) this realm for many years. I am the third.

But my task was not like the task of those other rulers. For why? Because Sl. Maḥmūd, when he conquered Hindūstān, had the throne of Khurāsān subject to his rule, vassal and obedient to him were the sultāns of Khwārizm and the Marches (*Dārul-marz*), and under his hand was the ruler of Samarkand. Though his army may not have numbered 2 *laks*, what question is there that it\(^8\) was one. Then again, rājas were his opponents; all Hindūstān was not under one supreme head (*pādshāh*), but each rāja ruled independently in his own country. Sl. Shihābu’d-din again,—though he himself had no rule in Khurāsān, his elder brother Ghiyāṣu’d-din had it. *The Tabaqāt-i-nāshirī*\(^9\) brings it forward

---

\(^1\) *āṯūrūshūb*, Pers. trs. *chaspida*, stuck to.
\(^2\) The first expedition is fixed by the preceding passage as in 925 AH, which was indeed the first time a passage of the Indus is recorded. Three others are found recorded, those of 926, 930 and 932 AH. Perhaps the fifth was not led by Bābur in person, and may be that of his troops accompanying `Alam Khān in 931 AH. But he may count into the set of five, the one made in 910 AH. which he himself meant to cross the Indus. Various opinions are found expressed by European writers as to the dates of the five.
\(^3\) Muḥammad died 632 AD. (11 AH.).
\(^4\) Tramontana, n. of Hindū-kush. For particulars about the dynasties mentioned by Bābur see Stanley Lane-Poole’s *Muḥammadan Dynasties*.
\(^5\) Maḥmūd of Ghazni, a Turk by race, d. 1030 AD. (421 AH.).
\(^6\) Known as Muḥ. *Ghūrī*, d. 1206 AD. (602 AH.).
\(^7\) *sūrūbtūrī*, lit. drove them like sheep (cf. f. 154b).
\(^8\) *khāṭ*, itself, not Bābur’s only Hibernianism.
\(^9\) “This is an excellent history of the Musalman world down to the time of Sl. Nāṣir of Dīhli A.D. 1252. It was written by Abū ‘Umār Minhāj al Jūrjānī. See Stewart’s catalogue of Tipoo’s Library, p. 7” (Erskine). It has been translated by Raverty.
that he once led into Hindūstān an army of 120,000 men and horse in mail. His opponents also were rāīs and rājas; one man did not hold all Hindūstān.

That time we came to Bhīra, we had at most some 1500 to 2000 men. We had made no previous move on Hindūstān with an army equal to that which came the fifth time, when we beat Sl. Ibrāhīm and conquered the realm of Hindūstān, the total written down for which, taking one retainer with another, and with traders and servants, was 12,000. Dependent on me were the countries of Badakhshān, Qūndūz, Kābul and Qandahār, but no reckonable profit came from them, rather it was necessary to reinforce them fully because several lie close to an enemy. Then again, all Māwarā’u’n-nahr was in the power of the Aūzbeg khāns and sultāns, an ancient foe whose armies counted up to 100,000. Moreover Hindūstān, from Bhīra to Bihār, was in the power of the Afghāns and in it Sl. Ibrāhīm was supreme. In proportion to his territory his army ought to have been 5 laks, but at that time the Eastern amīrs were in hostility to him. His army was estimated at 100,000 and people said his elephants and those of his amīrs were 1000.

Under such conditions, in this strength, and having in my rear 100,000 old enemies such as are the Aūzbegs, we put trust in God and faced the ruler of such a dense army and of domains so wide. As our trust was in Him, the most high God did not make our labour and hardships vain, but defeated that powerful foe and conquered that broad realm. Not as due to strength and effort of our own do we look upon this good fortune, but as had solely through God’s pleasure and kindness. We know that this happiness was not the fruit of our own ambition and resolve, but that it was purely from His mercy and favour.

DESCRIPTION OF HINDŪSTĀN.

(a. Hindūstān.)

The country of Hindūstān is extensive, full of men, and full of produce. On the east, south, and even on the west, it ends at its great enclosing ocean (muhīṭ daryā-ši-gha). On the north

1 bargustwān-wār; Erskine, cataphract horse.
it has mountains which connect with those of Hindū-kush, Kāfrīstān and Kashmir. North-west of it lie Kābul, Ghaznī and Qandahār. Dīhlī is held (airīmīsh) to be the capital of the whole of Hindūstān. From the death of Shihābu'd-dīn Ghūrī (d. 602 AH.—1206 AD.) to the latter part of the reign of Sl. Firūz Shāh (Tūghlūq Turk d. 790 AH.—1388 AD.), the greater part of Hindūstān must have been under the rule of the sultāns of Dīhlī.

(b. Rulers contemporary with Bābur’s conquest.)

At the date of my conquest of Hindūstān it was governed by five Musalmān rulers (pādshāhī) and two Pagans (kāfīr). These were the respected and independent rulers, but there were also, in the hills and jungles, many rāīs and rājas, held in little esteem (kīchik karīm).

First, there were the Afghāns who had possession of Dīhlī, the capital, and held the country from Bhira to Bihār. Jūnpūr, before their time, had been in possession of Sl. Husain Shargī (Eastern) whose dynasty Hindūstānīs call Pūrābī (Eastern). His ancestors will have been cup-bearers in the presence of Sl. Firūz Shāh and those (Tūghlūq) sultāns; they became supreme in Jūnpūr after his death. At that time Dīhlī was in the hands of Sl. ‘Alāu'u'd-dīn ('Ālam Khān) of the Sayyid dynasty to whose ancestor Timūr Beg had given it when, after having captured it, he went away. Sl. Buhlūl Lūdī and his son (Sikandar) got possession of the capital Jūnpūr and the capital Dīhlī, and brought both under one government (881 AH.—1476 AD.).

Secondly, there was Sl. Muhammad Muẓaffer in Gujrat; he departed from the world a few days before the defeat of Sl. Ibrāhīm. He was skilled in the Law, a ruler (pādshāh) seeking after knowledge, and a constant copyist of the Holy Book. His dynasty people call Tānk. His ancestors also will have been

1 The numerous instances of the word pādshāh in this part of the Bābur-nāma imply no such distinction as attaches to the title Emperor by which it is frequently translated (Index s.n. pādshāh).
2 d. 1500 AD. (905 AH.).
3 d. 1388 AD. (790 AH.).
4 The ancestor mentioned appears to be Naṣrat Shāh, a grandson of Firūz Shāh Tūghlūq (S. L.-Poole p. 300 and Beale, 298).
5 His family belonged to the Rājpūt sept of Tānk, and had become Muhammadan in the person of Sadharān the first ruler of Gujrat (Crooke’s Tribes and Castes; Mirāt-i-sikandarī, Bayley p. 67 and n.).
wine-servers to Sl. Firūz Shāh and those (Tūghlūq) sultāns; they became possessed of Gujrāt after his death.

Thirdly, there were the Bāhmanis of the Dakkan (Deccan, i.e. South), but at the present time no independent authority is left them; their great begs have laid hands on the whole country, and must be asked for whatever is needed.¹

Fourthly, there was Sl. Maḥmūd in the country of Malwā, which people call also Mandāū.² His dynasty they call Khilij (Turk). Rānā Sangā had defeated Sl. Maḥmūd and taken possession of most of his country. This dynasty also has become feeble. Sl. Maḥmūd's ancestors also must have been cherished by Sl. Firūz Shāh; they became possessed of the Malwā country after his death.³

Fifthly, there was Naṣrat Shāh⁴ in the country of Bengal. His father (Husain Shah), a sayyid styled 'Alā'u'ud-dīn, had ruled in Bengal and Naṣrat Shāh attained to rule by inheritance. A surprising custom in Bengal is that hereditary succession is rare. The royal office is permanent and there are permanent offices of amirs, wazīrs and manṣab-dārs (officials). It is the office that Bengalis regard with respect. Attached to each office is a body of obedient, subordinate retainers and servants. If the royal heart demand that a person should be dismissed and another be appointed to sit in his place, the whole body of subordinates attached to that office become the (new) office-holder's. There is indeed this peculiarity of the royal office itself that any person who kills the ruler (pādshāh) and seats himself on the throne, becomes ruler himself; amirs, wazīrs, soldiers and peasants submit to him at once, obey him, and recognize him for the rightful ruler his predecessor in office had been.⁵ Bengalis say, "We are faithful to the throne; we loyally

¹ S. L.-Poole p. 316–7.
² Mandāū (Mandū) was the capital of Malwā.
³ Stanley Lane-Poole shews (p. 311) a dynasty of three Ghūris interposed between the death of Firūz Shāh in 790 AH. and the accession in 839 AH. of the first Khilji ruler of Gujrāt Maḥmūd Shāh.
⁴ He reigned from 1518 to 1532 A.D. (925 to 939 AH. S.L.-P. p. 308) and had to wife a daughter of Ibrāhīm Lūdī (Riyazū's-salāṭīn). His dynasty was known as the Ḥusain-shāhī, after his father.
⁵ "Strange as this custom may seem, a similar one prevailed down to a very late period in Malabar. There was a jubilee every 12 years in the Samorin's country, and any-one who succeeded in forcing his way through the Samorin's guards and slew
obey whoever occupies it." As for instance, before the reign of Naṣrat Shāh's father 'Alā'u'd-dīn, an Abyssinian (Ḥabshi, named Muẓaffar Shāh) had killed his sovereign (Maḥmūd Shāh Ḫiyās), mounted the throne and ruled for some time. 'Alā'u'd-dīn killed that Abyssinian, seated himself on the throne and became ruler. When he died, his son (Naṣrat) became ruler by inheritance. Another Bengali custom is to regard it as a disgraceful fault in a new ruler if he expend and consume the treasure of his predecessors. On coming to rule he must gather treasure of his own. To amass treasure Bengalis regard as a glorious distinction. Another custom in Bengal is that from ancient times parganas have been assigned to meet the charges of the treasury, stables, and all royal expenditure and to defray these charges no impost is laid on other lands.

These five, mentioned above, were the great Musalmān rulers, honoured in Hindūstān, many-legioned, and broad-landed. Of the Pagans the greater both in territory and army, is the Rāja of Bijānagar.¹

The second is Rānā Sangā who in these latter days had grown great by his own valour and sword. His original country was Chitūr; in the downfall from power of the Mandāū суltāns, he became possessed of many of their dependencies such as Rantanbūr, Sārangpūr, Bhilsān and Chandīrī. Chandīrī I stormed in 934 AH. (1528 A.D.)² and, by God's pleasure, took it in a few hours; in it was Rānā Sangā's great and trusted man Midnī

Fol. 272.

him, reigned in his stead. 'A jubilee is proclaimed throughout his dominions at the end of 12 years, and a tent is pitched for him in a spacious plain, and a great feast is celebrated for 10 or 12 days with mirth and jollity, guns firing night and day, so, at the end of the feast, any four of the guests that have a mind to gain a throne by a desperate action in fighting their way through 30 or 40,000 of his guards, and kill the Samorin in his tent, he that kills him, succeeds him in his empire.' See Hamilton's New Account of the East Indies vol. i. p. 309. The attempt was made in 1695, and again a very few years ago, but without success" (Erskine p. 311).

The custom Bābur writes of—it is one dealt with at length in Frazer's Golden Bough—would appear from Blochmann's Geography and History of Bengal (JASB 1873 p. 286) to have been practised by the Habshi rulers of Bengal of whom he quotes Faria y Souza as saying, "They observe no rule of inheritance from father to son, but even slaves sometimes obtain it by killing their master, and whoever holds it three days, they look upon as established by divine providence. Thus it fell out that in 40 years space they had 13 kings successively."

¹ No doubt this represents Vijāyanagar in the Deccan.

² This date places the composition of the Description of Hindustan in agreement with Shaikh Zain's statement that it was in writing in 935 AH.
Rāo; we made general massacre of the Pagans in it and, as will be narrated, converted what for many years had been a mansion of hostility, into a mansion of Islām.

There are very many rāis and rājas on all sides and quarters of Hindūstān, some obedient to Islām, some, because of their remoteness or because their places are fastnesses, not subject to Musālman rule.

(c. Of Hindūstān.)

Hindūstān is of the first climate, the second climate, and the third climate; of the fourth climate it has none. It is a wonderful country. Compared with our countries it is a different world; its mountains, rivers, jungles and deserts, its towns, its cultivated lands, its animals and plants, its peoples and their tongues, its rains, and its winds, are all different. In some respects the hot-country (garm-sīl) that depends on Kābul, is like Hindūstān, but in others, it is different. Once the water of Sind is crossed, everything is in the Hindūstān way (tāriq) land, water, tree, rock, people and horde, opinion and custom.

(d. Of the northern mountains.)

After crossing the Sind-river (eastwards), there are countries, in the northern mountains mentioned above, appertaining to Kashmīr and once included in it, although most of them, as for example, Paklī and Shahmang (?), do not now obey it. Beyond Kashmīr there are countless peoples and hordes, parganas and cultivated lands, in the mountains. As far as Bengal, as far indeed as the shore of the great ocean, the peoples are without break. About this procession of men no-one has been able to give authentic information in reply to our enquiries and investigations. So far people have been saying that they call these hill-men Kas.¹ It has struck me that as a Hindūstānī pronounces shīn as sīn (i.e. sh as s), and as Kashmir is the one respectable town in these mountains, no other indeed being heard of, Hindūstānīs might pronounce it Kasmir.² These

¹ Are they the Khas of Nepal and Sikkim? (G. of I.).
² Here Erskine notes that the Persian (trs.) adds, "mīr signifying a hill, and kas being the name of the natives of the hill-country." This may not support the name kas as correct but may be merely an explanation of Bābur's meaning. It is not in I.O. 217 f. 189 or in Muḥ. Shirāzī's lithographed Wāqiʿūl-bābūrī p. 190.
people trade in musk-bags, b:hri-qūṭās,\(^1\) saffron, lead and copper.

Hindiş call these mountains Sawālak-parbat. In the Hindi tongue sawāl-lak means one lak and a quarter, that is, 125,000, and parbat means a hill, which makes 125,000 hills.\(^2\) The snow on these mountains never lessens; it is seen white from many districts of Hind, as, for example, Lāhor, Sihrind and Sambal. The range, which in Kābul is known as Hindū-kush, comes from Kābul eastwards into Hindūstān, with slight inclination to the south. The Hindūstānāt\(^3\) are to the south of it. Tibet lies to the north of it and of that unknown horde called Kas.

*(e. Of rivers.)*

Many rivers rise in these mountains and flow through Hindūstān. Six rise north of Sihrind, namely Sind, Bahat (Jīlam), Chān-āb [sic], Rāwī, Biāh, and Sutluj\(^4\); all meet near Multān, flow westwards under the name of Sind, pass through the Tatta country and fall into the 'Umān(-sea).

Besides these six there are others, such as Jūn (Jumna), Gang (Ganges), Rahap (Rapti?), Gūmī, Gagar (Ghaggar), Sirū, Gandak, and many more; all unite with the Gang-daryā, flow east under its name, pass through the Bengal country, and are poured into the great ocean. They all rise in the Sawālak-parbat.

Many rivers rise in the Hindūstān hills, as, for instance, Chāmbal, Banās, Bitwi, and Sūn (Son). There is no snow whatever on these mountains. Their waters also join the Gang-daryā.

*(f. Of the Arāvalli.)*

Another Hindūstān range runs north and south. It begins in the Dīhlī country at a small rocky hill on which is Fīrūz Shāh's residence, called Jahān-namā,\(^5\) and, going on from there, appears near Dīhlī in detached, very low, scattered here and there, rocky

---

\(^1\) Either yak or the tassels of the yak. See Appendix M.

\(^2\) My husband tells me that Bābur's authority for this interpretation of Sawālak may be the Zafar-nāma (Bib. Ind. ed. ii, 149).

\(^3\) *i.e.* the countries of Hindūstān.

\(^4\) So pointed, carefully, in the Ḥāl. MS. Mr. Erskine notes of these rivers that they are the Indus, Hydaspes, Ascesines, Hydraotes, Hesudrus and Hyphasis.

\(^5\) Ṭyin-i-akbarī, Jarrett 279.
Beyond Mīwāt, it enters the Bīāna country. The hills of Sikri, Bāri and Dūlpūr are also part of this same including (tūtā) range. The hills of Gāliūr—they write it Gāliūr—although they do not connect with it, are off-sets of this range; so are the hills of Rantanbūr, Chitūr, Chandīrī, and Mandāū. They are cut off from it in some places by 7 to 8 kurohs (14 to 16 m.). These hills are very low, rough, rocky and jungly. No snow whatever falls on them. They are the makers, in Hindūstān, of several rivers.

*(g. Irrigation.)*

The greater part of the Hindūstān country is situated on level land. Many though its towns and cultivated lands are, it nowhere has running waters. Rivers and, in some places, standing-waters are its “running-waters” (āgār-sūlār). Even where, as for some towns, it is practicable to convey water by digging channels (ārīq), this is not done. For not doing it there may be several reasons, one being that water is not at all a necessity in cultivating crops and orchards. Autumn crops grow by the downpour of the rains themselves; and strange it is that spring crops grow even when no rain falls. To young trees water is made to flow by means of buckets or a wheel. They are given water constantly during two or three years; after which they need no more. Some vegetables are watered constantly.

In Lāhor, Dibālpūr and those parts, people water by means of a wheel. They make two circles of ropes long enough to suit the depth of the well, fix strips of wood between them, and on these fasten pitchers. The ropes with the wood and attached pitchers are put over the well-wheel. At one end of the wheel-axle a second wheel is fixed, and close (qāsh) to it another on an upright axle. This last wheel the bullock turns; its teeth catch in the teeth of the second, and thus the wheel with the pitchers is turned. A trough is set where the water empties from the pitchers and from this the water is conveyed everywhere.

---

1. *parcha parcha, kīchikrāk kīchikrāk, āndā mūndā, tāshīq tāqghīna.* The Gazetteer of India (1907 i, 1) puts into scientific words, what Bābur here describes, the ruin of a great former range.

2. Here āgār-sūlār might safely be replaced by “irrigation channels” (Index s.n.).
In Āgra, Chandwār, Bīāna and those parts, again, people water with a bucket; this is a laborious and filthy way. At the well-edge they set up a fork of wood, having a roller adjusted between the forks, tie a rope to a large bucket, put the rope over the roller, and tie its other end to the bullock. One person must drive the bullock, another empty the bucket. Every time the bullock turns after having drawn the bucket out of the well, that rope lies on the bullock-track, in pollution of urine and dung, before it descends again into the well. To some crops needing water, men and women carry it by repeated efforts in pitchers.¹

(h. Other particulārs about Hindūstān.)

The towns and country of Hindūstān are greatly wanting in charm. Its towns and lands are all of one sort; there are no walls to the orchards (bāghāt), and most places are on the dead level plain. Under the monsoon-rains the banks of some of its rivers and torrents are worn into deep channels, difficult and troublesome to pass through anywhere. In many parts of the plains thorny jungle grows, behind the good defence of which the people of the pargana become stubbornly rebellious and pay no taxes.

Except for the rivers and here and there standing-waters, there is little “running-water”. So much so is this that towns and countries subsist on the water of wells or on such as collects in tanks during the rains.

In Hindūstān hamlets and villages, towns indeed, are depopulated and set up in a moment! If the people of a large town, one inhabited for years even, flee from it, they do it in such a way that not a sign or trace of them remains in a day or a day and a half.² On the other hand, if they fix their eyes on

¹ The verb here is tāshmāq; it also expresses to carry like ants (l. 220), presumably from each person’s carrying a pitcher or a stone at a time, and repeatedly.

² “This” notes Erskine (p. 315) “is the wulsa or walsa, so well described by Colonel Wilks in his Historical Sketches vol. i. p. 309, note ‘On the approach of an hostile army, the unfortunate inhabitants of India bury under ground their most cumbersome effects, and each individual, man, woman, and child above six years of age (the infant children being carried by their mothers), with a load of grain proportioned to their strength, issue from their beloved homes, and take the direction of a country (if such can be found,) exempt from the miseries of war; sometimes of a strong fortress, but more generally of the most unfrequented hills and woods, where they prolong a miserable existence until the departure of the enemy, and if this should be
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a place in which to settle, they need not dig water-courses or construct dams because their crops are all rain-grown,¹ and as the population of Hindūstān is unlimited, it swarms in. They make a tank or dig a well; they need not build houses or set up walls—khas-grass (*Andropogon muricatum*) abounds, wood is unlimited, huts are made, and straightway there is a village or a town!

(i. *Fauna of Hindūstān* :—*Mammals*.)

The elephant, which Hindūstānīs call *hät(h)ī*, is one of the wild animals peculiar to Hindūstān. It inhabits the (western ?) borders of the Kālpi country, and becomes more numerous in its wild state the further east one goes (in Kālpi ?). From this tract it is that captured elephants are brought; in Karrah and Mānikpūr elephant-catching is the work of 30 or 40 villages.² People answer (jawāb birūrlār) for them direct to the exchequer.³ The elephant is an immense animal and very sagacious. If people speak to it, it understands; if they command anything from it, it does it. Its value is according to its size; it is sold by measure (gārilāb); the larger it is, the higher its price. People protracted beyond the time for which they have provided food, a large portion necessarily dies of hunger.⁴ See the note itself. The Historical Sketches should be read by everyone who desires to have an accurate idea of the South of India. It is to be regretted that we do not possess the history of any other part of India, written with the same knowledge or research.”

“*The word wulsa or valsa is Dravidian. Telugu has valasa, ‘emigration, flight, or removing from home for fear of a hostile army.’ Kanarese has valasa, blasal, and dīrīṣ, ‘flight, a removing from home for fear of a hostile army.’ Tamil has valasei, ‘flying for fear, removing hastily.’ The word is an interesting one. I feel pretty sure it is not Aryan, but Dravidian; and yet it stands alone in Dravidian, with nothing that I can find in the way of a root or affinities to explain its etymology. Possibly it may be a borrowed word in Dravidian. Malayalam has no corresponding word. Can it have been borrowed from Kolarian or other primitive Indian speech?” [Letter to H. Beveridge from Mr. F. E. Pargiter, 8th August, 1914.]

Wulsa seems to be a derivative from Sanscrit *ulvāsh*, and to answer to Persian *wairānī* and Turki *būzūglīghti.*

¹ “The improvement of Hindūstān since Bābur’s time must be prodigious. The wild elephant is now confined to the forests under Hemālā, and to the Ghats of Malabar. A wild elephant near Karrah, Mānikpūr, or Kālpi, is a thing, at the present day (1826 A.D.), totally unknown. May not their familiar existence in these countries down to Bābur’s days, be considered rather hostile to the accounts given of the superabundant population of Hindūstān in remote times?” (Erskine).

² “*diwān*. I.O. 217 f. 1906, dar diwān fil jawāb migūnd; Mem. p. 316. They account to the government for the elephants they take; *Mems*. ii, 188, *Les habitants payent l’impôt avec le produit de leur chasse*. Though de Courteille’s reading probably states the fact, Erskine’s includes de C.’s and more, inasmuch as it covers all captures and these might reach to a surplusage over the imposts.
rumour that it is heard of in some islands as 10 qārī high, but in this tract it 2 is not seen above 4 or 5. It eats and drinks entirely with its trunk; if it lose the trunk, it cannot live. It has two great teeth (tusks) in its upper jaw, one on each side of its trunk; by setting these against walls and trees, it brings them down; with these it fights and does whatever hard tasks fall to it. People call these ivory (‘āj, var. ghāj); they are highly valued by Hindūstānis. The elephant has no hair. 3 It is much relied on by Hindūstānis, accompanying every troop of their armies. It has some useful qualities:—it crosses great rivers with ease, carrying a mass of baggage, and three or four have gone dragging without trouble the cart of the mortar (gasān) it takes four or five hundred men to haul. 4 But its stomach is large; one elephant eats the corn (būghūz) of two strings (qītār) of camels. 5

The rhinoceros is another. This also is a large animal, equal in bulk to perhaps three buffaloes. The opinion current in those countries (Tramontana) that it can lift an elephant on its horn, seems mistaken. It has a single horn on its nose, more than nine inches (qārīs) long; one of two qārīs is not seen. 6 Out of one large horn were made a drinking-vessel 7 and a dice-box, leaving over [the thickness of] 3 or 4 hands. 8 The rhinoceros'

1 Pers. trs. gas = 24 inches. Il est bon de rappeler que le mot turk qārī, que la version persane rend par gas, désigne proprement l'espace compris entre le haut de l'épale jusqu'au bout des doigts (de Courteille, ii, 189 note). The qārī like one of its equivalents, the ell (Zenker), is a variable measure; it seems to approach more nearly to a yard than to a gas of 24 inches. See Memoirs of Jahāngīr (R. & B. pp. 18, 141 and notes) for the heights of elephants, and for discussion of some measures.

2 khūd, itself.

3 i.e. pelt; as Erskine notes, its skin is scattered with small hairs. Details such as this stir the question, for whom was Bābur writing? Not for Hindūstān where what he writes is patent; hardly for Kābul; perhaps for Transoxania.

4 Shaikh Zain's wording shows this reference to be to a special piece of artillery, perhaps that of f. 302.

5 A string of camels contains from five to seven, or, in poetry, even more (Vullers, ii, 728, sermon poëtico series decem camelorum). The item of food compared is corn only (būghūz) and takes no account therefore of the elephant's green food.

6 The Ency. Br. states that the horn seldom exceeds a foot in length; there is one in the B.M. measuring 18 inches.

7 ăb-khwura kishtī, water-drinker's boat, in which name kishtī may be used with reference to shape as boat is in sauce-boat. Erskine notes that rhinoceros-horn is supposed to sweat on approach of poison.

8 ailiki, Pers. trs. angusiūt, finger, each seemingly representing about one inch, a hand's thickness, a finger's breadth.
hide is very thick; an arrow shot from a stiff bow, drawn with full strength right up to the arm-pit, if it pierce at all, might penetrate 4 inches (ailik, hands). From the sides (qāsh) of its fore and hind legs, folds hang which from a distance look like housings thrown over it. It resembles the horse more than it does any other animal. As the horse has a small stomach (appetite?), so has the rhinoceros; as in the horse a piece of bone (pastern?) grows in place of small bones (T. āshūq, Fr. osselets (Zenker), knuckles), so one grows in the rhinoceros; as in the horse’s hand (ailik, Pers. dast) there is kūmūk (or gūmūk, a tibia, or marrow), so there is in the rhinoceros. It is more ferocious than the elephant and cannot be made obedient and submissive. There are masses of it in the Parashāwar and Hashnagar jungles, so too between the Sind-river and the jungles of the Bhīra country. Masses there are also on the banks of the Sārū-river in Hindūstān. Some were killed in the Parashāwar and Hashnagar jungles in our moves on Hindūstān. It strikes powerfully with its horn; men and horses enough have been horned in those hunts. In one of them the horse of a chuhra (brave) named Maqṣūd was tossed a spear’s-length, for which reason the man was nick-named the rhino’s aim (maqṣūd-i-karg).

The wild-buffalo is another. It is much larger than the (domestic) buffalo and its horns do not turn back in the same way. It is a mightily destructive and ferocious animal.

The nila-gāū (blue-bull) is another. It may stand as high as a horse but is somewhat lighter in build. The male is bluish-gray, hence, seemingly, people call it nila-gāū. It has two rather small horns. On its throat is a tuft of hair, nine inches long; (in this) it resembles the yak. Its hoof is cleft (āiri)

---

1 lit. hand (gūf) and leg (būl).
2 The anatomical details by which Bābur supports this statement are difficult to translate, but his grouping of the two animals is in agreement with the modern classification of them as two of the three Ungulata vera, the third being the tapir (Fauna of British India:—Mammals, Blanford 467 and, illustration, 468).
3 De Courteille (ii, 190) reads kūmūk, osseuse; Erskine reads gūmūk, marrow.
4 Index s.n. rhinoceros.
5 Bos bubalus.
6 "so as to grow into the flesh” (Erskine, p. 317).
7 sic in text. It may be noted that the name nil-gāū, common in general European writings, is that of the cow; nil-gāū, that of the bull (Blanford).
8 b : k : rī qūfās; see Appendix M.
like the hoof of cattle. The doe is of the colour of the bughū-
marāl; she, for her part, has no horns and is plumper than
the male.

The hog-deer (kotah-pāicha) is another. It may be of the
size of the white deer (āq kiyik). It has short legs, hence its
name, little-legged. Its horns are like a bughū's but smaller;
like the bughū it casts them every year. Being rather a poor
runner, it does not leave the jungle.

Another is a deer (kiyik) after the fashion of the male deer
(aîrkākī hūna) of the jirān. Its back is black, its belly white, its
horns longer than the hūna's, but more crooked. A Hindūstānī
calls it kalahara, a word which may have been originally kālā-
haran, black-buck, and which has been softened in pronunciation
to kalahara. The doe is light-coloured. By means of this
kalahara people catch deer; they fasten a noose (jalqā) on its
horns, hang a stone as large as a ball on one of its feet, so as
to keep it from getting far away after it has brought about the
capture of a deer, and set it opposite wild deer when these
are seen. As these (kalahara) deer are singularly combative,
advance to fight is made at once. The two deer strike with
their horns and push one another backwards and forwards,
during which the wild one's horns become entangled in the net
that is fast to the tame one's. If the wild one would run away,
the tame one does not go; it is impeded also by the stone on
its foot. People take many deer in this way; after capture they
tame them and use them in their turn to take others; they
also set them to fight at home; the deer fight very well.

There is a smaller deer (kiyik) on the Hindūstān hill-skirts,
as large may-be as the one year's lamb of the arqārghalcha
(Ovis poli).

1 The doe is brown (Blanford, p. 518). The word bughū (stag) is used alone
just below and seems likely to represent the bull of the Asiatic wapiti (f. 4 n. on
bughū-marāl.)
2 Axis porcinus (Jerdon, Cervus porcinus).
3 Saiga tartarica (Shaw). Turkī hūna is used, like English deer, for male, female,
and both. Here it seems defined by aîrkākī to mean stag or buck.
4 Antelope cervicapra, black-buck, so called from the dark hue of its back (Yule's
5 ṭūyāq, underlined in the Elph. MS. by kura, cannon-ball; Erskine, foot-ball,
de Courteille, pierre plus grosse que la cheville (ṭūyāq).
6 This mode of catching antelopes is described in the Āyin-i-akbarī, and is noted
by Erskine as common in his day.
HINDÜSTAN

The gīnī-cow ¹ is another, a very small one, perhaps as large as the qūchqār (ram) of those countries (Tramontana). Its flesh is very tender and savoury.

The monkey (maimūn) is another—a Hindūstānī calls it bandar. Of this too there are many kinds, one being what people take to those countries. The jugglers (lūlī) teach them tricks. This kind is in the mountains of Nūr-dara, in the skirt-hills of Safid-koh neighbouring on Khaibar, and from there downwards all through Hindūstān. It is not found higher up. Its hair is yellow, its face white, its tail not very long.—Another kind, not found in Bajaur, Sawād and those parts, is much larger than the one taken to those countries (Tramontana). Its tail is very long, its hair whitish, its face quite black. It is in the mountains and jungles of Hindūstān.²—Yet another kind is distinguished (būlā dūr), quite black in hair, face and limbs.³

The naval (nūl) ⁴ is another. It may be somewhat smaller than the kīsh. It climbs trees. Some call it the mūsh-i-khūrma (palm-rat). It is thought lucky.

A mouse (T. sīchqān) people call galāhrī (squirrel) is another. It is just always in trees, running up and down with amazing alertness and speed.⁵

¹ H. gainā. It is 3 feet high (Yule's H. J. s.n. Gynee). Cf. A. A. Blochmann, p. 149. The ram with which it is compared may be that of Ovis ammon (Vigne's Kashmir etc. ii, 278).
² Here the Pers. trs. adds:—They call this kind of monkey langār (baboon, I.O. 217 f. 192).
³ Here the Pers. trs. adds what Erskine mistakenly attributes to Bābūr:—People bring it from several islands.—They bring yet another kind from several islands, yellowish-grey in colour like a pūstin tīn (leather coat of?; Erskine, skin of the fig, tīn). Its head is broader and its body much larger than those of other monkeys. It is very fierce and destructive. It is singular quod penis ejus semper sit erectus, et munguam non ad coitum idoneus [Erskine].
⁴ This name is explained on the margin of the Elph. MS. as “rāsū, which is the weasel of Tartary” (Erskine). Rāsū is an Indian name for the squirrel Scirurus indicus. The kīsh, with which Bābūr's nūl is compared, is explained by de C. as belette, weasel, and by Steingass as a fur-bearing animal; the fur-bearing weasel is (Mustelidae) putorius ermina, the ermine-weasel (Blanford, p. 165), which thus seems to be Bābūr's kīsh. The alternative name Bābūr gives for his nūl, i.e. mūsh-i-khūrma, is, in India, that of Scirurus palmarum, the palm-squirrel (G. of L. i, 227); this then, it seems that Bābūr's nūl is. (Erskine took nūl here to be the mongoose (Herpestes mungus) (p. 318); and Blanford, perhaps partly on Erskine's warrant, gives mūsh-i-khūrma as a name of the lesser mungus of Bengal. I gather that the name naval is not exclusively confined even now to the mungus.)
⁵ If this be a tree-mouse and not a squirrel, it may be Vandeleuria oleracea (G. of I. i, 228).
(1. Fauna of Hindūstān:—Birds.)

The peacock (Ar. tāūs) is one. It is a beautifully coloured and splendid animal. Its form (andām) is not equal to its colouring and beauty. Its body may be as large as the crane's (tūrna) but it is not so tall. On the head of both cock and hen are 20 to 30 feathers rising some 2 or 3 inches high. The hen has neither colour nor beauty. The head of the cock has an iridescent collar (tauq sūsanī); its neck is of a beautiful blue; below the neck, its back is painted in yellow, parrot-green, blue and violet colours. The flowers on its back are much the smaller; below the back as far as the tail-tips are [larger] flowers painted in the same colours. The tail of some peacocks grows to the length of a man's extended arms. It has a small tail under its flowered feathers, like the tail of other birds; this ordinary tail and its primaries are red. It is in Bajaur and Sawād and below them; it is not in Kunur [Kūnūr] and the Lamghānāt or any place above them. Its flight is feeble, less than the pheasant's (qirghwāwal); it cannot do more than make one or two short flights. On account of its feeble flight, it frequents the hills or jungles, which is curious, since jackals abound in the jungles it frequents. What damage might these jackals not do to birds that trail from jungle to jungle, tails as long as a man's stretch (qūlāch)! Hindūstānis call the peacock mor. Its flesh is lawful food, according to the doctrine of Imām Abū Ḥanīfa; it is like that of the partridge and not unsavoury, but is eaten with instinctive aversion, in the way camel-flesh is.

The parrot (H. tūṭī) is another. This also is in Bajaur and countries lower down. It comes into Nīnghahār and the

1 The notes to this section are restricted to what serves to identify the birds Bābur mentions, though temptation is great to add something to this from the mass of interesting circumstance scattered in the many writings of observers and lovers of birds. I have thought it useful to indicate to what language a bird's name belongs.

2 Persian, gūl; English, eyes.

3 qūlāch (Zenker, p. 720); Pers. trs. (217 f. 192b) yak qad-i-adm; de Courteille, brasse (fathom). These three are expressions of the measure from finger-tip to finger-tip of a man's extended arms, which should be his height, a fathom (6 feet).

4 qānāt, of which here "primaries" appears to be the correct rendering, since Jerdon says (ii, 506) of the bird that its "wings are striated black and white, primaries and tail deep chestnut".

5 The qirghwāwal, which is of the pheasant species, when pursued, will take several flights immediately after each other, though none long; peacocks, it seems, soon get tired and take to running (Erskine).
Lamghānāt in the heats when mulberries ripen; it is not there at other times. It is of many, many kinds. One sort is that which people carry into those (Tramontane) countries. They make it speak words. Another sort is smaller; this also they make speak words. They call it the jungle-parrot. It is numerous in Bajaur, Sawād and that neighbourhood, so much so that 5 or 6000 fly in one flock (khāil). Between it and the one first-named the difference is in bulk; in colouring they are just one and the same. Another sort is still smaller than the jungle-parrot. Its head is quite red, the top of its wings (i.e. the primaries) is red also; the tip of its tail for two hands'-thickness is lustrous. The head of some parrots of this kind is iridescent (sūsānī). It does not become a talker. People call it the Kashmir parrot. Another sort is rather smaller than the jungle-parrot; its beak is black; round its neck is a wide black collar; its primaries are red. It is an excellent learner of words. We used to think that whatever a parrot or a shārak (mīna) might say of words people had taught it, it could not speak of any matter out of its own head. At this juncture one of my immediate servants Abūl-qāsim Jalāīr, reported a singular thing to me. A parrot of this sort whose cage must have been covered up, said, “Uncover my face; I am stifling.” And another time when palkī bearers sat down to take breath, this parrot, presumably on hearing wayfarers pass by, said, “Men are going past, are you not going on?” Let credit rest with the narrator, but never-the-less, so long as a person has not heard with his own ears, he may not believe! Another kind is of a beautiful full red; it has other colours also, but, as nothing is distinctly remembered about them, no description is made. It is a very beautiful bird, both in colour and form. People are understood to make this also speak words. Its defect is a most unpleasant, sharp voice, like the drawing of broken china on a copper plate.

1 Ar. barrāq, as on f. 278b last line where the Elph. MS. has barrāq, marked with the tashdīd.

2 This was, presumably, just when Bābur was writing the passage.

3 This sentence is in Arabic.

4 A Persian note, partially expunged from the text of the Elph. MS. is to the effect that 4 or 5 other kinds of parrot are heard of which the revered author did not see.

5 Erskine suggests that this may be the loory (Loriculus vernalis, Indian loriquet).
The (P.) shārak is another. It is numerous in the Lamghānāt and abounds lower down, all over Hindūstān. Like the parrot, it is of many kinds.—The kind that is numerous in the Lamghānāt has a black head; its primaries (qānāt) are spotted, its body rather larger and thicker than that of the (T.) chūghūr-chūq. People teach it to speak words.—Another kind they call p'ndāwalī; they bring it from Bengal; it is black all over and of much greater bulk than the shārak (here, house-mīna). Its bill and foot are yellow and on each ear are yellow wattles which hang down and have a bad appearance. It learns to speak well and clearly.—Another kind of shārak is slimmerer than the last and is red round the eyes. It does not learn to speak. People call it the wood-shārak. Again, at the time when (934 AH.) I had made a bridge over Gang (Ganges), crossed it, and put my adversaries to flight, a kind of shārak was seen, in the neighbourhood of Laknau and Aūd (Oude), for the first time, which had a white breast, piebald head, and black back. This kind does not learn to speak.

1 The birds Bābur classes under the name shārak seem to include what Oates and Blanford (whom I follow as they give the results of earlier workers) class under Sturnus, Eulabes and Calornis, starling, grackle and mīna, and tree-stare (Fauna of British India, Oates, vols. i and ii, Blanford, vols. iii and iv).

2 Turki, qābā; Ilinsky, p. 361, tang (tund?).

3 E. D. Ross's Polyglot List of Birds, p. 314, Chīghūr-chīq, Northern swallow; Elph. MS. f. 230b interlined jīl (Steingass lark). The description of the bird allows it to be Sturnus humii, the Himālayan starling (Oates, i, 520).

4 Elph. and Hai. MSS. (Sans. and Bengāli) p'ndūi; two good MSS. of the Pers. trs. (I.O. 217 and 218) p'ndāwalī; Ilinsky (p. 361) mīna; Erskine (Mems. p. 319) p'ndāwēt, but without his customary translation of an Indian name. The three forms shewn above can all mean "having protuberance or lump" (p'ndā) and refer to the bird's wattles. But the word of the presumably well-informed scribes of I.O. 217 and 218 can refer to the bird's sagacity in speech and be p'ndāwāli, possessed of wisdom. With the same spelling, the word can translate into the epithet religiosa, given to the wattled mīna by Linnaeus. This epithet Mr. Leonard Wray informs me has been explained to him as due to the frequenting of temples by the birds; and that in Malāya they are found living in cotes near Chinese temples.—An alternative name (one also connecting with religiosa) allowed by the form of the word is binda-walī. H. bindā is a mark on the forehead, made as a preparative to devotion by Hindūs, or in Sans. and Bengāli, is the spot of paint made on an elephant's trunk; the meaning would thus be "having a mark". Cf. Jerdon and Oates s.n. Eulabes religiosa.

5 Eulabes intermedia, the Indian grackle or hill-mīna. Here the Pers. trs. adds that people call it mīna.

6 Calornis chalybeius, the glossy starling or tree-stare, which never descends to the ground.

7 Sturnopastor contra, the pied mīna.
The Ṽṣāq is another. This bird they call (Ar.) bū-qalamūn (chameleon) because, between head and tail, it has five or six changing colours, resplendent (barrāq) like a pigeon's throat. It is about as large as the kabg-i-dari and seems to be the kabg-i-dari of Hindūstān. As the kabg-i-dari moves (yūrūr) on the heads (kulah) of mountains, so does this. It is in the Nijr-āu mountains of the countries of Kābul, and in the mountains lower down but it is not found higher up. People tell this wonderful thing about it:—When the birds, at the onset of winter, descend to the hill-skirts, if they come over a vineyard, they can fly no further and are taken. God knows the truth! The flesh of this bird is very savoury.

The partridge (durrāj) is another. This is not peculiar to Hindūstān but is also in the Garm-sīr countries; as however some kinds are only in Hindūstān, particulars of them are given here. The durrāj (Francolius vulgaris) may be of the same bulk as the kīklik; the cock's back is the colour of the hen-pheasant (qīrghāwal-ning māda-sī); its throat and breast are black, with quite white spots. A red line comes down on both sides of both eyes. It is named from its cry which is something like Shir dāram shakrak. It pronounces shir short; dāram shakrak it says distinctly. Astarābād partridges are said to cry Bāt mīnī tūtilār (Quick! they have caught me). The partridge of Arabia and those parts is understood to cry, Bīl

---

1 Part of the following passage about the Ṽṣāq (var. lākha, lūcha) is verbatim with part of that on f. 135; both were written about 934-5 AH. as is shewn by Shaikh Zain (Index s.n.) and by inference from references in the text (Index s.n. B.N. date of composition). See Appendix N.

2 Lit. mountain-partridge. There is ground for understanding that one of the birds known in the region as monals is meant. See Appendix N.

3 Sans. chakora; Ar. durrāj; P. kabg; T. kīklik.

4 Here, probably, southern Afghanistān.

5 Caccabis chukār (Scully, Shaw's Vocabulary) or C. pallescens (Hume, quoted under No. 126 E. D. Ross' Polyglot List).

6 In some parts of the country (i.e. India before 1841 AD.), tippets used to be made of the beautiful black, white-spotted feathers of the lower plumage (of the durrāj), and were in much request, but they are rarely procurable now. (Bengal Sporting Magazine for 1841, quoted by Jerdon, ii, 501).

7 A broad collar of red passes round the whole neck (Jerdon, ii, 558).

8 Ar. durrāj means one who repeats what he hears, a tell-tale.

9 Various translations have been made of this passage, "I have milk and sugar" (Erskine), "J'ai du lait, un peu de sucre" (de Courteille), but with short shːr, it might be read in more than one way ignoring milk and sugar. See Jerdon, ii, 558 and Hobson Jobson s.n. Black-partridge.
shakar tadawm al nī‘am (with sugar pleasure endures)! The hen-bird has the colour of the young pheasant. These birds are found below Nijr-aū.—Another kind is called kanjāl. Its bulk may be that of the one already described. Its voice is very like that of the kiklik but much shriller. There is little difference in colour between the cock and hen. It is found in Parashāwar, Hashnagar and countries lower down, but not higher up.

The $p(h)ūl$-paikār is another. Its size may be that of the kabg-i-darī; its shape is that of the house-cock, its colour that of the hen. From forehead ($tūmāgh$) to throat it is of a beautiful colour, quite red. It is in the Hindūstān mountains.

The wild-fowl (saḥrāī-tāūgh) is another. It flies like a pheasant, and is not of all colours as house-fowl are. It is in the mountains of Bajaur and lower down, but not higher up.

The chilī (or jilī) is another. In bulk it equals the $p(h)ūl$-paikār but the latter has the finer colouring. It is in the mountains of Bajaur.

The shām is another. It is about as large as a house-fowl; its colour is unique (ghair mukarrar). It also is in the mountains of Bajaur.

The quail (P. būdana) is another. It is not peculiar to Hindūstān but four or five kinds are so.—One is that which goes to our countries (Tramontana), larger and more spreading than the (Hindūstān) quail. Another kind is smaller than the one first named. Its primaries and tail are reddish. It flies in flocks like the chīr (Phasianus Wallichii). Another kind is smaller than that which goes to our countries and is darker on throat.
and breast.\(^1\) Another kind goes in small numbers to Kābul; it is very small, perhaps a little larger than the yellow wag-tail (qāṛcha)\(^2\); they call it qūrāṭu in Kābul.

The Indian bustard (P. kharchāl)\(^3\) is another. It is about as large as the (T.) tūghdāq (Otis tarda, the great bustard), and seems to be the tūghdāq of Hindūstān.\(^4\) Its flesh is delicious; of some birds the leg is good, of others, the wing; of the bustard all the meat is delicious and excellent.

The florican (P. charz)\(^5\) is another. It is rather less than the tūghdārī (houbara)\(^6\); the cock's back is like the tūghdārī's, and its breast is black. The hen is of one colour.

The Hindūstān sand-grouse (T. bāṛhī-qrār)\(^7\) is another. It is smaller and slenderer than the bāṛhī-qrār [Pterocles arenarius] of those countries (Tramontana). Also its cry is sharper.

Of the birds that frequent water and the banks of rivers, one is the dēng,\(^8\) an animal of great bulk, each wing measuring a qūlāch (fathom). It has no plumage (tūqī) on head or neck; a thing like a bag hangs from its neck; its back is black; its breast is white. It goes sometimes to Kābul; one year people brought one they had caught. It became very tame; if meat

---

\(^1\) Perhaps Coturnix coronandellifica, the black-breasted or rain quail, 7 inches long.
\(^2\) Perhaps Motacilla citrella, a yellow wag-tail which summers in Central Asia (Oates, ii, 298). If so, its Kābul name may refer to its flashing colour. Cf. E. D. Ross, l.c. No. 301; de Courteille's Dictionary which gives gāṛcha, wag-tail, and Zenker's which fixes the colour.
\(^3\) Eurystomus edwardsii; Turki, tūghdār or tūghdārī.
\(^4\) Erskine noting (Mems. p. 321), that the bustard is common in the Dakkan where it is bigger than a turkey, says it is called tūghdār and suggests that this is a corruption of tūghdāq. The uses of both words are shewn by Bābūr, here, and in the next following, account of the charz. Cf. G. of I. i, 260 and E. D. Ross l.c. Nos. 36, 40.
\(^5\) Syphoetis Bengalensis and S. aurita, which are both smaller than Otis houbara (tūghdārī). In Hindūstān S. aurita is known as likh which name is the nearest approach I have found to Bābūr's [liŋga] lükha.
\(^6\) Jerdon mentions (ii, 615) that this bird is common in Afgānīstān and there called dugūar (tūghdār, tūghdārī).
\(^7\) Cf. Appendix B, since I wrote which, further information has made it fairly safe to say that the Hindūstān bāṛhī-qrār is Pterocles exustus, the common sand-grouse and that the one of f. 49b is Pterocles arenarius, the larger or black-bellied sand-grouse. P. exustus is said by Yule (H. J. s.n. Rock-pigeon) to have been miscalled rock-pigeon by Anglo-Indians, perhaps because its flight resembles the pigeon's. This accounts for Erskine's rendering (p. 321) bāṛhī-qrār here by rock-pigeon.
\(^8\) Leptotilus dubius, Hind. hargātā. Hindūstāns call it pīṛ-i-dēng (Erskine) and peda dhauk (Blanford), both names referring, perhaps, to its pouch. It is the adjutant of Anglo-India. Cf. f. 235.
were thrown to it, it never failed to catch it in its bill. Once it swallowed a six-nailed shoe, another time a whole fowl, wings and feathers, all right down.

The sāras (Grus antigone) is another. Turks in Hindūstān call it tīwa-tūrṇā (camel-crane). It may be smaller than the dīṅg but its neck is rather longer. Its head is quite red.1 People keep this bird at their houses; it becomes very tame.

The mānēk2 is another. In stature it approaches the sāras, but its bulk is less. It resembles the lag-lag (Ciconia alba, the white stork) but is much larger; its bill is larger and is black. Its head is iridescent, its neck white, its wings partly-coloured; the tips and border-feathers and under parts of the wings are white, their middle black.

Another stork (lag-lag) has a white neck and all other parts black. It goes to those countries (Tramontana). It is rather smaller than the lag-lag (Ciconia alba). A Hindūstānī calls it yak-rang (one colour?).

Another stork in colour and shape is exactly like the storks that go to those countries. Its bill is blacker and its bulk much less than the lag-lag’s (Ciconia alba).3

Another bird resembles the grey heron (aūqār) and the lag-lag; but its bill is longer than the heron’s and its body smaller than the white stork’s (lag-lag).

Another is the large buzak4 (black ibis). In bulk it may equal the buzzard (Turkī, sār). The back of its wings is white. It has a loud cry.

The white buzak5 is another. Its head and bill are black.

1 only when young (Blanford, ii, 188).
2 Elph. MS. mānīk-sā or mānīkīā; Ḫai. MS. m:nk. Haughton’s Bengali Dictionary gives two forms of the name mānēk-jur and mānēk-yoī. It is Dissura episcopus, the white-necked stork (Blanford iv, 370, who gives manik-jor amongst its Indian names). Jerdon classes it (ii, 737) as Ciconia leucocephala. It is the beef-steak bird of Anglo-India.
3 Ciconia nigra (Blanford, iv, 369).
4 Under the Hindūstānī form, būza, of Persian buzak the birds Bābur mentions as buzak can be identified. The large one is Inocotis papillosus, būza, kāla būza, black curlew, king-curlew. The bird it equals in size is a buzzard, Turkī sār (not Persian sār, starling). The king-curlew has a large white patch on the inner lesser and marginal coverts of its wings (Blanford, iv, 303). This agrees with Bābur’s statement about the wings of the large buzak. Its length is 27 inches, while the starling’s is 9½ inches.
5 Ibis melanocephala, the white ibis, Pers. safed buzak, Bengali sabut būza. It is 30 inches long.
It is much larger than the one that goes to those countries, but smaller than the Hindustān busak.²

The gharm-pāī³ (spotted-billed duck) is another. It is larger than the sūna būrčin⁴ (mallard). The drake and duck are of one colour. It is in Hashnagar at all seasons, sometimes it goes into the Lamghānāt. Its flesh is very savoury.

The shāh-murg (Sarcidiornis melanonotus, comb duck or nukta) is another. It may be a little smaller than a goose. It has a swelling on its bill; its back is black; its flesh is excellent eating.

The zu mamma is another. It is about as large as the būrgūt (Aquila chrysaetos, the golden eagle).

The (T.) ālā-qārgha of Hindustān is another (Corvus cornix, the pied crow). This is slenderer and smaller than the ālā-qārgha of those countries (Tramontana). Its neck is partly white.

Another Hindustān bird resembles the crow (T. qārcha, C. splendens) and the magpie (Ar. ‘agqa). In the Lamghānāt people call it the jungle-bird (P. murgh-i-jangal).⁵ Its head and breast are black; its wings and tail reddish; its eye quite red. Having a feeble flight, it does not come out of the jungle, whence its name.

The great bat (P. shapara)⁶ is another. People call it (Hindi) chungādūr. It is about as large as the owl (T. yāpālāq, Otus brachyotus), and has a head like a puppy’s. When it is thinking of lodging for the night on a tree, it takes hold of a branch, turns head-downwards, and so remains. It has much singularity.

The magpie (Ar. ‘agqa) is another. People call it (H. ?) matā (Dendrocitta rufa, the Indian tree-pie). It may be somewhat

---

¹ Perhaps, Plegadis falcinellus, the glossy ibis, which in most parts of India is a winter visitor. Its length is 25 inches.
² Erskine suggests that this is Platalea leucorodia, the chamach-būza, spoon-bill. It is 33 inches long.
³ Anas poecilorhyncha. The Ḩai. MS. writes gharm-pāi, and this is the Indian name given by Blanford (iv, 437).
⁴ Anas boschas. Dr. Ross notes (No. 147), from the Sanglākh, that sūna is the drake, būrčin, the duck and that it is common in China to call a certain variety of bird by the combined sex-names. Something like this is shewn by the uses of būghā and marāl q.v. Index.
⁵ Centropus rufigenlis, the common coucal (Yule’s H. J. s.n. Crow-.localsant); H. makokkā, Cuculus castaneus (Buchanan, quoted by Forbes).
⁶ Pteropus edwardsii, the flying-fox. The inclusion of the bat here amongst birds, may be a clerical accident, since on f. 136 a flying-fox is not written of as a bird.
less than the 'aqqa (Pica rustica), which moreover is pied black and white, while the matā is pied brown and black.1

Another is a small bird, perhaps of the size of the (T.) sāndūlāch.2 Fol. 281b. It is of a beautiful red with a little black on its wings.

The karcha3 is another; it is after the fashion of a swallow (T. gārīghāch), but much larger and quite black.

The kūil4 (Eudynamys orientalis, the koel) is another. It may be as large as the crow (P. zāq) but is much slenderer. It has a kind of song and is understood to be the bulbul of Hindūstān. Its honour with Hindūstānīs is as great as is the bulbul's. It always stays in closely-wooded gardens.

Another bird is after the fashion of the (Ar.) shiqarrāk (Cissa chinensis, the green-magpie). It clings to trees, is perhaps as large as the green-magpie, and is parrot-green (Gecinus striolatus, the little green-woodpecker?).

(k. Fauna of Hindūstān:—Aquatic animals.)

One is the water-tiger (P. shīr-ābī, Crocodilus palustris).5 This is in the standing-waters. It is like a lizard (T. gīlās).6 People say it carries off men and even buffaloes.

1 Bābur here uses what is both the Kābul and Andijān name for the magpie, Ar. 'aqqa (Oates, i, 31 and Scully's Voc.), instead of T. sāghīzhān or P. dam-sīcha (tail-wagger).
2 The Pers.trs. writes sāndūlāch mamūlā, mamūlā being Arabic for wag-tail. De Courteille's Dictionary describes the sāndūlāch as small and having a long tail, the cock-bird green, the hen, yellow. The wag-tail suited this in colouring is Motacilla borealis (Oates, ii, 294; syn. Budistes viridis, the green wag-tail); this, as a migrant, serves to compare with the Indian "little bird", which seems likely to be a red-start.
3 This word may represent Scully's kirīch and be the Turki name for a swift, perhaps Cypselus affinis.
4 This name is taken from its cry during the breeding season (Yule's H.J. s.n. Koel).
5 Bābur's distinction between the three crocodiles he mentions seems to be that of names he heard, shīr-ābī, siyāh-sār, and gharīāl.
6 In this passage my husband finds the explanation of two somewhat vague statements of later date, one made by Abūl-fażl (A. A. Blochmann, p. 65) that Akbar called the kīlās (cherry) the shāh-ālā (king-plum), the other by Jahāngīr that this change was made because kīlās means lizard (Jahāngīr's Memoirs, R. & B. i, 116). What Akbar did is shewn by Bābur; it was to reject the Persian name kīlās, cherry, because it closely resembled Turki gīlās, lizard. There is a lizard Stellio Lehmanni of Transoxiana with which Bābur may well have compared the crocodile's appearance (Schuyler's Turkistan, i, 383). Akbar in Hindūstān may have had Varanus salvator (6 ft. long) in mind, if indeed he had not the great lizard, al lagarto, the alligator itself in his thought. The name kīlās evidently was banished only from the Court circle, since it is still current in Kashmir (Blochmann L.C. p. 616); and Speede (p. 201) gives keeras, cherry, as used in India.
The (P.) sīyāḥ-sār (black-head) is another. This also is like a lizard. It is in all rivers of Hindūstān. One that was taken and brought in was about 4–5 gārī (cir. 13 feet) long and as thick perhaps as a sheep. It is said to grow still larger. Its snout is over half a yard long. It has rows of small teeth in its upper and lower jaws. It comes out of the water and sinks into the mud (bātā).

The (Sans.) gḥarīāl (Gavialis gangeticus) is another. It is said to grow large; many in the army saw it in the Sarū (Gogra) river. It is said to take people; while we were on that river's banks (934–935 A.H.), it took one or two slave-women (dādūk), and it took three or four camp-followers between Ghāzīpūr and Banāras. In that neighbourhood I saw one but from a distance only and not quite clearly.

The water-hog (P. khūk-ābī, Platanista gangetica, the porpoise) is another. This also is in all Hindūstān rivers. It comes up suddenly out of the water; its head appears and disappears; it dives again and stays below, shewing its tail. Its snout is as long as the sīyāḥ-sār's and it has the same rows of small teeth. Its head and the rest of its body are fish-like. When at play in the water, it looks like a water-carrier's bag (mashak). Water-hogs, playing in the Sarū, leap right out of the water; like fish, they never leave it.

Again there is the kalah (or galah)-fish [bālīgh]. Two bones

1 This name as now used, is that of the purely fish-eating crocodile. [In the Turki text Bābur's account of the ghariāl follows that of the porpoise; but it is grouped here with those of the two other crocodiles.]

2 As the Hai. MS. and also I.O. 216 f. 137 (Pers. trs.) write kalah (galah)-fish, this may be a large cray-fish. One called by a name approximating to galah-fish is found in Malāyan waters, viz. the galah-prawn (hūdang) (cf. Bengāli gūla-chingrī, gūla-prawn, Haughton). Galah and gūla may express lament made when the fish is caught (Haughton pp. 931, 933, 952); or if kalah be read, this may express scolding. Two good MSS. of the Wāqī'āt-i-bāburī (Pers. trs.) write kaka; and their word cannot but have weight. Erskine reproduces kaka but offers no explanation of it, a failure betokening difficulty in his obtaining one. My husband suggests that kaka may represent a stuttering sound, doing so on the analogy of Vullers' explanation of the word,—Vir ridiculus et facetos qui simul balbutiat; and also he inclines to take the fish to be a crab (kakra). Possibly kaka is a popular or vulgar name for a crayfish or a crab. Whether the sound is lament, scolding, or stuttering the fisherman knows! Shaikh Zain enlarges Bābur's notice of this fish; he says the bones are prolonged (bar āwardā) from the ears, that these it agitates at time of capture, making a noise like the word kaka by which it is known, that it is two wajab (18 in.) long, its flesh surprisingly tasty, and that it is very active, leaping a gas (cir. a yard) out of the water when the fisherman's net is set to take it. For information about the Malāyan fish, I am indebted to Mr. Cecil Wray.
each about 3 inches (aïlik) long, come out in a line with its ears; these it shakes when taken, producing an extraordinary noise, whence, seemingly, people have called it kalah [or galah].

The flesh of Hindūstān fishes is very savoury; they have no odour (aïd) or tiresomeness.¹ They are surprisingly active. On one occasion when people coming, had flung a net across a stream, leaving its two edges half a yard above the water, most fish passed by leaping a yard above it. In many rivers are little fish which fling themselves a yard or more out of the water if there be harsh noise or sound of feet.

The frogs of Hindūstān, though otherwise like those others (Tramontane), run 6 or 7 yards on the face of the water.²

(l. Vegetable products of Hindūstān: Fruits.)

The mango (P. anbah) is one of the fruits peculiar to Hindūstān. Hindūstānis pronounce the b in its name as though no vowel followed it (i.e. Sans. anb);³ this being awkward to utter, some people call the fruit [P.] naghzak⁴ as Khwāja Khusrau does:

\[\text{Naghzak-i mā [var. khwash] naghz-kun-i būstān,} \]
\[\text{Naghztarin mewa [var. na'nat]-i-Hindūstān.}\]⁵

Mangoes when good, are very good, but, many as are eaten, few are first-rate. They are usually plucked unripe and ripened in the house. Unripe, they make excellent condiments (qātiq), are good also preserved in syrup.⁶ Taking it altogether, the mango is the best fruit of Hindūstān. Some so praise it as to give it preference over all fruits except the musk-melon (T. qāwūn), but

¹ T. qiýûnlîght, presumably referring to spines or difficult bones; T. qîn, however, means a scabbard [Shaw].
² One of the common frogs is a small one which, when alarmed, jumps along the surface of the water (G. of I. i, 273).
³ Anb and anbah (pronounced amb and anbah) are now less commonly used names than ōm. It is an interesting comment on Bābur’s words that Abû’l-fazl spells anb, letter by letter, and says that the b is quiescent (Āyîn 28; for the origin of the word mango, vide Yule’s H.J. s.n.).
⁴ A corresponding diminutive would be fairling.
⁵ The variants, entered in parenthesis, are found in the Bib. Ind. ed. of the Āyîn-i-akbarī p. 75 and in a (bazar) copy of the Qurānu’s-sā’dain in my husband’s possession. As Amîr Khusrau was a poet of Hindūstān, either khwash (khwesh) [our own] or mā [our] would suit his meaning. The couplet is, literally:—

Our fairing, [i.e. mango] beauty-maker of the garden, Fairest fruit of Hindūstān.
such praise outmatches it. It resembles the kārdī peach. It ripens in the rains. It is eaten in two ways: one is to squeeze it to a pulp, make a hole in it, and suck out the juice,—the other, to peel and eat it like the kārdī peach. Its tree grows very large and has a leaf somewhat resembling the peach-tree's. The trunk is ill-looking and ill-shaped, but in Bengāl and Gujrat is heard of as growing handsome (khūb).

The plantain (Sans. kelā, Musa sapientum) is another. An 'Arab calls it maut. Its tree is not very tall, indeed is not to be called a tree, since it is something between a grass and a tree. Its leaf is a little like that of the amān-garā but grows about 2 yards (gāri) long and nearly one broad. Out of the middle of its leaves rises, heart-like, a bud which resembles a sheep's heart. As each leaf (petal) of this bud expands, there grows at its base a row of 6 or 7 flowers which become the plantains. These flowers become visible with the lengthening of the heart-like shoot and the opening of the petals of the bud. The tree is understood to flower once only. The fruit has two pleasant qualities, one that it peels easily, the other that it has neither stone nor fibre. It is rather longer and thinner than the egg-plant (P. bādanjān; Solanum melongena). It is not very sweet; the Bengāl plantain (i.e. chīni-champa) is, however, said to be very

1 I have learned nothing more definite about the word kārdī than that it is the name of a superior kind of peach (Chiyašul-lughat).
2 The preceding sentence is out of place in the Turkī text; it may therefore be a marginal note, perhaps not made by Babur.
3 This sentence suggests that Babur, writing in Agra or Fathpūr did not there see fine mango-trees.
4 See Yule's H.J. on the plantain, the banana of the West.
5 This word is a descendant of Sanscrit mocha, and parent of musa the botanical name of the fruit (Yule).
6 Shaikh Effendi (Kunos), Zenker and de Courteille say of this only that it is the name of a tree. Shaw gives a name that approaches it, ārman, a grass, a weed; Scully explains this as Artemisia vulgaris, wormwood, but Roxburgh gives no Artemisia having a leaf resembling the plantain's. Scully has arāmadān, unexplained, which, like amān-garā, may refer to comfort in shade. Babur's comparison will be with something known in Transoxiana. Maize has general resemblance with the plantain. So too have the names of the plants, since mocha and maut stand for the plantain and (Hindi) mukā'ī for maize. These incidental resemblances bear, however lightly, on the question considered in the Ency. Br. (art. maize) whether maize was early in Asia or not; some writers hold that it was; if Babur's amān-garā were maize, maize will have been familiar in Transoxiana in his day.
7 Abū’l-faşl mentions that the plantain-tree bears no second crop unless cut down to the stump.
8 Babur was fortunate not to have met with a seed-bearing plantain.
sweet. The plantain is a very good-looking tree, its broad, broad, leaves of beautiful green having an excellent appearance.

The anblī (H. imli, Tamarindus indica, the tamarind) is another. By this name (anblī) people call the khurmā-i-hind (Indian date-tree). It has finely-cut leaves (leaflets), precisely like those of the (T.) būtā, except that they are not so finely-cut. It is a very good-looking tree, giving dense shade. It grows wild in masses too.

The (Beng.) mahuwa (Bassia latifolia) is another. People call it also (P.) gul-chikān (or chigān, distilling-flower). This also is a very large tree. Most of the wood in the houses of Hindūstānis is from it. Spirit (‘arāq) is distilled from its flowers, not only so, but they are dried and eaten like raisins, and from them thus dried, spirit is also extracted. The dried flowers taste just like kishmish; they have an ill-flavour. The flowers are not bad in their natural state; they are eatable. The mahuwa grows wild also. Its fruit is tasteless, has rather a large seed with a thin husk, and from this seed, again, oil is extracted.

The mimusops (Sans. khirnī, Mimusops kauki) is another. Its tree, though not very large, is not small. The fruit is yellow and

1 The ripe “dates” are called P. tamar-i Hind, whence our tamarind, and Tamarindus Indica.
2 Sophora alopecuroides, a leguminous plant (Scully).
3 Aū‘l-fazl gives galantium as the name of the “fruit” [mewa].—Forbes, as that of the fallen flower. Cf. Brandis p. 426 and Yule’s H. J. s.n. Mohwa.
4 Bābur seems to say that spirit is extracted from both the fresh and the dried flowers. The fresh ones are favourite food with deer and jackals; they have a sweet spirituous taste. Erskine notes that the spirit made from them was well-known in Bombay by the name of Moura, or of Parsi-brandy, and that the farm of it was a considerable article of revenue (p. 325 n.). Roxburgh describes it as strong and intoxicating (p. 411).
5 This is the name of a green, stoneless grape which when dried, results in a raisin resembling the sultanas of Europe (Jahāngīr’s Memoirs and Yule’s H. J. s.n.; Griffiths’ Journal of Travel pp. 359, 388).
6 Aūl, lit. the aūl of the flower. The Persian translation renders aūl by bū which may allow both words to be understood in their (root) sense of being, i.e. natural state. De Courteille translates by quand la fleur est fraîche (ii, 210); Erskine took bū to mean smell (Memoirs p. 325), but the aūl it translates, does not seem to have this meaning. For reading aūl as “the natural state”, there is circumstantial support in the flower’s being eaten raw (Roxburgh). The annotator of the Elphinstone MS. [whose defacement of that Codex has been often mentioned], has added points and tashdīd to the aūl-i (i.e. its aūl), so as to produce awwaltī (first, f. 235). Against this there are the obvious objections that the Persian translation does not reproduce, and that its bū does not render awwaltī; also that aūl-i is a noun with its enclitic genitive yā (i).
7 This word seems to be meant to draw attention to the various merits of the mahuwa tree.
thinner than the red jujube (T. chikdā, Eleagnus angustifolia). It has just the grape’s flavour, but a rather bad after-taste; it is not bad, however, and is eatable. The husk of its stone is thin.

The (Sans.) jāman (Eugenia jambolana)⁠² is another. Its leaf, except for being thicker and greener, is quite like the willow’s (T. tāl). The tree does not want for beauty. Its fruit is like a black grape, is sourish, and not very good.

The (H.) kamrak (Beng. kamrungra, Averrhoa carambola) is another. Its fruit is five-sided, about as large as the ‘ain-ālu⁠³ and some 3 inches long. It ripens to yellow; gathered unripe, it is very bitter; gathered ripe, its bitterness has become sub-acid, not bad, not wanting in pleasantness.⁣⁴

The jack-fruit (H. kadhil, B. kanthal, Artocarpus integrifolia) is another.⁣⁵ This is a fruit of singular form and flavour; it looks like a sheep’s stomach stuffed and made into a haggis (gīpa);⁶ and it is sickeningly-sweet. Inside it are filbert-like stones⁷ which, on the whole, resemble dates, but are round, not long, and have softer substance; these are eaten. The jack-fruit is very adhesive; for this reason people are said to oil mouth and hands before eating of it. It is heard of also as growing, not only on the branches of its tree, but on trunk and root too.⁸ One would say that the tree was all hung round with haggises.

The monkey-jack (H. badhal, B. burhul, Artocarpus lacoocha) is another. The fruit may be of the size of a quince (var. apple).

---

¹ Erskine notes that this is not to be confounded with E. jāmbū, the rose-apple (Memoirs p. 325 n.). Cf. Yule’s H.J. s.n. Jambu.
² var. ghat-ālū, ghab-ālū, ghain-ālū, shalt-ālū. Scully enters ‘ain-ālū (true-plum?) unexplained. The kamrak fruit is 3 in. long (Brandis) and of the size of a lemon (Firminger); dimensions which make Bābur’s 4 aīlik (hand’s-thickness) a slight excess only, and which thus allow aīlik, with its Persion translation, angusht, to be approximately an inch.
³ Speede, giving the fruit its Sanscrit name kamrunga, says it is acid, rather pleasant, something like an insipid apple; also that its pretty pink blossoms grow on the trunk and main branches (i, 211).
⁴ Cf. Yule’s H.J. s.n. jack-fruit. In a Calcutta nurseryman’s catalogue of 1914 AD. three kinds of jack-tree are offered for sale, viz. “Crispy or Khaja, Soft or Neo, Rose-scented”⁹ (Seth, Feronia Nursery).
⁵ The gīpa is a sheep’s stomach stuffed with rice, minced meat, and spices, and boiled as a pudding. The resemblance of the jack, as it hangs on the tree, to the haggis, is wonderfully complete (Erskine).
⁶ These when roasted have the taste of chestnuts.
⁷ Firminger (p. 186) describes an ingenious method of training.
⁸ For a note of Humāyūn’s on the jack-fruit see Appendix O.
Its smell is not bad. Unripe it is a singularly tasteless and empty thing; when ripe, it is not so bad. It ripens soft, can be pulled to pieces and eaten anywhere, tastes very much like a rotten quince, and has an excellent little austere flavour.

The lote-fruit (Sans. ber, Zizyphus jujuba) is another. Its Persian name is understood to be kanār. It is of several kinds: of one the fruit is larger than the plum (ālūcha); another is shaped like the Ḥusainī grape. Most of them are not very good; we saw one in Bāndīr (Gūālīr) that was really good. The lote-tree sheds its leaves under the Signs Ṣaur and Jauzā (Bull and Twins), burgeons under Saratān and Asad (Crab and Lion) which are the true rainy-season,—then becoming fresh and green, and it ripens its fruit under Dalū and Haut (Bucket i.e. Aquarius, and Fish).

The (Sans.) karaūndā (Carissa carandas, the corinda) is another. It grows in bushes after the fashion of the (T.) chi̇ka of our country, but the chi̇ka grows on mountains, the karaūndā on the plains. In flavour it is like the rhubarb itself, but is sweeter and less juicy.

The (Sans.) pāniyālā (Flacourtia cataphracta) is another. It is larger than the plum (ālūcha) and like the red-apple unripe. It is a little austere and is good. The tree is taller than the pomegranate's; its leaf is like that of the almond-tree but smaller.

1 aidd-i-yamān aṭmās. It is somewhat curious that Bābūr makes no comment on the odour of the jack itself.
2 būsh, English bosh (Shaw). The Persian translation inserts no more about this fruit.
3 Erskine notes that "this is the bullace-plum, small, not more than twice as large as the sloe and not so high-flavoured; it is generally yellow, sometimes red." Like Bābūr, Brandis enumerates several varieties and mentions the seasonal changes of the tree (p. 170).
4 This will be Kābul, probably, because Transoxiana is written of by Bābūr usually, if not invariably, as "that country," and because he mentions the chi̇ka (i.e. chi̇ka?), under its Persian name sinjiād, in his Description of Kābul (f. 129b).
5 P. mar manjān, which I take to refer to the ri̇wāshf of Kābul. (Cf. f. 129b, where, however, (note 5) are corrigenda of Masson's rawash for ri̇wāš, and his third to second volume.) Kehr's Codex contains an extra passage about the karaun dā, viz. that from it is made a tasty fritter-like dish, resembling a rhubarb-fritter (Ilminsky, p. 369).
6 People call it (P.) pālasa also (Elph. MS. f. 236, marginal note).
7 Perhaps the red-apple of Kābul, where two sorts are common, both rosy, one very much so, but much inferior to the other (Griffith's Journal of Travel p. 388).
The (H.) gūlar (Ficus glomerata, the clustered fig)\(^1\) is another. The fruit grows out of the tree-trunk, resembles the fig (P. anjīr), but is singularly tasteless.

The (Sans.) āmlā (Phyllanthus emblica, the myrobalan-tree) is another. This also is a five-sided fruit.\(^2\) It looks like the un-blown cotton-pod. It is an astringent and ill-flavoured thing, but confiture made of it is not bad. It is a wholesome fruit. Its tree is of excellent form and has very minute leaves.

The (H.) chirūnjī (Buchanania latifolia)\(^3\) is another. This tree had been understood to grow in the hills, but I knew later about it, because there were three or four clumps of it in our gardens. It is much like the mahuva. Its kernel is not bad, a thing between the walnut and the almond, not bad! rather smaller than the pistachio and round; people put it in custards (P. pālūḍa) and sweetmeats (Ar. ḫalva).

The date-palm (P. khurmā, Phænix dactylifera) is another. This is not peculiar to Hindūstān, but is here described because it is not in those countries (Tramontana). It grows in Lamghān also.\(^4\) Its branches (i.e. leaves) grow from just one place at its top; its leaves (i.e. leaflets) grow on both sides of the branches (midribs) from neck (būīn) to tip; its trunk is rough and ill-coloured; its fruit is like a bunch of grapes, but much larger. People say that the date-palm amongst vegetables resembles an animal in two respects: one is that, as, if an animal's head be cut off, its life is taken, so it is with the date-palm, if its head is cut off, it dries off; the other is that, as the offspring of animals is not produced without the male, so too with the date-palm, it gives no good fruit unless a branch of the male-tree be brought into touch with the female-tree. The truth of this last matter is not known (to me). The above-mentioned head of the date-palm is called its cheese. The tree so grows that where its leaves come out is cheese-white, the leaves becoming green as they lengthen. This white part, the so-called cheese, is tolerable eating, not bad, much like the walnut. People make a wound in

---

\(^1\) Its downy fruit grows in bundles from the trunk and large branches (Roxburgh).

\(^2\) The reference by "also" (ham) will be to the kamrak (f. 283b), but both Roxburgh and Brandis say the āmla is six striated.

\(^3\) The Sanserit and Bengālī name for the chirūnjī-tree is pīyala (Roxburgh p. 363).

\(^4\) Cf. f. 250b.
the cheese, and into this wound insert a leaf(leaf), in such a way that all liquid flowing from the wound runs down it.\(^1\) The tip of the leaflet is set over the mouth of a pot suspended to the tree in such a way that it collects whatever liquor is yielded by the wound. This liquor is rather pleasant if drunk at once; if drunk after two or three days, people say it is quite exhilarating (\textit{kaifiyat}). Once when I had gone to visit Bārī,\(^2\) and made an excursion to the villages on the bank of the Chāmbal-river, we met in with people collecting this date-liquor in the valley-bottom. A good deal was drunk; no hilarity was felt; much must be drunk, seemingly, to produce a little cheer.

The coco-nut palm (\textit{P. nārgil}, \textit{Cocos nucifera}) is another. An 'Arab gives it Arabic form\(^3\) and says \textit{nārjīl}; Hindūstān people say \textit{nālīr}, seemingly by popular error.\(^4\) Its fruit is the Hindī-nut from which black spoons (\textit{qarā qāshūq}) are made and the larger ones of which serve for guitar-bodies. The coco-palm has general resemblance to the date-palm, but has more, and more glistening leaves. Like the walnut, the coco-nut has a green outer husk; but its husk is of fibre on fibre. All ropes for ships and boats and also cord for sewing boat-seams are heard of as made from these husks. The nut, when stripped of its husk, near one end shews a triangle of hollows, two of which are solid, the third a nothing (\textit{būsh}), easily pierced. Before the kernel forms, there is fluid inside; people pierce the soft hollow and drink this; it tastes like date-palm cheese in solution, and is not bad.

The (Sans.) \textit{tār} (\textit{Borassus flabelliformis}, the Palmyra-palm) is another. Its branches (\textit{i.e.} leaves) also are quite at its top. Just as with the date-palm, people hang a pot on it, take its juice and drink it. They call this liquor \textit{tārī};\(^5\) it is said to be more exhilarating than date liquor. For about a yard along its branches

\(^1\) The leaflet is rigid enough to serve as a runlet, but soon wears out; for this reason, the usual practice is to use one of split bamboo.

\(^2\) This is a famous hunting-ground between Bānā and Dhūlpūr, Rājpūtāna, visited in 933 AH. (f. 330\textdegree). Bābur's great-great-grandson Shāh-jahān built a hunting-lodge there (G. of I.).

\(^3\) Hai. MS. \textit{mu'arrab}, but the Elph. MS. \textit{maghrīb}, [occidentalizing]. The Hai. MS. when writing of the orange (\textit{infra}) also has \textit{maghrīb}. A distinction of locality may be drawn by \textit{maghrīb}.

\(^4\) Bābur’s “Hindūstān people” (\textit{aīl}) are those neither Turks nor Afghāns.

\(^5\) This name, with its usual form \textit{tādī} (toddy), is used for the fermented sap of the date, coco, and \textit{mhār} palms also (cf. Yule's H.J. \textit{s.n.} toddy).
(i.e. leaf-stems) there are no leaves; above this, at the tip of the branch (stem), 30 or 40 open out like the spread palm of the hand, all from one place. These leaves approach a yard in length. People often write Hindi characters on them after the fashion of account rolls (daftar yūsūnlūq).

The orange (Ar. nāranj, Citrus aurantium) and orange-like fruits are others of Hindūstān. Oranges grow well in the Lamghānāt, Bajaur and Sawād. The Lamghānāt one is smallish, has a navel, is very agreeable, fragile and juicy. It is not at all like the orange of Khurāsān and those parts, being so fragile that many spoil before reaching Kābul from the Lamghānāt which may be 13—14 yīghāch (65—70 miles), while the Astarābād orange, by reason of its thick skin and scant juice, carries with less damage from there to Samarkand, some 270—280 yīghāch. The Bajaur orange is about as large as a quince, very juicy and more acid than other oranges. Khwāja Kalān once said to me, “We counted the oranges gathered from a single tree of this sort in Bajaur and it mounted up to 7,000.” It had been always in my mind that the word nāranj was an Arabic form; it would seem to be really so, since every-one in Bajaur and Sawād says (P.) nārang.

1 Bābur writes of the long leaf-stalk as a branch (shākh); he also seems to have taken each spike of the fan-leaf to represent a separate leaf. [For two omissions from my trs. see Appendix O.]
2 Most of the fruits Bābur describes as orange-like are named in the following classified list, taken from Watts' Economic Products of India:—

Citrus aurantium, naranj, sangtara, amrit-phal; C. decumana, punelo, shaddock, forbidden-fruit, sada-phal; C. medica proper, turunj, limu; C. medica limonum, jambhira, karna-nebu.” Under C. aurantiuni Brandis enters both the sweet and the Seville oranges (nārang); this Bābur appears to do also.

3 hindiklik, explained in the Elph. Codex by nāfwār (f. 238). This detail is omitted by the Persian translation. Firminger's description (p. 221) of Aurangābād oranges suggests that they also are navel-oranges. At the present time one of the best oranges had in England is the navel one of California.

4 Useful addition is made to earlier notes on the variability of the yīghāch, a variability depending on time taken to cover the ground, by the following passage from Henderson and Hume's Lahor to Yarkand (p. 120), which shews that even in the last century the farsang (the P. word used in the Persian translation of the Bābur-nāma for T. yīghāch) was computed by time. “All the way from Kargaliq (Qārghaliq) to Yarkand, there were tall wooden mile-posts along the roads, at intervals of about 5 miles, or rather one hour's journey, apart. On a board at the top of each post, or farsang as it is called, the distances were very legibly written in Turki.”

5 ma'rib, Elph. MS. magharrib; (cf. f. 285b note).

6 i.e. nārang (Sans. nāranḍa) has been changed to nāranj in the 'Arab mouth. What is probably one of Humāyūn's notes preserved by the Elph. Codex (f. 238), appears to say—it is mutilated—that nārang has been corrupted into nāranj.
The lime (B. *limū, C. *acida*) is another. It is very plentiful, about the size of a hen's egg, and of the same shape. If a person poisoned drink the water in which its fibres have been boiled, danger is averted.¹

The citron (P. *turunj*,² C. *medica*) is another of the fruits resembling the orange. Bajaurīs and Sawādīs call it *bālang* and hence give the name *bālang-marabbā* to its marmalade (marabbā) confiture. In Hindūstān people call the *turunj baijaurī*.³ There are two kinds of *turunj*: one is sweet, flavourless and nauseating, of no use for eating but with peel that may be good for marmalade; it has the same sickening sweetness as the Lamghānāt *turunj*; the other, that of Hindūstān and Bajaur, is acid, quite deliciously acid, and makes excellent sherbet, well-flavoured, and wholesome drinking. Its size may be that of the Khusrawī melon; it has a thick skin, wrinkled and uneven, with one end thinner and beaked. It is of a deeper yellow than the orange (*nāranj*). Its tree has no trunk, is rather low, grows in bushes, and has a larger leaf than the orange.

The *sangtāra*⁴ is another fruit resembling the orange (*nāranj*).

¹ The Elph. Codex has a note—mutilated in early binding—which is attested by its scribe as copied from Humāyūn's hand-writing, and is to the effect that once on his way from the Hot-bath, he saw people who had taken poison and restored them by giving lime-juice.

² Erskine here notes that the same antidotal quality is ascribed to the citron by Virgil:—

```plaintext
   Media fert tristes succos. tardumque saporem
   Felicis mali, quo non praeentius ullum,
   Pocula si quando saevas infecere novercae,
   Miscueruntque herbas et non inoxia verba,
            Auxilium venit, ac membriis agit atra venena.
```

³ Georgics II. v. 126.

⁴ Vide Heyne's note i, 438.

² P. *turunj*, wrinkled, puckered; Sans. *vījāpura* and H. *bijaurā* (*Āyin* 28), seed-filled.

³ Bābūr may have confused this with H. *bijaurā*; so too appears to have done the writer (Humāyūn?) of a [now mutilated] note in the Elph. Codex (f. 238), which seems to say that the fruit or its name went from Bajaur to Hindūstān. Is the country of Bajaur so-named from its indigenous orange (*vījāpura*, whence *bijaurā*)? The name occurs also north of Kangra.

⁴ Of this name variants are numerous, *santra*, *santhara*, *santara*, etc. Watts classes it as a *C. aurantium*; Erskine makes it the common sweet orange; Firminger, quoting Ross (p. 221) writes that, as grown in the Nagpur gardens it is one of the finest Indian oranges, with rind thin, smooth and close. The Emperor Muḥammad Shāh is said to have altered its name to *rang-tāra* because of its fine colour (*rang*) (Forbes). Speede (ii, 109) gives both names. As to the meaning and origin of the name *santara* or *santra*, so suggestive of Cintra, the Portuguese home of a similar orange, it may be said that it looks like a hill-name used in N.E. India, for there is a village in the
It is like the citron (turunj) in colour and form, but has both ends of its skin level; also it is not rough and is somewhat the smaller fruit. Its tree is large, as large as the apricot (aurūq), with a leaf like the orange's. It is a deliciously acid fruit, making a very pleasant and wholesome sherbet. Like the lime it is a powerful stomachic, but not weakening like the orange (nāranj).

The large lime which they call (H.) gal-gal \(^2\) in Hindūstān is another fruit resembling the orange. It has the shape of a goose's egg, but unlike that egg, does not taper to the ends. Its skin is smooth like the sangtāra's; it is remarkably juicy.

The (H.) jānbirī lime \(^3\) is another orange-like fruit. It is orange-shaped and, though yellow, not orange-yellow. It smells like the citron (turunj); it too is deliciously acid.

The (Sans.) sadā-fal (phal) \(^4\) is another orange-like fruit. This is pear-shaped, colours like the quince, ripens sweet, but not to the sickly-sweetness of the orange (nāranj).

The amrī-l-fal (sic. Hai. MS.—Sans. amrit-phal) \(^5\) is another orange-like fruit.

The lemon (H. karnā, C. limonum) is another fruit resembling the orange (nāranj); it may be as large as the gal-gal and is also acid.

The (Sans.) amal-bid \(^6\) is another fruit resembling the orange.

Bhutan Hills, (Western Duars) known from its orange groves as Santra-bārī, Abode of the orange. To this (mentioned already as my husband's suggestion in Mr. Crooke's ed. of Yule's H.J.) support is given by the item "Suntura, famous Nipal variety", entered in Seth's Nursery-list of 1914 (Feronia Nurseries, Calcutta). Light on the question of origin could be thrown, no doubt, by those acquainted with the dialects of the hill-tract concerned.

1 This refers, presumably, to the absence of the beak characteristic of all citrons.
2 melter, from the Sans. root gal, which provides the names of several lemons by reason of their solvent quality, specified by Bābur (infra) of the amal-bid. Erskine notes that in his day the gal-gal was known as kilmek (galnak?).
3 Sans. jambirā, H. jambir, classed by Abū'1-fażl as one of the somewhat sour fruits and by Watts as Citrus medica limonum.
4 Watts, C. decumana, the shaddock or pumelo; Firminger (p. 223) has C. decumana pyriformis suiting Bābur's "pear-shaped". What Bābur compared it with will be the Transoxanian pear and quince (P. amrūd and biḥī) and not the Indian guava and Bengal quince (P. amrūd and H. baef).
5 The Turki text writes amrd. Watts classes the amrit-phal as a C. aurantium. This supports Erskine's suggestion that it is the mandarin-orange. Humāyūn describes it in a note which is written pell-mell in the text of the Elph. Codex and contains also descriptions of the kāmila and santara oranges; it can be seen translated in Appendix O.
6 So spelled in the Turki text and also in two good MSS. of the Pers. trs. I.O. 217 and 218, but by Abū'1-fażl amal-bit. Both P. bid and P. bit mean willow and cane (ratan), so that amal-bid (bit) can mean acid-willow and acid-cane. But as
After three years (in Hindūstān), it was first seen to-day.¹ They say a needle melts away if put inside it,² either from its acidity or some other property. It is as acid, perhaps, as the citron and lemon (turunj and līmū).³

(m. Vegetable products of Hindūstān:—Flowers.)

In Hindūstān there is great variety of flowers. One is the (D.) jāsūn (Hibiscus rosa sinensis), which some Hindūstānīs call (Hindi) gāzhal.⁴ *It is not a grass (giyāh); its tree (is in stems like the bush of the red-rose; it) is rather taller than the bush of the red-rose.⁵ * The flower of the jāsūn is fuller in colour than that of the pomegranate, and may be of the size of the red-rose, but, the red-rose, when its bud has grown, opens simply, whereas, when the jāsūn-bud opens, a stem on which other petals grow, is seen like a heart amongst its expanded petals. Though the two are parts of the one flower, yet the outcome of the lengthening and thinning of that stem-like heart of the first-opened petals gives the semblance of two flowers.⁶ It is not a common matter. The beautifully coloured flowers look very well on the tree, but

Bābur is writing of a fruit like an orange, the cane that bears an acid fruit, Calamus rotang, can be left aside in favour of Citrus medica acidissima. Of this fruit the solvent property Bābur mentions, as well as the commonly-known service in cleansing metal, link it, by these uses, with the willow and suggest a ground for understanding, as Erskine did, that amal-bid meant acid-willow; for willow-wood is used to rub rust off metal.

¹ This statement shows that Bābur was writing the Description of Hindūstān in 935 AH. (1528-9 AD.), which is the date given for it by Shaikh Zain.

² This story of the needle is believed in India of all the citron kind, which are hence called sūī-gal (needle-melter) in the Dakhin (Erskine). Cf. Forbes, p. 489 s.n. sūī-gal.

³ Erskine here quotes information from Abū’l-faṣl (Āyīn 28) about Akbar’s encouragement of the cultivation of fruits.

⁴ Hindustani (Urdu) garhal. Many varieties of Hibiscus (syn. Althea) grow in India; some thrive in Surrey gardens; the jāsūn by name and colour can be taken as what is known in Malayan, Tamil, etc., as the shoe-flower, from its use in darkening leather (Yule’s H.J.).

⁵ I surmise that what I have placed between asterisks belongs to the next-following plant, the oleander. For though the branches of the jāsūn grow vertically, the bush is a dense mass upon one stout trunk, or stout short stem. The words placed in parenthesis above are not with the Ḥaḍarabād but are with the Elphinstone Codex. There would seem to have been a scribe’s skip from one “rose” to the other. As has been shewn repeatedly, this part of the Bābur-nāma has been much annotated; in the Elph. Codex, where only most of the notes are preserved, some are entered by the scribe pell-mell into Bābur’s text. The present instance may be a case of a marginal note, added to the text in a wrong place.

⁶ The peduncle supporting the plume of medial petals is clearly seen only when the flower opens first. The plumed Hibiscus is found in florists’ catalogues described as “double”.

they do not last long; they fade in just one day. The jäsün blossoms very well through the four months of the rains; it seems indeed to flower all through the year; with this profusion, however, it gives no perfume.

The (H.) kanir (Nerium odoratum, the oleander) is another. It grows both red and white. Like the peach-flower, it is five petalled. It is like the peach-bloom (in colour?), but opens 14 or 15 flowers from one place, so that seen from a distance, they look like one great flower. The oleander-bush is taller than the rose-bush. The red oleander has a sort of scent, faint and agreeable. (Like the jäsün,) it also blooms well and profusely in the rains, and it also is had through most of the year.

The (H.) (kūrā) (Pandanus odoratissimus, the screw-pine) is another. It has a very agreeable perfume. Musk has the defect of being dry; this may be called moist musk—a very agreeable perfume. The tree’s singular appearance notwithstanding, it has flowers perhaps 1½ to 2 qārīsh (13½ to 18 inches) long. It has long leaves having the character of the reed (P.) gharau and having spines. Of these leaves, while pressed together bud-like, the outer ones are the greener and more spiny; the inner ones are soft and white. In amongst these inner leaves grow things like what belongs to the middle of a flower, and from these things comes the excellent perfume. When the tree first comes up not yet shewing any trunk, it is like the bush (būṭa) of the male-reed, but with wider and more spiny leaves. What serves it for a trunk is very shapeless, its roots remaining shewn.

1 This Anglo-Indians call also rose-bay. A Persian name appears to be zahr-gįyah, poison-grass, which makes it the more probable that the doubtful passage in the previous description of the jäsün belongs to the rod-like oleander, known as the poison-grass. The oleander is common in river-beds over much country known to Bābur, outside India.

2 Roxburgh gives a full and interesting account of this tree.

3 Here the Elph. Codex, only, has the (seeming) note, “An ‘Arab calls it kāži” (or kāwi). This fills out Steingass’ part-explanation of kāwi, “the blossom of the fragrant palm-tree, armāt” (p. 1010), and of armāt, “a kind of date-tree with a fragrant blossom” (p. 39), by making armāt and kāwi seem to be the Pandanus and its flower.

4 Calamus scriptorius (Vullers ii, 607. H. B.). Abūl-faṭl compares the leaves to jawārī, the great millet (Forbes); Blochmann (A. A. p. 83) translates jawārī by māsia (juwārā, Forbes).

5 T. ārīkāk-qūmūsh, a name Scully enters unexplained. Under qūmūsh (reed) he enters Arundo madagascarenstis; Bābur’s comparison will be with some Transoxanian Arundo or Calamus, presumably.
The (P.) *yāsman* (jasmine) is another; the white they call (B.) *champa*. It is larger and more strongly scented than our *yāsman*-flower.

(n. *Seasons of the year.)*

Again:—whereas there are four seasons in those countries,² there are three in Hindūstān, namely, four months are summer; four are the rains; four are winter. The beginning of their months is from the welcome of the crescent-moons.³ Every three years they add a month to the year; if one had been added to the rainy season, the next is added, three years later, to the winter months, the next, in the same way, to the hot months. This is their mode of intercalation.⁴ (Chait, Baisākh, Jeth and Asārh) are the hot months, corresponding with the Fish, (Ram, Bull and Twins; Sāwan, Bhādoṇ, Kā,ār and Kātik) are the rainy months, corresponding with the Crab, (Lion, Virgin and Balance; Aghan, Pūs, Māgh and Phālgun) are the cold months, corresponding with the Scorpion, (Archer, Capricorn, and Bucket or Aquarius).

The people of Hind, having thus divided the year into three seasons of four months each, divide each of those seasons by taking from each, the two months of the force of the heat, rain,⁵ and cold. Of the hot months the last two, i.e. Jeth and Asārh are the force of the heat; of the rainy months, the first two, i.e. Sāwan and Bhādoṇ are the force of the rains; of the cold season, the middle two, i.e. Pūs and Māgh are the force of the cold. By this classification there are six seasons in Hindūstān.

¹ *Champa* seems to have been Bābur’s word (Elph. and Hai. MSS.), but is the (B.) name for *Michelia champaka*; the Pers. translation corrects it by (B.) *chambeli*, (yāsman, jasmine).

² Here, “outside India” will be meant, where Hindū rules do not prevail.

³ Hind aśāri-ning ibtidā-si hilāl aśāri-ning istiqbāl-dīn dūr. The use here of istiqbāl, welcome, attracts attention; does it allude to the universal welcome of lighter nights? or is it reminiscent of Muḥammadan welcome to the Moon’s crescent in Shawwāl?

⁴ For an exact statement of the intercalary months vide Cunningham’s *Indian Eras*, p. 91.

In my next sentence (supra) the parenthesis-marks indicate blanks left on the page of the Hai. MS. as though waiting for information. These and other similar blanks make for the opinion that the Hai. Codex is a direct copy of Bābur’s draft manuscript.

⁵ The sextuple division (ṣītū) of the year is referred to on f. 284, where the Signs Crab and Lion are called the season of the true Rains.
(o. Days of the week.)

To the days also they have given names:—\(^1\) (Sanīchar is Saturday; Rabī-bār is Sunday; Som-wār is Monday; Mangal-wār is Tuesday; Budh-bār is Wednesday; Brihaspat-bār is Thursday; Shukr-bār is Friday).

(p. Divisions of time.)

As in our countries what is known by the (Turkī) term kīcha-gūndūz (a day-and-night, nycthemeron) is divided into 24 parts, each called an hour (Ar. sā‘at), and the hour is divided into 60 parts, each called a minute (Ar. daqiqa), so that a day-and-night consists of 1440 minutes,—so the people of Hind divide the night-and-day into 60 parts, each called a (S.) g‘hari.\(^2\) They also divide the night into four and the day into four, calling each part a (S.) pahr (watch) which in Persian is a pās. A watch and watchman (pās u pāsbān) had been heard about (by us) in those countries (Transoxania), but without these particulars. Agreeing with the division into watches, a body of g‘hariālis\(^3\) is chosen and appointed in all considerable towns of Hindūstān. They cast a broad brass (plate-) thing,\(^4\) perhaps as large as a tray (tabag) and about two hands’-thickness; this they call a g‘hariāl and hang up in a high place (bīr buland yīr-dā). Also they have a vessel perforated at the bottom like an hour-cup\(^5\) and filling

\(^1\) Bābur appears not to have entered either the Hindi or the Persian names of the week:—the Ḩai. MS. has a blank space; the Elph. MS. had the Persian names only, and Hindi ones have been written in above these; Kehr has the Persian ones only; Ilminsky has added the Hindi ones. (The spelling of the Hindi names, in my translation, is copied from Forbes’ Dictionary.)

\(^2\) The Ḩai. MS. writes gari and gariāl. The word now stands for the hour of 60 minutes.

\(^3\) i.e. gong-men. The name is applied also to an alligator Lacertus gangeticus (Forbes).

\(^4\) There is some confusion in the text here, the Ḩai. MS. reading birinj-dīn tishī (?) nīma qūṭūbartlār—the Elph. MS. (f. 240b) birinj-dīn bir yāsī nīma qūṭūbartlār. The Persian translation, being based on the text of the Elphinstone Codex reads as birinj yāk chīz pāhī rekhītā and. The word tishī of the Ḩai. MS. may represent tashī plate or yāsī, broad; against the latter however there is the sentence that follows and gives the size.

\(^5\) Here again the wording of the Ḩai. MS. is not clear; the sense however is obvious. Concerning the clepsydra vide A. A. Jarrett, ii, 15 and notes; Smith’s Dictionary of Antiquities; Yule’s H.J. s.n. Ghurry.
in one g’hārī (i.e. 24 minutes). The g’hārīālīs put this into water and wait till it fills. For example, they will put the perforated cup into water at day-birth; when it fills the first time, they strike the gong once with their mallets; when a second time, twice, and so on till the end of the watch. They announce the end of a watch by several rapid blows of their mallets. After these they pause; then strike once more, if the first day-watch has ended, twice if the second, three times if the third, and four times if the fourth. After the fourth day-watch, when the night-watches begin, these are gone through in the same way. It used to be the rule to beat the sign of a watch only when the watch ended; so that sleepers chancing to wake in the night and hear the sound of a third or fourth g’hārī, would not know whether it was of the second or third night-watch. I therefore ordered that at night or on a cloudy day the sign of the watch should be struck after that of the g’hārī, for example, that after striking the third g’hārī of the first night-watch, the g’hārīālīs were to pause and then strike the sign of the watch, in order to make it known that this third g’hārī was of the first night-watch,—and that after striking four g’hārīs of the third night-watch, they should pause and then strike the sign of the third watch, in order to make it known that this fourth g’hārī was of the third night-watch. It did very well; anyone happening to wake in the night and hear the gong, would know what g’hārī of what watch of night it was.

Again, they divide the g’hārī into 60 parts, each part being called a pal; by this each night-and-day will consist of 3,500 pals. (Author’s note on the pal.) They say the length of a pal is the shutting and opening of the eyelids 60 times, which in a night-and-day would be 216,000 shuttings and openings of the eyes. Experiment shews that a pal is about equal to 8 repetitions of the Qur’a’n-assallāh and Bismillāh; this would be 28,000 repetitions in a night-and-day.

(q. Measures.)

The people of Hind have also well-arranged measures:—

8 ratis = 1 māsha; 4 māsha = 1 tānk = 32 ratis; 5 māsha = 1 misgāl = 40 ratis; 12 māsha = 1 tūla = 96 ratis; 14 tūla = 1 ser.

1 The table is:—60 bipals = 1 pal; 60 pals = 1 g’hārī (24 m.); 60 g’hārī or 8 pahr = one din-rāt (nycthemeron).

2 Qorān, cap. CXII, which is a declaration of God’s unity.

3 The (S.) rāt = 8 rice-grains (Eng. 8 barley-corns); the (S.) māsha is a kidney-bean; the (P.) tānk is about 2 oz.; the (Ar.) misgāl is equal to 40 ratis; the (S.) tūla is about 145 oz.; the (S.) ser is of various values (Wilson’s Glossary and Yule’s H.J.).
This is everywhere fixed:—$40 \text{ ser} = 1 \text{ mānbān}$; $12 \text{ mānbān} = 1 \text{ mānī}$; $100 \text{ mānī}$ they call a mīnāsa.¹

Pearls and jewels they weigh by the tānk.

(r. Modes of reckoning.)

The people of Hind have also an excellent mode of reckoning: $100,000$ they call a lak; $100$ laks, a krūr; $100$ krūrs, an arb; $100$ arb, 1 karb; $100$ karbs, 1 nil; $100$ sils, 1 padam; $100$ padams, 1 sāṅg. The fixing of such high reckonings as these is proof of the great amount of wealth in Hindūstān.

(s. Hindū inhabitants of Hindūstān.)

Most of the inhabitants of Hindūstān are pagans; they call a pagan a Hindū. Most Hindūs believe in the transmigration of souls. All artisans, wage-earners, and officials are Hindūs. In our countries dwellers in the wilds (i.e. nomads) get tribal names; here the settled people of the cultivated lands and villages get tribal names.² Again:—every artisan there is follows the trade that has come down to him from forefather to forefather.

(t. Defects of Hindūstān.)

Hindūstān is a country of few charms. Its people have no good looks; of social intercourse, paying and receiving visits there is none; of genius and capacity none; of manners none; in handicraft and work there is no form or symmetry, method or quality; there are no good horses, no good dogs, no grapes, muskmelons or first-rate fruits, no ice or cold water, no good bread or cooked food in the bāzārs, no Hot-baths, no Colleges, no candles, torches or candlesticks.

In place of candle and torch they have a great dirty gang they call lamp-men (dīwatt), who in the left hand hold a smallish wooden tripod to one corner of which a thing like the top of

¹ There being 40 Bengāl sers to the man, Bābur’s word mānbān seems to be another name for the man or maund. I have not found mānbān or mīnāsā. At first sight mānbān might be taken, in the Hai. MS. for (T.) bātmān, a weight of 13 or 15 lbs., but this does not suit. Cf. f. 167 note to bātmān and f. 173b (where, however, in the note f. 157 requires correction to f. 167). For Bābur’s table of measures the Pers. trs. has 40 sers = 1 man; 12 mans = 1 mānī; 100 mānī they call mīnāsa (217, f. 201b, l. 8).

² Presumably these are caste-names.
a candlestick is fixed, having a wick in it about as thick as the thumb. In the right hand they hold a gourd, through a narrow slit made in which, oil is let trickle in a thin thread when the wick needs it. Great people keep a hundred or two of these lamp-men. This is the Hindūstān substitute for lamps and candlesticks! If their rulers and begs have work at night needing candles, these dirty lamp-men bring these lamps, go close up and there stand.

Except their large rivers and their standing-waters which flow in ravines or hollows (there are no waters). There are no running-waters in their gardens or residences ('imāratlār). These residences have no charm, air (hawā), regularity or symmetry.

Peasants and people of low standing go about naked. They tie on a thing called lungūtā, a decency-clout which hangs two spans below the navel. From the tie of this pendant decency-clout, another clout is passed between the thighs and made fast behind. Women also tie on a cloth (lung), one-half of which goes round the waist, the other is thrown over the head.

(u. Advantages of Hindūstān.)

Pleasant things of Hindūstān are that it is a large country and has masses of gold and silver. Its air in the Rains is very fine. Sometimes it rains 10, 15 or 20 times a day; torrents pour down all at once and rivers flow where no water had been. While it rains and through the Rains, the air is remarkably fine, not to be surpassed for healthiness and charm. The fault is that the air becomes very soft and damp. A bow of those (Transoxanian) countries after going through the Rains in Hindūstān, may not be drawn even; it is ruined; not only the bow, everything is affected, armour, book, cloth, and utensils all; a house even does

1 The words in parenthesis appear to be omitted from the text; to add them brings Bābur’s remark into agreement with others on what he several times makes note of, viz. the absence not only of irrigation-channels but of those which convey “running-waters” to houses and gardens. Such he writes of in Farghāna; such are a well-known charm e.g. in Madeira, where the swift current of clear water flowing through the streets, turns into private precincts by side-runlets.

2 The Hai. MS. writes lungūtā-dik, like a lungūtā, which better agrees with Bābur’s usual phrasing. Lung is Persian for a cloth passed between the loins, is an equivalent of S. dhoti. Bābur’s use of it (infra) for the woman’s (P.) chaddar or (S.) sārī does not suit the Dictionary definition of its meaning.
not last long. Not only in the Rains but also in the cold and the hot seasons, the airs are excellent; at these times, however, the north-west wind constantly gets up laden with dust and earth. It gets up in great strength every year in the heats, under the Bull and Twins when the Rains are near; so strong and carrying so much dust and earth that there is no seeing one another. People call this wind Darkener of the Sky (H. āndhī). The weather is hot under the Bull and Twins, but not intolerably so, not so hot as in Balkh and Qandahār and not for half so long.

Another good thing in Hindūstān is that it has unnumbered and endless workmen of every kind. There is a fixed caste (jamʿī) for every sort of work and for every thing, which has done that work or that thing from father to son till now. Mullā Sharaf, writing in the Zafar-nāma about the building of Timūr Beg’s Stone Mosque, lays stress on the fact that on it 200 stone-cutters worked, from Āzarbāijān, Fars, Hindūstān and other countries. But 680 men worked daily on my buildings in Āgra and of Āgra stone-cutters only; while 1491 stone-cutters worked daily on my buildings in Āgra, Sīkri, Bīāna, Dūlpūr, Gūālīār and Kūīl. In the same way there are numberless artisans and workmen of every sort in Hindūstān.

(v. Revenues of Hindūstān.)

The revenue of the countries now held by me (935 AH.–1528 AD.) from Bhīra to Bihār is 52 krūrs, as will be known in detail from the following summary. Eight or nine krūrs of this

---

1 When Erskine published the Memoirs in 1826 AD. he estimated this sum at 1½ millions Sterling, but when he published his History of India in 1854, he had made further research into the problem of Indian money values, and judged then that Bābūr’s revenue was £4,212,000.

2 Erskine here notes that the promised details had not been preserved, but in 1854 AD. he had found them in a “paraphrase of part of Bābūr”, manifestly in Shaikh Zain’s work. He entered and discussed them and some matters of money-values in Appendices D. and E. of his History of India, vol. I. Ilmīnsky found them in Kehr’s Codex (C. ii, 230). The scribe of the Elph. MS. has entered the revenues of three sarkārs only, with his usual quotation marks indicating something extraneous or doubtful. The Haï. MS. has them in contents precisely as I have entered them above, but with a scattered mode of setting down. They are in Persian, presumably as they were rendered to Bābūr by some Indian official. This official statement will have been with Bābūr’s own papers; it will have been copied by Shaikh Zain into his own paraphrase. It differs slightly in Erskine’s and again, in de Courteille’s versions. I regret that I am incompetent to throw any light upon the
are from parganas of rāis and rājas who, as obedient from of old, receive allowance and maintenance.

**Revenues of Hindūstān from what has so far come under the victorious standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sarkārs</th>
<th>Krūrs</th>
<th>Laks.</th>
<th>Tankas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trans-sutluj:—Bhīra, Lāhūr, Siālkūt, Dībālāpūr, etc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sihrād</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hīsār-fīrūza</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The capital Dīhlī and Miān-dū-āb</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>50,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miwāt, not included in Sikandar’s time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīāna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āgra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>76,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miān-wilāyat (Midlands)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gūālīār</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kālpī and Sehonda (Seondhā)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qanauj</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śambhal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lāknūr and Baksar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>82,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khāirābād</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aūd (Oude) and Bahraj (Baraich)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jūnpūr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>88,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karra and Mānīkpūr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihār</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarwār</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17,506½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāran</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>18,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champārān</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāndla</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirhut from Rāja Rup-narāin’s tribute, silver</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black (i.e. copper)</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rantānbhūr from Būlt, Chātsū, and Malarna</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagūr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>00,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāja Bikrāmājīt in Rantānbhūr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalanjār</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāja Bīr-sang-deo (or, Sang only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāja Bikam-deo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāja Bikam-chand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) So far as particulars and details about the land and people of the country of Hindūstān have become definitely known, they have been narrated and described; whatever matters worthy of record may come to view hereafter, I shall write down.

question of its values and that I must leave some uncertain names to those more expert than myself. Cf. Erskine’s Appendices l. c. and Thomas’ Revenue resources of the Mughal Empire. For a few comments see App. P.

\(^1\) Here the Turki text resumes in the Hai. MS.
HISTORICAL NARRATIVE RESUMED.

(a. Distribution of treasure in Agra.)

(May 12th) On Saturday the 29th of Rajab the examination and distribution of the treasure were begun. To Humayun were given 70 laks from the Treasury, and, over and above this, a treasure house was bestowed on him just as it was, without ascertaining and writing down its contents. To some begs 10 laks were given, 8, 7, or 6 to others. Suitable money-gifts were bestowed from the Treasury on the whole army, to every tribe there was, Afgan, Hazara, ‘Arab, Biluch etc. to each according to its position. Every trader and student, indeed every man who had come with the army, took ample portion and share of bounteous gift and largess. To those not with the army went a mass of treasure in gift and largess, as for instance, 17 laks to Kamran, 15 laks to Muhammad-i-zaman Mirza, while to ‘Askari, Hindal and indeed to the whole various train of relations and younger children went masses of red and white (gold and silver), of plenishing, jewels and slaves. Many gifts went to the begs and soldiery on that side (Tramontana). Valuable gifts (saughat) were sent for the various relations in Samarkand, Khurasan, Kashghar and ‘Irak. To holy men belonging to Samarkand and Khurasan went offerings vowed to God (nusur); so too to

1 Elph. MS. f. 243b; W. i. B. I.O. 215 has not the events of this year (as to which omission vide note at the beginning of 932 AH. f. 251b) and 217 f. 203; Mems. p. 334; Ilinsky’s imprint p. 380; Mems. ii, 232.
2 This should be 30th if Saturday was the day of the week (Gladwin, Cunningham and Babur’s narrative of f. 269). Saturday appears likely to be right; Babur entered Agra on Thursday 28th; Friday would be used for the Congregational Prayer and preliminaries inevitable before the distribution of the treasure. The last day of Babur’s narrative 932 AH. is Thursday Rajab 28th; he would not be likely to mistake between Friday, the day of his first Congregational prayer in Agra, and Saturday. It must be kept in mind that the Description of Hindustan is an interpolation here, and that it was written in 935 AH., three years later than the incidents here recorded. The date Rajab 29th may not be Babur’s own entry; or if it be, may have been made after the interpolation of the dividing mass of the Description and made wrongly.
3 Erskine estimated these sums as ‘probably $56,700 to Humayun; and the smaller ones as $8,100, $6,480, $5,670 and $4,860 respectively; very large sums for the age’ (History of India, i. 440 n. and App. E.)
4 These will be his daughters. Gul-badan gives precise details of the gifts to the family circle (Humayun-nama f. 10).
5 Some of these slaves were Sl. Ibrahim’s dancing-girls (Gul-badan, ib.).
Makka and Madīna. We gave one *shāhrukhi* for every soul in the country of Kābul and the valley-side of Varsak, man and woman, bond and free, of age or non-age.

(b. Disaffection to Bābur.)

On our first coming to Āgra, there was remarkable dislike and hostility between its people and mine, the peasantry and soldiers running away in fear of our men. Delhī and Āgra excepted, not a fortified town but strengthened its defences and neither was in obedience nor submitted. Qāsim Saṃbhālī was in Saṃbhāl; Niẓām Khān was in Bīāna; in Miwāt was Hasan Khān Miwātī himself, impious mannīkī! who was the sole leader of the trouble and mischief. Muḥammad *Zaitūn* was in Dūlpūr; Tātār Khān Sārang-khānī was in Güāliār; Husain Khān *Nuḥānī* was in Rāpri; Quṭb Khān was in Itāwa (Etāwa); 'Ālām Khān (Kālpī) was in Kālpī. Qanaūj and the other side of Gang (Ganges) was all held by Afghāns in independent hostility, such as Naṣīr Khān Nuḥānī, Maʿrūf Farmūlī and a crowd of other amīrs. These had been in rebellion for three or four years before Ibrāhīm's death and when I defeated him, were holding Qanaūj and the whole country beyond it. At the present time they were lying two or three marches on our side of Qanaūj and had made Bihār Khān the son of Daryā Khān Nuḥānī their pādshāh, under the style Sulṭān Muḥammad. Fol. 294b. Marghūb the slave was in Mahāwin (*Muttra?*); he remained there, thus close, for some time but came no nearer.

---

1. *sada*. Perhaps it was a station of a hundred men. Varsak is in Badakhshān, on the water flowing to Tāliqān from the Khwāja Muḥammad range. Erskine read (p. 335) *sada* Varsak as *sadār rashk*, incentive to emulation; de C. (ii, 233) translates *sada* conjecturally by *circumscription*. Šaikh Zain has Varsak and to the recipients of the gifts adds the "Khwāstās, people noted for their piety" (A.N.trs. H.B.i, 248 n.). The gift to Varsak may well have been made in gratitude for hospitality received by Bābur in the time of adversity after his loss of Samarkand and before his return to Kābul in 920 AH.

2. *circa* 10d. or 11d. Bābur left himself stripped so bare by his far-flung largess that he was nick-named Qalandar (Firishta).

3. Badāyūnī says of him (Bib. Ind. ed. i, 340) that he was *kāsīr kalīma-gū*, a pagan making the Muhammadan Confession of Faith, and that he had heard of him, in Akbar's time from Bairām Khān-i-khānān, as kingly in appearance and poetic in temperament. He was killed fighting for Rānā Ṣangā at Kānwaha.

4. This is his family name.

5. *i.e.* not acting with Hasan Miwātī.
(c. Discontent in Bābur's army.)

It was the hot-season when we came to Āgra. All the inhabitants (khalāq) had run away in terror. Neither grain for ourselves nor corn for our horses was to be had. The villages, out of hostility and hatred to us had taken to thieving and highway-robbery; there was no moving on the roads. There had been no chance since the treasure was distributed to send men in strength into the parganas and elsewhere. Moreover the year was a very hot one; violent pestilential winds struck people down in heaps together; masses began to die off.

On these accounts the greater part of the begs and best braves became unwilling to stay in Hindūstān, indeed set their faces for leaving it. It is no reproach to old and experienced begs if they speak of such matters; even if they do so, this man (Bābur) has enough sense and reason to get at what is honest or what is mutinous in their representations, to distinguish between loss and gain. But as this man had seen his task whole, for himself, when he resolved on it, what taste was there in their reiterating that things should be done differently? What recommends the expression of distasteful opinions by men of little standing (kīchik karīm)? Here is a curious thing:—This last time of our riding out from Kābul, a few men of little standing had just been made begs; what I looked for from them was that if I went through fire and water and came out again, they would have gone in with me unhesitatingly, and with me have come out, that wherever I went, there at my side would they be,—not that they would speak against my fixed purpose, not that they would turn back from any task or great affair on which, all counselling, all consenting, we had resolved, so long as that counsel was not abandoned. Badly as these new begs behaved, Secretary Ahmadi and Treasurer Walī behaved still worse. Khwāja Kalān had done well in the march out from Kābul, in Ibrāhīm's defeat and until Āgra was occupied; he had spoken bold words and shewn ambitious views. But a few days after the capture of Āgra, all his views changed,—the one zealous for departure at any price was Khwāja Kalān.1

1 Gul-badan says that the Khwāja several times asked leave on the ground that his constitution was not fitted for the climate of Hindūstān; that His Majesty was not at all, at all, willing for him to go, but gave way at length to his importunity.
(d. Bābur calls a council.)

When I knew of this unsteadiness amongst (my) people, I summoned all the begs and took counsel. Said I, "There is no supremacy and grip on the world without means and resources; without lands and retainers sovereignty and command (pādshāhīq u amīrlīq) are impossible. By the labours of several years, by encountering hardship, by long travel, by flinging myself and the army into battle, and by deadly slaughter, we, through God's grace, beat these masses of enemies in order that we might take their broad lands. And now what force compels us, what necessity has arisen that we should, without cause, abandon countries taken at such risk of life? Was it for us to remain in Kābul, the sport of harsh poverty? Henceforth, let no well-wisher of mine speak of such things! But let not those turn back from going who, weak in strong persistence, have set their faces to depart!" By these words, which recalled just and reasonable views to their minds, I made them, willy-nilly, quit their fears.

(e. Khwāja Kalān decides to leave Hindūstān.)

As Khwāja Kalān had no heart to stay in Hindūstān, matters were settled in this way:—As he had many retainers, he was to convoy the gifts, and, as there were few men in Kābul and Ghaznī, was to keep these places guarded and victualled. I bestowed on him Ghaznī, Girdiz and the Sultan Mas'ūdī Hazāra, gave also the Hindūstān pargana of G'hūram,¹ worth 3 or 4 laks. It was settled for Khwāja Mīr-i-mīrān also to go to Kābul; the gifts were put into his immediate charge, under the custody of Mullā Hasan the banker (ṣarrāf) and Tūka² Hindū. Loathing Hindūstān, Khwāja Kalān, when on his way, had the following couplet inscribed on the wall of his residence ('imāratī) in Dihlī:—

If safe and sound I cross the Sind,
Blacken my face ere I wish for Hind!

It was ill-mannered in him to compose and write up this partly-jesting verse while I still stayed in Hind. If his departure

¹ in Patiāla, about 25 miles s.w. of Ambāla.
² Shaikh Zain, Gul-badan and Erskine write Nau-kār. It was now that Khwāja Kalān conveyed money for the repair of the great dam at Ghaznī (f. 139).
caused me one vexation, such a jest doubled it. I composed the following off-hand verse, wrote it down and sent it to him:

Give a hundred thanks, Bābur, that the generous Pardoner
Has given thee Sind and Hind and many a kingdom.
If thou (i.e. the Khwāja) have not the strength for their heats,
If thou say, “Let me see the cold side (yūs),” Ghaznī is there.

(f. Accretions to Bābur’s force.)

At this juncture, Mullā Āpāq was sent into Kūl with royal letters of favour for the soldiers and quiver-wearers (tarkash-band) of that neighbourhood. Shaikh Gūran (G’hūran) came trustfully and loyally to do obeisance, bringing with him from 2 to 3,000 soldiers and quiver-wearers from Between-two-waters (Mīān-dū-āb).

Yūnas-i-‘alī when on his way from Dīhlī to Āgra had lost his way a little and got separated from Humāyūn; he then met in with ‘Alī Khān Farmūlī’s sons and train, had a small affair with them, took them prisoners and brought them in. Taking advantage of this, one of the sons thus captured was sent to his father in company with Daulat-qadam Turk’s son Mirzā Mughūl who conveyed royal letters of favour to ‘Alī Khān. At this time of break-up, ‘Alī Khān had gone to Mīwāt; he came to

1 The friends did not meet again; that their friendship weathered this storm is shewn by Bābur’s letter of f. 359. The Ābūshqā says the couplet was inscribed on a marble tablet near the Hauz-i-khāṣ at the time the Khwāja was in Dīhlī after bidding Bābur farewell in Āgra.

2 This quatrain is in the Rāmpūr Divān (q.v. index). The Ābūshqā quotes the following as Khwāja Kalān’s reply, but without mentioning where the original was found. Cf. de Courteille, Dict. s.n. taskārī. An English version is given in my husband’s article Some verses by the Emperor Bābur (A.Q.R. January, 1911).

You shew your gaiety and your wit,
In each word there lie acres of charm.
Were not all things of Hind upside-down,
How could you in the heat be so pleasant on cold?

It is an old remark of travellers that everything in India is the opposite of what one sees elsewhere. Timūr is said to have remarked it and to have told his soldiers not to be afraid of the elephants of India, “For,” said he, “their trunks are empty sleeves, and they carry their tails in front; in Hindustan everything is reversed” (H. Beveridge ibid.). Cf. App. Q.

3 Badāyūnī i., 337 speaks of him as unrivalled in music.

4 f. 267b.

5 āṛāq, which here no doubt represents the women of the family.
me when Mīrzā Mughūl returned, was promoted, and given valid (?) pargana\(^1\) worth 25 laks.

(g. Action against the rebels of the East.)

Sl. Ibrāhīm had appointed several amīrs under Muṣṭafā Farmūlī and Fīrūz Kān Sārang-khānī, to act against the rebel amīrs of the East (Pūrab). Muṣṭafā had fought them and thoroughly drubbed them, giving them more than one good beating. He dying before Ibrāhīm's defeat, his younger brother Shaikh Bāyazīd—Ibrāhīm being occupied with a momentous matter\(^2\)—had led and watched over his elder brother's men. He now came to serve me, together with Fīrūz Kān, Mahmūd Kān Nuḥānī and Qāzī Jīā. I shewed them greater kindness and favour than was their claim; giving to Fīrūz Kān 1 krūr, 46 laks and 5000 tankas from Jūnąpūr, to Shaikh Bāyazīd 1 krūr, 48 laks and 50,000 tankas from Aūd (Oude), to Mahmūd Kān 90 laks and 35,000 tankas from Ghāzīpūr, and to Qāzī Jīā 20 laks.\(^3\)

(h. Gifts made to various officers.)

It was a few days after the 'Īd of Shawwāl\(^4\) that a large party was held in the pillared-porch of the domed building standing in the middle of Sl. Ibrāhīm's private apartments. At this party there were bestowed on Humāyūn a chār-gāb,\(^5\) a sword-belt,\(^6\) a tipūchāq horse with saddle mounted in gold; on Chīn-tīmūr Sulṭān, Mahdī Khwāja and Muhammad Sl. Mīrzā chār-gābs, sword-belts and dagger-belts; and to the beggs and braves, to each according to his rank, were given sword-belts, dagger-belts, and dresses of honour, in all to the number specified below:—

---
\(^1\) 'ain parganalār.
\(^2\) Bābur's advance, presumably.
\(^3\) The full amounts here given are not in all MSS., some scribes contenting themselves with the largest item of each gift (Memoirs p. 337).
\(^4\) The 'Īd of Shawwāl, it will be remembered, is celebrated at the conclusion of the Ramzān fast, on seeing the first new moon of Shawwāl. In A.H. 932 it must have fallen about July 11th 1526 (Erskine).
\(^5\) A square shawl, or napkin, of cloth of gold, bestowed as a mark of rank and distinction (Memoirs p. 338 n.); une tunique enrichie de broderies (Mémoires, ii, 240 n.).
\(^6\) kamar-shamšīr. This Steingass explains as sword-belt, Erskine by "sword with a belt". The summary following shews that many weapons were given and not belts alone. There is a good deal of variation in the MSS. The Hai. MS. has not a complete list. The most all the lists show is that gifts were many.
2 items (rā's) of tīpūchāq horses with saddles.
16 items (qabzá) of poinards, set with jewels, etc.
8 items (qabzá) of purpūt over-garments.
2 items (lōb) of jewelled sword-belts.
— items (qabzá) of broad daggers (jamādar) set with jewels.
25 items of jewelled hangers (khanjār).
— items of gold-hilted Hindū knives (kārd).
51 pieces of purpūt.

On the day of this party it rained amazingly, rain falling thirteen times. As outside places had been assigned to a good many people, they were drowned out (gharaq).

(i. Of various forts and postings.)

Samāna (in Patlāla) had been given to Muḥammadī Kūkūl-dāsh and it had been arranged for him to make swift descent on Saṃbāl (Saṃbhal), but Saṃbāl was now bestowed on Humāyūn, in addition to his guerdon of Ḥiṣār-fīrūza, and in his service was Hindū Beg. To suit this, therefore, Hindū Beg was sent to make the incursion in Muḥammadī’s place, and with him Kittā Beg, Bābā Qashqa’s (brother) Malik Qāsim and his elder and younger brethren, Mullā Apāq and Shaikh Gūran (G’hūran) with the quiver-wearers from Between-two-waters (Mīān-dū-āb). Three or four times a person had come from Qāsim Saṃbali, saying, “The renegade Bīban is besieging Saṃbāl and has brought it to extremity; come quickly.” Bīban, with the array and the preparation (hayāt) with which he had deserted us,¹ had gone skirting the hills and gathering up Afghān and Hindūstānī deserters, until, finding Saṃbāl at this juncture ill-garrisoned, he laid siege to it. Hindū Beg and Kittā Beg and the rest of those appointed to make the incursion, got to the Ahār-passage ² and from there sent ahead Bābā Qashqa’s Malik Qāsim with his elder and younger brethren, while they themselves were getting over the water. Malik Qāsim crossed, advanced swiftly with from 100 to 150 men—his own and his brethren’s—and reached Saṃbāl by the Mid-day Prayer. Bīban for his part came out of his camp in array. Malik Qāsim and his troop moved rapidly forward, got the fort in their rear, and came to grips. Bīban could make no stand; he fled. Malik Qāsim cut off the heads of part of his force, took many horses,

¹ f. 263b.
² over the Ganges, a little above Anūp-shahr in the Buland-shahr district.
a few elephants and a mass of booty. Next day when the other begs arrived, Qāsim Sambālī came out and saw them, but not liking to surrender the fort, made them false pretences. One day Shaikh Gūran (G’hūran) and Hīndū Beg having talked the matter over with them, got Qāsim Sambālī out to the presence of the begs, and took men of ours into the fort. They brought Qāsim’s wife and dependents safely out, and sent Qāsim (to Court).¹

Qalandar the foot-man was sent to Nizām Khān in Biāna with royal letters of promise and threat; with these was sent also the following little off-hand (Persian) verse:—²

Strive not with the Turk, o Mīr of Biāna!
His skill and his courage are obvious.
If thou come not soon, nor give ear to counsel,—
What need to detail (bāyān) what is obvious?

Biāna being one of the famous forts of Hindūstān, the senseless mannikin, relying on its strength, demanded what not even its strength could enforce. Not giving him a good answer, we ordered siege apparatus to be looked to.

Bābā Quli Beg was sent with royal letters of promise and threat to Muḥammad Zaitūn (in Dūlpūr); Muḥammad Zaitūn also made false excuses.

While we were still in Kābul, Rānā Sangā had sent an envoy to testify to his good wishes and to propose this plan: “If the honoured Pādshāh will come to near Dihlī from that side, I from this will move on Āgra.” But I beat Ibrāhīm, I took Dihlī and Āgra, and up to now that Pagan has given no sign soever of moving. After a while he went and laid siege to Kandār ³ a fort in which was Makan’s son, Ḥasan by name. This Ḥasan-of-Makan had sent a person to me several times, but had not shewn himself. We had not been able to detach reinforcement for him because, as the forts round-about—Atāwa (Etāwa), Dūlpūr, and Biāna—had not yet surrendered, and the Eastern Afghāns were seated with their army in obstinate rebellion two or three marches on the Āgra side of Qanūj, my mind was not quite free from the whirl and strain of things

¹ A seeming omission in the text is made good in my translation by Shaikh Zain’s help, who says Qāsim was sent to Court.
² This quatrain is in the Rāmpūr Dīrūān. It appears to pun on Biāna and bī(y)ān.
³ Kandār is in Rājpūtāna; Abū’l-faḍl writes Kuhan-dār, old habitation.
close at hand. Makan’s Hasan therefore, becoming helpless, had surrendered Kandār two or three months ago.

Ḥusain Khān (Nuhānī) became afraid in Rāpri, and he abandoning it, it was given to Muhammad ‘Ali Jang-jang.

To Ḥuṭb Khān in Etāwa royal letters of promise and threat had been sent several times, but as he neither came and saw me, nor abandoned Etāwa and got away, it was given to Mahdī Khwāja and he was sent against it with a strong reinforcement of begs and household troops under the command of Muhammad Sl. Mirzā, Sl. Muḥammad Dūldāī, Muḥammad ‘Ali Jang-jang and ‘Abdu’l-‘azīz the Master of the Horse. Qanūj was given to Sl. Muḥammad Dūldāī; he was also (as mentioned) appointed against Etāwa; so too were Fīrūz Khān, Maḥmūd Khān, Shaikh Bāyazīd and Qāzī Jīā, highly favoured commanders to whom Eastern parganas had been given.

Muḥammad Zaitūn, who was seated in Dūlpūr, deceived us and did not come. We gave Dūlpūr to Sl. Junaid Barlās and reinforced him by appointing ‘Ādil Sulṭān, Muḥammadī Kūkūldāsh, Shāh Maṇṣūr Barlās, Qūtlūq-qadam, Treasurer Wali, Jān Beg, ‘Abdu’l-lāh, Pīr-qulī, and Shāh Ḥasan Yāragī (or Bāragī), who were to attack Dūlpūr, take it, make it over to Sl. Junaid Barlās and advance on Bīāna.

(j. Plan of operations adopted.)

These armies appointed, we summoned the Turk amīrs and the Hindūstān amīrs, and tossed the following matters in amongst them:—The various rebel amīrs of the East, that is to say, those under Nāṣir Khān Nuhānī and Maʿrūf Farmūli, have crossed Gang (Ganges) with 40 to 50,000 men, taken Qanūj, and now lie some three miles on our side of the river. The Pagan Rānā Sangā has captured Kandār and is in a hostile and mischievous attitude. The end of the Rains is near. It seems expedient to move either against the rebels or the Pagan, since the task of the forts near-by is easy; when the great foes are got rid of, what road will remain open for the rest? Rānā Sangā is thought not to be the equal of the rebels.

1 This is the first time Bābur’s begs are called amīrs in his book; it may be by a scribe’s slip.
To this all replied unanimously, "Rānā Sangā is the most distant, and it is not known that he will come nearer; the enemy who is closest at hand must first be got rid of. We are for riding against the rebels." Humāyūn then represented, "What need is there for the Pādshāh to ride out? This service I will do." This came as a pleasure to every-one; the Turk and Hind amīrs gladly accepted his views; he was appointed for the East. A Kābulī of Ahmād-i-qāsim's was sent galloping off to tell the armies that had been despatched against Dūlpūr to join Humāyūn at Chandwār;1 also those sent against Etāwa under Mahdī Khwāja and Muhammad Sl. M. were ordered to join him.

(August 21st) Humāyūn set out on Thursday the 13th of Zūl-qa'da, dismounted at a little village called Jīlīsīr (Jalesar) some 3 kurohs from Āgra, there stayed one night, then moved forward march by march.

(k. Khwāja Kalān's departure.)

(August 28th) On Thursday the 20th of this same month, Khwāja Kalān started for Kābul.

(l. Of gardens and pleasances.)

One of the great defects of Hindūstān being its lack of running-waters,2 it kept coming to my mind that waters should be made to flow by means of wheels erected wherever I might settle down, also that grounds should be laid out in an orderly and symmetrical way. With this object in view, we crossed the Jūn-water to look at garden-grounds a few days after entering Āgra. Those grounds were so bad and unattractive that we traversed them with a hundred disgusts and repulsions. So ugly and displeasing were they, that the idea of making a Chār-bāgh in them passed from my mind, but needs must! as there was no other land near Āgra, that same ground was taken in hand a few days later.

The beginning was made with the large well from which water comes for the Hot-bath, and also with the piece of ground where

---

1 Chandwār is on the Jumna, between Āgra and Etāwah.
2 Here āgar-sūlār will stand for the waters which flow—sometimes in marble channels—to nourish plants and charm the eye, such for example as beautify the Tāj-maḥal pleasance.
the tamarind-trees and the octagonal tank now are. After that came the large tank with its enclosure; after that the tank and tālār¹ in front of the outer (?) residence²; after that the private-house (khilwat-khāna) with its garden and various dwellings; after that the Hot-bath. Then in that charmless and disorderly Hind, plots of garden³ were seen laid out with order and symmetry, with suitable borders and parterres in every corner, and in every border rose and narcissus in perfect arrangement.

(m. Construction of a chambered-well.)

Three things oppressed us in Hindūstān, its heat, its violent winds, its dust. Against all three the Bath is a protection, for in it, what is known of dust and wind? and in the heats it is so chilly that one is almost cold. The bath-room in which the heated tank is, is altogether of stone, the whole, except for the īsāra (dado?) of white stone, being, pavement and roofing, of red Bīāna stone.

Khalīfa also and Shaikh Zain, Yūnas-i-ʿalī and whoever got land on that other bank of the river laid out regular and orderly gardens with tanks, made running-waters also by setting up wheels like those in Dipālpūr and Lāhor. The people of Hind who had never seen grounds planned so symmetrically and thus laid out, called the side of the Jūn where (our) residences were, Kābul.

In an empty space inside the fort, which was between Ibrāhīm’s residence and the ramparts, I ordered a large chambered-well (zuāin) to be made, measuring 10 by 10,⁴ a large

¹ Index s.n. The tālār is raised on pillars and open in front; it serves often for an Audience-hall (Erskine).
² tāsh ‘imārat, which may refer to the extra-mural location of the house, or contrast it with the inner khilwat-khāna, the women’s quarters, of the next sentence. The point is noted as one concerning the use of the word tāsh (Index s.n.). I have found no instance in which it is certain that Bābur uses tāsh, a stone or rock, as an adjective. On f. 301 he writes tāshdīn ‘imārat, house-of-stone, which the Persian text renders by ‘imārat-i-sangīn. Wherever tāsh can be translated as meaning outer, this accords with Bābur’s usual diction.
³ bāghcha (Index s.n.). That Bābur was the admitted pioneer of orderly gardens in India is shewn by the 30th Āyīn, On Perfumes:—“After the foot-prints of Firdaus-makānī (Bābur) had added to the glory of Hindūstān, embellishment by avenues and landscape-gardening was seen, while heart-expanding buildings and the sound of falling-waters widened the eyes of beholders.”
⁴ Perhaps gaz, each somewhat less than 36 inches.
well with a flight of steps, which in Hindūstān is called a wāin.¹ This well was begun before the Chār-bāgh²; they were busy digging it in the true Rains (‘aīn bishkāl, Sāwan and Bhadon); it fell in several times and buried the hired workmen; it was finished after the Holy Battle with Rānā Sangā, as is stated in the inscription on the stone that bears the chronogram of its completion. It is a complete wāin, having a three-storeyed house in it. The lowest storey consists of three rooms, each of which opens on the descending steps, at intervals of three steps from one another. When the water is at its lowest, it is one step below the bottom chamber; when it rises in the Rains, it sometimes goes into the top storey. In the middle storey an inner chamber has been excavated which connects with the domed building in which the bullock turns the well-wheel. The top storey is a single room, reached from two sides by 5 or 6 steps which lead down to it from the enclosure overlooked from the well-head. Facing the right-hand way down, is the stone inscribed with the date of completion. At the side of this well is another the bottom of which may be at half the depth of the first, and into which water comes from that first one when the bullock turns the wheel in the domed building afore-mentioned. This second well also is fitted with a wheel, by means of which water is carried along the ramparts to the high-garden. A stone building (tāshdīn ‘imārat) stands at the mouth of the well and there is an outer (?) mosque³ outside (tāshqārī) the enclosure in which the well is. The mosque is not well done; it is in the Hindūstānī fashion.

(n. Humāyūn’s campaign.)

At the time Humāyūn got to horse, the rebel amīrs under Naṣīr Khān Nuḥānī and Ma‘rūf Farmūlī were assembled at Jājmāū.⁴ Arrived within 20 to 30 miles of them, he sent out

¹ The more familiar Indian name is baoli. Such wells attracted Peter Mundy’s attention; Yule gives an account of their names and plan (Mundy’s Travels in Asia, Hakluyt Society, ed. R. C. Temple, and Yule’s Hobson Jobson s.n. Bowly). Bābur’s account of his great wāin is not easy to translate; his interpreters vary from one another; probably no one of them has felt assured of translating correctly.

² i.e. the one across the river.

³ tāsh masjid; this, unless some adjectival affix (e.g. dīn) has been omitted by the scribe, I incline to read as meaning extra, supplementary, or outer, not as “mosque-of-stone”.

⁴ or Jājmāwa, the old name for the sub-district of Kānhpūr (Cawnpur).
Mūmin Ātāka for news; it became a raid for loot; Mūmin Ātāka was not able to bring even the least useful information. The rebels heard about him however, made no stay but fled and got away. After Mūmin Ātāka, Qusm-nāī (?) was sent for news, with Bābā Chuhra \(^1\) and Būjka; they brought it of the breaking-up and flight of the rebels. Humāyūn advancing, took Jājmāū and passed on. Near Dilmāū \(^2\) Fath Khān Sarvānī came and saw him, and was sent to me with Mahdī Khwāja and Muḥammad Sl. Mīrzā.

\(o. \) News of the Aūzbegs.\)

This year ‘Ubaidu'l-lāh Khān (Aūzbeg) led an army out of Bukhārā against Marv. In the citadel of Marv were perhaps 10 to 15 peasants whom he overcame and killed; then having taken the revenues of Marv in 40 or 50 days,\(^3\) he went on to Sarakhs. In Sarakhs were some 30 to 40 Red-heads (Qīsīl-bāshī) who did not surrender, but shut the Gate; the peasantry however scattered them and opened the Gate to the Aūzbeg who entering, killed the Red-heads. Sarakhs taken, he went against Tūs and Mashhad. The inhabitants of Mashhad being helpless, let him in. Tūs he besieged for 8 months, took possession of on terms, did not keep those terms, but killed every man of name and made their women captive.

\(p. \) Affairs of Gujrat.\)

In this year Bahādur Khān,—he who now rules in Gujrat in the place of his father Sl. Muẓaffar Gujratī—having gone to Sl. Ibrāhīm after quarrel with his father, had been received without honour. He had sent dutiful letters to me while I was near Pānī-pat; I had replied by royal letters of favour and kindness summoning him to me. He had thought of coming, but changing his mind, drew off from Ibrāhīm's army towards Gujrat. Meantime his father Sl. Muẓaffar had died (Friday Jumāda II. 2nd AH.—March 16th 1526 AD.); his elder brother Sikandar Shāh who was Sl. Muẓaffar's eldest son, had become

\(^1\) \textit{i.e.} of the Corps of Braves.

\(^2\) Dilmāū is on the left bank of the Ganges, s.e. from Bareilly (Erskine).

\(^3\) \textit{Marv-ning bundi-nī bāghlāb}, which Erskine renders by "Having settled the revenue of Merv", and de Courteille by, "Aprè\(s\) avoir occupé Merv." Were the year's revenues compressed into a 40 to 50 days collection?
ruler in their father's place and, owing to his evil disposition, Fol. 302.
had been strangled by his slave 'Imādū'l-mulk, acting with others (Sha'ban 14th—May 25th). Bahādur Khān, while he was on his road for Gujrat, was invited and escorted to sit in his father's place under the style Bahādur Shāh (Ramzān 26th—July 6th). He for his part did well; he retaliated by death on 'Imādū'l-mulk for his treachery to his salt, and killed some others of his father's begs.¹ People point at him as a dread-naught (bī bāk) youth and a shedder of much blood.

¹ i.e. those who had part in his brother's murder. Cf. Niẓāmu'd-dīn Ahmad's Ṭabaqät-i-akbarī and the Mirat-i-sikandarī (trs. History of Gujrat E. C. Bayley).
933 A.H.—OCT. 8TH 1526 TO SEP. 27TH 1527 A.D.\(^1\)

(a. Announcement of the birth of a son.)

In Muḥarram Beg Wais brought the news of Fārūq's birth; though a foot-man had brought it already, he came this month for the gift to the messenger of good tidings.\(^2\) The birth must have been on Friday eve, Shawwāl 23rd (932 A.H.—August 2nd 1526 A.D.); the name given was Fārūq.

(b. Casting of a mortar.)

(October 22nd—Muharram 15th) Ustād ‘Alī-qlī had been ordered to cast a large mortar for use against Biāna and other forts which had not yet submitted. When all the furnaces and materials were ready, he sent a person to me and, on Monday the 15th of the month, we went to see the mortar cast. Round the mortar-mould he had had eight furnaces made in which were the molten materials. From below each furnace a channel went direct to the mould. When he opened the furnace-holes on our arrival, the molten metal poured like water through all these channels into the mould. After awhile and before the mould was full, the flow stopped from one furnace after another. Ustād ‘Alī-qlī must have made some miscalculation either as to the furnaces or the materials. In his great distress, he was for throwing himself into the mould of molten metal, but we comforted him, put a robe of honour on him, and so brought him out of his shame. The mould was left a day or two to cool; when it was opened, Ustād ‘Alī-qlī with great delight sent to say, “The stone-chamber (tāsh-awi) is without defect; to cast the powder-compartment (dārū-khad) is easy.” He got

\(^1\) Elph. MS. f. 252; W.-B. I.O. 215 f. 199b and 217 f. 205b; Mem. p. 343.

\(^2\) *siānchī* (Zenker). Fārūq was Māhīm’s son; he died in 934 A.H. before his father had seen him.
the stone-chamber out and told off a body of men to accoutre it, while he busied himself with casting the powder-compartment.

(c. Varia.)

Mahdi Khwaja arrived bringing Fath Khan Sarwani from Humayun’s presence, they having parted from him in Dilmau. I looked with favour on Fath Khan, gave him the parganas that had been his father ‘Azam-humayun’s, and other lands also, one pargana given being worth a krur and 60 laks.2

In Hindustan they give permanent titles [muqarrari khitabl] to highly-favoured amirs, one such being ‘Azam-humayun (August Might), one Khan-i-jahan (Khan-of-the-world), another Fol. 303. Khan-i-khanan (Khan-of-khans). Fath Khan’s father’s title was ‘Azam-humayun but I set this aside because on account of Humayun it was not seemly for any person to bear it, and I gave Fath Khan Sarwani the title of Khan-i-jahan.

(November 14th) On Wednesday the 8th of Safar 3 awnings were set up (in the Char-bagh) at the edge of the large tank beyond the tamarind-trees, and an entertainment was prepared there. We invited Fath Khan Sarwani to a wine-party, gave him wine, bestowed on him a turban and head-to-foot of my own wearing, uplifted his head with kindness and favour 4 and allowed him to go to his own districts. It was arranged for his son Mahmoud to remain always in waiting.

(d. Various military matters.)

(November 30th) On Wednesday the 24th of Muharram 5 Muhammad ‘Ali (son of Mihtar) Haidar the stirrup-holder was

1 salak. It is clear from the “‘tash-awi” (Pers. trs. khana-i-sang) of this mortar (qasam) that stones were its missiles. Erskine notes that from Babur’s account cannon would seem sometimes to have been made in parts and clamped together, and that they were frequently formed of iron bars strongly compacted into a circular shape. The accoutrement (salah) presumably was the addition of fittings.

2 About £40,000 sterling (Erskine).

3 The MSS. write Safar but it seems probable that Muharram should be substituted for this; one ground for not accepting Safar being that it breaks the consecutive order of dates, another that Safar allows what seems a long time for the journey from near Dilmau to Agra. All MSS. I have seen give the 8th as the day of the month but Erskine has 20th. In this part of Babur’s writings dates are sparse; it is a narrative and not a diary.

4 This phrase, foreign to Babur’s diction, smacks of a Court-Persian milieu.

5 Here the Elph. MS. has Safar Muharram (f. 253), as has also I.O. 215 f. 200b, but it seems unsafe to take this as an al Safaran extension of Muharram because Muh.-Safar 24th was not a Wednesday. As in the passage noted just above, it seems likely that Muharram is right.
sent (to Humâyûn) with this injunction, “As—thanks be to God!—the rebels have fled, do you, as soon as this messenger arrives, appoint a few suitable begs to Jûnpûr, and come quickly to us yourself, for Rânâ Sangâ the Pagan is conveniently close; let us think first of him!”

After (Humâyûn’s) army had gone to the East, we appointed, to make a plundering excursion into the Bîâna neighbourhood, Tardî Beg (brother) of Qûj Beg with his elder brother Sher-afgan, Muḥammad Khalîl the master-gelder (akhta-begî) with his brethren and the gelders (akhtachîlâr),¹ Rustam Turkmân with his brethren, and also, of the Hindûstânî people, Daud Sarwâni. If they, by promise and persuasion, could make the Bîâna garrison look towards us, they were to do so; if not, they were to weaken the enemy by raid and plunder.

In the fort of Tahangar² was ‘Âlam Khân the elder brother of that same Nîzâm Khân of Bîâna. People of his had come again and again to set forth his obedience and well-wishing; he now took it on himself to say, “If the Pâdshâh appoint an army, it will be my part by promise and persuasion to bring in the quiver-weavers of Bîâna and to effect the capture of that fort.” This being so, the following orders were given to the braves of Tardî Beg’s expedition, “As ‘Âlam Khân, a local man, has taken it on himself to serve and submit in this manner, act you with him and in the way he approves in this matter of Bîâna.” Swordsmen though some Hindûstânîs may be, most of them are ignorant and unskilled in military move and stand (yûrûsh u tûrûsh), in soldierly counsel and procedure. When our expedition joined ‘Âlam Khân, he paid no attention to what any-one else said, did not consider whether his action was good or bad, but went close up to Bîâna, taking our men with him. Our expedition numbered from 250 to 300 Turks with somewhat over 2000 Hindûstânîs and local people, while Nîzâm Khân of Bîâna’s Afghâns and sipâhîs³ were an army of over 4000 horse and of foot-men themselves again, more than 10,000. Nîzâm Khân

¹ Cf. f. 15b note to Qambar-i-‘alt. The title Akhta-begî is to be found translated by “Master of the Horse”, but this would not suit both uses of akhta in the above sentence. Cf. Shaw’s Vocabulary.
² i.e. Tahangarh in Karauli, Râjpâtâna.
³ Perhaps sipâhî represents Hindûstânî foot-soldiers.
looked his opponents over, sallied suddenly out and, his massed horse charging down, put our expeditionary force to flight. His men unhorsed his elder brother ‘Ālam Khān, took 5 or 6 others prisoner and contrived to capture part of the baggage. As we had already made encouraging promises to Nizām Khān, we now, spite of this last impropriety, pardoned all earlier and this later fault, and sent him royal letters. As he heard of Rānā Sangā’s rapid advance, he had no resource but to call on Sayyid Raﬁ’ for mediation, surrender the fort to our men, and come in with Sayyid Raﬁ’, when he was exalted to the felicity of an interview. I bestowed on him a pargana in Miān-dū-āb worth 20 laks. Dost, Lord-of-the-gate was sent for a time to Bīāna, but a few days later it was bestowed on Madhī Khwāja with a fixed allowance of 70 laks, and he was given leave to go there.

Tātur Khān Sārang-khānī, who was in Gūālīār, had been sending constantly to assure us of his obedience and good-wishes. After the pagan took Kandār and was close to Bīāna, Dharmankat, one of the Gūālīār rājas, and another pagan styled Khān-i-jahān, went into the Gūālīār neighbourhood and, coveting the fort, began to stir trouble and tumult. Tātur Khān, thus placed in difficulty, was for surrendering Gūālīār (to us). Most of our begs, household and best braves being away with (Humāyūn’s) army or on various raids, we joined to Raḥīm-dād a few Bhīra men and Lāhorīs with Hastachi tūnqiṭār and his brethren. We assigned parganas in Gūālīār itself to all those mentioned above. Mullā Apāq and Shaikh Gurān (G’huhrān) went also with them, they to return after Raḥīm-dād was established in Gūālīār. By the time they were near Gūālīār however, Tātur Khān’s views had changed, and he did not invite them into the fort. Meantime Shaikh Muḥammad Ghaus (Helper), a darwīsh-like man, not only very learned but with a large following of students and disciples, sent from inside the fort to say to Raḥīm-dād, “Get yourselves into the fort somehow, for

1 Raﬁ’u-d-dīn Safawī, a native of Īj near the Persian Gulf, teacher of Abū’ll-faqī’s father and buried near Āgra (Ayīn-e-akbarī).
2 This phrase, again, departs from Bābur’s simplicity of statement.
3 About £5,000 (Erskine).
4 About £17,500 (Erskine).
the views of this person (Tätär Khân) have changed, and he has evil in his mind.” Hearing this, Rahim-dâd sent to say to Tätär Khân, “There is danger from the Pagan to those outside; let me bring a few men into the fort and let the rest stay outside.” Under insistence, Tätär Khân agreed to this, and Rañim-dâd went in with rather few men. Said he, “Let our people stay near this Gate,” posted them near the Hâtí-pul (Elephant-gate) and through that Gate during that same night brought in the whole of his troop. Next day, Tätär Khân, reduced to helplessness, willy-nilly, made over the fort, and set out to come and wait on me in Ágra. A subsistence allowance of 20 laks was assigned to him on Biânwân pargana.

Muhammad Zaitûn also took the only course open to him by surrendering Dülûr and coming to wait on me. A pargana worth a few laks was bestowed on him. Dülûr was made a royal domain (khâlsa) with Abûl-fath Turkmân as its military-collector (shiqdâr).

In the Hisâr-fîrûza neighbourhood Ḥamîd Khân Sârang-khâni with a body of his own Afghâns and of the Pani Afghâns he had collected—from 3 to 4,000 in all—was in a hostile and troublesome attitude. On Wednesday the 15th Safar (Nov. 21st) we appointed against him Chin-tûrî Sl. (Chaghatâî) with the commanders Secretary Ahmadî, Abûl-fath Turkmân, Malik Dâd Kararâni and Mujâhid Khân of Multân. These going, fell suddenly on him from a distance, beat his Afghâns well, killed a mass of them and sent in many heads.

(e. Embassy from Persia.)

In the last days of Safar, Khwâjagî Asad who had been sent to Shâh-zâda Ţahmâsp in ’Irâq, returned with a Turkmân named Sulaimân who amongst other gifts brought two Circassian girls (qîzlâr).

 Fol. 305.

1 About £5000 (Erskine). Biânwân lies in the sîbah of Ágra.
2 Cf. f. 175 for Bâbur’s estimate of his service.
3 Cf. f. 268b for Bâbur’s clemency to him.
4 Firishta (Briggs ii, 53) mentions that Asad had gone to Ţahmâsp from Kábûl to congratulate him on his accession. Shâh Ismâyîl had died in 930 AH. (1524 AD.) ; the title Shâh-zâda is a misnomer therefore in 933 AH.—one possibly prompted by Ţahmâsp’s youth.
(f. Attempt to poison Bābūr.)

(Dec. 21st) On Friday the 16th of the first Rabī‘ a strange event occurred which was detailed in a letter written to Kābul. That letter is inserted here just as it was written, without addition or taking-away, and is as follows:—

“The details of the momentous event of Friday the 16th of the first Rabī‘ in the date 933 [Dec. 21st 1526 AD.] are as follows:—The ill-omened old woman 2 Ibrāhīm’s mother heard that I ate things from the hands of Hindūstānīs—the thing being that three or four months earlier, as I had not seen Hindūstānī dishes, I had ordered Ibrāhīm’s cooks to be brought and out of 50 or 60 had kept four. Of this she heard, sent to Atāwa (Etāwa) for Ahmad the chāshnīgīr—in Hindūstān they call a taster (bakāwal) a chāshnīgīr—and, having got him, 3 gave a tūla of poison, wrapped in a square of paper,—as has been mentioned a tūla is rather more than 2 misqāls 4—into the hand of a slave-woman who was to give it to him. That poison Aḥmad gave to the Hindūstānī cooks in our kitchen, promising them four parganas if they would get it somehow into the food. Following the first slave-woman that ill-omened old woman sent a second to see if the first did or did not give the poison she had received to Aḥmad. Well was it that Aḥmad put the poison not into the cooking-pot but on a dish! He did not put it into the pot because I had strictly ordered the tasters to compel any Hindūstānīs who were present while food was cooking in the pots, to taste that food. 5 Our graceless tasters were neglectful when the food (āshk) was being dished up. Thin slices of bread were put on a porcelain dish; on these less than half of the paper packet of poison was sprinkled, and over this buttered

1 The letter is likely to have been written to Māhīm and to have been brought back to India by her in 935 AH. (f. 380b). Some MSS. of the Pers. trs. reproduce it in Turki and follow this by a Persian version; others omit the Turki.
2 Turki, bāū. Hindi bāsvā means sister or paternal-aunt but this would not suit from Bābūr’s mouth, the more clearly not that his epithet for the offender is bad-bakht. Gul-badan (H.N. f. 19) calls her “ill-omened demon.”
3 She may have been still in the place assigned to her near Āgra when Bābūr occupied it (f. 269).
4 f. 290. Erskine notes that the tūla is about equal in weight to the silver rūpī.
5 It appears from the kitchen-arrangements detailed by Abū‘l-fażl, that before food was dished up, it was tasted from the pot by a cook and a subordinate taster, and next by the Head-taster.
Fol. 306. fritters were laid. It would have been bad if the poison had been strewn on the fritters or thrown into the pot. In his confusion, the man threw the larger half into the fire-place."

"On Friday, late after the Afternoon Prayer, when the cooked meats were set out, I ate a good deal of a dish of hare and also much fried carrot, took a few mouthfuls of the poisoned Hindūstānī food without noticing any unpleasant flavour, took also a mouthful or two of dried-meat (qāq). Then I felt sick. As some dried meat eaten on the previous day had had an unpleasant taste, I thought my nausea due to the dried-meat. Again and again my heart rose; after retching two or three times I was near vomiting on the table-cloth. At last I saw it would not do, got up, went retching every moment of the way to the water-closet (āb-khāna) and on reaching it vomited much. Never had I vomited after food, used not to do so indeed while drinking. I became suspicious; I had the cooks put in ward and ordered some of the vomit given to a dog and the dog to be watched. It was somewhat out-of-sorts near the first watch of the next day; its belly was swollen and however much people threw stones at it and turned it over, it did not get up. In that state it remained till mid-day; it then got up; it did not die. One or two of the braves who also had eaten of that dish, vomited a good deal next day; one was in a very bad state. In the end all escaped. (Persian) 'An evil arrived but happily passed on!' God gave me new-birth! I am coming from that other world; I am born today of my mother; I was sick; I live; through God, I know today the worth of life!' 

"I ordered Pay-master Sl. Muhammad to watch the cook; when he was taken for torture (qīn), he related the above particulars one after another."

"Monday being Court-day, I ordered the grandees and notables, amīrs and wazīrs to be present and that those two men and two women should be brought and questioned. They there related the particulars of the affair. That taster I had cut in pieces, that cook skinned alive; one of those women I had thrown

1 The Turki sentences which here follow the well-known Persian proverb, Rasīda būd balāt walt ba khair guzasht, are entered as verse in some MSS.; they may be a prose quotation.
under an elephant, the other shot with a match-lock. The old woman (būā) I had kept under guard; she will meet her doom, the captive of her own act.”

“On Saturday I drank a bowl of milk, on Sunday ‘araq in which stamped-clay was dissolved. On Monday I drank milk in which were dissolved stamped-clay and the best theriać, a strong purge. As on the first day, Saturday, something very dark like parched bile was voided.”

“Thanks be to God! no harm has been done. Till now I had not known so well how sweet a thing life can seem! As the line has it, ‘He who has been near to death knows the worth of life.’ Spite of myself, I am all upset whenever the dreadful occurrence comes back to my mind. It must have been God’s favour gave me life anew; with what words can I thank him?”

“Although the terror of the occurrence was too great for words, I have written all that happened, with detail and circumstance, because I said to myself, ‘Don’t let their hearts be kept in anxiety!’ Thanks be to God! there may be other days yet to see! All has passed off well and for good; have no fear or anxiety in your minds.”

“This was written on Tuesday the 20th of the first Rabī, I being then in the Chār-bāgh.”

When we were free from the anxiety of these occurrences, the above letter was written and sent to Kābul.

(g. Dealings with Ibrāhīm’s family.)

As this great crime had raised its head through that ill-omened old woman (būā-i-bad-bakht), she was given over to Yūnas-i-‘alī and Khwājāgī Asad who after taking her money and goods, slaves and slave-women (dādūk), made her over for careful watch to ‘Abdu’r-raḥim shaghāwal. Her grandson, Ibrāhīm’s son had been cared for with much respect and delicacy, but as the attempt on my life had been made, clearly, by that family, it

1 She, after being put under contribution by two of Bābur’s officers (l. 307b) was started off for Kābul, but, perhaps dreading her reception there, threw herself into the Indus in crossing and was drowned. (Cf. A.N.trs. H. Beveridge Errata and addenda p. xi for the authorities.)
2 gil makhtīm, Lemnian earth, terra sigillata, each piece of which was impressed, when taken from the quarry, with a guarantee-stamp (Cf. Ency. Br. s.n. Lemnos).
3 tīrīq-i-fārūq, an antidote.
4 Index s.n.
did not seem advisable to keep him in Agra; he was joined therefore to Mullā Sarsān—who had come from Kāmrān on important business—and was started off with the Mullā to Kāmrān on Thursday Rabī‘ I. 29th (Jan. 3rd 1527 AD.).

(h. Humāyūn’s campaign.)

Humāyūn, acting against the Eastern rebels took Jūna-pūr (sic), went swiftly against Naṣīr Khān (Nūḥānī) in Ghāzī-pūr and found that he had gone across the Gang-river, presumably on news* of Humāyūn’s approach. From Ghāzī-pūr Humāyūn went against Kharīd but the Afghāns of the place had crossed the Sārū-water (Gogra) presumably on the news* of his coming. Kharīd was plundered and the army turned back.

Humāyūn, in accordance with my arrangements, left Shāh Mir Ḥusain and Sl. Junaīd with a body of effective braves in Jūna-pūr, posted Qāzī Jīā with them, and placed Shaikh Bāyazīd [Farmūlī] in Aude (Oude). These important matters settled, he crossed Gang from near Karrah-Mānikpūr and took the Kālpī road. When he came opposite Kālpī, in which was Jalāl Khān jīk-hāl’s (son) ‘Ālam Khān who had sent me dutiful letters but had not waited on me himself, he sent some-one to chase fear from ‘Ālam Khān’s heart and so brought him along (to Agra).

Humāyūn arrived and waited on me in the Garden of Eight-paradises on Sunday the 3rd of the 2nd Rabī‘ (Jan. 6th 1527 AD.). On the same day Khwāja Dost-i-khāwand arrived from Kābul.

(i. Rānā Sangā’s approach.)

Meantime Mahdī Khwāja’s people began to come in, treading on one another’s heels and saying, “The Rānā’s advance is

1 Kāmrān was in Qandahār (Index s.n.). Erskine observes here that Bābur’s omission to give the name of Ibrāhīm’s son, is noteworthy; the son may however have been a child and his name not known to or recalled by Bābur when writing some years later.

2 f. 299b.

3 The Aŷīn-i-akbarī locates this in the sarkār of Jūn-pūr, a location suitable to the context. The second Persian translation (‘Abdu’r-rahīm’s) has here a scribe’s skip from one “news” to another (both asterisked in my text); hence Erskine has an omission.

4 This is the Chār-bāgh of f. 300, known later as the Rām (Arām)-bāgh (Garden-of-rest).

5 Presumably he was coming up from Marwār.
certain. Hasan Khan Miwātī is heard of also as likely to join him. They must be thought about above all else. It would favour our fortune, if a troop came ahead of the army to reinforce Bīāna.”

Deciding to get to horse, we sent on, to ride light to Bīāna, the commanders Muḥammad Sl. Mirzā, Yūnas-i-‘alī, Shāh Maṇṣūr Barlās, Kitta Beg, Qismatī and Būjka.

In the fight with Ibrāhīm, Hasan Khan Miwātī’s son Nāhar Khān had fallen into our hands; we had kept him as an hostage and, ostensibly on his account, his father had been making comings-and-goings with us, constantly asking for him. It now occurred to several people that if Hasan Khān were conciliated by sending him his son, he would thereby be the more favourably disposed and his waiting on me might be the better brought about. Accordingly Nāhar Khān was dressed in a robe of honour; promises were made to him for his father, and he was given leave to go. That hypocritical mannikin [Hasan Khān] must have waited just till his son had leave from me to go, for on hearing of this and while his son as yet had not joined him, he came out of Alūr (Alwar) and at once joined Rānā Sangā in Toda (bām, Āgra District). It must have been ill-judged to let his son go just then.

Meantime much rain was falling; parties were frequent; even Humāyūn was present at them and, abhorrent though it was to him, sinned 2 every few days.

(j. Tramontane affairs.)

One of the strange events in these days of respite 3 was this:— When Humāyūn was coming from Fort Victory (Qila‘-i-ṣafar) to join the Hindūstān army, (Muh. 932 AH. — Oct. 1525 AD.) Mullā Bābā of Pashāghar (Chaghatāī) and his younger brother Bābā Shaikh deserted on the way, and went to Kitīn-qarā Sl. (Aūṣbeg), into whose hands Balkh had fallen through the

1 This name varies; the Hai. MS. in most cases writes Qismatī, but on f. 267b, Qismatāī; the Elph. MS. on f. 220 has Q:smnāi; De Courtéille writes Qismi.
2 artkâb qildi, perhaps drank wine, perhaps ate opium-confections to the use of which he became addicted later on (Gulbadan’s Humāyūn-nāma f. 30b and 73b).
3 fursatār, i.e. between the occupation of Āgra and the campaign against Rānā Sangā.
enfeeblement of its garrison. This hollow mannkin and his younger brother having taken the labours of this side (Cis-Balkh?) on their own necks, come into the neighbourhood of Aibak, Khurram and Sār-bāgh.

Shāh Sikandar—his footing in Ghūrī lost through the surrender of Balkh—is about to make over that fort to the Aūzbeg, when Mullā Bābā and Bābā Shaikh, coming with a few Aūzbegs, take possession of it. Mīr Hamah, as his fort is close by, has no help for it; he is for submitting to the Aūzbeg, but a few days later Mullā Bābā and Bābā Shaikh come with a few Aūzbegs to Mīr Hamah's fort, purposing to make the Mīr and his troop march out and to take them towards Balkh. Mīr Hamah makes Bābā Shaikh dismount inside the fort, and gives the rest felt huts (aūtāq) here and there. He slashes at Bābā Shaikh, puts him and some others in bonds, and sends a man galloping off to Tīngri-bīrdī (Qūchīn, in Qūndūz). Tīngri-bīrdī sends off Yār-i-‘alī and ‘Abdu’l-latīf with a few effective braves, but before they reach Mīr Hamah's fort, Mullā Bābā has arrived there with his Aūzbegs; he had thought of a hand-to-hand fight (aūrūsh-mūrūsh), but he can do nothing. Mīr Hamah and his men joined Tīngri-bīrdī's and came to Qūndūz. Bābā Shaikh's wound must have been severe; they cut his head off and Mīr Hamah brought it (to Āgra) in these same days of respite. I uplifted his head with favour and kindness, distinguishing him amongst his fellows and equals. When Bāqī shaghāwāl went [to Balkh] I promised him a ser of gold for the head of each of the ill-conditioned old couple; one ser of gold was now given to Mīr Hamah for Bābā Shaikh's head, over and above the favours referred to above.

(k. Action of part of the Biāna reinforcement.)

Qismatī who had ridden light for Biāna, brought back several heads he had cut off; when he and Būjka had gone with a few

1 Apparently the siege Bābur broke up in 931 AH. had been renewed by the Aūzbegs (f. 255b and Trs. Note s:a. 931 AH. section c).
2 These places are on the Khulm-river between Khulm and Kāhmard. The present tense of this and the following sentences is Bābur's.
3 f. 261.
4 Erskine here notes that if the ser Bābur mentions be one of 14 tūlas, the value is about $27$; if of 24 tūlas, about $45$. 
braves to get news, they had beaten two of the Pagan’s scouting-parties and had made 70 to 80 prisoners. Qismatī brought news that Hasan Khān Miwātī really had joined Rānā Sangā.

(l. Trial-test of the large mortar of f. 302.)

(Feb. roth) On Sunday the 8th of the month (Jumāda I.), I went to see Ustād ‘Alī-qulí discharge stones from that large mortar of his in casting which the stone-chamber was without defect and which he had completed afterwards by casting the powder-compartment. It was discharged at the Afternoon Prayer; the throw of the stone was 1600 paces. A gift was made to the Master of a sword-belt, robe of honour, and tipūchāq (horse).

(m. Bābur leaves Āgra against Rānā Sangā.)

(Feb. 11th) On Monday the 9th of the first Jumāda, we got out of the suburbs of Āgra, on our journey (safar) for the Holy War, and dismounted in the open country, where we remained three or four days to collect our army and be its rallying-point. As little confidence was placed in Hindūstānī people, the Hindūstān amīrs were inscribed for expeditions to this or to that side:—‘Ālam Khān (Tahangārī) was sent hastily to Gūalīr to reinforce Raḥīm-dād; Makan, Qāsim Beg Sanbālī (Sambhālī), Hamid with his elder and younger brethren and Muḥammad Zaitūn were inscribed to go swiftly to Sanbal.

(n. Defeat of the advance-force.)

Into this same camp came the news that owing to Rānā Sangā’s swift advance with all his army, our scouts were able neither to get into the fort (Biāna) themselves nor to send news into it. The Biāna garrison made a rather incautious sally too far out; the enemy fell on them in some force and put them to

1 T. čopdāq. Cf. the two Persian translations 215 f. 205b and 217 f. 215; also Ilinsky, p. 401.
2 balghān čirīki. The Rānā’s forces are thus stated by Tod (Rājastān; Annals of Marwār Cap. ix):—“Eighty thousand horse, 7 Rajas of the highest rank, 9 Raos, and 104 chieftains bearing the titles of Rawul and Rawut, with 500 war-elephants, followed him into the field.” Bābur’s army, all told, was 12,000 when he crossed the Indus from Kābul; it will have had accretions from his own officers in the Panjāb and some also from other quarters, and will have had losses at Pānīpat; his reliable kernel of fighting-strength cannot but have been numerically insignificant, compared with the Rājpūt host. Tod says that almost all the princes of Rājastān followed the Rānā at Kanwā.
rout. There Sangur Khān Janjūha became a martyr. Kitta Beg had galloped into the pell-mell without his cuirass; he got one pagan afoot (yāyāglātiib) and was overcoming him, when the pagan snatched a sword from one of Kitta Beg’s own servants and slashed the Beg across the shoulder. Kitta Beg suffered great pain; he could not come into the Holy-battle with Rānā Sangā, was long in recovering and always remained blemished.

Whether because they were themselves afraid, or whether to frighten others is not known but Qismati, Shāh Manṣūr Bārlās and all from Bīāna praised and lauded the fierceness and valour of the pagan army.

Qāsim Master-of-the-horse was sent from the starting-ground (safar qīlghān yūrt) with his spadesmen, to dig many wells where the army was next to dismount in the Madhākūr pargana.

(Feb. 16th) Marching out of Āgra on Saturday the 14th of the first Jumāda, dismount was made where the wells had been dug. We marched on next day. It crossed my mind that the well-watered ground for a large camp was at Sikrī. It being possible that the Pagan was encamped there and in possession of the water, we arrayed precisely, in right, left and centre. As Qismati and Darwish-i-muhammad Sārbān in their comings and goings had seen and got to know all sides of Bīāna, they were sent ahead to look for camping-ground on the bank of the Sikrī lake (kūl). When we reached the (Madhākūr) camp, persons were sent galloping off to tell Mahdī Khwāja and the Bīāna garrison to join me without delay. Humāyūn’s servant Beg Mīrak Mughūl was sent out with a few braves to get news of the Pagan. They started that night, and next morning brought word that he was heard of as having arrived and dismounted at a place one kuroh (2 miles) on our side (aīlkārāk) of Basāwar. On this same day Mahdī Khwāja and Muhammad Sl. Mīrzā rejoined us with the troops that had ridden light to Bīāna.

1  dārbātūr. This is the first use of the word in the Babur-nāma; the defacer of the Elph. Codex has altered it to aūrātūr.
2  Shaikh Zain records [Abū’l-fazl also, perhaps quoting from him] that Bābūr, by varying diacritical points, changed the name Sikrī to Shukrī in sign of gratitude for his victory over the Rānā. The place became the Fathpūr-sikrī of Akbar.
3  Erskine locates this as 10 to 12 miles n.w. of Bīāna.
The begs were appointed in turns for scouting-duty. When it was 'Abdu'l-'azīz’s turn, he went out of Sikrī, looking neither before nor behind, right out along the road to Kanwā which is 5 kuroh (10 m.) away. The Rānā must have been marching forward; he heard of our men’s moving out in their reinless (jalāū-sīz) way, and made 4 or 5,000 of his own fall suddenly on them. With 'Abdu'l-'azīz and Mullā Apāq may have been 1000 to 1500 men; they took no stock of their opponents but just got to grips; they were hurried off at once, many of them being made prisoner.

On news of this, we despatched Khalīfa’s Muḥībb-i-‘alī with Khalīfa’s retainers. Mullā Ḥusain and some others aūbrūq-sūbrūq 1* were sent to support them,2 and Muḥammad ‘Alī Jang-jang also. Presumably it was before the arrival of this first, Muḥībb-i-‘alī’s, reinforcement that the Pagan had hurried off 'Abdu'l-'azīz and his men, taken his standard, martyred Mullā Nī'mat, Mullā Dāūd and the younger brother of Mullā Apāq, with several more. Directly the reinforcement arrived the pagans overcame Ṭāhir-tibri, the maternal uncle of Khalīfa’s Muḥībb-i-‘alī, who had not got up with the hurrying reinforcement [?].3 Meantime Muḥībb-i-‘alī even had been thrown down,

1 This phrase has not occurred in the B.N. before; presumably it expresses what has not yet been expressed; this Erskine’s rendering, "each according to the speed of his horse," does also. The first Persian translation, which in this portion is by Muḥammad-qulī Mughūl Ḥiẓārī, translates by az dambal yak digar (I.O. 215, f. 205b); the second, 'Abdu'r-rāhīm’s, merely reproduces the phrase; De Courteille (ii, 272) appears to render it by (amirs) que je ne nomme pas. If my reading of Ṭāhir-tibri’s failure be correct (infra), Erskine’s translation suits the context.

2 The passage cut off by my asterisks has this outside interest that it forms the introduction to the so-called "Fragments," that is, to certain Turki matter not included in the standard Bābur-nāma, but preserved with the Kehr—Ilminsky—de Courteille text. As is well-known in Bāburiana, opinion has varied as to the genesis of this matter; there is now no doubt that it is a translation into Turki from the (Persian) Akbar-nāma, prefaced by the above-asterisked passage of the Bābur-nāma and continuous (with slight omissions) from Bib. Ind. ed. i, 106 to 120 (trs. H. Beveridge i, 260 to 282). It covers the time from before the battle of Kanwā to the end of Abū'l-fażl’s description of Bābur’s death, attainments and Court; it has been made to seem Bābur’s own, down to his death-bed, by changing the third person of A.F.’s narrative into the autobiographical first person. (Cf. Ilminsky, p. 403 l. 4 and p. 494; Mémoires ii, 272 and 443 to 464; JRAS. 1908, p. 76.)

A minute point in the history of the B.N. manuscripts may be placed on record here: fāṣ, that the variants from the true Bābur-nāma text which occur in the Kehr—Ilminsky one, occur also in the corrupt Turki text of I.O. No. 214 (JRAS 1900, p. 455).

3 chāfār kūmāk yītmās, perhaps implying that the speed of his horses was not equal to that of Muḥībb-i-‘alī’s. Translators vary as to the meaning of the phrase.
but Bāltū getting in from the rear, brought him out. The enemy pursued for over a kuroh (2 m.), stopped however at the sight of the black mass of Muḥ. 'Ali Jang-jang’s troops.

Foot upon foot news came that the foe had come near and nearer. We put on our armour and our horses’ mail, took our arms and, ordering the carts to be dragged after us, rode out at the gallop. We advanced one kuroh. The foe must have turned aside.

(p. Bābur fortifies his camp.)

For the sake of water, we dismounted with a large lake (kūl) on one side of us. Our front was defended by carts chained together*, the space between each two, across which the chains stretched, being 7 or 8 qārī (circa yards). Muṣṭaṣa Rūmī had had the carts made in the Rūmī way, excellent carts, very strong and suitable.² As Ustād ‘Ali-qulī was jealous of him, Muṣṭaṣa was posted to the right, in front of Humāyūn. Where the carts did not reach to, Khurāsānī and Hindūstānī spadesmen and miners were made to dig a ditch.

Owing to the Pagan’s rapid advance, to the fighting-work in Biāna and to the praise and laud of the pagans made by Shāh Maņṣūr, Qismati and the rest from Biāna, people in the army shewed sign of want of heart. On the top of all this came the defeat of ‘Abdu’l-’azīz. In order to hearten our men, and give a look of strength to the army, the camp was defended and shut in where there were no carts, by stretching ropes of raw hide on wooden tripods, set 7 or 8 qārī apart. Time had drawn out to 20 or 25 days before these appliances and materials were fully ready.²

(q. A reinforcement from Kābul.)

Just at this time there arrived from Kābul Qāsim-i-ḥusain Sl. (Aūṣbeg Shaibān) who is the son of a daughter of Sl. Ḥusain M. (Bāi-qarā), and with him Ḩāmid-i-yūṣuf (Aūḫlāqchi), Qawwwām-i-aūrdū Shāh and also several single friends of mine,

¹ Erskine and de Courtelle both give Muṣṭaṣa the commendation the Turkī and Persian texts give to the carts.
² According to Tod’s Kājastān, negotiations went on during the interval, having for their object the fixing of a frontier between the Rānā and Bābur. They were conducted by a “traitor” Ṣalāḥ’d-dīn Tūār the chief of Raisin, who moreover is said to have deserted to Bābur during the battle.
counting up in all to 500 men. Muḥammad Sharif, the astrologer of ill-augury, came with them too, so did Bābā Dost the water-bearer (ṣūchī) who, having gone to Kābul for wine, had there loaded three strings of camels with acceptable Ghaznī wines.

At a time such as this, when, as has been mentioned, the army was anxious and afraid by reason of past occurrences and vicissitudes, wild words and opinions, this Muḥammad Sharif, the ill-augurer, though he had not a helpful word to say to me, kept insisting to all he met, “Mars is in the west in these days; who comes into the fight from this (east) side will be defeated.” Timid people who questioned the ill-augurer, became the more shattered in heart. We gave no ear to his wild words, made no change in our operations, but got ready in earnest for the fight.

(Feb. 24th). On Sunday the 22nd (of Jumāda I.) Shaikh Jamāl was sent to collect all available quiver-wearers from between the two waters (Ganges and Jumna) and from Dīhlī, so that with this force he might over-run and plunder the Miwāt villages, leaving nothing undone which could awaken the enemy’s anxiety for that side. Mullā Tark-i-‘alī, then on his way from Kābul, was ordered to join Shaikh Jamāl and to neglect nothing of ruin and plunder in Miwāt; orders to the same purport were given also to Maghfur the Diwān. They went; they over-ran and raided a few villages in lonely corners (būjqāq); they took some prisoners; but their passage through did not arouse much anxiety!

(r. Bābur renounces wine.)

On Monday the 23rd of the first Jumāda (Feb. 25th), when I went out riding, I reflected, as I rode, that the wish to cease from sin had been always in my mind, and that my forbidden acts had set lasting stain upon my heart. Said I, “Oh! my soul!”

(Persian) “How long wilt thou draw savour from sin? Repentance is not without savour, taste it!”

1 Cf. f. 89 for Bābur’s disastrous obedience to astrological warning.

2 For the reading of this second line, given by the good MSS. viz. Tauba ham bī masa nīst, bachast, Ilinsky (p. 405) has Tauba ham bī masa, mast bakhīs, which de Courtelle [II, 276] renders by, “O ivrogne insensé! que ne goûtes-tu aussi à la pénitence?” The Persian couplet seems likely to be a quotation and may yet be found elsewhere. It is not in the Rāmpūr Diwān which contains the Turki verses following it (E. D. Ross p. 21).
(Turkí) Through years how many has sin defiled thee?
How much of peace has transgression given thee?
How much hast thou been thy passions’ slave?
How much of thy life flung away?

With the Ghāzi’s resolve since now thou hast marched,
Thou hast looked thine own death in the face!
Who resolves to hold stubbornly fast to the death,
Thou knowest what change he attains,

That far he removes him from all things forbidden,
That from all his offences he cleanse himself.
With my own gain before me, I vowed to obey,
In this my transgression, the drinking of wine.  

The flagons and cups of silver and gold, the vessels of feasting,
I had them all brought;  
I had them all broken up then and there.
Thus eased I my heart by renunciation of wine.

The fragments of the gold and silver vessels were shared out to deserving persons and to darwishes. The first to agree in renouncing wine was ‘Asas;  
he had already agreed also about leaving his beard untrimmed.  
That night and next day some 300 begs and persons of the household, soldiers and not soldiers, renounced wine. What wine we had with us was poured on the ground; what Bābā Dost had brought was ordered salted to make vinegar. At the place where the wine was poured upon the ground, a well was ordered to be dug, built up with stone and having an almshouse beside it. It was already finished in Muḥarram 935 (AH.—Sep. 1528 AD.) at the time I went to Sikrī from Dūlpūr on my way back from visiting Gūāliār.

1 kīchmākli̇k, to pass over (to exceed ?), to ford or go through a river, whence to transgress. The same metaphor of crossing a stream occurs, in connection with drinking, on f. 1896.  
2 This line shews that Bābūr’s renunciation was of wine only; he continued to eat confections (ma’jūn).  
3 Cf. f. 1866. Bābūr would announce his renunciation in Dīwān; there too the forbidden vessels of precious metals would be broken. His few words leave it to his readers to picture the memorable scene.  
4 This night-guard (‘asas) cannot be the one concerning whom Gul-badan records that he was the victim of a little joke made at his expense by Bābūr (II. N. Index s.n.). He seems likely to be the Ḥājjī Mūḥ. ‘asas whom Abū’l-ḥāẓīr mentions in connection with Kāmān in 953 AH. (1547 AD.). He may be the ‘asas who took charge of Bābūr’s tomb at Ṡagra (cf. Gul-badan’s II. N. s.n. Mūḥ. ‘All ‘asas Ṭaghā‘ī, and Akbar-nāma trs. i, 502).  
5 saqālī girānmāţa u qūmāţa. Erskine here notes that “a vow to leave the beard untrimmed was made sometimes by persons who set out against the infidels. They did not trim the beard till they returned victorious. Some vows of similar nature may be found in Scripture”, e.g. II Samuel, cap. 19 v. 24.
FARMĀN ANNOUNCING BĀBUR’S RENUNCIATION OF WINE.

5 Let us praise the Long-suffering One who loveth the penitent and who loveth the cleansers of themselves; and let thanks be rendered to the Gracious One who absolveth His debtors, and forgiveth those who seek forgiveness. Blessings be upon Muhammad the Crown of Creatures, on the Holy family, on the pure Companions, and on the mirrors of the glorious congregation, to wit, the Masters of Wisdom who are treasure-houses of the pearls of purity and who bear the impress of the sparkling jewels of this purport:—that the nature of man is prone to evil, and that the abandonment of sinful appetites is only feasible by Divine aid

1 Index s.n. The tamghā was not really abolished until Jahāngīr’s time—if then (H. Beveridge). See Thomas’ Revenue Resources of the Mughal Empire.

2 There is this to notice here:—Bābur’s narrative has made the remission of the tamghā contingent on his success, but the farmān which announced that remission is dated some three weeks before his victory over Rānā Sangā (Jumāda II, 13th—March 16th). Manifestly Bābur’s remission was absolute and made at the date given by Shaikh Zain as that of the farmān. The farmān seems to have been despatched as soon as it was ready, but may have been inserted in Bābur’s narrative at a later date, together with the preceding paragraph which I have asterisked.

3 "There is a lacuna in the Turki copy" (i.e. the Elphinstone Codex) "from this place to the beginning of the year 935. Till then I therefore follow only Mr. Metcalfe’s and my own Persian copies" (Erskine).

4 I am indebted to my husband for this revised version of the farmān. He is indebted to M. de Courteille for help generally, and specially for the references to the Qurān (g.v. infra).

5 The passages in italics are Arabic in the original, and where traced to the Qurān, are in Sale’s words.
and the help that cometh from on high. “Every soul is prone unto evil,”¹ (and again) “This is the bounty of God; He will give the same unto whom He pleaseth; and God is endued with great bounty.”²

Our motive for these remarks and for repeating these statements is that, by reason of human frailty, of the customs of kings and of the great, all of us, from the Shâh to the sipâhi, in the heyday of our youth, have transgressed and done what we ought not to have done. After some days of sorrow and repentance, we abandoned evil practices one by one, and the gates of retrogression became closed. But the renunciation of wine, the greatest and most indispensable of renunciations, remained under a veil in the chamber of deeds pledged to appear in due season, and did not show its countenance until the glorious hour when we had put on the garb of the holy warrior and had encamped with the army of Islâm over against the infidels in order to slay them. On this occasion I received a secret inspiration and heard an infallible voice say “Is not the time yet come unto those who believe, that their hearts should humbly submit to the admonition of God, and that truth which hath been revealed?”³ Thereupon we set ourselves to extirpate the things of wickedness, and we earnestly knocked at the gates of repentance. The Guide of Help assisted us, according to the saying “Whoever knocks and re-knocks, to him it will be opened”, and an order was given that with the Holy War there should begin the still greater war which has to be waged against sensuality. In short, we declared with sincerity that we would subjugate our passions, and I engraved on the tablet of my heart “I turn unto Thee with repentance, and I am the first of true believers”.⁴ And I made public the resolution to abstain from wine, which had been hidden in the treasury of my breast. The victorious servants, in accordance with the illustrious order, dashed upon the earth of contempt and destruction the flagons and the cups, and the other utensils in gold and silver, which in their number and their brilliance were like the stars of the firmament. They dashed them in pieces, as, God willing! soon

¹ Qurân, Sûrah XII, v. 53.  
² Sûrah LVII, v. 21.  
³ Sûrah LVII, v. 15.  
⁴ Sûrah VII, v. 140.
will be dashed the gods of the idolaters,—and they distributed the fragments among the poor and needy. By the blessing of this acceptable repentance, many of the courtiers, by virtue of the saying that men follow the religion of their kings, embraced abstinence at the same assemblage, and entirely renounced the use of wine, and up till now crowds of our subjects hourly attain this auspicious happiness. I hope that in accordance with the saying "He who incites to good deeds has the same reward as he who does them" the benefit of this action will react on the royal fortune and increase it day by day by victories.

After carrying out this design an universal decree was issued that in the imperial dominions—May God protect them from every danger and calamity—no-one shall partake of strong drink, or engage in its manufacture, nor sell it, nor buy it or possess it, nor convey it or fetch it. "Beware of touching it." "Perchance this will give you prosperity."¹

In thanks for these great victories,² and as a thank-offering for God's acceptance of repentance and sorrow, the ocean of the royal munificence became commoved, and those waves of kindness, which are the cause of the civilization of the world and of the glory of the sons of Adam, were displayed,—and throughout all the territories the tax (tamghā) on Musalmāns was abolished,—though its yield was more than the dreams of avarice, and though it had been established and maintained by former rulers,—for it is a practice outside of the edicts of the Prince of Apostles (Muḥammad). So a decree was passed that in no city, town, road, ferry, pass, or port, should the tax be levied or exacted. No alteration whatsoever of this order is to be permitted. "Whoever after hearing it makes any change therein, the sin of such change will be upon him."³

The proper course (sabil) for all who shelter under the shade of the royal benevolence, whether they be Turk, Tājik, 'Arab, Hindī, or Fārsī (Persian), peasants or soldiers, of every nation or tribe

¹ Sūrah II, v. 185.
² These may be self-conquests as has been understood by Erskine (p. 356) and de Courteille (ii. 281) but as the Divine "acceptance" would seem to Bābūr vouched for by his military success, "victories" may stand for his success at Kanwā.
³ Sūrah II, 177 where, in Sale's translation, the change referred to is the special one of altering a legacy.
of the sons of Adam, is to strengthen themselves by the tenets of religion, and to be full of hope and prayer for the dynasty which is linked with eternity, and to adhere to these ordinances, and not in any way to transgress them. It behoves all to act according to this farmān; they are to accept it as authentic when it comes attested by the Sign-Manual.

Written by order of the Exalted one,—May his excellence endure for ever! on the 24th of Jumāda I. 933 (February 26th 1527).

(t. Alarm in Bābur’s camp.)

In these days, as has been mentioned, (our people) great and small, had been made very anxious and timid by past occurrences. No manly word or brave counsel was heard from any one soever. What bold speech was there from the wazirs who are to speak out (dīgūchī), or from the amirs who will devour the land (wilāyat-yīghūchī)? None had advice to give, none a bold plan of his own to expound. Khalifa (however) did well in this campaign, neglecting nothing of control and supervision, painstaking and diligence.

At length after I had made enquiry concerning people’s want of heart and had seen their slackness for myself, a plan occurred to me; I summoned all the begs and braves and said to them, “Begs and braves!

(Persian)  Who comes into the world will die;  
What lasts and lives will be God.

(Turki)  He who hath entered the assembly of life,  
Drinketh at last of the cup of death.  
He who hath come to the inn of life,  
Passeth at last from Earth’s house of woe.

1 The words dīgūchī and yīghūchī are translated in the second Wāqī’āt-i-bāburī by sukkan-gū and [wilāyat]-khwār. This ignores in them the future element supplied by their component gū which would allow them to apply to conditions dependent on Bābur’s success. The Hai. MS. and Ilinsky read dīghūchī, supporter- or helper-to-be, in place of the yīghūchī, eater-to-be I have inferred from the khwār of the Pers. translation; hence de Courteille writes “amirs auxquels incombaît l’obligation de raffermir le gouvernement”. But Erskine, using the Pers. text alone, and thus having khwār before him, translates by, “‘amirs who enjoyed the wealth of kingdoms.” The two Turki words make a depreciatory “jingle”, but the first one, dīghūchī, may imply serious reference to the duty, declared by Muḥammad to be incumbent upon a wazir, of reminding his sovereign “when he forgetteth his duty”. Both may be taken as alluding to dignities to be attained by success in the encounter from which wazirs and amirs were shrinking.
“Better than life with a bad name, is death with a good one.

(Persian) Well is it with me, if I die with good name!
A good name must I have, since the body is death’s.

“God the Most High has allotted to us such happiness and has created for us such good-luck that we die as martyrs, we kill as avengers of His cause. Therefore must each of you take oath upon His Holy Word that he will not think of turning his face from this foe, or withdraw from this deadly encounter so long as life is not rent from his body.” All those present, beg and retainer, great and small, took the Holy Book joyfully into their hands and made vow into and compact to this purport. The plan was perfect; it worked admirably for those near and afar, for seers and hearers, for friend and foe.

(u. Bābūr’s perilous position.)
In those same days trouble and disturbance arose on every side:—Husain Khān Nuhānī went and took Rāprī; Quṭb Khān’s man took Chandwār; a mannikin called Rustam Khān who had collected quiver-wearers from Between-the-two-waters (Ganges and Jamna), took Kūl (Koel) and made Kīchik ‘Alī prisoner; Khwāja Zāhid abandoned Sāmbal and went off; Sl. Muḥammad Dūlī came from Ḥanūj to me; the Gūālīār pagans laid siege to that fort; ‘Alam Khān when sent to reinforce it, did not go to Gūālīār but to his own district. Every day bad news came from every side. Desertion of many Hindūstānis set in; Haibat Khān Karg-andāz deserted and went to Sāmbal; Hasan Khān of Bārī deserted and joined the Pagan. We gave attention to none of them but went straight on with our own affair.

(v. Bābūr advances to fight.)
The apparatus and appliances, the carts and wheeled tripods being ready, we arrayed in right, left and centre, and marched forward on New Year’s Day, Tuesday, the 9th of the second Jumādā (March 13th), having the carts and wheeled tripods

1 Firdausī’s Shāh-nāma [Erskine].
2 Also Chand-wāl; it is 25 m. east of Āgra and on the Jamna [Tabaqāt-i-nāṣirī, Raverty, p. 742 n.9].
3 Probably, Overthrower of the rhinoceros, but if Gurg-andāz be read, of the wolf.
4 According to the Persian calendar this is the day the Sun enters Aries.
5 The practical purpose of this order of march is shewn in the account of the battle of Pānīpat, and in the Letter of Victory, f. 319.
moving in front of us, with Ustād ‘Ali-quli and all the matchlock-men ranged behind them in order that these men, being on foot, should not be left behind the array but should advance with it.

When the various divisions, right, left and centre, had gone each to its place, I galloped from one to another to give encouragement to begs, braves, and sipāhīs. After each man had had assigned to him his post and usual work with his company, we advanced, marshalled on the plan determined, for as much as one kuroh (2 m.) and then dismounted.

The Pagan's men, for their part, were on the alert; they came from their side, one company after another.

The camp was laid out and strongly protected by ditch and carts. As we did not intend to fight that day, we sent a few unmailed braves ahead, who were to get to grips with the enemy and thus take an omen. They made a few pagans prisoner, cut off and brought in their heads. Malik Qāsim also cut off and brought in a few heads; he did well. By these successes the hearts of our men became very strong.

When we marched on next day, I had it in my mind to fight, but Khalīfa and other well-wishers represented that the camping-ground previously decided on was near and that it would favour our fortunes if we had a ditch and defences made there and went there direct. Khalīfa accordingly rode off to get the ditch dug; he settled its position with the spades-men, appointed overseers of the work and returned to us.

(w. The battle of Kānwa.)

On Saturday the 13th of the second Jumāḍā (March 17th, 1527 AD.) we had the carts dragged in front of us (as before), made a kuroh (2 m.) of road, arrayed in right, left and centre, and dismounted on the ground selected.

1 kurohcha, perhaps a short kuroh, but I have not found Bābur using cha as a diminutive in such a case as kurohcha.
2 or Kānūa, in the Biānā district and three marches from Biānā-town. "It had been determined on by Rānā Sangrām Singh (i.e. Sangā) for the northern limit of his dominions, and he had here built a small palace." Tod thus describes Bābur's foe, "Sangā Rānā was of the middle stature, and of great muscular strength, fair in complexion, with unusually large eyes which appear to be peculiar to his descendants. He exhibited at his death but the fragments of a warrior: one eye was lost in the broil with his brother, an arm in action with the Lodi kings of Dehli, and he was a cripple owing to a limb being broken by a cannon-ball in another; while he counted 80 wounds from the sword or the lance on various parts of his body" (Tod's Rājastān, cap. Annals of Mewār).
A few tents had been set up; a few were in setting up when news of the appearance of the enemy was brought. Mounting instantly, I ordered every man to his post and that our array should be protected with the carts.¹

* As the following Letter-of-victory (Fath-nāma) which is what Shaikh Zain had indited, makes known particulars about the army of Islām, the great host of the pagans with the position of their arrayed ranks, and the encounters had between them and the army of Islām, it is inserted here without addition or deduction.²

**SHAikh ZAIN'S LETTER-OF-VICTORY.**

(a. Introduction.)

Praise be to God the Faithful Promiser, the Helper of His servants, the Supporter of His armies, the Scatterer of hostile hosts, the One alone without whom there is nothing.

¹ Here M. de C. has the following note (ii, 273 n.); it supplements my own of f. 264 [n. 3]. "Le mot arābā, que j'ai traduit par chariot est pris par M. Leyden" (this should be Erskine) "dans le sens de 'gun', ce que je ne crois pas exact; tout au plus signifierait-il 'affût'" (gun-carriage). "Il me paraît impossible d'admettre que Bāber eût à sa disposition une artillerie attelée aussi considérable. Ces arābā pouvaient servir en partie à transporter des pièces de campagne, mais ils avaient aussi une autre destination, comme on le voit par la suite du récit." It does not appear to me that Erskine translates the word arābā by the word gun, but that the arābas (all of which he took to be gun-carrriages) being there, he supposed the guns. This was not correct as the various passages about carts as defences show (cf. Index s.nn. arābā and carts).

² It is characteristic of Bābur that he reproduces Shaikh Zain's Fath-nāma, not because of its eloquence but because of its useful details. Erskine and de Courteille have the following notes concerning Shaikh Zain's farmān:—"Nothing can form a more striking contrast to the simple, manly and intelligent style of Baber himself, than the pompous, laboured periods of his secretary. Yet I have never read this Firmān to any native of India who did not bestow unlimited admiration on the official bombast of Zeineddin, while I have met with none but Turks who paid due praise to the calm simplicity of Baber" [Mems. p. 359]. "Comme la précédente (farnān), cette pièce est rédigée en langue persane et offre un modèle des plus accomplis du style en usage dans les chancelleries orientales. La traduction d'un semblable morceau d'éloquence est de la plus grande difficulté, si on veut être clair, tout en restant fidèle à l'original."

Like the Renunciation farmān, the Letter-of-victory with its preceding sentence which I have asterisked, was probably inserted into Bābur's narrative somewhat later than the battle of Kānwa. Hence Bābur's pluperfect-tense "had indited". I am indebted to my husband for help in revising the difficult Fath-nāma; he has done it with consideration of the variants between the earlier English and the French translations. No doubt it could be dealt with more searchingly still by one well-versed in the Qurān and the Traditions, and thus able to explain others of its allusions. The italics denote Arabic passages in the original; many of these are from the Qurān, and in tracing them M. de Courteille's notes have been most useful to us.
O Thou the Exalter of the pillars of Islām, Helper of thy faithful minister, Overthrower of the pedestals of idols, Overcomer of rebellious foes, Exterminator to the uttermost of the followers of darkness!

Lauds be to God the Lord of the worlds, and may the blessing of God be upon the best of His creatures Muhammad, Lord of ghāzīs and champions of the Faith, and upon his companions, the pointers of the way, until the Day of judgment.

The successive gifts of the Almighty are the cause of frequent praises and thanksgivings, and the number of these praises and thanksgivings is, in its turn, the cause of the constant succession of God's mercies. For every mercy a thanksgiving is due, and every thanksgiving is followed by a mercy. To render full thanks is beyond men's power; the mightiest are helpless to discharge their obligations. Above all, adequate thanks cannot be rendered for a benefit than which none is greater in the world and nothing is more blessed, in the world to come, to wit, victory over most powerful infidels and dominion over wealthiest heretics, "these are the unbelievers, the wicked."  

In the eyes of the judicious, no blessing can be greater than this. Thanks be to God! that this great blessing and mighty boon, which from the cradle until now has been the real object of this right-thinking mind (Bābur's), has now manifested itself by the graciousness of the King of the worlds; the Opener who dispenses his treasures without awaiting solicitation, hath opened them with a master-key before our victorious Nawāb (Bābur), so that the names of our conquering heroes have been emblazoned in the records of glorious ghāzīs. By the help of our victorious soldiers the standards of Islām have been raised to the highest pinnacles. The account of this auspicious fortune is as follows:—

---

1 Qurān, cap. 80, last sentence.
2 Shaikh Zain, in his version of the Bābur-nāma, styles Bābur Nawāb where there can be no doubt of the application of the title, viz. in describing Shāh Ţahmāsp's gifts to him (mentioned by Bābur on f. 305). He uses the title also in the farmān of renunciation (f. 313a), but it does not appear in my text, "royal" (fortune) standing for it (in loco p. 555, l. 10).
3 The possessive pronoun occurs several times in the Letter-of-victory. As there is no semblance of putting forward that letter as being Bābur's, the pronoun seems to imply "on our side".
When the flashing-swords of our Islam-guarded soldiers had illuminated the land of Hindustān with rays of victory and conquest, as has been recorded in former letters-of-victory, the Divine favour caused our standards to be upreared in the territories of Dīhlī, Āgra, Jūn-pūr, Kharīd, Bihār, etc., when many chiefs, both pagans and Muḥammadans submitted to our generals and shewed sincere obedience to our fortunate Nawāb. But Rānā Sangā the pagan who in earlier times breathed submissive to the Nawāb, now was puffed up with pride and became of the number of unbelievers. Satan-like he threw back his head and collected an army of accursed heretics, thus gathering a rabble-rout of whom some wore the accursed torque (tauq), the zīnār, on the neck, some had in the skirt the calamitous thorn of apostacy. Previous to the rising in Hindustān of the Sun of dominion and the emergence there of the light of the Shāhanshāh’s Khalifate [i.e. Bābūr’s] the authority of that execrated pagan (Sangā)—at the Judgment Day he shall have no friend—was such that not one of all the exalted sovereigns of this wide realm, such as the Sultān of Dīhlī, the Sultān of Gujrāt and the Sultān of Mandū, could cope with this evil-dispositioned one, without the help of other pagans; one and all they cajoled him and temporized with him; and he had this authority although the rājas and rāīs of high degree, who obeyed him in this battle, and the governors and commanders

1 The Bābur-nāma includes no other than Shaikh Zain’s about Kanwā. Those here alluded to will be the announcements of success at Milwāt, Pānīpāt, Dībālpūr and perhaps elsewhere in Hindustān.

2 In Jūn-pūr (Ayun-i-abkārī); Elliot & Dowson note (iv, 283-4) that it appears to have included, near Sikandarpūr, the country on both sides of the Gogra, and thence on that river’s left bank down to the Ganges.

3 That the word Nawāb here refers to Bābūr and not to his lieutenants, is shewn by his mention (f. 278) of Sangā’s messages to himself.

4 Qorān, cap. 2, v. 32. The passage quoted is part of a description of Satan, hence mention of Satan in Shaikh Zain’s next sentence.

5 The brahminical thread.

6 khar-i-mīmān-i-irtidād dar dāman. This Erskine renders by “who fixed thorns from the pangs of apostacy in the hem of their garments” (p. 360). Several good MSS. have khar, thorn, but Ilminsky has Ar. khimār, cymar, instead (p. 411). De Courteille renders the passage by “portent au pan de leurs habits la marque douloureuse de l’apostasie” (ii, 290). To read khimār, cymar (scarf), would serve, as a scarf is part of some Hindū costumes.

7 Qorān, cap. 69, v. 35.
who were amongst his followers in this conflict, had not obeyed him in any earlier fight or, out of regard to their own dignity, been friendly with him. Infidel standards dominated some 200 towns in the territories of Islām; in them mosques and shrines fell into ruin; from them the wives and children of the Faithful were carried away captive. So greatly had his forces grown that, according to the Hindu calculation by which one *lak* of revenue should yield 100 horsemen, and one *krūr* of revenue, 10,000 horsemen, the territories subject to the Pagan (Sangā) yielding 10 *krūrs*, should yield him 100,000 horse. Many not pagans who hitherto had not helped him in battle, now swelled his ranks out of hostility to the people of Islām. Ten powerful chiefs, each the leader of a pagan host, uprose in rebellion, as smoke rises, and linked themselves, as though enchained, to that perverse one (Sangā); and this infidel decade who, unlike the blessed ten,1 uplifted misery-freighted standards which *denounce unto them excruciating punishment*,2 had many dependants, and troops, and wide-extended lands. As, for instance, Šalāhu’d-dīn 3 had territory yielding 30,000 horse, Rāwal Údai Singh of Bāgar had 12,000, Medīnī Rāī had 12,000, Ḥasan Khān of Mīwāt had 12,000, Bār-mal of Īdr had 4,000, Narpāt Hāra had 7,000, Satrī of Kach (Cutch) had 6,000, Dharm-deo had 4,000, Bīr-sing-deo had 4,000, and Mahmūd Khān, son of Sl. Sikandar, to whom, though he possessed neither district nor *pargana*, 10,000 horse had gathered in hope of his attaining supremacy. Thus, according to the calculation of Hind, 201,000 was the total of those sundered from salvation.

In brief, that haughty pagan, inwardly blind, and hardened of

1 M. Defrémery, when reviewing the French translation of the B.N. (*Journal des Savans* 1873), points out (p. 18) that it makes no mention of the “blessed ten”. Erskine mentions them but without explanation. They are the *'asharah mubash-sharuh*, the decade of followers of Muḥammad who “received good tidings”, and whose certain entry into Paradise he foretold.

2 Qorān, cap. 3, v. 20. M. Defrémery readsShaikh Zain to mean that these words of the Qorān were on the infidel standards, but it would be simpler to read Shaikh Zain as meaning that the infidel insignia on the standards “denounce punishment” on their users.

3 He seems to have been a Rājpūt convert to Muḥammadanism who changed his Hindi name Sīhādī for what Bābur writes. His son married Sangā’s daughter; his siefs were Raisin and Sārāngpūr; he deserted to Bābur in the battle of Kānwa. (Cf. Erskine’s *History of India* i, 471 note; *Mirāt-i-sikandarī*, Bayley’strs. s.n.; *Akbar-nāma*, H.B.’strs. i, 261; Tod’s *Rājasthān* cap. Mewār.)
heart, having joined with other pagans, dark-fated and doomed to perdition, advanced to contend with the followers of Islam and to destroy the foundations of the law of the Prince of Men (Muhammad), on whom be God's blessing! The protagonists of the royal forces fell, like divine destiny, on that one-eyed Dajjal who, to understanding men, shewed the truth of the saying, *When Fate arrives, the eye becomes blind*, and, setting before their eyes the scripture which saith, *Whosoever striveth to promote the true religion, striveth for the good of his own soul,* they acted on the precept to which obedience is due, *Fight against infidels and hypocrites.*

(c. Military movements.)

(March 17th, 1527) On Saturday the 13th day of the second Jumāda of the date 933, a day blessed by the words, *God hath blessed your Saturday*, the army of Islam was encamped near the village of Kānwa, a dependency of Bīna, hard by a hill which was 2 kurohs (4 m.) from the enemies of the Faith. When those accursed infidel foes of Muhammad's religion heard the reverberation of the armies of Islam, they arrayed their ill-starred forces and moved forward with one heart, relying on their mountain-like, demon-shaped elephants, as had relied the Lords of the Elephant who went to overthrow the sanctuary (ka'ba) of Islam.

1 "Dejāl or al Masih al Dajjal, the false or lying Messiah, is the Muhammadan Anti-christ. He is to be one-eyed, and marked on the forehead with the letters K.F.R. signifying Kafer, or Infidel. He is to appear in the latter days riding on an ass, and will be followed by 70,000 Jews of Ispahān, and will continue on the Earth 40 days, of which one will be equal to a year, another to a month, another to a week, and the rest will be common days. He is to lay waste all places, but will not enter Mekka or Medina, which are to be guarded by angels. He is finally to slay at the gate of Lud by Jesus, for whom the Musalmans profess great veneration, calling him the breath or spirit of God.—See Sale's *Introductory Discourse to the Koran*" [Erskine].

2 Qorān, cap. 29, v. 5.

3 "This alludes to the defeat of [an Abyssinian Christian] Abraha the prince of Yemen who [in the year of Muhammad's birth] marched his army and some elephants to destroy the ka'ba of Makkā. 'The Meccans,' says Sale, 'at the appearance of so considerable a host, retired to the neighbouring mountains, being unable to defend their city or temple. But God himself undertook the defence of both. For when Abraha drew near to Mecca, and would have entered it, the elephant on which he rode, which was a very large one and named Māhmüd, refused to advance any nearer to the town, but knelt down whenever they endeavoured to force him that way, though he would rise and march briskly enough if they turned him towards any other quarter; and while matters were in this posture, on a sudden a large flock of birds, like swallows, came flying from the sea-coast, every-one of which carried three stones,
“Having these elephants, the wretched Hindus
Became proud, like the Lords of the Elephant;
Yet were they odious and vile as is the evening of death,
Blacker than night, outnumbering the stars,
All such as fire is but their heads upraised
In hate, as rises its smoke in the azure sky,
Ant-like they come from right and from left,
Thousands and thousands of horse and foot.”

They advanced towards the victorious encampment, intending
to give battle. The holy warriors of Islām, trees in the garden
of valour, moved forward in ranks straight as serried pines and,
like pines uplift their crests to heaven, uplifting their helmet-
crests which shine even as shine the hearts of those that strive
in the way of the Lord; their array was like Alexander’s iron-
wall, and, as is the way of the Prophet’s Law, straight and firm
and strong, as though they were a well-compacted building; and
they became fortunate and successful in accordance with the
saying, They are directed by their Lord, and they shall prosper.

In that array no rent was frayed by timid souls;
Firm was it as the Shāhanshāh’s resolve, strong as the Faith;
Their standards brushed against the sky;
Verily we have granted thee certain victory.

Obeying the cautions of prudence, we imitated the ghāzīs of
Rūm by posting matchlockmen (tufanchiān) and cannoneers
(raʿd-andāzān) along the line of carts which were chained to one
another in front of us; in fact, Islām’s army was so arrayed and
so steadfast that primal Intelligence and the firmament (‘aqī-
pīr u charkh-i-āsīr) applauded the marshalling thereof. To
effect this arrangement and organization, Nizāmu’d-din ʿAlī
Khalīfa, the pillar of the Imperial fortune, exerted himself
one in each foot and one in its bill; and these stones they threw down upon
the heads of Abrahā’s men, certainly killing every one they struck. The rest were
swept away by a flood or perished by a plague, Abrahā alone reaching Senaa, where
he also died” [Erskine]. The above is taken from Sale’s note to the 105 chapter of
the Qorān, entitled “the Elephant”.

1 Presumably black by reason of their dark large mass.
2 Presumably, devouring as fire.
3 This is 50 m. long and blocked the narrow pass of the Caspian Iron-gates. It
ends south of the Russian town of Dar-band, on the west shore of the Caspian.
Erskine states that it was erected to repress the invasions of Yajuj and Mujuj (Gog
and Magog).
4 Qorān, cap. lxì, v. 4.
5 Qorān, cap. ii, v. 4. Erskine appears to quote another verse.
6 Qorān, cap. xlviii, v. 1.
7 Index s.n.
8 Khirād, Intelligence or the first Intelligence, was supposed to be the guardian of
the empyreal heaven (Erskine).
strenuously; his efforts were in accord with Destiny, and were approved by his sovereign's luminous judgment.

(d. Commanders of the centre.)

His Majesty's post was in the centre. In the right-hand of the centre were stationed the illustrious and most upright brother, the beloved friend of Destiny, the favoured of Him whose aid is entreated (i.e. God), Chīn-tīmūr Sulṭān, the illustrious son, accepted in the sight of the revered Allāh, Sulaimān Shāh, the reservoir of sanctity, the way-shower, Khwāja Kamālu'd-dīn (Perfect-in-the Faith) Dost-i-khāwand, the trusted of the sultānate, the abider near the sublime threshold, the close companion, the cream of associates, Kamālu'd-dīn Yūnas-i-ālī, the pillar of royal retainers, the perfect in friendship, Jalālu'd-dīn (Glory-of-the-Faith) Shāh Mansūr Barlās, the pillar of royal retainers, most excellent of servants, Niẓāmu'd-dīn (Upholder-of-the-Faith) Darwīsh-i-muḥammad Sārbān, the pillars of royal retainers, the sincere in fidelity, Shihābu'd-dīn (Meteor-of-the-Faith) 'Abdu'l-lāh the librarian and Niẓāmu'd-dīn Dost Lord-of-the-Gate.

In the left-hand of the centre took each his post, the reservoir of sovereignty, ally of the Khalīfate, object of royal favour, Sulṭān 'Alā'u'd-dīn 'Ālam Khān son of Sl. Bahīlū Lūdī, the intimate of illustrious Majesty, the high priest (dastūr) of sadrs amongst men, the refuge of all people, the pillar of Islām, Shaikh Zain of Khawāf, the pillar of the nobility, Kamālu'd-dīn Muḥibb-i-ālī, son of the intimate counsellor named above (i.e. Khalīfa), the pillar of royal retainers, Niẓāmu'd-dīn Tardī Beg brother of Qūj (son of) Ahmed, whom God hath taken into His mercy, Shīr-afghan son of the above-named Qūj Beg deceased, the pillar of great ones, the mighty khān, Ārāish Khān, the wazīr, greatest

---

1 Chīn-tīmūr Chīngīz-khānid Chaghatāī is called Bābur's brother because a (maternal-) cousin of Bābur's own generation, their last common ancestor being Yūnas Khān.

2 Sulaimān Timūrid Mīrān-shāhī is called Bābur's son because his father was of Bābur's generation, their last common ancestor being Sl. Abū-sa'īd Mīrzā. He was 13 years old and, through Shāh Begīm, hereditary shāh of Badakhshān.

3 The Shaikh was able, it would appear, to see himself as others saw him, since the above description of him is his own. It is confirmed by Abū'l-faṣl and Badāyūni's accounts of his attainments.

4 The honourable post given to this amīr of Hind is likely to be due to his loyalty to Bābur.
of wazîrs amongst men, Khwâja Kamâlu’d-din Ȣusain,—and a number of other attendants at Court (dîwanî). 

(e. Commanders of the right wing.)

In the right wing was the exalted son, honourable and fortunate, the befriended of Destiny, the Star of the Sign of sovereignty and success, Sun of the sphere of the Khalifate, lauded of slave and free, Muhammad Humâyûn Bahâdur. On that exalted prince’s right hand there were, one whose rank approximates to royalty and who is distinguished by the favour of the royal giver of gifts, Qâsim-i-(bus) Sultân,—the pillar of the nobility Nizâmû’d-din Åhmad-i-yûsuf Aûghlîqûtî,¹—the trusted of royalty, most excellent of servants, Jalâlu’d-din Hindû Beg qûchûn,²—the trusted of royalty, perfect in loyalty, Jalâlu’d- din Khusrau Kûkûldâsh,—the trusted of royalty, Qâwâm (var. Qiyâm) Beg Aûrdû-shâh,—the pillar of royal retainers, of perfect sincerity, Wali Qarâ-qûzi the treasurer,³—the pillar of royal retainers, Nizâmû’d-din Pîr-qûli of Sîstân,—the pillar of wazîrs, Khwâja Kamâlu’d-din pahlawân (champion) of Badakhshân,—the pillar of royal retainers, ‘Abdu’l-shakûr,—the pillar of the nobility, most excellent of servants, the envoy from ‘Irâq Sulaimân Āqâ,—and Ȣusain Āqâ the envoy from Sîstân. On the victory-crowned left of the fortunate son already named there were, the sayyid of lofty birth, of the family of Murtîzâ (‘Ali), Mir Hama (or Hâma),—the pillar of royal retainers, the perfect in sincerity, Shamsu’d-dîn Muhammadi Kûkûldâsh and Nizâmû’d-din Khwâjagi Asad jân-dâr.⁴

¹ Åhmad may be a nephew of Yûsuf of the same agnomen (Index s.nn.).
² I have not discovered the name of this old servant or the meaning of his seeming-sobriquet, Hindû. As a qûchûn he will have been a Mughûl or Turk. The circumstance of his service with a son of Mahmûd Mîrân-shâhâ (down to 905 AH.) makes it possible that he drew his name in his youth from the tract s.e. of Mahmûd’s Hisâr territory which has been known as Little Hind (Index s.n. Hind). This is however conjecture merely. Another suggestion is that as hindû can mean black, it may stand for the common qarâ of the Turks e.g. Qarâ Barlâs, Black Barlás.
³ I am uncertain whether Qarâ-qûzi is the name of a place, or the jesting sobriquet of more than one meaning it can be.
⁴ Soul-full, animated; var. Ȣâi. MS. khân-dâr. No agnomen is used for Asad by Bâbûr. The Akbar-nâmâ varies to jâmadâr, wardrobe-keeper, cup-holder (Bib. Ind. ed. i, 107), and Firishta to sar-jâmadâr, head wardrobe-keeper (lith. ed. p. 209 top). It would be surprising to find such an official sent as envoy to ‘Irâq, as Asad was both before and after he fought at Kânwa.
there were, of the amirs of Hind,—the pillar of the State, the Khān-of-Khāns, Dilāwar Khān,1—the pillar of the nobility, Malik Dād Kararānī,—and the pillar of the nobility, the Shaikh-of-shaikhs, Shaikh Gūran, each standing in his appointed place.

(f. Commanders of the left wing.)

In the left wing of the armies of Islām there extended their ranks,—the lord of lofty lineage, the refuge of those in authority, the ornament of the family of Ṭa Ḥa and Ya Sin,2 the model for the descendants of the prince of ambassadors (Muḥammad), Sayyid Mahdī Khwāja,—the exalted and fortunate brother, the well-regarded of his Majesty, Muḥammad Sī. Mīrzā,3—the personage approximating to royalty, the descended of monarchs, ‘Ādil Sultān son of Mahdī Sultan,4—the trusted in the State, perfect in attachment, ‘Abdu’l-‘azīz Master of the Horse,—the trusted in the State, the pure in friendship, Shamsu’d-dīn Muḥammad ‘Ali Ḥang-ḥang,5—the pillar of royal retainers, Jalālu’d-dīn Qūṭlūq-qadam qarāwal (scout),—the pillar of royal retainers, the perfect in sincerity, Jalālu’d-dīn Shāh Ḥusain yārāği Mughūl Ghānchī (?),6—and Nizāmu’d-dīn Jān-i-μuḥammad Beg Āṭāka.

Of amirs of Hind there were in this division, the scions of sultāns, Kamāl Khān and Jamāl Khān sons of the Sl. ‘Alā’u’d-dīn above-mentioned,—the most excellent officer ‘Alī Khān Shaikhzāda of Farmūl,—and the pillar of the nobility, Nizām Khān of Biāna.

1 son of Daulat Khān Yusuf-khail Lūdī.
2 These are the titles of the 20th and 36th chapters of the Qorān; Sale offers conjectural explanations of them. The “family” is Muḥammad’s.
3 a Bāī-qarā Timūrid of Bābūr’s generation, their last common ancestor being Timūr himself.
4 an Aūzbeg who married a daughter of Sl. Ḥusain M. Bāī-qarā.
5 It has been pointed out to me that there is a Chinese title of nobility Yūn-wāng, and that it may be behind the words Ḥang-ḥang. Though the suggestion appears to be improbable, looking to the record of Bābūr’s officer, to the prevalence of sobriquets amongst his people, and to what would be the sporadic appearance of a Chinese title or even class-name borne by a single man amongst them, I add this suggestion to those of my note on the meaning of the words (Index s.n. Muḥ. ‘Alī). The title Yūn-wāng occurs in Dr. Denison Ross’ Three MSS. from Kāshghar, p. 5, v. 5 and translator’s preface, p. 14.
6 Cf. f. 266 and f. 299. Yārāği may be the name of his office, (from yārāq) and mean provisioner of arms or food or other military requirements.
For the flank-movement (tūlghāma) of the right wing there were posted two of the most trusted of the household retainers, Tardīka and Malik Qāsim the brother of Bābā Qashqa, with a body of Mughuls; for the flank-movement of the left wing were the two trusted chiefs Mūmin Ātāka and Rustam Turkmān, leading a body of special troops.

The pillar of royal retainers, the perfect in loyalty, the cream of privy-counsellors, Niẓāmu'd-din Sulṭān Muḥammad Bakhshī, after posting the ghāzīs of Islām, came to receive the royal commands. He despatched adjutants (tawāchī) and messengers (yasāwal) in various directions to convey imperative orders concerning the marshalling of the troops to the great sulṭāns and amīrs. And when the Commanders had taken up their positions, an imperative order was given that none should quit his post or, uncommanded, stretch forth his arm to fight.

One watch of the afore-mentioned day had elapsed when the opposing forces approached each other and the battle began. As Light opposes Darkness, so did the centres of the two armies oppose one another. Fighting began on the right and left wings, such fighting as shook the Earth and filled highest Heaven with clangour.

The left wing of the ill-fated pagans advanced against the right wing of the Faith-garbed troops of Islām and charged down on Khusrau Kūkūldāsh and Bābā Qashqa's brother Malik Qāsim. The most glorious and most upright brother Chīn-tīmūr Sulṭān, obeying orders, went to reinforce them and, engaging in the conflict with bold attack, bore the pagans back almost to the rear of their centre. Guerdon was made for the brother's glorious fame. The marvel of the Age, Muṣṭafā of Rūm, had his post in the centre (of the right wing) where was the exalted son, upright and fortunate, the object of the favourable regard of

or, Tardī yakka, the champion, Gr. monomachus (A.N. trs. i, 107 n.).
var. 1 watch and 2 g'harīs; the time will have been between 9 and 10 a.m.
jūldū ba nām al 'azīz-i-barādar shud, a phrase not easy to translate.
Creative Majesty (i.e. God), the one distinguished by the particular grace of the mighty Sovereign who commands to do and not to do (i.e. Bābur), Muhammad Humāyūn Bahādur. This Muṣṭafā of Rūm had the carts (arābahā) brought forward and broke the ranks of pagans with matchlock and culverin dark like their hearts (?). In the thick of the fight, the most glorious brother Qāsim-i-ḥusain Sulṭān and the pillars of royal retainers, Niẓāmu’d-din Aḥmad-i-yūsuf and Qawām Beg, obeying orders, hastened to their help. And since band after band of pagan troops followed each other to help their men, so we, in our turn, sent the trusted in the State, the glory of the Faith, Hindū Beg, and, after him, the pillars of the nobility, Muḥammadī Kūkūlḍāsh and Khwājagī Asad jān-dār, and, after them, the trusted in the State, the trustworthy in the resplendent Court, the most confided-in of nobles, the elect of confidential servants, Yūnas-i-‘alī, together with the pillar of the nobility, the perfect in friendship, Shāh Mansūr Barlās and the pillar of the grandees, the pure in fidelity, ‘Abdu’l-lāh the librarian, and after these, the pillar of the nobles, Dost the Lord-of-the-Gate, and Muḥammad Khalil the master-gelder (akhta-begī).

The pagan right wing made repeated and desperate attack on the left wing of the army of Islām, falling furiously on the holy warriors, possessors of salvation, but each time was made to turn back or, smitten with the arrows of victory, was made to descend into Hell, the house of perdition; they shall be thrown to burn therein, and an unhappy dwelling shall it be. Then the trusty amongst the nobles, Mūmin Ātāka and Rustam Turkmān betook themselves to the rear of the host of darkened pagans; and to help them were sent the Commanders Khwāja Maḥmūd and ‘Alī Ātāka, servants of him who amongst the royal retainers is near the throne, the trusted of the Sulṭānate, Niẓāmu’d-din ‘Alī Khalīfa.

1 viz. those chained together as a defence and probably also those conveying the culverins.
2 The comparison may be between the darkening smoke of the fire-arms and the heresy darkening pagan hearts.
3 There appears to be a distinction of title between the akhta-begī and the mīr-akhwūr (master of the horse).
4 Qurān, cap. 14, v. 33.
5 These two men were in one of the flanking-parties.
Our high-born brother\(^1\) Muḥammad Sl. Mīrzā, and the representative of royal dignity, ‘Ādil Sulṭān, and the trusted in the State, the strengthener of the Faith, ‘Abdu’l-‘azīz, the Master of the Horse, and the glory of the Faith, Qūtlūq-qadam \(\text{qarāwal}\), and the meteor of the Faith, Muḥammad ‘Alī Jang-jang, and the pillar of royal retainers, Shāh Ḥusain \(\text{yāragī Mughūl Ghānchī(?)}\) stretched out the arm to fight and stood firm. To support them we sent the \(\text{Dastūr}\), the highest of wazīrs, Khwāja Kamālu’d-dīn Ḥusain with a body of \(\text{dīwānīs}\).\(^2\) Every holy warrior was eager to show his zeal, entering the fight with desperate joy as if approving the verse, \(\text{Say}, \text{Do you expect any other should befall us than one of the two most excellent things, victory or martyrdom?}\)\(^3\) and, with display of life-devotion, uplifted the standard of life-sacrifice.

As the conflict and battle lasted long, an imperative order was issued that the special royal corps \(\text{(tābīnān-i-khāṣa-i-pādshāḥī}\)\(^4\) who, heroes of one hue,\(^5\) were standing, like tigers enchained, behind the carts,\(^6\) should go out on the right and the left of the centre,\(^7\) leaving the matchlockmen's post in-between, and join battle on both sides. As the True Dawn emerges from its cleft in the horizon, so they emerged from behind the carts; they poured a ruddy crepuscule of the blood of those ill-fated pagans on the nadir of the Heavens, that battle-field; they made fall from the firmament of existence many heads of the headstrong, as stars fall from the firmament of heaven. The marvel of the Age, Ustād ‘Alī-quḷī, who with his own appurtenances stood in front of the centre, did deeds of valour, discharging against the iron-mantled forts of the infidels\(^8\) stones of such size that were (one) put into a scale of the Balance in which actions are weighed, that \(\text{scale shall be heavy with good works and he}\)

\(^1\) This phrase "our brother" would support the view that Shaikh Zain wrote as for Bābur, if there were not, on the other hand, mention of Bābur as His Majesty, and the precious royal soul.

\(^2\) \(\text{dīwānīs}\) here may mean those associated with the wazīr in his duties: and not those attending at Court.

\(^3\) Qorān, cap. 14, v. 52.

\(^4\) Index s.n. chukra (a brave).

\(^5\) \(\text{hisabrān-i-besha yakrangi}\), literally, forest-tigers (or, lions) of one hue.

\(^6\) There may be reference here to the chains used to connect the carts into a defence.

\(^7\) The bravest of the \(\text{khāṣa tābīn}\) were part of Bābur’s own centre.

\(^8\) perhaps the cataphract elephants; perhaps the men in mail.
(i.e. its owner) shall lead a pleasing life; and were such stones discharged against a hill, broad of base and high of summit, it would become like carded wool. Such stones Ustād ‘Alī-quist discharged at the iron-clad fortress of the pagan ranks and by this discharge of stones, and abundance of culverins and matchlocks (?) destroyed many of the builted bodies of the pagans. The matchlockmen of the royal centre, in obedience to orders, going from behind the carts into the midst of the battle, each one of them made many a pagan taste of the poison of death. The foot-soldiers, going into a most dangerous place, made their names to be blazoned amongst those of the forest-tigers (i.e. heroes) of valour and the champions in the field of manly deeds. Just at this time came an order from his Majesty the Khāqān that the carts of the centre should be advanced; and the gracious royal soul (i.e. Bābur) moved towards the pagan soldiers, Victory and Fortune on his right, Prestige and Conquest on his left. On witnessing this event, the victorious troops followed from all sides; the whole surging ocean of the army rose in mighty waves; the courage of all the crocodiles of that ocean was manifested by the strength of their deeds; an obscuring cloud of dust o'erspread the sky (?). The dust that gathered over the battle-field was traversed by the lightning-flashes of the sword; the Sun's face was shorn of light as is a mirror's back; the striker and the struck, the victor and the vanquished were commingled, all distinction between them lost. The Wizard of Time produced such a night that its only planets were arrows, its only constellations of fixed stars were the steadfast squadrons.

Upon that day of battle sank and rose
Blood to the Fish and dust-clouds to the Moon,
While through the horse-hoofs on that spacious plain,
One Earth flew up to make another Heaven.

1 Qorān, cap. 101, v. 54.
2 Qorān, cap. 101, v. 4.
3 bā andākhtan-i-sang u žarb-zan tufak bisyārī. As Bābur does not in any place mention metal missiles, it seems safest to translate sang by its plain meaning of stone.
4 Also, metaphorically, swords.
5 tīr. My husband thinks there is a play upon the two meanings of this word, arrow and the planet Mercury; so too in the next sentence, that there may be allusion in the kuākib sāwābi to the constellation Pegasus, opposed to Bābur's squadrons of horse.
6 The Fish mentioned in this verse is the one pictured by Muhammadan cosmogony as supporting the Earth. The violence of the fray is illustrated by supposing that of
At the moment when the holy warriors were heedlessly flinging away their lives, they heard a secret voice say, *Be not dismayed, neither be grieved, for, if ye believe, ye shall be exalted above the unbelievers,*¹ and from the infallible Informer heard the joyful words, *Assistance is from God, and a speedy victory!* And do thou bear glad tidings to true believers.² Then they fought with such delight that the plaudits of the saints of the Holy Assembly reached them and the angels from near the Throne, fluttered round their heads like moths. Between the first and second Prayers, there was such blaze of combat that the flames thereof raised standards above the heavens, and the right and left of the army of Islām rolled back the left and right of the doomed infidels in one mass upon their centre.

When signs were manifest of the victory of the Strivers and of the up-rearing of the standards of Islām, those accursed infidels and wicked unbelievers remained for one hour confounded. At length, their hearts abandoning life, they fell upon the right and left of our centre. Their attack on the left was the more vigorous and there they approached furthest, but the holy warriors, their minds set on the reward, planted shoots (*nihāl*) of arrows in the field of the breast of each one of them, and, such being their gloomy fate, overthrew them. In this state of affairs, the breezes of victory and fortune blew over the meadow of our happy Nawāb, and brought the good news, *Verily we have granted thee a manifest victory.*³ And Victory the beautiful woman (*shāhid*) whose world-adornment of waving tresses was embellished by *God will aid you with a mighty aid,*⁴ bestowed on us the good fortune that had been hidden behind a veil, and made it a reality. The absurd (*bātīl*) Hindūs, knowing their position perilous, *dispersed like carded wool before the wind, and like moths scattered abroad.*⁴ᵃ Many fell dead on the field of battle; others, desisting from fighting, fled to the desert of exile and

Earth's seven climes one rose to Heaven in dust, thus giving Heaven eight. The verse is from Firdausi's *Shāh-nāma,* [Turner-Macan's ed. i, 222]. The translation of it is Warner's, [ii, 15 and n.]. I am indebted for the information given in this note to my husband's long search in the *Shāh-nāmā.*

¹ Qorān, cap. 3, v. 133.
² Qorān, cap. 61, v. 13.
³ Qorān, cap. 48, v. 1.
⁴ Qorān, cap. 48, v. 3.
became the food of crows and kites. Mounds were made of the bodies of the slain, pillars of their heads.

(j. Hindū chiefs killed in the battle.)

Hasan Khān of Miwāt was enrolled in the list of the dead by the force of a matchlock (ṣarb-i-tufak); most of those headstrong chiefs of tribes were slain likewise, and ended their days by arrow and matchlock (tīr u tufak). Of their number was Rawal Ūdi Singh of Bāgar,\(^1\) ruler (wāli) of the Dungarpūr country, who had 12,000 horse, Rāi Chandrabān Chūhān who had 4,000 horse, Bhūpat Rāo son of that Ṣalāhu’d-dīn already mentioned, who was lord of Chandirī and had 6,000 horse, Mānik-chand Chūhān and Dīlpat Rāo who had each 4,000 horse, Kankū (or Gangū) and Karm Singh and Dankūśī (?)\(^2\) who had each 3,000 horse, and a number of others, each one of whom was leader of a great command, a splendid and magnificent chieftain. All these trod the road to Hell, removing from this house of clay to the pit of perdition. The enemy’s country (dāru’l-harb) was full, as Hell is full, of wounded who had died on the road. The lowest pit was gorged with miscreants who had surrendered their souls to the lord of Hell. In whatever direction one from the army of Islām hastened, he found everywhere a self-willed one dead; whatever march the illustrious camp made in the wake of the fugitives, it found no foot-space without its prostrate foe.

All the Hindūs slain, abject (khwār, var. zār) and mean,
By matchlock-stones, like the Elephants’ lords,\(^3\)
Many hills of their bodies were seen,
And from each hill a fount of running blood.
Dreading the arrows of (our) splendid ranks,
Passed they in flight to each waste and hill.

----

\(^{42}\) [see p. 572] farāš. De Courteille, reading firāš, translates this metaphor by comme un lit lorsqu’il est défait. He refers to Qurān, cap. 101, v. 3. A better metaphor for the breaking up of an army than that of moths scattering, one allowed by the word farāš, but possibly not by Muhammad, is vanished like bubbles on wine.

\(^1\) Bāgar is an old name for Dungarpūr and Bānśwāra [G. of T. vi, 408 s.n. Bānśwāra].

\(^2\) sīc, Hai. MS. and may be so read in I.O. 217 f.220b; Erskine writes BIKERSI (p. 367) and notes the variant NAGERSI; Ilminskey (p. 421) N:krši; de Courteille (ii, 307) NIGUERSI.

\(^3\) Cf. f. 318b, and note, where it is seen that the stones which killed the lords of the Elephants were so small as to be carried in the bill of a bird like a swallow. Were such stones used in matchlocks in Bābur’s day?

\(^4\) guśār, var. guwāzān, caused to flee and hogs (Erskine notes the double-meaning).
They turn their backs. The command of God is to be performed. Now praise be to God, All-hearing and All-wise, for victory is from God alone, the Mighty, the Wise.\(^1\) Written Jumāda II. 25th 933 (AH.—March 29th 1527 A.D.).\(^2\)

**MINOR SEQUELS OF VICTORY.**

(a. Bābur assumes the title of Ghāsī.)

After this success Ghāsī (Victor in a Holy-war) was written amongst the royal titles.

\(^1\) This passage, entered in some MSS. as if verse, is made up of Qurān, cap. 17, v. 49, cap. 33, v. 38, and cap. 3, v. 122.

\(^2\) As the day of battle was Jumāda II. 13th (March 16th), the Fath-nāma was ready and dated twelve days after that battle. It was started for Kābul on Rajab 9th (April 11th). Something may be said here appropriately about the surmise contained in Dr. Ilinsky's Preface and M. de Courteille's note to Mémoires ii, 443 and 450, to the effect that Bābur wrote a plain account of the battle of Kanwār and for this in his narrative substituted Shaikh Zain's Fath-nāma, and that the plain account has been preserved in Kehr's Bābur-nāma volume [whence Ilinsky reproduced it, it was translated by M. de Courteille and became known as a "Fragment" of Bāburiana]. Almost certainly both scholars would have judged adversely of their suggestion by the light of to-day's easier research. The following considerations making against its value, may be set down:—

1) There is no sign that Bābur ever wrote a plain account of the battle or any account of it. There is against his doing so his statement that he inserts Shaikh Zain's Fath-nāma because it gives particulars. If he had written any account, it would be found preceding the Fath-nāma, as his account of his renunciation of wine precedes Shaikh Zain's Farnān announcing the act.

2) Moreover, the "Fragment" cannot be described as a plain account such as would harmonize with Bābur's style; it is in truth highly rhetorical, though less so as Shaikh Zain's.

3) The "Fragment" begins with a quotation from the Bābur-nāma (f. 310b and n.), skips a good deal of Bābur's matter preliminary to the battle, and passes on with what there can be no doubt is a translation in inferior Turki of the Akbar-nāma account.

4) The whole of the extra matter is seen to be continuous and not fragmentary, if it is collated with the chapter in which Abū'l-fażl describes the battle, its sequel of events, the death, character, attainments, and Court of Bābur. Down to the death, it is changed to the first person so as to make Bābur seem to write it. The probable concocter of it is Jahāngīr.

5) If the Fragment were Bābur's composition, where was it when 'Abdu-r-raḥīm translated the Bābur-nāma in 998 AH.—1590 AD.; where too did Abū'l-fażl find it to reproduce in the Akbar-nāma?

6) The source of Abū'l-fażl's information seems without doubt to be Bābur's own narrative and Shaikh Zain's Fath-nāma. There are many significant resemblances between the two rhetoricians' metaphors and details selected.

7) A good deal might be said of the dissimilarities between Bābur's diction and that of the "Fragment". But this is needless in face of the larger and more circumstantial objections already mentioned. (For a fuller account of the "Fragment" see JRAS. Jan. 1906 pp. 81, 85 and 1908 p. 75 ff.)
Below the titles (†ughra)¹ entered on the Fath-nāma, I wrote the following quatrain:—

For Islām’s sake, I wandered in the wilds,
Prepared for war with pagans and Hindūs,
Resolved myself to meet the martyr’s death.
Thanks be to God! a ghāst I became.

(b. Chronograms of the victory.)

Shaikh Zain had found (tāpib aiṭā) the words Fath-i-pādshāh-i-islām³ (Victory of the Pādshāh of the Faith) to be a chronogram of the victory. Mir Gesū, one of the people come from Kābul, had also found these same words to be a chronogram, had composed them in a quatrain and sent this to me. It was a coincidence that Shaikh Zain and Mir Gesū should bring forward precisely the same words in the quatrains they composed to embellish their discoveries.⁴ Once before when Shaikh Zain found the date of the victory at Dībālpūr in the words Wasat-i-shahr Rabī‘ul-awwal⁵ (Middle of the month Rabī‘ I.), Mir Gesū had found it in the very same words.

HISTORICAL NARRATIVE RESUMED.

(a. After the victory.)

The foes beaten, we hurried them off, dismounting one after another. The Pagan’s encirclement⁶ may have been 2 kurohs

¹ †ughra means an imperial signature also, but would Bābur sign Shaikh Zain’s Fath-i-nāma? His autograph verse at the end of the Rāmpūr Dīwān has his signature following it. He is likely to have signed this verse. Cf. App. Q. [Erskine notes that titles were written on the back of despatches, an unlikely place for the quatrain, one surmises.]

² This is in the Rāmpūr dīwān (E.D.R. Plate 17). Dr. E. Denison Ross points out (p.17 n.) that in the 2nd line the Hai. Codex varies from the Dīwān. The MS. is wrong; it contains many inaccuracies in the latter part of the Hindūstān section, perhaps due to a change of scribe.

³ These words by abjad yield 933. From Bābur’s use of the pluperfect tense, I think it may be inferred that (my) Sections a and b are an attachment to the Fath-nāma, entered with it at a somewhat later date.

⁴ My translation of this puzzling sentence is tentative only.

⁵ This statement shews that the Dībālpūr affair occurred in one of the B.N. gaps, and in 930 AH. The words make 330 by abjad. It may be noted here that on f.312b and notes there are remarks concerning whether Bābur’s remissment of the tamgāhā was contingent on his winning at Kānwa. If the remissment had been delayed until his victory was won, it would have found fitting mention with the other sequels of victory chronicled above; as it is not with these sequels, it may be accepted as an absolute remission, proclaimed before the fight. The point was a little uncertain owing to the seemingly somewhat deferred insertion in Bābur’s narrative of Shaikh Zain’s Fārmān.

⁶ dī’ira, presumably a defended circle. As the word aūrdā [bracketed in the text] shows, Bābur used it both for his own and for Sangā’s camps.
from our camp (aūrdū); when we reached his camp (aūrdū), we sent Muḥammadā, 'Abdu'l-'azīz, 'Alī Khān and some others in pursuit of him. There was a little slackness;¹ I ought to have gone myself, and not have left the matter to what I expected from other people. When I had gone as much as a kuroh (2 m.) beyond the Pagan’s camp, I turned back because it was late in the day; I came to our camp at the Bed-time Prayer.

With what ill-omened words Muḥammad Sharīf the astrologer had fretted me! Yet he came at once to congratulate me! I emptied my inwards² in abuse of him, but, spite of his being heathenish, ill-omened of speech, extremely self-satisfied, and a most disagreeable person, I bestowed a lak upon him because there had been deserving service from him in former times, and, after saying he was not to stay in my dominions, I gave him leave to go.

(b. Suppression of a rebellion.)

(March 17th) We remained next day (Jumāda II. 14th) on that same ground. Muḥammad ‘Alī Jang-jang and Shaikh Gūrān and ‘Abdu'l-malik ³ the armourer were sent off with a dense (qālīn) army against Iliās Khān who, having rebelled in Between-the-two-waters (Ganges and Jumna), had taken Kūl (Koel) and made Kīchīk ‘Alī prisoner.⁴ He could not fight when they came up; his force scattered in all directions; he himself was taken a few days later and brought into Āgra where I had him flayed alive.

(c. A trophy of victory.)

An order was given to set up a pillar of pagan heads on the infant-hill (koh-bachā) between which and our camp the battle had been fought.

¹ Hence the Rānā escaped. He died in this year, not without suspicion of poison.
² aichīnī khālī qildīm, a seeming equivalent for English, “I poured out my spleen.”
³ On f. 315 the acts attributed to Iliās Khān are said to have been done by a “mannikin called Rustam Khān”. Neither name appears elsewhere in the B.N.; the hero’s name seems a sarcasm on the small man.

⁴ var. malūk as e.g. in I.O. 217 f.225b, and also elsewhere in the Babur-nāma.
(d. Biāna visited.)

(March 20th) Marching on from that ground, and after halting on two nights, we reached Biāna (Sunday, Jumāda II. 17th). Countless numbers of the bodies of pagans and apostates ¹ who had fallen in their flight, lay on the road as far as Biāna, indeed as far as Alūr and Miwāt.²

(e. Discussion of plans.)

On our return to camp, I summoned the Turk amīrs and the amīrs of Hind to a consultation about moving into the Pagan (Sangā)'s country; the plan was given up because of the little water and much heat on the road.

(f. Miwāt.)

Near Dihli lies the Miwāt country which yields revenue of 3 or 4 krūrs.³ Ḥasan Khān Miwātī ⁴ and his ancestors one after another had ruled it with absolute sway for a hundred years or two. They must have made imperfect submission to the Dihli Sultāns; the Sultāns of Hind,⁶ whether because their own dominions were wide, or because their opportunity was narrow, or because of the Miwāt hill-country,⁷ did not turn in the Miwāt direction, did not establish order in it, but just

¹ Bābur so-calls both Ḥasan and his followers, presumably because they followed their race sympathies, as of Rājpūt origin, and fought against co-religionists. Though Ḥasan’s subjects, Meos, were nominally Muhammadans, it appears that they practised some Hindu customs. For an account of Miwāt, see Gazetteer of Ulwur (Alwar, Alūr) by Major P. W. Powlett.

² Alwar being in Miwāt, Bābur may mean that bodies were found beyond that town in the main portion of the Miwāt country which lies north of Alwar towards Dihli.

³ Major Powlett speaking (p.9) of the revenue Miwāt paid to Bābur, quotes Thomas as saying that the coins stated in Bābur’s Revenue Accounts, viz. 169,81,000 tankas were probably Sikandari tankas, or Rs. 8,490,50.

⁴ This word appears to have been restricted in its use to the Khān-zādas of the ruling house in Miwāt, and was not used for their subjects, the Meos (Powlett l.c. Cap. I.). The uses of “Miwāt” and “Meo” suggest something analogous with those of “Chaghātāi” and “Mughūl” in Bābur’s time. The resemblance includes mutual dislike and distrust (Powlett l.c.).

⁵ giljurlār aikān dār. This presumptive past tense is frequently used by the cautious Bābur. I quote it here and in a few places near-following because it supports Shaw’s statement that in it the use of aikān (iṅkān) reduces the positive affirmation of the perfect to presumption or rumour. With this statement all grammarians are not agreed; it is fully supported by the Bābur-nāma.

⁶ Contrast here is suggested between Šūlāns of Dihli & Hind; is it between the greater Turks with whom Bābur classes himself immediately below as a conqueror of Hind, and the Lūḍi Šūlāns of Dihli?

⁷ The strength of the Tijāra hills towards Dihli is historical (Powlett l.c. p.132).
put up with this amount of (imperfect) submission. For our own part, we did after the fashion of earlier Sulṭāns; having conquered Hind, we shewed favour to Ḥasan Khān, but that thankless and heathenish apostate disregarded our kindness and benefits, was not grateful for favour and promotion, but became the mover of all disturbance and the cause of all misdoing.

When, as has been mentioned, we abandoned the plan (against Rānā Sangā), we moved to subdue Miwāt. Having made 4 night-halts on the way, we dismounted on the bank of the Mānas-nī 1 6 kurohs (12 m.) from Alūr, the present seat of government in Miwāt. Ḥasan Khān and his forefathers must have had their seat 2 in Tijāra, but when I turned towards Hindūstān, beat Pahār (or Bihār) Khān and took Lāhor and Dībālpūr (930AH.—1524AD.), he bethought himself betimes and busied himself for a residence (‘imārat) in Fort Alūr (Alwar).

His trusted man, Karm-chand by name, who had come from him to me in Āgra when his son (Nāhar i.e. Tiger) was with me there, 3 came now from that son’s presence in Alūr and asked for peace. ‘Abdu’r-rahim shaghdwal went with him to Alūr, conveying letters of royal favour, and returned bringing Nāhar Khān who was restored to favour and received parganas worth several laks for his support.

(g. Rewards to officers.)

Thinking, “What good work Khusrau did in the battle!” I named him for Alūr and gave him 50 laks for his support, but unluckily for himself, he put on airs and did not accept this. Later on it [khwud, itself] came to be known that Chin-timūr must have done 4 that work; guerdon was made him for his renown (?); 5 Tijāra-town, the seat of government

1 This is one of the names of the principal river which flows eastwards to the south of Alwar town; other names are Bārah and Rūparel. Powlett notes that it appears in Thorn’s Map of the battle of Laswarree (1803 AD.), which he reproduces on p. 146. But it is still current in Gurgaon, with also a variant Mānas-le, man-killer (G. of Gurgaon 1910 AD. ivA, p. 6).
2 aūltururlār aīkān dūr, the presumptive past tense.
3 f. 308.
4 qilshān aīkān dūr, the presumptive past tense.
5 Sulṭān ātīghā juldū bālūb; Pers. trs. Juldū ba nām-i Sulṭān shud. The juldū guerdon seems to be apart from the fief and allowance.
in Miwāt, was bestowed on him together with an allowance of 50 laks for his support.

Alūr and an allowance of 15 laks was bestowed on Tardika (or, Tardī yakka) who in the flanking-party of the right-hand (qūl) had done better than the rest. The contents of the Alūr treasury were bestowed on Humāyūn.

(h. Alwar visited.)

(April 13th) Marching from that camp on Wednesday the 1st of the month of Rajab, we came to within 2 kurohs (4 m.) of Alūr. I went to see the fort, there spent the night, and next day went back to camp.

(i. Leave given to various followers.)

When the oath before-mentioned ¹ was given to great and small before the Holy-battle with Rānā Sangā, it had been mentioned ² that there would be nothing to hinder leave after this victory, and that leave would be given to anyone wishing to go away (from Hindūstān). Most of Humāyūn's men were from Badakhshān or elsewhere on that side (of Hindū-kūsh); they had never before been of an army led out for even a month or two; there had been weakness amongst them before the fight; on these accounts and also because Kābul was empty of troops, it was now decided to give Humāyūn leave for Kābul.

(April 11th) Leaving the matter at this, we marched from Alūr on Thursday the 9th of Rajab, did 4 or 5 kurohs (8–10 m.) and dismounted on the bank of the Mānas-water.

Mahdi Khwāja also had many discomforts; he too was given leave for Kābul. The military-collectorate of Bīāna [he held] was bestowed on Dost Lord-of-the-gate, and, as previously Etāwa had been named for Mahdi Khwāja, ³ Mahdi Khwāja's son Ja'far Khwāja was sent there in his father's place when (later) Qutb Khān abandoned it and went off.⁴

¹ f. 315.
² Bābur does not record this detail (f. 315).
³ f. 298b and f. 328b. Ja'far is mentioned as Mahdi's son by Gul-badan and in the Habībū's-sīyar iii, 311, 312.
⁴ f. 388b.
Because of the leave given to Humayun, two or three days were spent on this ground. From it Mumin-i-`ali the messenger (tawâchî) was sent off for Kabul with the Fath-nâma.

Praise had been heard of the Firûzpûr-spring and of the great lake of Kûtila. Leaving the camp on that same ground, I rode out on Sunday (Rajab 12th--April 14th) both to visit these places and to set Humayun on his way. After visiting Firûzpûr and its spring on that same day, ma`jûn was eaten. In the valley where the spring rises, oleanders (kanûr) were in bloom; the place is not without charm but is over-praised. I ordered a reservoir of hewn stone, 10 by 10\(^2\) to be made where the water widened, spent the night in that valley, next day rode on and visited the Kûtila lake. It is surrounded by mountain-skirts. The Mûnas-ni is heard-say to go into it. It is a very large lake, from its one side the other side is not well seen. In the middle of it is rising ground. At its sides are many small boats, by going off in which the villagers living near it are said to escape from any tumult or disturbance. Even on our arrival a few people went in them to the middle of the lake.

On our way back from the lake, we dismounted in Humayun's camp. There we rested and ate food, and after having put robes of honour on him and his begs, bade him farewell at the Bed-time Prayer, and rode on. We slept for a little at some place on the road, at shoot of day passed through the pargana of Khari, again slept a little, and at length got to our camp

1 The town of Firûzpûr is commonly known as Firûzpûr-jhirkâ (Firûzpûr of the spring), from a small perennial stream which issues from a number of fissures in the rocks bordering the road through a pass in the Miwât hills which leads from the town vûd Tijâra to Rewârî (G. of Gurgaon, p.249). In Abû'l-fazl's day there was a Hindu shrine of Mahadeo near the spring, which is still a place of annual pilgrimage. The Kûtila lake is called Kotla-jhil in the G. of G. (p.7). It extends now 3 m. by 24 m. varying in size with the season; in Abû'l-fazl's day it was 4 kos (8 m.) round. It lies partly in the district of Nûh, partly in Gurgaon, where the two tracts join at the foot of the Alwar hills.

2 This is the frequently mentioned size for reservoirs; the measure here is probably the qârî, cir. a yard.

3 Bâbur does not state it as a fact known to himself that the Mûnas-ni falls into the Kûtila lake; it did so formerly, but now does not, tradition assigning a cause for the change (G. of G. p.6). He uses the hear-say tense, kirâr aimîsh.
which had dismounted at Toda-(bhim). After leaving Toda, we dismounted at Sünkär; there Hasan Khán Miwātī's son Nāhar Khán escaped from 'Abdu'r-rahīm's charge.

Going on from that place, we halted one night, then dismounted at a spring situated on the bill of a mountain between Busāwar and Chausa (or Jūsa); there awnings were set up and we committed the sin of ma'jūn. When the army had passed by this spring, Tardī Beg khāksār had praised it; he (or we) had come and seen it from on horse-back (sar-asbgī) and passed on. It is a perfect spring. In Hindūstān where there are never running-waters, people seek out the springs themselves. The rare springs that are found, come oozing drop by drop (āb-zih) out of the ground, not bubbling up like springs of those lands. From this spring comes about a half-mill-water. It bubbles up on the hill-skirt; meadows lie round it; it is very beautiful. I ordered an octagonal reservoir of hewn stone made above it. While we were at the border of the spring, under the soothing influence of ma'jūn, Tardī Beg, contending for its surpassing beauty, said again and again, (Persian) "Since I am celebrating the beauty of the place, a name ought to be settled for it". 'Abdu'l-lāh said, "It must be called the Royal-spring approved of by Tardī Beg." This saying caused much joke and laughter.

Dost Lord-of-the-gate coming up from Biāna, waited on me at this spring-head. Leaving this place, we visited Biāna again, went on to Sikrī, dismounted there at the side of a garden which had been ordered made, stayed two days supervising the garden, and on Thursday the 23rd of Rajab (April 25th), reached Āgra.

(1. Chandwār and Rāpri regained.)

During recent disturbances, the enemy, as has been mentioned, had possessed themselves of Chandwār and Rāpri. Against

1 Kharī and Toda were in Akbar’s sarkār of Rantambhor.
2 Bhosāwar is in Bhurtpūr, and Chausa (or Jūsa) may be the Chausath of the Āyīn-i-akbarī, ii, 183.
3 As has been noted frequently, this phrase stands for artificial water-courses.
4 Certainly Trans-Hindū-kush lands; presumably also those of Trans-Indus, Kābul in chief.
5 Austī; perhaps the reservoir was so built as to contain the bubbling spring.
6 Chun jātī khwush karda ām.
7 f. 315.
8 var. Janwār (Jarrett). It is 25 m. east of Āgra on the Muttra–Etāwa road (G. of I.).
those places we now sent Muhammad 'Ali Jang-jang, Qūj Beg’s (brother) Tārdī Beg, ‘Abdu’l-malik the armourer, and Ḥasan Khān with his Daryā-khānīs. When they were near Chandwār, Qūṭb Khān’s people in it got out and away. Our men laid hands on it, and passed on to Rāpri. Here Ḥusain Khān Nāhānī’s people came to the lane-end thinking to fight a little, could not stand the attack of our men, and took to flight. Ḥusain Khān himself with a few followers went into the Jūn-river (Jumna) on an elephant and was drowned. Qūṭb Khān, for his part, abandoned Etāwa on hearing these news, fled with a few and got away. Etāwa having been named for Mahdī Khwāja, his son Ja’far Khwāja was sent there in his place.

(m. Apportionment of fiefs.)

When Rānā Sangā sallied out against us, most Hindūstānīs and Afghāns, as has been mentioned, turned round against us and took possession of their parganas and districts.

Sl. Muḥammad Dūldāī who had abandoned Qanūj and come to me, would not agree to go there again, whether from fear or for his reputation’s sake; he therefore exchanged the 30 laks of Qanūj for the 15 of Sihrīnd, and Qanūj was bestowed with an allowance of 30 laks on Muḥammad Sl. Mīrzā. Badāīn was given to Qāsim-i-husain Sulṭān and he was sent against Bibān who had laid siege to Luknūr during the disturbance with Rānā Sangā, together with Muḥammad Sl. Mīrzā, and, of Turk amīrs, Bābā Qashqa’s Malik Qāsim with his elder and younger brethren and his Mughuls, and Abū’l-muḥammad the lance-player, and Mu’yad with his father’s Daryā-khānīs and those of Ḥusain Khān Daryā-khānī and the retainers of Sl. Muḥammad Dūldāī, and again, of amīrs of Hind, ‘Alī Khān Farmūli and Malik Dād Kararānī and Shaikh Muḥammad of Shaikh Bhakhārī (?) and Tāṭār Khān Khān-i-jahān.

1 kūcha-band, perhaps a barricade at the limit of a suburban lane.
2 This has been mentioned already (f.327).
3 f.315.
4 i.e. those professedly held for Bābūr.
5 Or, according to local pronunciation, Badāyūn.
6 This is the old name of Shāhābad in Rāmpūr (G. of I. xxii, 197). The A.-i-A. locates it in Sambal. Cf. E. and D.’s History of India, iv, 384 n. and v. 215 n.
At the time this army was crossing the Gang-river (Ganges), Biban, hearing about it, fled, abandoning his baggage. Our army followed him to Khairābād, stayed there a few days and then turned back.

(n. Appointments and dispersion for the Rains.)

After the treasure had been shared out, Rānā Sangā's great affair intervened before districts and parganas were apportioned. During the respite now from Holy-war against the Pagan (Sangā), this apportionment was made. As the Rains were near, it was settled for every-one to go to his pargana, get equipment ready, and be present when the Rains were over.

(o. Misconduct of Humāyūn.)

Meantime news came that Humāyūn had gone into Dihlī, there opened several treasure-houses and, without permission, taken possession of their contents. I had never looked for such a thing from him; it grieved me very much; I wrote and sent off to him very severe reproaches.

(p. An embassy to 'Irāq.)

Khwājagī Asad who had already gone as envoy to 'Irāq and returned with Sulaimān Turkmān, was again joined with him and on the 15th of Sha'bān (May 17th) sent with befitting gifts to Shāh-zāda Tāhmāsp.

(q. Tārdī Beg khāksār resigns service.)

I had brought Tārdī Beg out from the darwīsh-life and made a soldier of him; for how many years had he served me! Now his desire for the darwīsh-life was overmastering and he asked for leave. It was given and he was sent as an envoy to Kāmrān conveying 3 laks from the Treasury for him.

1 Perhaps the one in Sitāpur.
2 f. 3056. 3 As the Elphinstone Codex which is the treasure-house of Humāyūn's notes, has a long lacuna into which this episode falls, it is not known if the culprit entered in his copy of the Bābur-nāma a marginal excuse for his misconduct (cf. f. 252 and n.); such excuse was likely to be that he knew he would be forgiven by his clement father.
4 f. 3056. 5 Kāmrān would be in Qandahār. Erskine notes that the sum sent to him would be about £750, but that if the coins were rūpia, it would be £30,000.
(r. Lines addressed to deserting friends.)

A little fragment ¹ had been composed suitng the state of those who had gone away during the past year; I now addressed it to Mullā 'Ali Khān and sent it to him by Tārdī Beg. It is as follows:—²

Ah you who have gone from this country of Hind,
Aware for yourselves of its woe and its pain,
With longing desire for Kābul's fine air,
You went hot-foot forth out of Hind.
The pleasure you looked for you will have found there
With sociable ease and charm and delight;
As for us, God be thanked! we still are alive,
In spite of much pain and unending distress;
Pleasures of sense and bodily toil
Have been passed-by by you, passed-by too by us.

(s. Of the Ramzān Feast.)

Ramzān was spent this year with ablution and tarāwīḥ³ in the Garden-of-eight-paradises. Since my 11th year I had not kept the Ramzān Feast for two successive years in the same place; last year I had kept it in Āgra; this year, saying, "Don't break the rule!" I went on the last day of the month to keep it in Sikri. Tents were set up on a stone platform made on the n.e. side of the Garden-of-victory which is now being laid out at Sikrī, and in them the Feast was held.⁴

(t. Playing cards.)

The night we left Āgra Mīr 'Ali the armourer was sent to Shāh Ḥasan (Arghūn) in Tatta to take him playing-cards [ganjīfā] he much liked and had asked for.⁵

¹ qīta⁴, for account of which form of poem see Blochmann's translations of Saifī's and Jāmil's Prosody, p.86.
² Rāmūr Dīwān (E. D. Ross' ed. p.16 and Plate 14a). I am uncertain as to the meaning of ll.4 and 10. I am not sure that what in most MSS. ends line 4, vis. aūlām, should not be read as aūlum, death; this is allowed by Plate 14a where for space the word is divided and may be aūlum. To read aūlum and that the deserters fled from the death in Hind they were anxious about, has an answering phrase in "we still are alive". Ll. 9 and 10 perhaps mean that in the things named all have done alike. [Ilminsky reads khār nafsī for the elsewhere hāgfs-nafsī.]
³ These are 20 attitudes (rā'ah) assumed in prayer during Ramzān after the Bedtime Prayer. The ablution (ghusl) is the bathing of the whole body for ceremonial purification.
⁴ This Feast is the 'Īd-i-fitr, held at the breaking of the Ramzān Fast on the 1st of Shawwāl.
⁵ Erskine notes that this is the earliest mention of playing-cards he can recall in oriental literature.
(u. Illness and a tour.)

(August 3rd) On Sunday the 5th of Zūl-qa'da I fell ill; the illness lasted 17 days.

(August 24th) On Friday the 24th of the same month we set out to visit Dūlpūr. That night I slept at a place half-way; Fol. 330b. reached Sikandar's dam at dawn, and dismounted there.

At the end of the hill below the dam the rock is of building-stone. I had Ustād Shāh Muḥammad the stone-cutter brought and gave him an order that if a house could be cut all in one piece in that rock, it was to be done, but that if the rock were too low for a residence (‘imārat), it was to be levelled and have a reservoir, all in one piece, cut out of it.

From Dūlpūr we went on to visit Bārī. Next morning (August 26th) I rode out from Bārī through the hills between it and the Chambal-river in order to view the river. This done I went back to Bārī. In these hills we saw the ebony-tree, the fruit of which people call tindū. It is said that there are white ebony-trees also and that most ebony-trees in these hills are of this kind.2 On leaving Bārī we went to Sikrī; we reached Agra on the 29th of the same month (August 28th).

(v. Doubts about Shaikh Bāyazīd Farmūlī.)

As in these days people were telling wild news about Shaikh Bāyazīd, Sl. Qulī Turk was sent to him to give him tryst3 in 20 days.

(w. Religious and metrical exercises.)

(August 28th) On Friday the 2nd of Zūl-ḥijja I began what one is made to read 41 times.4

In these same days I cut up [taqṭī] the following couplet of mine into 504 measures5:

---

1 fol. 330b.
2 The two varieties mentioned by Bābur seem to be Diospyrus melanoxylon, the wood of which is called tindu abnūs in Hindūstānī, and D. tomentosa, Hindī, tindu (Brandis s.n.). Bārī is 19 m. west of Dūlpūr.
3 miʿād, perhaps the time at which the Shaikh was to appear before Bābur.
4 The Pers. trs. makes the more definite statement that what had to be read was a Section of the Qurān (wird). This was done with remedial aim for the illness.
5 As this statement needs comment, and as it is linked to matters mentioned in the Rampūr Dīwān, it seems better to remit remarks upon it to Appendix Q, Some matters concerning the Rampūr Dīwān.
"Shall I tell of her eye or her brow, her fire or her speech?
Shall I tell of her stature or cheek, of her hair or her waist?"

On this account a treatise was arranged.

(x. Return of illness.)

Fol. 331. On this day (i.e. 2nd Zü'1-hijja) I fell ill again; the illness lasted nine days.

(y. Start for Sambal.)

(Sep. 24th) On Thursday the 29th of Zü'1-hijja we rode out for an excursion to Kūl and Sambal.

\textsuperscript{1} risāla. See Appendix Q.
934 A.H.—SEP. 27TH 1527 TO SEP. 15TH 1528 A.D.¹

(a. Visit to Kūl (Aligarh) and Sāmbal.)

(Sep. 27th) On Saturday the 1st of Muḥarram we dismounted in Kūl (Koel). Humāyūn had left Darwīsh (i.-ʿalī) and Yūsuf-i-ʿali² in Sāmbal; they crossed one river,³ fought Qūṭb Sīrwanī⁴ and a party of rājas, beat them well and killed a mass of men. They sent a few heads and an elephant into Kūl while we were there. After we had gone about Kūl for two days, we dismounted at Shaikh Gūran’s house by his invitation, where he entertained us hospitably and laid an offering before us.

(Sep. 30th—Muḥ. 4th) Riding on from that place, we dismounted at Aūrūlī (Atrauli).⁵

(Oct. 1st—Muḥ. 5th) On Wednesday we crossed the river Gang (Ganges) and spent the night in villages of Sāmbal.

(Oct. 2nd—Muḥ. 6th) On Thursday we dismounted in Sāmbal. After going about in it for two days, we left on Saturday.

(Oct. 5th—Muḥ. 9th) On Sunday we dismounted in Sikandara⁶

¹ Elph. MS. lacuna; I.O. 215 lacuna and 217 f.229; Mems. p.373. This year’s narrative resumes the diary form.
² There is some uncertainty about these names and also as to which adversary crossed the river. The sentence which, I think, shews, by its plural verb, that Humāyūn left two men and, by its co-ordinate participles, that it was they crossed the river, is as follows——(Darwīsh and Yūsuf, understood) Qūṭb Sīrwanī-ni u bir pāra rājalar-ni bir daryā aūṭūb aūrūshūb yaksī bāsīb tūlār. Aūṭūb, aūrūshūb and bāsīb are grammatically referable to the same subject, [whatever was the fact about the crossing].
³ bir daryā; W.-i-B. 217 f.229, yak daryā, one river, but many MSS. har daryā, every river. If it did not seem pretty certain that the rebels were not in the Miyān-dū-āb one would surmise the river to be “one river” of the two enclosing the tract “between the waters”, and that one to be the Ganges. It may be one near Sāmbhal, east of the Ganges.
⁴ var. Shīrwanī. The place giving the cognomen may be Sarwān, a thakurāt of the Mālwā Agency (G. of I.). Qūṭb of Sīrwanī may be the Qūṭb Khān of earlier mention without the cognomen.
⁵ n.w. of Aligarh (Kūl). It may be noted here, where instances begin to be frequent, that my translation “we marched” is an evasion of the Turki impersonal “it was marched”. Most rarely does Bābur write “we marched”, never, “I marched.”
⁶ in the Aligarh (Kūl) district; it is the Sikandara Rao of the A.-i-A. and the G. of I.
at the house of Rāo Sīrvānī who set food before us and served us. When we rode out at dawn, I made some pretext to leave the rest, and galloped on alone to within a kuroh of Āgra where they overtook me. At the Mid-day Prayer we dismounted in Āgra.

(b. Illness of Bābur.)

(Oct. 12th) On Sunday the 16th of Muḥarram I had fever and ague. This returned again and again during the next 25 or 26 days. I drank operative medicine and at last relief came. I suffered much from thirst and want of sleep.

While I was ill, I composed a quatrain or two; here is one of them:—

Fever grows strong in my body by day,
Sleep quits my eyes as night comes on;
Like to my pain and my patience the pair,
For while that goes waxing, this wanes.

(c. Arrival of kinswomen.)

(Nov. 23rd) On Saturday the 28th of Ṣafar there arrived two of the paternal-aunt begīms, Fakhr-i-jahān Begīm and Khadija-sulṭān Begīm. I went to above Sikandarābād to wait on them.

(d. Concerning a mortar.)

(Nov. 24th—Ṣafar 29th) On Sunday Ustād 'Alī-qlī discharged a stone from a large mortar; the stone went far but the mortar broke in pieces, one of which, knocking down a party of men, killed eight.

(e. Visit to Sikrī.)

(Dec. 1st) On Monday the 7th of the first Rabī’ I rode out to visit Sikrī. The octagonal platform ordered made in the middle of the lake was ready; we went over by boat, had an awning set up on it and elected for ma’jūn.

1 Rāmpūr Diwān (E.D.Ross’ ed., p.19, Plate 16b). This Diwān contains other quatrains which, judging from their contents, may well be those Bābur speaks of as also composed in Sambal. See Appendix Q, Some matters concerning the Rāmpūr Diwān.

2 These are aunts of Bābur, daughters of St. Abū-sa’id Mīrān-shāhī.

3 Sikandarabād is in the Buland-shahr district of the United Provinces.
(f. Holy-war against Chandīrī.)

(Dec. 9th) After returning from Sikrī we started on Monday night the 14th of the first Rabi',1 with the intention of making Holy-war against Chandīrī, did as much as 3 kurohs (6 m.) and dismounted in Jalīsīr.2 After staying there two days for people to equip and array, we marched on Thursday (Dec. 12th—Rabi' II. 17th) and dismounted at Anwār. I left Anwār by boat, and disembarked beyond Chandwār.3

(Dec. 23rd) Advancing march by march, we dismounted at the Kanār-passage4 on Monday the 28th.

(Dec. 26th) On Thursday the 2nd of the latter Rabi' I crossed the river; there was 4 or 5 days delay on one bank or the other before the army got across. On those days we went more than once on board a boat and ate mājūn. The junction of the river Chāmbal is between one and two kurohs (2–4 m.) above the Kanār-passage; on Friday I went into a boat on the Chāmbal, passed the junction and so to camp:

(g. Troops sent against Shaikh Bāyazīd Farmūlī.)

Though there had been no clear proof of Shaikh Bāyazīd's hostility, yet his misconduct and action made it certain that he had hostile intentions. On account of this Muḥammad 'Alī Jang-jang was detached from the army and sent to bring together from Qanātī Muḥammad Sī. Mīrzā and the sultāns and amirs of that neighbourhood, such as Qāsim-i-Ḥusain Sultān, Bī-khūb (or, Ni-khūb) Sultān, Malik Qāsim, Kūkī, Abūl-muḥammad the lancer, and Minūchihr Khān with his elder and younger brethren and Daryā-khānīs, so that they might move against the hostile Afghāns. They were to invite Shaikh Bāyazīd to go with them; if he came frankly, they were to take him along; if not, were to drive him off. Muḥammad 'Alī

1 It is not clear whether Bābur returned from Sikrī on the day he started for Jalīsīr; no question of distance would prevent him from making the two journeys on the Monday.

2 As this was the rendezvous for the army, it would be convenient if it lay between Āgra and Anwār; as it was 6 m. from Āgra, the only mapped place having approximately the name Jalīsīr, viz. Jalesar, in Etah, seems too far away.

3 Anwār would be suitably the Unwār of the Indian Atlas, which is on the first important southward dip of the Jumna below Āgra. Chandwār is 25 m. east of Āgra, on the Muttra-Etawah road (G. of I.); Jarrett notes that Tiefenthaler identifies it with Firūzābād (A.-i-A. ii, 183 n.).

4 In the district of Kālpī. The name does not appear in maps I have seen.
asking for a few elephants, ten were given him. After he had leave to set off, Bābā Chuhra (the Brave) was sent to and ordered to join him.

(h. Incidents of the journey to Chandirī.)

From Kanār one kuroh (2 m.) was done by boat.

(Jan. 1st 1528 AD.) On Wednesday the 8th of the latter Rabī‘ we dismounted within a kuroh of Kālpī. Bābā Sl. came to wait on me in this camp; he is a son of Khalil Sl. who is a younger brother of the full-blood of Sl. Sa‘īd Khān. Last year he fled from his elder brother but, repenting himself, went back from the Andar-āb border; when he neared Kāshghar, The Khān (Sa‘īd) sent Ḥairdā M. to meet him and take him back.

(Jan. 2nd—Rabī‘ II. 9th) Next day we dismounted at Ālam Khān’s house in Kālpī where he set Hindūstānī food before us and made an offering.

(Jan. 6th) On Monday the 13th of the month we marched from Kālpī.

(Jan. 10th—Rabī‘ II. 17th) On Friday we dismounted at Īrij.2

(Jan. 11th) On Saturday we dismounted at Bāndīr.3

(Jan. 12th) On Sunday the 19th of the month Chīn-timūr Sl. was put at the head of 6 or 7000 men and sent ahead against Chandirī. With him went the begs Bāqī ming-bāšī (head of a thousand), Qūj Beg’s (brother) Tardī Beg, ‘Ashiq the taster, Mullā Apāq, Muḥsīn 4 Dūldāī and, of the Hindūstānī begs, Shaikh Gūran.

(Jan 17th) On Friday the 24th of the month we dismounted near Kachwa. After encouraging its people, it was bestowed on the son of Badru’d-dīn.5

Kachwa6 is a shut-in place, having lowish hills all round it.

1 āghā, Angliec, uncle. He was Sa‘īd Khān of Kāshghar. Ḥairdā M. says Bābā Sl. was a spoiled child and died without mending his ways.

2 From Kālpī Bābur will have taken the road to the s.w. near which now runs the Cawnpur (Kānpūr) branch of the Indian Midland Railway, and he must have crossed the Betwa to reach Īrij (Irich, Indian Atlas, Sheet 69 N.W.).

3 Leaving Īrij, Bābur will have recrossed the Betwa and have left its valley to go west to Bāndīr (Bhandar) on the Pahūj (Indian Atlas, Sheet 69 S.W.).

4 beneficent, or Muḥassan, comely.

5 The one man of this name mentioned in the B.N. is an amir of Sl. Ḥusain Bāī-gārā.

6 It seems safe to take Kachwa [Kajwa] as the Kajwarra of Ibn Batūta, and the Kadwāha (Kadwaia) of the Indian Atlas; Sheet 52 N.E. and of Luard’s Gazetteer
A dam has been thrown across between hills on the south-east of it, and thus a large lake made, perhaps 5 or 6 kurohs (10–12 m.) round. This lake encloses Kachwa on three sides; on the north-west a space of ground is kept dry;\(^1\) here, therefore is its Gate. On the lake are a great many very small boats, able to hold 3 or 4 persons; in these the inhabitants go out on the lake, if they have to flee. There are two other lakes before Kachwa is reached, smaller than its own and, like that, made by throwing a dam across between hills.

\(^{of Gwalior\ (i, 247)}\), which is situated in 24° 58' N. and 77° 57' E. Each of the three names is of a place standing on a lake; Ibn Batūta's lake was a league (4 m.) long, Bābur's about 11 miles round; Luard mentions no lake, but the *Indian Atlas* marks one quite close to Kadwāhā of such form as to seem to have a tongue of land jutting into it from the north-west, and thus suitting Bābur's description of the site of Kachwa. Again,—Ibn Batūta writes of Kajwarra as having, round its lake, idol-temples; Luard says of Kadwāhā that it has four idol-temples standing and nine in ruins; there may be hinted something special about Bābur's Kachwa by his remark that he encouraged its people, and this speciality may be interaction between Muhammadanism and Hinduism serving here for the purpose of identification. For Ibn Batūta writes of the people of Kajwarra that they were jogīs, yellowed by asceticism, wearing their hair long and matted, and having Muhammadan followers who desired to learn their (occult?) secrets. If the same interaction existed in Bābur's day, the Muhammadan following of the Hindu ascetics may well have been the special circumstance which led him to promise protection to those Hindus, even when he was out for Holy-war. It has to be remembered of Chandīrī, the nearest powerful neighbour of Kachwa, that though Bābur's capture makes a vivid picture of Hinduism in it, it had been under Muhammadan rulers down to a relatively short time before his conquest. The jogīs of Kachwa could point to long-standing relations of tolerance by the Chandīrī Governors; this, with their Muhammadan following, explains the encouragement Bābur gave them, and helps to identify Kachwa with Kajjara. It may be observed that Bābur was familiar with the interaction of the two creeds, witness his "apostates", mostly Muhammadans following Hindu customs, witness too, for the persistent fact, the reports of District-officers under the British *Rāj*. Again,—a further circumstance helping to identify Kajwarra, Kachwa and Kadwāhā is that these are names of the last important station the traveller and the soldier, as well perhaps as the modern wayfarer, stays in before reaching Chandīrī. The importance of Kajwarra is shewn by Ibn Batūta, and of Kadwāhā by its being a mahāllī in Akbar's sarkār of Bāyawān of the ṣabā of Agra. Again,—Kadwāhā is the place nearest to Chandīrī about which Bābur's difficulties as to intermediate road and jungle would arise. That intermediate road takes off the main one a little south of Kadwāhā and runs through what looks like a narrow valley and broken country down to Bhamor, Bhūrānpūr and Chandīrī. Again,—no bar to identification of the three names is placed by their differences of form, in consideration of the vicissitudes they have weathered in tongue, script, and transliteration. There is some ground, I believe, for supposing that their common source is kajjūr, the date-fruit. [I am indebted to my husband for the help derived from Ibn Batūta, traced by him in Sanguinetti'strs. iv, 33, and S. Lee's trs. p. 162.]

(Two places similar in name to Kachwa, and situated on Bābur's route *viz.* Kocha near Ḫansī, and Kuchoowa north of Kadwāhā (Sheet 69 S.W.) are unsuitable for his "Kachwa", the first because too near Bandīr to suit his itinerary, the second because too far from the turn off the main-road mentioned above, because it has no lake, and has not the help in identification detailed above of Kadwāhā.)

\(^1\) gūrūghīr which could mean also reserved (from the water?).
(Jan. 18th) We waited a day in Kachwa in order to appoint active overseers and a mass of spadesmen to level the road and cut jungle down, so that the carts and mortar 1 might pass along it easily. Between Kachwa and Chandiri the country is jungly.

(Jan. 19th—Rabi' II. 26th) After leaving Kachwa we halted one night, passed the Burhānpur-water (Bhurānpūr) 2 and dismounted within 3 kurohs (6 m.) of Chandiri.

(i. Chandiri and its capture.)

The citadel of Chandīrī stands on a hill; below it are the town ( şehr) and outer-fort (tāsh-qūrghān), and below these is the level road along which carts pass.3 When we left Burhānpūr (Jan. 10th) we marched for a kuroh below Chandiri for the convenience of the carts.4

(Jan. 21st) After one night's halt we dismounted beside Bahjat Khān's tank 5 on the top of its dam, on Tuesday the 28th of the month.

(Jan. 22nd—Rabi' II. 29th) Riding out at dawn, we assigned post after post (būljār, būljār), 6 round the walled town (qūrghān)

1 gūsān. There seems to have been one only; how few Bābur had is shewn again on f.337.

2 Indian Atlas, Sheet 52 N.E. near a tributary of the Betwa, the Or, which appears to be Bābur's Burhānpūr-water.

3 The bed of the Betwa opposite Chandīrī is 1050 ft. above the sea; the walled-town (qūrghān) of Chandīrī is on a table-land 250 ft. higher, and its citadel is 230 ft. higher again (Cunningham’s Archeological Survey Report, 1871 A.D. ii, 404).

4 The plan of Chandīrī illustrating Cunningham's Report (see last note) allows surmise about the road taken by Bābur, surmise which could become knowledge if the names of tanks he gives were still known. The courtesy of the Government of India allows me to reproduce that plan [Appendix R, Chandīrī and Gwalīdwar].

5 He is said to have been Governor of Chandīrī in 1513 AD.

6 Here and in similar passages the word m:ljār or m:ljār is found in MSS. where the meaning is that of T. būljār. It is not in any dictionary I have seen; Mr. Irvine found it "obscure" and surmised it to mean "approach by trenches", but this does not suit its uses in the Bābur-nāma of a military post, and a rendezvous. This surmise, containing, as it does, a notion of protection, links m:ljār in sense with Ar. maljā. The word needs expert consideration, in order to decide whether it is to be received into dictionaries, or to be rejected because explicable as the outcome of unfamiliarity in Persian scribes with T. būljār or, more Persico with narrowed vowels, būljār. Shaw in his Vocabulary enters būljāg (būljār?), "a station for troops, a rendezvous, see maljā;" thus indicating, it would seem, that he was aware of difficulty about m:ljār and būljāg (būljār?). There appears no doubt of the existence of a Turkī word būljār with the meanings Shaw gives to būljāg; it could well be formed from the root bāl, being, whence follows, being in a place, posted. Maljā has the meaning of a standing-place, as well as those of a refuge and an asylum; both meanings seem combined in the m:ljār of f.336b, where for matchlockmen a m:ljār was ordered "raised". (Cf. Irvine's Army of the Indian Moghuls p.278.)
to centre, right, and left. Ustād ʿAli-quli chose, for his stone
-discharge, ground that had no fall; overseers and spadesmen
were told off to raise a place (mālār) for the mortar to rest on,
and the whole army was ordered to get ready appliances for
taking a fort, mantelets, ladders and mantelets (tūra).

Formerly Chandirī will have belonged to the Sultāns of
Mandū (Mandū). When Sl. Nāṣiru’d-din passed away, one
of his sons Sl. Mahmūd who is now holding Mandū, took
possession of it and its neighbouring parts, and another son
called Muhammad Shāh laid hands on Chandirī and put it
under Sl. Sikandar (Lūdī)’s protection, who, in his turn, took
Muhammad Shāh’s side and sent him large forces. Muhammad
Shāh survived Sl. Sikandar and died in Sl. Ibrāhīm’s time, leaving
a very young son called Aḥmad Shāh whom Sl. Ibrāhīm drove
out and replaced by a man of his own. At the time Rānā Sangā
led out an army against Sl. Ibrāhīm and Ibrāhīm’s begs turned
against him at Dūlpūr, Chandirī fell into the Rānā’s hands and
by him was given to Medini [Mindni] Rāo the greatly-trusted
pagan who was now in it with 4 or 5000 other pagans.

As it was understood there was friendship between Medini

\[1\] yāghdā; Pers. trs. sar-āshīb. Bābur’s remark seems to show that for effect his
mortar needed to be higher than its object. Presumably it stood on the table-land
north of the citadel.

\[2\] shātū. It may be noted that this word, common in accounts of Bābur’s sieges,
may explain one our friend the late Mr. William Irvine left undecided (l.c. p.278),
viz. shātūr. On p. 281 he states that nardūbān is the name of a scaling-ladder
and that Bābur mentions scaling ladders more than once. Bābur mentions them however
always as shātū. Perhaps shātūr which, as Mr. Irvine says, seems to be made of
the trunks of trees and to be a siege appliance, is really shātū u . . . (ladder and
. . .) as in the passage under note and on f.216b, some other name of an appliance
following.

\[3\] The word here preceding tūra has puzzled scribes and translators. I have seen
the following variants in MSS. ;—nākri or tūkri, b:māri or ʃ:ki, bākri or ŋūkri,
būkri or ŋūkri, each of which the k may stand for g. Various suggestions
might be made as to what the word is, but all involve reading the Persian enclitic i
(forming the adjective) instead of Turki lik. Two roots, tūg and yūg, afford plausible
explanations of the unknown word ; appliances suitting the case and able to bear
names formed from one or other of these roots are wheeled mantelet, and head-strike
(F. sar-kob). That the word is difficult is shewn not only by the variants I have
quoted, but by Erskine’s reading naukārī tūra, “to serve the tūras,” a requisite not
specified earlier by Bābur, and by de Courteille’s paraphrase, tout ce qui est nécessaire
aux tours.

\[4\] Sl. Nāṣiru’d-din was the Khilji ruler of Mālwā from 906 to 916 A.H. (1500–
1510 AD.).

\[5\] He was a Rājpūt who had been prime-minister of Sl. Mahmūd II. Khilji (son
of Nāṣiru’d-din) and had rebelled. Bābur (like some other writers) spells his name
Mindni, perhaps as he heard it spoken.
Rāo and Ārāish Khān, the latter was sent with Shaikh Gūran to speak to Medinī Rāo with favour and kindness, and promise Shamsābād in exchange for Chandīrī. One or two of his trusted men got out (?) No adjustment of matters was reached, it is not known whether because Medinī Rāo did not trust what was said, or whether because he was buoyed up by delusion about the strength of the fort.

(Jan. 28th) At dawn on Tuesday the 6th of the first Jumāda we marched from Bahjat Khān’s tank intending to assault Chandīrī. We dismounted at the side of the middle-tank near the fort.

(j. Bad news.)

On this same morning after reaching that ground, Khalīfā brought a letter or two of which the purport was that the troops appointed for the East had fought without consideration, been beaten, abandoned Laknau, and gone to Qanūj. Seeing that Khalīfā was much perturbed and alarmed by these news, I said, (Persian) "There is no ground for perturbation or alarm; nothing comes to pass but what is predestined of God. As this task (Chandīrī) is ahead of us, not a breath must be drawn about what has been told us. Tomorrow we will assault the fort; that done, we shall see what comes."

(k. Siege of Chandīrī, resumed.)

The enemy must have strengthened just the citadel, and have posted men by twos and threes in the outer-fort for prudence’ sake. That night our men went up from all round; those few in the outer-fort did not fight; they fled into the citadel.

1 Presumably the one in the United Provinces. For Shamsābād in Güālīr see Luard l.c. i, 286.

2 chīqt; Pers. trs. bar āmad and, also in some MSS. namī bar āmad; Mem. p.376, "averse to conciliation"; Mem. ii, 329, "s’élèvent contre cette proposition." So far I have not found Bābur using the verb chīqmāq metaphorically. It is his frequent verb to express "getting away", "going out of a fort". It would be a short step in metaphor to understand here that Medinī’s men "got out of it", i.e. what Bābur offered. They may have left the fort also; if so, it would be through dissent.

3 f. 332.

4 I.O.217, f.231, inserts here what seems a gloss, "Tā īn jā Farsī farnīda" (gusta, said). As Bābur enters his speech in Persian, it is manifest that he used Persian to conceal the bad news.
(Jan. 29th) At dawn on Wednesday the 7th of the first Jumāda, we ordered our men to arm, go to their posts, provoke to fight, and attack each from his place when I rode out with drum and standard.

I myself, dismissing drum and standard till the fighting should grow hot, went to amuse myself by watching Ustād ‘Alī-quli’s stone-discharge.

Nothing was effected by it because his ground had no fall (yāghdā) and because the fort-walls, being entirely of stone, were extremely strong.

That the citadel of Chandīrī stands on a hill has been said already. Down one side of this hill runs a double-walled road (dū-tahi) to water. This is the one place for attack; it had been assigned as the post of the right and left hands and royal corps of the centre.

Hurled though assault was from every side, the greatest force was here brought to bear. Our braves did not turn back, however much the pagans threw down stones and flung flaming fire upon them. At length Shāhīm the centurion got up where the dū-tahi wall touches the wall of the outer fort; braves swarmed up in other places; the dū-tahi was taken.

Not even as much as this did the pagans fight in the citadel; when a number of our men swarmed up, they fled in haste. In a little while they came out again, quite naked, and renewed the fight; they put many of our men to flight; they made them fly (ānchārdilār) over the ramparts; some they cut down and killed.

Why they had gone so suddenly off the walls seems to have been that they had taken the resolve of those who give up a place as lost; they put all their ladies and beauties (sūratīlār) to death, then, looking themselves to die, came naked out to fight. Our men attacking, each one from his post, drove them from the walls whereupon 2 or 300 of them entered Medīnī Rāo’s house and there almost all killed one another in this way:—one having taken stand with a sword, the rest

1 The Illustrated London News of July 10th, 1915 (on which day this note is written), has an apropos picture of an ancient fortress-gun, with its stone-ammunition, taken by the Allies in a Dardanelles fort.
2 The dū-tahi is the āb-duṣad, water-thief, of f. 67. Its position can be surmised from Cunningham’s Plan [Appendix R].
3 For Bābur’s use of hand (gūl) as a military term see f. 209.
4 His full designation would be Shāh Muhammad yūs-begī.
5 This will be flight from the ramparts to other places in the fort.
eagerly stretched out the neck for his blow.\(^1\) Thus went the greater number to hell.

By God's grace this renowned fort was captured in 2 or 3 garis\(^2\) (cir. an hour), without drum and standard,\(^3\) with no hard fighting done. A pillar of pagan-heads was ordered set up on a hill north-west of Chandirī. A chronogram of this victory having been found in the words Fath-i-dāri'l-ḥarb\(^4\) (Conquest of a hostile seat), I thus composed them:

Was for awhile the station Chandirī
Pagan-full, the seat of hostile force;
By fighting, I vanquished its fort,
The date was Fath-i-dāri'l-ḥarb.

(1. Further description of Chandirī.)

Chandirī is situated (in) rather good country,\(^5\) having much running-water round about it. Its citadel is on a hill and inside it

---

\(^1\) Bābur's account of the siege of Chandirī is incomplete, inasmuch as it says nothing of the general massacre of pagans he has mentioned on f.272. Khwāfī Khān records the massacre, saying, that after the fort was surrendered, as was done on condition of safety for the garrison, from 3 to 4000 pagans were put to death by Bābur's troops on account of hostility shewn during the evacuation of the fort. The time assigned to the massacre is previous to the jūhar of 1000 women and children and the self-slaughter of men in Medini Rāo's house, in which he himself died. It is not easy to fit the two accounts in; this might be done, however, by supposing that a folio of Bābur's MS. was lost, as others seem lost at the end of the narrative of this year's events (q.v.). The lost folio would tell of the surrender, one clearly affecting the mass of Rājput followers and not the chiefs who stood for victory or death and who may have made sacrifice to honour after hearing of the surrender. Bābur's narrative in this part certainly reads less consecutive than is usual with him; something preceding his account of the jūhar would improve it, and would serve another purpose also, since mention of the surrender would fix a term ending the now too short time of under one hour he assigns as the duration of the fighting. If a surrender had been mentioned, it would be clear that his "2 or 3 garis" included the attacking and taking of the dā-tahī and down to the retreat of the Rājpūts from the walls. On this Bābur's narrative of the unavailing sacrifice of the chiefs would follow in due order. Khwāfī Khān is more circumstantial than Firishta who says nothing of surrender or massacre, but states that 6000 men were killed fighting. Khwāfī Khān's authorities may throw light on the matter, which so far does not hang well together in any narrative, Bābur's, Firishta's, or Khwāfī Khān's. One would like to know what led such a large body of Rājpūts to surrender so quickly; had they been all through in favour of accepting terms? One wonders, again, why from 3 to 4000 Rājpūts did not put up a better resistance to massacre. Perhaps their assailants were Turks, stubborn fighters down to 1915 AD.

\(^2\) For suggestion about the brevity of this period, see last note.

\(^3\) Clearly, without Bābur's taking part in the fighting.

\(^4\) These words by ahjad make 934. The Hai. MS. mistakenly writes Būd Chandiri in the first line of the quatrain instead of Būd chanār. Khwāfī Khān quotes the quatrain with slight variants.

\(^5\) Chandirī ṭawūrī wilīyat (da?) wāqî bālūb tūr, which seems to need dā, in, because the fort, and not the country, is described. Or there may be an omission e.g. of a second sentence about the walled-town (fort).
has a tank cut out of the solid rock. There is another large tank 1 at the end of the dū-tahi by assaulting which the fort was taken. All houses in Chandirī, whether of high or low, are built of stone, those of chiefs being laboriously carved; 2 those of the lower classes are also of stone but are not carved. They are covered in with stone-slabs instead of with earthen tiles. In front of the fort are three large tanks made by former governors who threw dams across and made tanks round about it; their ground lies high. 3 It has a small river (daryācha), Betwa 4 by name, which may be some 3 kurohs (6 m.) from Chandirī itself; its water is noted in Hindūstān as excellent and pleasant drinking. It is a perfect little river (daryā-ghīna). In its bed lie piece after piece of sloping rock (qūlār) 5 fit for making houses. 6 Chandirī is 90 kurohs (180 m.) by road to the south of Āgra. In Chandirī the altitude of the Pole-star (?) is 25 degrees. 7

(m. Enforced change of campaign.)

(Jan. 30th—Jumāda I. 8th) At dawn on Thursday we went round the fort and dismounted beside Mallū Khān’s tank. 8

1 This is the “Kirat-sagar” of Cunningham’s Plan of Chandirī; it is mentioned under this name by Luard (l.c. i, 210). 2 “Kirat” represents Kirtī or Kirit Singh who ruled in Gūlīār from 1455 to 1479 AD., there also making a tank (Luard, l.c. i, 232).
3 For illustrative photographs see Luard, l.c. vol. i, part iv.
4 I have taken this sentence to apply to the location of the tanks, but with some doubt; they are on the table-land.
5 Bābūr appears to have written Betwī, this form being in MSS. I have read the name to be that of the river Betwa which is at a considerable distance from the fort. But some writers dispraise its waters where Bābūr praises.
6 T. qūlā means a slope or slant; here it may describe tilted strata, such as would provide slabs for roofing and split easily for building purposes. (See next note.)
7 Chandirī-dā judai (jady)-ning itrigā’t yīgīrma-bīsh darja dār; Erskine, p. 378, Chanderi is situated in the 25th degree of N. latitude; de Courteille, ii, 334, La hauteur du Capricorne à Tchanderī est de 25 degrées. The latitude of Chandirī, it may be noted, is 24° 43'. It does not appear to me indisputable that what Bābūr says here is a statement of latitude. The word judai (or jady) means both Pole-star and the Sign Capricorn. M. de Courteille translates the quoted sentence as I have done, but with Capricorn for Pole-star. My acquaintance with such expressions in French does not allow me to know whether his words are a statement of latitude. It occurs to me against this being so, that Bābūr uses other words when he gives the latitude of Samarkand (l.f. 446); and also that he has shewn attention to the Pole-star as a guide on a journey (f. 203, where he uses the more common word Qutb). Perhaps he notes its lower altitude when he is far south, in the way he noted the first rise of Canopus to his view (f. 125).
8 Mallū Khān was a noble of Mālwā, who became ruler of Mālwā in 1532 or 1533 AD. [?] under the style of Qādir Shāh.
We had come to Chandrī meaning, after taking it, to move against Rāising, Bhilsān, and Sarangpūr, pagan lands dependent on the pagan Šalāḥu’ddin, and, these taken, to move on Rānā Sangā in Chītūr. But as that bad news had come, the begs were summoned, matters were discussed, and decision made that the proper course was first to see to the rebellion of those malignants. Chandrī was given to the Aḥmad Shāh already mentioned, a grandson of Sl. Nāṣiru’ddin; 50 laks from it were made khalṣa; Mullā Apāq was entrusted with its military-collectorate, and left to reinforce Aḥmad Shāh with from 2 to 3000 Turks and Hindūstānis.

(Feb. 2nd) This work finished, we marched from Mallū Khān’s tank on Sunday the 11th of the first Jumāda, with the intention of return (north), and dismounted on the bank of the Burhānpūr-water.

(Feb. 9th) On Sunday again, Yakka Khwāja and Ja’far Khwāja were sent from Bāndir to fetch boats from Kālpī to the Kanār-passage.

(Feb. 22nd) On Saturday the 24th of the month we dismounted at the Kanār-passage, and ordered the army to begin to cross.

(n. News of the rebels.)

News came in these days that the expeditionary force² had abandoned Qanūj also and come to Rāpī, and that a strong body of the enemy had assaulted and taken Shamsābād although Abū’l-muḥammad the lancer must have strengthened it.³ There was delay of 3 or 4 days on one side or other of the river before the army got across. Once over, we moved march by march towards Qanūj, sending scouting braves (qāsāq yīgītlār) ahead to get news of our opponents. Two or three marches from Qanūj, news was brought that Ma’rūf’s son had fled on seeing the dark mass of the news-gatherers, and got away. Biban, Bāyazīd and Ma’rūf, on hearing news of us, crossed Gang (Ganges) and seated themselves on its eastern bank opposite Qanūj, thinking to prevent our passage.

¹ i.e. paid direct to the royal treasury.
² This is the one concerning which bad news reached Bābur just before Chandrī was taken.
³ This presumably is the place offered to Medini Rāo (f. 333ᵇ), and Bikramājit (f. 343).
(o. A bridge made over the Ganges.)

(Feb. 27th) On Thursday the 6th of the latter Jumāda we passed Qānūj and disembarked on the western bank of Gang. Some of the braves went up and down the river and took boats by force, bringing in 30 or 40, large or small. Mīr Muḥammad the raftsmen was sent to find a place convenient for making a bridge and to collect requisites for making it. He came back approving of a place about a kuroh (2 m.) below the camp. Energetic overseers were told off for the work. Ustād ʿAlī-qulī placed the mortar for his stone-discharge near where the bridge was to be and shewed himself active in discharging it. Muṣṭafā Rāmī had the culverin-carts crossed over to an island below the place for the bridge, and from that island began a culverin-discharge. Excellent matchlock fire was made from a post raised above the bridge. Malik Qāsim Mughūl and a very few men went across the river once or twice and fought excellently (yakhshīlār aūrūshtīlār). With equal boldness Bābā Sl. and Darwish Sl. also crossed, but went with the insufficient number of from 10 to 15 men; they went after the Evening Prayer and came back without fighting, with nothing done; they were much blamed for this crossing of theirs. At last Malik Qāsim, grown bold, attacked the enemy’s camp and, by shooting arrows into it, drew him out (?); he came with a mass of men and an elephant, fell on Malik Qāsim and hurried him off. Malik Qāsim got into a boat, but before it could put off, the elephant came up and swamped it. In that encounter Malik Qāsim died.

In the days before the bridge was finished Ustād ʿAlī-qulī did good things in stone-discharge (yakhshīlār tāsh aūṭī), on the first day discharging 8 stones, on the second 16, and going on equally well for 3 or 4 days. These stones he discharged from the Ghāzī-mortar which is so-called because it was used in the battle with Rānā Sangā the pagan. There had been another and larger mortar which burst after discharging one stone. The matchlockmen made a mass (qālin) of discharges, bringing down many

1 Obviously for the bridge.
2 m.ļīr (see f. 333 n.). Here the word would mean befittingly a protected standing-place, a refuge, such as matchlockmen used (f. 217 and Index s.n. arāba).
3 sighūrūdī, a vowel-variant, perhaps, of sughūrūdī.
4 f. 331b. This passage shews that Bābur’s mortars were few.
men and horses; they shot also slave-workmen running scared away (?) and men and horses passing-by.¹

(March 11th) On Wednesday the 19th of the latter Jumāda the bridge being almost finished, we marched to its head. The Afghāns must have ridiculed the bridge-making as being far from completion.²

(March 12th) The bridge being ready on Thursday, a small body of foot-soldiers and Lāhoris went over. Fighting as small followed.

(p. Encounter with the Afghāns.)

(March 13th) On Friday the royal corps, and the right and left hands of the centre crossed on foot. The whole body of Afghāns, armed, mounted, and having elephants with them, attacked us. They hurried off our men of the left hand, but our centre itself (i.e. the royal corps) and the right hand stood firm, fought, and forced the enemy to retire. Two men from these divisions had galloped ahead of the rest; one was dismounted and taken; the horse of the other was struck again and again, had had enough,³ turned round and when amongst our men, fell down. On that day 7 or 8 heads were brought in; many of the enemy had arrow or matchlock wounds. Fighting went on till the Other Prayer. That night all who had gone across were made to return; if (more) had gone over on that Saturday’s eve,⁴ most of the enemy would probably have fallen into our hands, but this was in my mind:—Last year we marched out of Sikri to fight Rānā Sangā on Tuesday, New-year’s-day, and crushed that rebel on Saturday; this year we had marched to crush these rebels on Wednesday, New-year’s-day,⁵ and it would be one of singular things, if we beat them on Sunday. So thinking, we did not make the rest of

¹ nufūr gil-ˌlār-ˌdīn ham karka bīla rah rawā kīshī u ˈat ˈaṭṭīlār, a difficult sentence.
² Afghānlīr kāpˈrūk bāqhāmāˈmā nis istibˈād gīlāb tamāskhur gilāˈlār ˈaʃkāndār.
³ təˈlāb; Pers. trs. uʃtān u khesān, limping, or falling and rising, a translation raising doubt, because such a mode of progression could hardly have allowed escape from pursuers.
⁴ Anglicē, on Friday night.
⁵ According to the Persian calendar, New-year’s-day is that on which the Sun enters Aries.
the army cross. The enemy did not come to fight on Saturday, but stood arrayed a long way off.

(Sunday March 15th—Jumāda II. 23rd) On this day the carts were taken over, and at this same dawn the army was ordered to cross. At beat of drum news came from our scouts that the enemy had fled. Chīn-tīmūr Sl. was ordered to lead his army in pursuit and the following leaders also were made pursuers who should move with the Sulṭān and not go beyond his word:—Muḥammad ‘Alī Jang-jang, Ḥusamū’d-dīn ‘Alī (son) of Khalīfa, Muḥibb-i-‘āli (son) of Khalīfa, Kūkī (son) of Bābā Qashqa, Dost-i-μuḥammad (son) of Bābā Qashqa, Bāqī of Tāshkint, and Red Wali. I crossed at the Sunnat Prayer. The camels were ordered to be taken over at a passage seen lower down. That Sunday we dismounted on the bank of standing-water within a kūroh of Bangarmāwū. Those appointed to pursue the Afghāns were not doing it well; they had dismounted in Bangarmāwū and were scurrying off at the Mid-day Prayer of this same Sunday.

(March 16th—Jumāda II. 24th) At dawn we dismounted on the bank of a lake belonging to Bangarmāwū.

(q. Arrival of a Chaghatāī cousin.)

On this same day (March 16th) Tūkhtā-būghā Sl. a son of my mother's brother (dādā) the Younger Khān (Aḥmad Chaghatāī) came and waited on me.

(March 21st) On Saturday the 29th of the latter Jumāda I visited Laknau, crossed the Gūī-water and dismounted. This day I bathed in the Gūī-water. Whether it was from water getting into my ear, or whether it was from the effect of the climate, is not known, but my right ear was obstructed and for a few days there was much pain.

(r. The campaign continued.)

One or two marches from Aūd (Oudh) some-one came from Chīn-tīmūr Sl. to say, “The enemy is seated on the far side of

1 so-spelled in the Ḥāi. MS.; by de Courteille Banguermādū; the two forms may represent the same one of the Arabic script.

2 or Gūī, from the context clearly the Gumti. Jarrett gives Godī as a name of the Gumti; Gūī and Godī may be the same word in the Arabic script.

3 Some MSS. read that there was not much pain.
the river Sird[a ?]; 'let His Majesty send help." We detached a reinforcement of 1000 braves under Qarācha.

(March 28th) On Saturday the 7th of Rajab we dismounted 2 or 3 kurohs from Aūd above the junction of the Gagar (Gogra) and Sird[a]. Till today Shaikh Bāyazid will have been on the other side of the Sird[a] opposite Aūd, sending letters to the Sultān and discussing with him, but the Sultān getting to know his deceitfulness, sent word to Qarācha at the Mid-day Prayer and made ready to cross the river. On Qarācha's joining him, they crossed at once to where were some 50 horsemen with 3 or 4 elephants. These men could make no stand; they fled; a few having been dismounted, the heads cut off were sent in.

Following the Sultān there crossed over Bī-khūb (var. Nī-khūb) Sl. and Tardi Beg (the brother) of Qūj Beg, and Bābā Chuhra (the Brave), and Bāqī shaghāwal. Those who had crossed first and gone on, pursued Shaikh Bāyazid till the Evening Prayer, but he flung himself into the jungle and escaped. Chīn-timūr dismounted late on the bank of standing-water, rode on at midnight after the rebel, went as much as 40 kurohs (80 m.), and came to where Shaikh Bāyazīd's family and relations (nisba?) had been; they however must have fled. He sent galloppers off in all directions from that place; Bāqī shaghāwal and a few braves drove the enemy like sheep before them, overtook the family and brought in some Afghan prisoners.

We stayed a few days on that ground (near Aūd) in order to settle the affairs of Aūd. People praised the land lying along the Sird[a] 7 or 8 kurohs (14–16 m.) above Aūd, saying it was hunting-ground. Mīr Muḥammad the raftsmen was sent out and returned after looking at the crossings over the Gagar-water (Gogra) and the Sird[a]-water (Chauka?).

(April 2nd) On Thursday the 12th of the month I rode out intending to hunt.2

1 I take this to be the Kali-Sarda-Chauka affluent of the Gogra and not its Sarju or Saru one. To so take it seems warranted by the context; there could be no need for the fords on the Sarju to be examined, and its position is not suitable.

2 Unfortunately no record of the hunting-expedition survives.
TRANSLATOR'S NOTE.

Here, in all known texts of the Bābur-nāma there is a break of the narrative between April 2nd and Sep. 18th 1528 AD.—Jumāda II, 12th 934 AH. and Muḥarram 3rd 935 AH., which, whether intentional or accidental, is unexplained by Bābur's personal circumstances. It is likely to be due to a loss of pages from Bābur's autograph manuscript, happening at some time preceding the making of either of the Persian translations of his writings and of the Elphinstone and Ḥaidarābād transcripts. Though such a loss might have occurred easily during the storm chronicled on f.376b, it seems likely that Bābur would then have become aware of it and have made it good. A more probable explanation of the loss is the danger run by Humāyūn's library during his exile from rule in Hindūstān, at which same time may well have occurred the seeming loss of the record of 936 and 937 AH.

a. Transactions of the period of the lacuna.

Mr. Erskine notes (Mem. p.381 n.) that he found the gap in all MSS. he saw and that historians of Hindūstān throw no light upon the transactions of the period. Much can be gleaned however as to Bābur's occupations during the 5½ months of the lacuna from his chronicle of 935 AH. which makes several references to occurrences of "last year " and also allows several inferences to be drawn. From this source it becomes known that the Afghān campaign the record of which is broken by the gap, was carried on and that in its course Bābur was at Jūn-pūr (f.365), Chausa (f.365b) and Baksara (f.366–366b); that he swam the Ganges (f.366b), bestowed Sarūn on a Farmūlī Shaikh-zāda (f.374b and f.377), negociated with Rānā Sangā's son Bikramājīt (f.342b), ordered a Chār-bāgh laid out (f.340), and was ill for 40 days (f.346b). It may be inferred too that he visited Dūlpūr (f.353b), recalled 'Askari (f.339), sent Khwāja Dost-i-khāwand on family affairs to Kābul (f.345b), and was much pre-occupied by the
disturbed state of Kābul (see his letters to Humāyūn and Khwāja Kālan written in 935 AH.).

It is not easy to follow the dates of events in 935 AH. because in many instances only the day of the week or a "next day" is entered. I am far from sure that one passage at least now found s.a. 935 AH. does not belong to 934 AH. It is not in the Ḥai. Codex (where its place would have been on f. 363b), and, so far as I can see, does not fit with the dates of 935 AH. It will be considered with least trouble with its context and my notes (q.v. f. 363b and ff. 366–366b).

b. Remarks on the lacuna.

One interesting biographical topic is likely to have found mention in the missing record, viz. the family difficulties which led to 'Askari's supersession by Kāmrān in the government of Multān (f. 359).

Another is the light an account of the second illness of 934 AH. might have thrown on a considerable part of the Collection of verses already written in Hindūstān and now known to us as the Rāmpūr Dīwān. The Bābur-nāma allows the dates of much of its contents to be known, but there remain poems which seem prompted by the self-examination of some illness not found in the B.N. It contains the metrical version of Khwāja 'Ubaidu'll-lāh's Wālidiyyah of which Bābur writes on f. 346 and it is dated Monday Rabi' II. 15th 935 AH. (Dec. 29th 1528 AD.). I surmise that the reflective verses following the Wālidiyyah belong to the 40 days' illness of 934 AH. i.e. were composed in the period of the lacuna. The Collection, as it is in the "Rāmpūr Dīwān", went to a friend who was probably Khwāja Kalān; it may have been the only such collection made by Bābur. No other copy of it has so far been found. It has the character of an individual gift with verses specially addressed to its recipient. Any light upon it which may have vanished with pages of 934 AH. is an appreciable loss.

One historian, Ahmad-i-yādgār states in his Tārikh-i-salātīn-i-asfāghina that Bābur went to Lāhor immediately after his capture of Chandīrī, and on his return journey to Āgra suppressed in the Panj-āb a rising of the Mundāhār (or, Mandhar) Rājpūts. His date is discredited by Bābur's existing narrative of 934 AH. as also by the absence in 935 AH. of allusion to either episode. My husband who has considered the matter, advises me that the Lāhor visit may have been made in 936 or early in 937 AH. [These are a period of which the record is lost or, less probably, was not written.]
935 A.H.—SEP. 15TH 1528 TO SEP. 5TH 1529 A.D.

(a. Arrivals at Court.)

(Sep. 18th) On Friday the 3rd of Muharram, 'Askari whom I had summoned for the good of Multān before I moved out for Chandīrī, waited on me in the private-house.

(Sep. 19th) Next day waited on me the historian Khwānd-amir, Maulānā Shihāb the enigmatist, and Mir Ibrāhīm the harper a relation of Yūnas-i-‘ālī, who had all come out of Herī long before, wishing to wait on me.

(b. Bābur starts for Gūāliār.)

(Sep. 20th) With the intention of visiting Gūāliār which in books they write Gālūr, I crossed the Jūn at the Other

1 Elph. MS. f. 262; I. O. 215 f. 207b and 217 f. 234b : Memms. p. 382. Here the Elphinstone MS. recommends after a lacuna extending from Hai. MS. f. 312b.

2 See Appendix S:—Concerning the dating of 935 A.H.

3 ‘Askari was now about 12 years old. He was succeeded in Multān by his elder brother Kāmrān, transferred from Qandahār [Index; JRAS. 1908 p. 829 para. (1)]. This transfer, it is safe to say, was due to Bābur’s resolve to keep Kābul in his own hands, a resolve which his letters to Humāyūn (f. 348), to Kāmrān (f. 359), and to Khwāja Kalān (f. 359) attest, as well as do the movements of his family at this time. What would make the stronger government of Kāmrān seem now more “for the good of Multān” than that of the child ‘Askari are the Bilūchi incursions, mentioned somewhat later (f. 355b) as having then occurred more than once.

4 This will be his own house in the Garden-of-eight-paradises, the Chār-bāgh begun in 932 AH. (August 1526 AD.).

5 To this name Khwānd-amir adds Aḥmadu’l-haqīrī, perhaps a pen-name; he also quotes verses of Shihāb’s (Habīb’s-siyar lith. ed. iii, 350).

6 Khwānd-amir’s account of his going into Hindūstān is that he left his “dear home” (Herāt) for Qandahār in mid-Shawwāl 933 AH. (mid-July 1527 AD.); that on Jumāda I. 10th 934 AH. (Feb. 1st 1528 AD.) he set out from Qandahār on the hazardous journey into Hindūstān; and that owing to the distance, heat, setting-in of the Rains, and breadth of rapid rivers, he was seven months on the way. He mentions no fellow-travellers, but he gives as the day of his arrival in Agra the one on which Bābur says he presented himself at Court. (For an account of annoyances and misfortunes to which he was subjected under Aūzībeg rule in Herāt see Journal des Savans, July 1843, pp. 389, 393, Quatremère’s art.)

7 Concerning Gūāliār see Cunningham’s Archeological Survey Reports vol. ii; Louis Rousselet’s L’Inde des Rajas; Lepel Griffin’s Famous Monuments of Central India, especially for its photographs; Gazetteer of India; Luard’s Gazetteer of Gwalior, text and photographs; Travels of Peter Mundy, Hakluyt Society ed. R. C. Temple, ii, 61, especially for its picture of the fort and note (p. 62) enumerating early writers on Gūāliār. Of Persian books there is Jalāl Ḵīšārī’s Tārīḵ-i-Gwāliāwār (B. M. Add. 16,859) and Hirāman’s (B. M. Add. 16,709) unacknowledged version of it, which is of the B. M. MSS. the more legible.

8 Perhaps this stands for Gwāliāwār, the form seeming to be used by Jalāl Ḵīšārī, and having good traditional support (Cunningham p. 373 and Luard p. 228).
Prayer of Sunday the 5th of the month, went into the fort of Ágra to bid farewell to Fakhr-i-jahān Begīm and Khadija-sultān Begīm who were to start for Kābul in a few days, and got to horse. Muḥammad-i-zamān Mīrzā asked for leave and stayed behind in Ágra. That night we did 3 or 4 kurohs (6–8 m.) of the road, dismounted near a large lake (kūl) and there slept.

(Sep. 21st) We got through the Prayer somewhat before time (Muḥ. 6th) and rode on, nooned on the bank of the Gamb[h]ir-water, and went on shortly after the Mid-day Prayer. On the way we ate powders mixed with the flour of parched grain, Mullā Rafī having prepared them for raising the spirits. They were found very distasteful and unsavoury. Near the Other Prayer we dismounted a kuroh (2 m.) west of Dūlpūr, at a place where a garden and house had been ordered made.

(c. Work in Dūlpūr (Dhūlpūr).)

That place is at the end of a beaked hill, its beak being of solid red building-stone (‘imārat-tāsh). I had ordered the (beak of the) hill cut down (dressed down?) to the ground-level and that if there remained a sufficient height, a house was to be cut out in it, if not, it was to be levelled and a tank (haus) cut out in its top. As it was not found high enough for a house, Ústād Shāh Muḥammad the stone-cutter was ordered to level it and cut out an octagonal, roofed tank. North of this tank the ground is thick with trees, mangoes, jāman (Eugenia jambolana), all sorts of trees; amongst them I had ordered a well made, 10 by 10; it was almost ready; its water goes to the afore-named tank. To the north of this tank Sl. Sikandar’s dam is flung across (the valley); on it houses have been built, and above it the waters of the Rains gather into a great lake. On the east of this lake is a garden; I ordered a seat and four-pillared platform (tālār)

1 tāshlānīb, i.e. they took rest and food together at mid-day.
2 This seems to be the conjoined Gambhīr and Bāngānga which is crossed by the Ágra-Dhūlpūr road (G. of I. Atlas, Sheet 34).
3 atīchtāq, the plural of which shews that more than one partook of the powders (safūf).
4 T. tālgān, Hindi sattu (Shaw). M. de Courteille’s variant translation may be due to his reading for tālgān, tālghāq, flot, agitation (his Dict. s.n.) and yīl, wind, for bilā, with.
5 in 933 AH. f. 330b.
6 "Each beaked promontory" (Lycidas). Our name "Selsey-bill" is an English instance of Bābur’s (not infrequent) tumshīq, beak, bill of a bird.
to be cut out in the solid rock on that same side, and a mosque built on the western one.

(Sept. 22nd and 23rd—Muh. 7th and 8th) On account of these various works, we stayed in Dulpur on Tuesday and Wednesday.  

(d. Journey to Guáliáır resumed.)

(Sep. 24th) On Thursday we rode on, crossed the Chambal-river and made the Mid-day Prayer on its bank, between the two Prayers (the Mid-day and the Afternoon) bestirred ourselves to leave that place, passed the Kawári and dismounted. The Kawári-water being high through rain, we crossed it by boat, making the horses swim over.

(Sep. 25th) Next day, Friday which was 'Áshúr (Muh. 10th), we rode on, took our nooning at a village on the road, and at the Bed-time Prayer dismounted a kuroh north of Guáliáır, in a Chár-bágh ordered made last year.³

(Sep. 26th) Riding on next day after the Mid-day Prayer, we visited the low hills to the north of Guáliáır, and the Praying-place, went into the fort ² through the Gate called Hááti-púl which joins Mán-sing's buildings ('imárát²), and dismounted, close to the Other Prayer, at those ('imárátlár)⁴ of Rája Bikramájít in which Rahim-dád ⁵ had settled himself.

1 No order about this Chár-bágh is in existing annals of 934 AH. Such order is likely to have been given after Babur's return from his operations against the Afghans, in his account of which the annals of 934 AH. break off.

2 The fort-hill at the northern end is 300 ft. high, at the southern end, 274 ft.; its length from north to south is 1½ m.; its breadth varies from 600 ft. opposite the main entrance (Hááti-púl) to 2,800 ft. in the middle opposite the great temple (Sáá-bhao). Cf. Cunningham p. 330 and Appendix R, in loco, for his Plan of Guáliáár.

3 This Arabic plural may have been prompted by the greatness and distinction of Mán-sing's constructions. Cf. Index s.n. begát and bághát.

4 A translation point concerning the (Arabic) word 'imárát is that the words "palace", "palais", and "residence" used for it respectively by Erskine, de Courteille, and, previous to the Hindústán Section, by myself, are too limited in meaning to serve for Babur's uses of it in Hindústán; and this (1) because he uses it throughout his writings for buildings under palatial rank (e.g. those of high and low in Chandír); (2) because he uses it in Hindústán for non-residential buildings (e.g. for the Bádalgarh outwork, f. 341b, and a Hindú temple ib.) ; and (3) because he uses it for the word "building" in the term building-stone, f. 335b and f. 339b. Building is the comprehensive word under which all his uses of it group. For labouring this point a truism pleads my excuse, namely, that a man's vocabulary being characteristic of himself, for a translator to increase or diminish it is to intrude on his personality, and this the more when an autobiography is concerned. Hence my search here (as elsewhere) for an English grouping word is part of an endeavour to restrict the vocabulary of my translation to the limits of my author's.

5 Jalál Hisárá describes "Khwája Rahim-dád" as a paternal-nephew of Mahdí Khwája. Neither man has been introduced by Babur, as it is his rule to introduce
To-night I elected to take opium because of ear-ache; another reason was the shining of the moon.¹

(e. Visit to the Rājas' palaces.)

(Sep. 27th) Opium sickness gave me much discomfort next day (Muh. 12th); I vomited a good deal. Sickness notwithstanding, I visited the buildings ('imāratlār) of Mān-sing and Bikramājit thoroughly. They are wonderful buildings, entirely of hewn stone, in heavy and unsymmetrical blocks however.² Of all the Rājas' buildings Mān-sing's is the best and loftiest.³ It is more elaborately worked on its eastern face than on the others. This face may be 40 to 50 qārī (yards) high,⁴ and is entirely of hewn stone, whitened with plaster.⁵ In parts it is four storeys high; the lower two are very dark; we went through them with

when he first mentions a person of importance, by particulars of family, etc. Both men became disloyal in 935 AH. (1529 AD.) as will be found referred to by Bābur. Jalāl Ḥisārī supplements Bābur's brief account of their misconduct and Shaikh Muhammad Ghaus' mediation in 936 AH. For knowledge of his contribution I am indebted to my husband's perusal of the Tarikh-i-Gwālibistar.

¹ Erskine notes that Indians and Persians regard moonshine as cold but this only faintly expresses the wide-spread fear of moon-stroke expressed in the Psalm (121 v. 6), "The Sun shall not smite thee by day, nor the Moon by night."

² Agarcha lūk balūk u bī sīyāg. Ilminsky [p. 441] has balūk balūk but without textual warrant and perhaps following Erskine, as he says, speaking generally, that he has done in case of need (Ilminsky's Preface). Both Erskine and de Courteille, working, it must be remembered, without the help of detailed modern descriptions and pictures, took the above words to say that the buildings were scattered and without symmetry, but they are not scattered and certainly Mān-sing's has symmetry. I surmise that the words quoted above do not refer to the buildings themselves but to the stones of which they are made. T. lūk means heavy, and T. balūk [?block] means a thing divided off, here a block of stone. Such blocks might be bī sīyāg, i.e. irregular in size. To take the words in this way does not contradict known circumstances, and is verbally correct.

³ The Rājas' buildings Bābur could compare were Rāja Karnā (or Kirit)’s [who ruled from 1454 to 1479 AD.], Rāja Mān-sing’s [1486 to 1516 AD.], and Rāja Bikramājit’s [1516 to 1526 AD. when he was killed at Panipat].

⁴ The height of the eastern face is 100 ft. and of the western 60 ft. The total length from north to south of the outside wall is 300 ft.; the breadth of the residence from east to west 160 ft. The 300 ft. of length appears to be that of the residence and service-courtyard (Cunningham p. 347 and Plate lxxvii).

⁵ kaj bīla āqāritīb. There can be little doubt that a white pediment would show up the coloured tiles of the upper part of the palace-walls more than would pale red sandstone. These tiles were so profuse as to name the building Chit Mandir (Painted Mandir). Guided by Bābur's statement, Cunningham sought for and found plaster in crevices of carved work; from which one surmises that the white coating approved itself to successors of Mān-sing. [It may be noted that the word Mandir is in the same case for a translator as is 'imārat (f. 3396 n.) since it requires a grouping word to cover its uses for temple, palace, and less exalted buildings.]
candles. On one (or, every) side of this building are five cupolas having between each two of them a smaller one, square after the fashion of Hindustān. On the larger ones are fastened sheets of gilded copper. On the outside of the walls is painted-tile work, the semblance of plantain-trees being shewn all round with green tiles. In a bastion of the eastern front is the Hāṭī-pūl, hāṭī being what these people call an elephant, pūl, a gate. A sculptured image of an elephant with two drivers (fil-bān) stands at the out-going (chīqīsh) of this Gate; it is exactly like an elephant; from it the gate is called Hāṭī-pūl. A window in the lowest storey where the building has four, looks towards this elephant and gives a near view of it. The cupolas which have been mentioned above are themselves the topmost stage (murtaba) of the building; the sitting-rooms are on the second storey (jabaqat), in a hollow even; they are rather airless places although Hindustānī pains have been taken with them. The buildings of Mān-sing's son Bikramājit are in a central position (aūrta dā) on the north side of the fort. The son's buildings do not match the father's. He has made a great dome, very dark but growing lighter if one stays awhile in it. Under it is a smaller building

1 The lower two storeys are not only backed by solid ground but, except near the Hāṭī-pūl, have the rise of ground in front of them which led Bābur to say they were "even in a pit" (chīqūr).

2 MSS. vary between ḥar and bīr, every and one, in this sentence. It may be right to read bīr, and apply it only to the eastern façade as that on which there were most cupolas. There are fewer on the south side, which still stands (Luard's photo. No. 37).

3 The ground rises steeply from this Gate to an inner one, called Hawā-pūl from the rush of air (hawā) through it.

4 Cunningham says the riders were the Rāja and a driver Perhaps they were a mahout and his mate. The statue stood to the left on exit (chīqīsh).

5 This window will have been close to the Gate where no mound interferes with outlook.

6 Rooms opening on inner and open courts appear to form the third story of the residence.

7 T. chūqūr, hollow, pit. This storey is dark and unventilated, a condition due to small windows, absence of through draught, and the adjacent mound. Cunningham comments on its disadvantages.

8 Agarcha Hindūstānī takalluflār qīlīb tūrlār wali bi hawālīk-rāq yēlār dār. Perhaps amongst the pains taken were those demanded for punkhās. I regret that Erskine's translation of this passage, so superior to my own in literary merit, does not suit the Turki original. He worked from the Persian translation, and not only so, but with a less rigid rule of translation than binds me when working on Bābur's ipsissima verba (Mems. p. 384; Cunningham p. 349; Luard p. 226).

9 The words aūrta dā make apt contrast between the outside position of Mān-sing's buildings which helped to form the fort-wall, and Bikramājit's which were further in except perhaps one wall of his courtyard (see Cunningham's Plate lxxiii).

10 Cunningham (p. 350) says this was originally a bārā-dārī, a twelve-doored open hall, and must have been light. His "originally" points to the view that the hall
into which no light comes from any side. When Rahim-dad settled down in Bikramajit’s buildings, he made a rather small hall [kīchīkrāq tālārghīna] on the top of this dome. From Bikramajit’s buildings a road has been made to his father’s, a road such that nothing is seen of it from outside and nothing known of it inside, a quite enclosed road.

After visiting these buildings, we rode to a college Rahim-dad had made by the side of a large tank, there enjoyed a flower-garden he had laid out, and went late to where the camp was in the Chārbāgh.

(f. Rahim-dad’s flower-garden.)

Rahim-dad has planted a great numbers of flowers in his garden (bāghchā), many being beautiful red oleanders. In these places the oleander-flower is peach, those of Güāliār are beautiful, deep red. I took some of them to Agra and had them planted in gardens there. On the south of the garden is a large lake where the waters of the Rains gather; on the west of it is a lofty idol-house, side by side with which Sl. Shihābu’d-dīn Ailtmish (Altamsh) made a Friday mosque; this is a very lofty building (‘imārat), the highest in the fort; it is seen, with the fort, from the Dūlpūr-hill (cir. 30 m. away). People say the stone for it was cut out and brought from the large lake above-mentioned. Rahim-dad has made a wooden (yīghāch) tālār in his garden, and had been altered before Babur saw it but as it was only about 10 years old at that time, it was in its first form, presumably. Perhaps Babur saw it in a bad light. The dimensions Cunningham gives of it suggest that the high dome must have been frequently ill-lighted.

1 The word tālār, having various applications, is not easy to match with a single English word, nor can one be sure in all cases what it means, a platform, a hall, or etc. To find an equivalent for its diminutive tālār-ghīna is still more difficult. Rahim-dad’s tālār-ette will have stood on the flat centre of the dome, raised on four pillars or perhaps with its roof only so-raised; one is sure there would be a roof as protection against sun or moon. It may be noted that the dome is not visible outside from below, but is hidden by the continuation upwards of walls which form a mean-looking parallelogram of masonry.

2 T. tūr yāl. Concerning this hidden road see Cunningham p. 350 and Plate lxxvii.

3 bāghchā. The context shows that the garden was for flowers. For Babur’s distinctions between bāghchā, bāgh and baghāt, see Index s.mn.

4 shaft-dilā i.e. the rosy colour of peach-flowers, perhaps lip-red (Steingass). Babur’s contrast seems to be between those red oleanders of Hindūstān that are rosylred, and the deep red ones he found in Güāliār.

5 kul, any large sheet of water, natural or artificial (Bābur). This one will be the Sūraj-kund (Sun-tank).

6 This is the Teli Mandir, or Telingana Mandir (Luard). Cf. Cunningham, p. 356 and Luard p. 227 for accounts of it; and G. of I. s.m. Teliagarhi for Teli Rājas.
porches at the gates, which, after the Hindūstānī fashion, are somewhat low and shapeless.

(\textit{g. The Urwāh-valley.})

\textit{\textit{(Sep. 28th)}} Next day (\textit{Muḥ. 13th}) at the Mid-day Prayer we rode out to visit places in Güāliār we had not yet seen. We saw the \textit{‘imārat} called Bādalgār\textsuperscript{1} which is part of Mān-sing’s fort (\textit{qīla’}), went through the Hāti-pūl and across the fort to a place called Urwā (Urwāh), which is a valley-bottom (\textit{gūl}) on its western side. Though Urwā is outside the fort-wall running along the top of the hill, it has two stages (\textit{murtaba}) of high wall at its mouth. The higher of these walls is some 30 or 40 \textit{gārī} (yards) high; this is the longer one; at each end it joins the wall of the fort. The second wall curves in and joins the middle part of the first; it is the lower and shorter of the two. This curve of wall will have been made for a water-thief;\textsuperscript{2} within it is a stepped well (\textit{wā’in}) in which water is reached by 10 or 15 steps. Above the Gate leading from the valley to this walled-wall the name of Sl. Shihābu’d-din Aīltmīsh (Altamsh) is inscribed, with the date 630 (AH—1233 AD.). Below this outer wall and outside the fort there is a large lake which seems to dwindle (at times) till no lake remains; from it water goes to the water-thief. There are two other lakes inside Urwā the water of which those who live in the fort prefer to all other.

Three sides of Urwā are solid rock, not the red rock of Biāna but one paler in colour. On these sides people have cut out idol-statues, large and small, one large statue on the south side being perhaps 20 \textit{gārī} (yds.) high.\textsuperscript{3} These idols are shewn quite

\textsuperscript{1} This is a large outwork reached from the Gate of the same name. Bābur may have gone there specially to see the Güjārī Mandīr said by Cunningham to have been built by Mān-sing’s Güjar wife Mrīga-nayāna (fawn-eyed). Cf. Cunningham p. 351 and, for other work done by the same Queen, in the s.e. corner of the fort, p. 344; Luard p. 226. In this place \textit{“construction”} would serve to translate \textit{‘imārat} (l. 130 n.).

\textsuperscript{2} \textit{āb-duad}, a word conveying the notion of a stealthy taking of the water. The walls at the mouth of Urwā were built by Altamsh for the protection of its water for the fort. The date Bābur mentions (a few lines further) is presumably that of their erection.

\textsuperscript{3} Cunningham, who gives 57 ft. as the height of this statue, says Bābur estimated it at 20 \textit{gaz}, or 40 ft., but this is not so. Bābur’s word is not \textit{gaz} a measure of 24 fingers-breadth, but \textit{gārī}, the length from the tip of the shoulder to the fingers-ends; it is about 33 inches, not less, I understand. Thus stated in \textit{gāris} Bābur’s estimate of the height comes very near Cunningham’s, being a good 55 ft. to 57 ft. (I may note that I have usually translated \textit{gārī} by \textit{“yard”}, as the yard is its nearest English equivalent. The Pers. trs. of the B.N. translates by \textit{gaz}, possibly a larger \textit{gaz} than that of 24 fingers-breadth \textit{i.e.} inches.)
naked without covering for the privities. Along the sides of
the two Urwā lakes 20 or 30 wells have been dug, with water
from which useful vegetables (saβzī kārīiklār), flowers and trees
are grown. Urwā is not a bad place; it is shut in (T. tūr); the
idols are its defect; I, for my part, ordered them destroyed.¹

Going out of Urwā into the fort again, we enjoyed the window ²
of the Sultānī-pūl which must have been closed through the pagan
time till now, went to Raḥim-dād’s flower-garden at the Evening
Prayer, there dismounted and there slept.

(b. A son of Rānā Sangā negotiates with Bābur.)

(Sep. 29th) On Tuesday the 14th of the month came people
from Rānā Sangā’s second son, Bikramājī by name, who with
his mother Padmāwati was in the fort of Rantanbūr. Before
I rode out for Guālīār,³ others had come from his great and
trusted Hindū, Asūk by name, to indicate Bikramājī’s sub-
mission and obeisance and ask a subsistence-allowance of 70 laks
for him; it had been settled at that time that parganas to the
amount he asked should be bestowed on him, his men were given
leave to go, with tryst for Guālīār which we were about to visit.
They came into Guālīār somewhat after the trysting-day. The
Hindū Asūk ⁴ is said to be a near relation of Bikramājī’s mother
Padmāwati; he, for his part, set these particulars forth father-
like and son-like; ⁵ they, for theirs, concurring with him, agreed
to wish me well and serve me. At the time when Sl. Maḥmūd
(Khiljī) was beaten by Rānā Sangā and fell into pagan captivity

¹ The statues were not broken up by Bābur’s agents; they were mutilated; their
heads were restored with coloured plaster by the Jains (Cunningham p. 395; Luard
p. 228).
² rozan [or, aūz:n] . . . tafarruj qilīb. Neither Cunningham nor Luard mentions
this window, perhaps because Erskine does not; nor is this name of a Gate found.
It might be that of the Dhonda-paur (Cunningham, p. 339). The 1st Pers. trs.
[I.O. 215 f. 210] omits the word rozan (or, aūz:n); the 2nd (I.O. 217 f. 236b) renders
it by jēfī, place. Manifestly the Gate was opened by Bābur, but, presumably, not
precisely at the time of his visit. I am inclined to understand that rozan . . .
tafarruj karda means enjoying the window formerly used by Muḥammadan rulers.
If aūz:n be the right reading, its sense is obscure.
³ This will have occurred in the latter half of 934 AH, of which no record is now
known.
⁴ He is mentioned under the name Asūk Mal Rājpūt, as a servant of Rānā Sangā
by the Mīrāt-i-sikandar, lith. ed. p. 161. In Bayley’s Translation p. 273 he is called
Awāsūk, manifestly by clerical error, the sentence being az jānīb-i-au Asūk Mal
Rājpūt dar ān (qilī) buḍa . . .
⁵ ātā-lik, aṅghūl-lik, i.e. he spoke to the son as a father, to the mother as a son.
(925 AH.—1519 AD.) he possessed a famous crown-cap (tāj-kula) and golden belt, accepting which Sangā let him go free. That crown-cap and golden belt must have become Bikramājīt’s; his elder brother Ratan-sī, now Rānā of Chitūr in his father’s place, had asked for them but Bikramājīt had not given them up,¹ and now made the men he sent to me, speak to me about them, and ask for Bīāna in place of Rantanbūr. We led them away from the Bīāna question and promised Shamsābād in exchange for Rantanbūr. To-day (Muh. 14th) they were given a nine days’ tryst for Bīāna, were dressed in robes of honour, and allowed to go.

(i. Hindū temples visited.)

We rode from the flower-garden to visit the idol-houses of Guāliār. Some are two, and some are three storeys high, each storey rather low, in the ancient fashion. On their stone plinths (izāra) are sculptured images. Some idol-houses, College-fashion, have a portico, large high cupolas ² and madrāsa-like cells, each topped by a slender stone cupola.³ In the lower cells are idols carved in the rock.

After enjoying the sight of these buildings (‘imāratlār) we left the fort by the south Gate,⁴ made an excursion to the south, and went (north) to the Chār-bāgh Rahim-dād had made over-against the Hāṭi-pūl.⁵ He had prepared a feast of cooked-meat (āsk) for us and, after setting excellent food before us, made offering of a mass of goods and coin worth 4 laks. From his Chār-bāgh I rode to my own.

(j. Excursion to a waterfall.)

(Sep. 30th.) On Wednesday the 15th of the month I went to see a waterfall 6 kurohs (12 m.) to the south-east of Guāliār. Less

¹ The Mirāt-i-sikandār (lith. ed. p. 234, Bayley’s trs. p. 372) confirms Bābur’s statement that the precious things were at Bikramājīt’s disposition. Perhaps they had been in his mother’s charge during her husband’s life. They were given later to Bahādur Shāh of Gujrat.

² The Tell Mandir has not a cupola but a waggon-roof of South Indian style, whence it may be that it has the southern name Telingana, suggested by Col. Luard.

³ See Luard’s Photo. No. 139 and P. Mundy’s sketch of the fort p. 62.

⁴ This will be the Ghargaraj-gate which looks south though it is not at the south end of the fort-hill where there is only a postern approached by a flight of stone steps (Cunningham p. 332).

⁵ The garden will have been on the lower ground at the foot of the ramp and not near the Hāṭi-pūl itself where the scar is precipitous.
than that must have been ridden;¹ close to the Mid-day Prayer we reached a fall where sufficient water for one mill was coming down a slope (gīā) an arghamchi² high. Below the fall there is a large lake; above it the water comes flowing through solid rock; there is solid rock also below the fall. A lake forms wherever the water falls. On the banks of the water lie piece after piece of rock as if for seats, but the water is said not always to be there. We sat down above the fall and ate ma'jūn, went up-stream to visit its source (badayat), returned, got out on higher ground, and stayed while musicians played and reciters repeated things (nīma aīṭīlār). The Ebony-tree which Hindīs call tīndū, was pointed out to those who had not seen it before. We went down the hill and, between the Evening and Bed-time Prayers, rode away, slept at a place reached near the second watch (midnight), and with the on-coming of the first watch of day (6 a.m. Muh. 16th–Oct. 1st) reached the Char-bāgh and dismounted.

(k. Ṣalāḥu'd-dīn's birth-place.)³

(Oct. 2nd) On Friday the 17th of the month, I visited the garden of lemons and pumeloes (sadal-fal) in a valley-bottom amongst the hills above a village called Sukhjana (?)⁴ which is Ṣalāḥu'd-dīn's birth-place. Returning to the Char-bāgh, I dismounted there in the first watch.⁵

(l. Incidents of the march from Gūālīār.)

(Oct. 4th) On Sunday the 19th of the month, we rode before dawn from the Char-bāgh, crossed the Kawārī-water and took our nooning (tūshlāndūk). After the Mid-day Prayer we rode on, at sunset passed the Chambal-water, between the Evening and Bed-time Prayers entered Dulpūr-fort, there, by lamp-light,

¹ Māndūn kīchikrāq ātlānīlghān aikāndūr. This may imply that the distance mentioned to Bābur was found by him an over-estimate. Perhaps the fall was on the Mūrār-river.
² Rope (Shaw): corde qui sort à attacher le bagage sur les chameaux (de Courteille); a thread of 20 cubits long for weaving (Steingass); I have the impression that an arghamchi is a horse's tether.
³ For information about this opponent of Bābur in the battle of Kānwa, see the Asiatic Review, Nov. 1915, H. Beveridge's art. Sīhādī, and the Mirāt-i-sikandari.
⁴ Colonel Luard has suggested to us that the Bābur-nāma word Sukhjana may stand for Salwai or Sukhalhari, the names of two villages near Gūālīār.
⁵ Presumably of night, 6–9 p.m., of Saturday Muh. 18th–Oct. 2nd.
visited a Hot-bath which Abūl-fath had made, rode on, and dismounted at the dam-head where the new Chār-bāgh is in making.

(Oct. 5th) Having stayed the night there, at dawn (Monday 20th) I visited what places had been ordered made. The face (yūz) of the roofed-tank, ordered cut in the solid rock, was not being got up quite straight; more stone-cutters were sent for who were to make the tank-bottom level, pour in water, and, by help of the water, to get the sides to one height. They got the face up straight just before the Other Prayer, were then ordered to fill the tank with water, by help of the water made the sides match, then busied themselves to smooth them. I ordered a water-chamber (āb-khānā) made at a place where it would be cut in the solid rock; inside it was to be a small tank also cut in the solid rock.

(Here the record of 6 days is wanting.)

(Oct. 12th?) To-day, Monday (27th?), there was a ma'jūn party. (Oct. 13th) On Tuesday I was still in that same place. (Oct. 14th) On the night of Wednesday, after opening the mouth and eating something we rode for Sikri. Near the second watch (midnight), we dismounted somewhere and slept; I myself could not sleep on account of pain in my ear, whether caused by cold, as is likely, I do not know. At the top of the dawn, we bestirred ourselves from that place, and in the first watch dismounted at

1 f. 330b and f. 339b.
2 Between the last explicit date in the text, viz. Sunday, Muḥ. 19th, and the one next following, viz. Saturday, Safar 3rd, the diary of six days is wanting. The gap seems to be between the unfinished account of doings in Dhūlpūr and the incomplete one of those of the Monday of the party. For one of the intermediate days Bābur had made an appointment, when in Gūllār (f. 343), with the envoys of Bikramājīt, the trysting-day being Muḥ. 23rd (i.e. 9 days after Muḥ. 14th). Bābur is likely to have gone to Bīnā as planned; that envoys met him there may be surmised from the circumstance that when negotiations with Bikramājīt were renewed in Āgra (f.345), two sets of envoys were present, a "former" one and a "later" one, and this although all envoys had been dismissed from Gūllār. The "former" ones will have been those who went to Bīnā, were not given leave there, but were brought on to Āgra; the "later" ones may have come to Āgra direct from Ranthambhūr. It suits all round to take it that pages have been lost on which was the record of the end of the Dhūlpūr visit, of the journey to the, as yet unseen, fort of Bīnā, of tryst kept by the envoys, of other doings in Bīnā where, judging from the time taken to reach Sikri, it may be that the ma'jūn party was held.

3 Anglice, Tuesday after 6 p.m.
4 aghaz aichib nima yīb, which words seem to imply the breaking of a fast.
the garden now in making at Sikrí. The garden-wall and well-buildings were not getting on to my satisfaction; the overseers therefore were threatened and punished. We rode on from Sikrí between the Other and Evening Prayers, passed through Marhākūr, dismounted somewhere and slept.

(Oct. 15th) Riding on (Thursday 30th), we got into Āgra during the first watch (6–9 a.m.). In the fort I saw the honoured Khadija-sultān Begīm who had stayed behind for several reasons when Fakhr-i-jahān Begīm started for Kābul. Crossing Jūn (Jumna), I went to the Garden-of-eight paradises.1

(m. Arrival of kinswomen.)

(Oct. 17th) On Saturday the 3rd of Šafar, between the Other and Evening Prayers, I went to see three of the great-aunt begīms,2 Gauhar-shād Begīm, Badi‘u’l-jamāl Begīm, and Āq Begīm, with also, of lesser begīms,3 Sl. Maṣ‘ūd Mīrza’s daughter Khān-zāda Begīm, and Sultān-bakht Begīm’s daughter, and my yinkā chīcha’s grand-daughter, that is to say, Zaināb-sultān Begīm.4 They had come past Tūta and dismounted at a small standing-water (qarā sū) on the edge of the suburbs. I came back direct by boat.

(n. Despatch of an envoy to receive charge of Ranthambhōr.)

(Oct. 19th) On Monday the 5th of the month of Šafar, Hāmūshī son of Diwa, an old Hindū servant from Bhīra, was joined with Bikramājīt’s former 5 and later envoys in order that pact and agreement for the surrender of Ranthanbūr and for the conditions of Bikramājīt’s service might be made in their own (hindū) way and custom. Before our man returned, he was to see, and learn, and make sure of matters; this done, if that

---

1 Doubtless the garden owes its name to the eight heavens or paradises mentioned in the Qurān (Hughes’ Dictionary of Islam s.n. Paradise). Bābur appears to have reached Agra on the 1st of Šafar; the 2nd may well have been spent on the home affairs of a returned traveller.

2 The great, or elder trio were daughters of Sl. Abū-sa‘īd Mīrza, Bābur’s paternal-aunts therefore, of his dutiful attendance on whom, Gul-badan writes.

3 “Lesser,” i.e. younger in age, lower in rank as not being the daughters of a sovereign Mīrza, and held in less honour because of a younger generation.

4 Gul-badan mentions the arrival in Hindūstān of a khānim of this name, who was a daughter of Sl. Mahmūd Khān Chaghatāī, Bābur’s maternal-uncle; to this maternal relationship the word chīcha (mother) may refer. Yinkā, uncle’s or elder brother’s wife, has occurred before (ff. 192, 207), chīcha not till now.

5 Cf. f. 344b and n. 5 concerning the surmised movements of this set of envoys.
person (i.e. Bikramājīt) stood fast to his spoken word, I, for my part, promised that, God bringing it aright, I would set him in his father's place as Rānā of Chitūr.¹

(Here the record of 3 days is wanting.)

(o. A levy on stipendiaries.)

(Oct. 22nd) By this time the treasure of Iskandar and Ibrāhīm in Dihlī and Āgra was at an end. Royal orders were given therefore, on Thursday the 8th of Ṣafar, that each stipendiary (wajhdār) should drop into the Dīwān, 30 in every 100 of his allowance, to be used for war-material and appliances, for equipment, for powder, and for the pay of gunners and matchlockmen.

(p. Royal letters sent into Khurāsān.)

(Oct. 24th) On Saturday the 10th of the month, Pay-master Sl. Muḥammad's foot-man Shāh Qāsim who once before had taken letters of encouragement to kinsfolk in Khurāsān,² was sent to Herī with other letters to the purport that, through God's grace, our hearts were at ease in Hindūstān about the rebels and pagans of east and west; and that, God bringing it aright, we should use every means and assuredly in the coming spring should touch the goal of our desire.³ On the margin of a royal letter sent to Āḥmad Afshār (Turk) a summons to Farīdūn the qabūs-player was written with my own hand.

(Here the record of 11 days is wanting.)

¹ This promise was first proffered in Gūāliār (f. 343).
² These may be Bāl-qarā kinsfolk or Mirān-shāhīs married to them. No record of Shāh Qāsim's earlier mission is preserved; presumably he was sent in 934 AH. and the record will have been lost with much more of that year's. Khwānd-amīr may well have had to do with this second mission, since he could inform Bābur of the discomfort caused in Herī by the near leaguer of 'Ubaidūl-lah Aūzbeg.
³ Al batta aūsūmīzī har nū' gilīh tīgürkūmīz dūr. The following versions of this sentence attest its difficulty: — Wāqī'īz-i-bāburī, 1st trs. I. O. 215 f. 212, al batta khūdhrā ha har nū' ka bāshad dar ān khūb khwāhīm rasānad; and 2nd trs. I. O. 217 f. 238b, al batta dar har nū' karda khūdhrā mī rasānim; Memoirs p. 388, "I would make an effort and return in person to Kābul"; Mémoires ii, 356, je ferais tous mes efforts pour pousser en avant. I surmise, as Pāyanda-i-hāsan seems to have done (1st Pers. trs. supra), that the passage alludes to Bābur's aims in Hindūstān which he expects to touch in the coming spring. What seems likely to be implied is what Erskine says and more, viz. return to Kābul, renewal of conflict with the Aūzbeg and release of Khurāsān kin through success. As is said by Bābur immediately after this, Tāhmāsp of Persia had defeated 'Ubaidūl-lah Aūzbeg before Bābur's letter was written.
In today's forenoon (Tuesday 20th?) I made a beginning of eating quicksilver.¹

(q. News from Kābul and Khurāsān.)²

(Nov. 4th) On Wednesday the 21st of the month (Ṣafar) a Hindūstānī foot-man (pīāda) brought dutiful letters (ʿarz-dāštīlār) from Kāmrān and Khwāja Dost-i-khāwand. The Khwāja had reached Kābul on the 10th of Zūl-hijja³ and will have been anxious to go on ⁴ to Humāyūn's presence, but there comes to him a man from Kāmrān, saying, "Let the honoured Khwāja come (to see me); let him deliver whatever royal orders there may be; let him go on to Humāyūn when matters have been talked over."⁵ Kāmrān will have gone into Kābul on the 17th of Zūl-hijja (Sep. 2nd), will have talked with the Khwāja and, on the 28th of the same month, will have let him go on for Fort Victory (Qila'-i-ṣafar).

There was this excellent news in the dutiful letters received:—that Shāh-zāda Ṭahmāsp, resolute to put down the Aūzbeg,⁶ had overcome and killed Rīnīsh (var. Zīnīsh) Aūzbeg in Dāmghān and made a general massacre of his people; that 'Ubaid Khān, getting sure news about the Qīsīl-bāsh (Red-head) had risen from round Herī, gone to Merv, called up to him there all the sultāns of Samarkand and those parts, and that all the sultāns of Mā warā'u'n-nahr had gone to help him⁷.

This same foot-man brought the further news that Humāyūn was said to have had a son by the daughter of Yādgār Ṭaghāi,

¹ Ṣimāḥ yīmākni bunyād qīldīm, a statement which would be less abrupt if it followed a record of illness. Such a record may have been made and lost.
² The preliminaries to this now somewhat obscure section will have been lost in the gap of 934 AH. They will have given Bābur's instructions to Khwāja Dost-i-khāwand and have thrown light on the unsatisfactory state of Kābul, concerning which a good deal comes out later, particularly in Bābur's letter to its Governor Khwāja Kalān. It may be right to suppose that Kāmrān wanted Kābul and that he expected the Khwāja to bring him an answer to his request for it, whether made by himself or for him, through some-one, his mother perhaps, whom Bābur now sent for to Hindūstān.
³ 934 AH.—August 26th 1528 AD.
⁴ The useful verb ṭibrāmāk which connotes agitation of mind with physical movement, will here indicate anxiety on the Khwāja's part to fulfil his mission to Humāyūn.
⁵ Kāmrān's messenger seems to repeat his master's words, using the courteous imperative of the 3rd person plural.
⁶ Though Bābur not infrequently writes of e.g. Bengalis and Aūzbegs and Turks in the singular, the Bengali, the Aūzbeg, the Turk, he seems here to mean 'Ubaid'u'l-lāh, the then dominant Aūzbeg, although Kūchām was Khāqān.
⁷ This muster preceded defeat near Jām of which Bābur heard some 19 days later.
and that Kāmrān was said to be marrying in Kābul, taking the
daughter of his mother’s brother Sl. ‘Alī Mīrzā (Begchīk).¹

(r. Honours for an artificer.)²

On this same day Sayyid Daknī of Shīrāz the diviner (ghaibā-gar?) was made to wear a dress of honour, given presents, and ordered to finish the arched (?) well (khvāraliq-chāh) as he best knew how.

(s. The Wālidiyyah-risāla (Parental-tract).)

(Nov. 6th) On Friday the 23rd of the month³ such heat⁴ appeared in my body that with difficulty I got through the Congregational Prayer in the Mosque, and with much trouble through the Mid-day Prayer, in the book-room, after due time, and little by little. Thereafter⁵ having had fever, I trembled less on Sunday (Nov. 28th). During the night of Tuesday ⁶ the 27th of the month Safar, it occurred to me to versify (naẓm gīlmāq)

¹ Humāyūn’s wife was Bega Begīm, the later Hājī Begīm; Kāmrān’s bride was her cousin perhaps named Māh-afrūz (Gul-badan’s Humāyūn-nāma f. 64b). The hear-say tense used by the messenger allows the inference that he was not accredited to give the news but merely repeated the rumour of Kābul. The accredited bearer-of-good-tidings came later (f. 346b).
² There are three enigmatic words in this section. The first is the Sayyid’s cognomen; was he dāknī, rather dark of hue, or sāknī, one who knows, or ruknī, one who props, erects scaffolding, etc.? The second mentions his occupation; was he a ghaibā-gar, diviner (Erskine, water-finder), a jība-gar, cuirass-maker, or a jībā-gar, cistern-maker, which last suits with well-making? The third describes the kind of well he had in hand, perhaps the stone one of f. 353b; had it scaffolding, or was it for drinking-water only (khvāraliq); had it an arch, or was it chambered (khvāsāliq)? If Bābūr’s orders for the work had been preserved,—they may be lost from f. 344b, trouble would have been saved to scribes and translators, as an example of whose uncertainty it may be mentioned that from the third word (khvāraliq?) Erskine extracted “jets d’eau and artificial water-works”, and de Courteille “taille dans le roc vif”.
³ All Bābūr’s datings in Safar are inconsistent with his of Muḥarram, if a Muḥarram of 30 days [as given by Gladwin and others].
⁴ harārat. This Erskine renders by “so violent an illness” (p. 388), de Courteille by “une inflammation d’entraîlles” (ii, 357), both swayed perhaps by the earlier mention, on Muḥ. 10th, of Bābūr’s medicinal quick-silver, a drug long in use in India for internal affections (Erskine). Some such ailment may have been recorded and the record lost (f. 345b and n. 8), but the heat, fever, and trembling in the illness of Safar 23rd, taken with the reference to last year’s attack of fever, all point to climatic fever.
⁵ ajinī (or, ajīnī). Consistently with the readings quoted in the preceding note, E. and de C. date the onset of the fever as Sunday and translate ajinī to mean “two days after”. It cannot be necessary however to specify the interval between Friday and Sunday; the text is not explicit; it seems safe to surmise only that the cold fit was less severe on Sunday; the fever had ceased on the following Thursday.
⁶ Anglicē, Monday after 6 p.m.
the *Walidiyah-risāla* of his Reverence Khwāja 'Ubadu'll-lāh.¹ I laid it to heart that if I, going to the soul of his Reverence ² for protection, were freed from this disease, it would be a sign that my poem was accepted, just as the author of the *Qaṣīdatu'l-būrda* ³ was freed from the affliction of paralysis when his poem had been accepted. To this end I began to versify the tract, using the metre ⁴ of Maulānā ‘Abdu’r-rahīm Īmām’s *Subḥatu'l-ābrār* (Rosary of the Righteous). Thirteen couplets were made in that same night. I trusted myself not to make fewer than 10 a day; in the end one day had been omitted. While last year every time such illness had happened, it had persisted at least a month or 40 days, ⁵ this year, by God’s grace and his Reverence’s favour, I was free, except for a little depression (*afsurda*), on Thursday the 29th of the month (Nov. 12th). The end of versifying the contents of the tract was reached on Saturday the 8th of the first Rabi’ (Nov. 20th). One day 52 couplets had been made.⁶

(t. Troops warned for service.)

(Nov. 11th) On Wednesday the 28th of the month royal orders were sent on all sides for the armies, saying, “God

¹ The *Rashahāt-i-‘ainul-hayāt* (Tricklings from the fountain of life) contains an interesting and almost contemporary account of the Khwāja and of his *Walidiyah-risāla*. A summary of what in it concerns the Khwāja can be read in the JRAS. Jan. 1916, H. Beveridge’s art. The tract, so far as we have searched, is now known in European literature only through Bābur’s metrical translation of it; and this, again, is known only through the *Nāṣfūr Dīwān*. [It may be noted here, though the topic belongs to the beginning of the Bābur-nāma (f. 2), that the *Rashahāt* contains particulars about Āḥrār’s interventions for peace between Bābur’s father ‘Umar Shaikh and those with whom he quarrelled.]

² “Here unfortunately, Mr. Elphinstone’s Turki copy finally ends” (Erskine), that is to say, the Elphinstone Codex belonging to the Faculty of Advocates of Edinburgh.

³ This work, Al-buṣīrī’s famous poem in praise of the Prophet, has its most recent notice in M. René Basset’s article of the *Encyclopedia of Islam* (Leyden and London).

⁴ Bābur’s technical terms to describe the metre he used are, *ramal musaddas makhbūn arūz* and *ṣarb gāh aḍār gāh makhbūn muḥṣūf wasān*.

⁵ *aṭbaḥān yīl* (u) *har maḥal mūndāq ‘ārīzāt kim būlād*, from which it seems correct to omit the *u* (and), thus allowing the reference to be to last year’s illnesses only; because no record, of any date, survives of illness lasting even one full month, and no other year has a *lacuna* of sufficient length unless one goes improbably far back: for these attacks seem to be of Indian climatic fever. One in last year (934 AH.) lasting 25-26 days (f. 331) might be called a month’s illness; another or others may have happened in the second half of the year and their record be lost, as several have been lost, to the detriment of connected narrative.

⁶ Mr. Erskine’s rendering (*Memoirs*, p. 388) of the above section shows something of what is gained by acquaintance which he had not, with the *Rashahāt-i-‘ainul-hayāt* and with Bābur’s versified *Walidiyah-risāla*. 
bringing it about, at an early opportunity my army will be got to horse. Let all come soon, equipped for service."

(Here the record of 9 days is wanting.) ¹

(u. Messengers from Humâyûn.)

(Nov. 21st) On Sunday the 9th of the first Rabî‘, Beg Muḥammad ta‘allugchi ² came, who had been sent last year (934 AH.) at the end of Muḥarram to take a dress of honour and a horse to Humâyûn.³

(Nov. 22nd) On Monday the 10th of the month there came from Humâyûn’s presence Wais Lāghari’s (son) Beg-gina (Little Beg) and Biān Shaikh, one of Humâyûn’s servants who had come as the messenger of the good tidings of the birth of Humâyûn’s son whose name he gave as Al-amān. Shaikh Abū’l-wajd found Shâh sa‘ādatmand ⁴ to be the date of his birth.

(v. Rapid travel.)

Biān Shaikh set out long after Beg-gina. He parted from Humâyûn on Friday the 9th of Ṣafar (Oct. 23rd) at a place below Kishm called Dū-shamba (Monday); he came into Agra on Monday the 10th of the first Rabî‘ (Nov. 23rd). He came very quickly! Another time he actually came from Qila‘-i-Ẓafar to Qandahâr in 11 days.⁵

¹ This gap, like some others in the diary of 935 AH. can be attributed safely to loss of pages, because preliminaries are now wanting to several matters which Bābūr records shortly after it. Such are (1) the specification of the three articles sent to Naṣrat Shāh, (2) the motive for the feast of f. 351b, (3) the announcement of the approach of the surprising group of envos, who appear without introduction at that entertainment, in a manner opposed to Bābūr’s custom of writing, (4) an account of their arrival and reception.

² Land-holder (see Hobson-Jobson s.n. talookdar).

³ The long detention of this messenger is mentioned in Bābūr’s letter to Humâyûn (f. 349).

⁴ These words, if short a be read in Shâh, make 934 by abjad. The child died in infancy; no son of Humâyûn’s had survived childhood before Akbar was born, some 14 years later. Concerning Abū’l-wajd Fārighi, see Ḥabību’s-siyar, lith. ed. ii, 347; Muntakhabu’t-tawârîkh, Bib. Ind. ed. i, 3; and Index s.n.

⁵ I am indebted to Mr. A. E. Hinks, Secretary of the Royal Geographical Society, for the following approximate estimate of the distances travelled by Biān Shaikh:—(a) From Kishm to Kābul 240 m.—from Kābul to Peshāwar 175 m.—from Peshāwar to Agra (railroad distance) 759 m.—total 1 174 m.; daily average cir. 38 miles; (b) Qila‘-i-Ẓafar to Kābul 264 m.—Kābul to Qandahâr 316 m.—total 580 m.; daily average cir. 53 miles. The second journey was made probably in 913 AH. and to inform Bābūr of the death of the Shâh of Badakhshān (f. 213b).
(cv. News of Tahmāsp’s victory over the Aūzbegs.)

Bīān Shaikh brought news about Shāh-zāda Tahmāsp’s advancing out of ‘Irāq and defeating the Aūzbeg.¹ Here are his particulars:—Shāh-zāda Tahmāsp, having come out of ‘Irāq with 40,000 men arrayed in Rūmī fashion of matchlock and cart,² advances with great speed, takes Bastām, slaugthers Rīnīsh (var. Zinīsh) Aūzbeg and his men in Dāmghān, and from there passes right swiftly on.³ Kīpik Bi’s son Qāmbar-i-‘alī Beg is beaten by one of the Qīsīl-bāsh (Red-head)’s men, and with his few followers goes to ‘Ubaid Khān’s presence. ‘Ubaid Khān finds it undesirable to stay near Heri, hurriedly sends off gallopers to all the sultāns of Balkh, Ḥiṣār, Samarkand, and Tāshkend (Tāshkīnt) and goes himself to Merv. Siūnjak Sl.’s younger son Bārāq Sl. from Tāshkend, Kūchūm Khān, with (his sons) Abū-sa‘īd Sl. and Pūlad Sl., and Jānī Beg Sl. with his sons, from Samarkand and Miān-kāl, Mahdī Sl.’s and Ḥamza Sl.’s sons from Ḥiṣār, Kitīn-qarā Sl. from Balkh, all these sultāns assemble right swiftly in Merv. To them their informers (tīl-chī) take news that Shāh-zāda, after saying, “‘Ubaid Khān is seated near Heri with few men only,” had been advancing swiftly with his 40,000 men, but that when he heard of this assembly (i.e. in Merv), he made a ditch in the meadow of Rādagān⁴ and seated

¹ On Muh. 10th 934 A.H.—Sep. 26th 1528 A.D. For accounts of the campaign see Rieu’s Suppl. Persian Cat. under Histories of Tahmāsp (Churchill Collection); the Habīb’s-siyar and the ‘Alam-ārāt-‘abbāsī, the last a highly rhetorical work. Bābur’s accounts (Index s.n. Jām) are merely repetitions of news given to him; he is not responsible for mistakes he records, such as those of f. 354. [It must be mentioned that Mr. Erskine has gone wrong in his description of the battle, the starting-point of error being his reversal of two events, the encampment of Tahmāsp at Rādagān and his passage through Mashhad. A century ago less help, through maps and travel, was available than now.]

² ṭafak u arāba, the method of array Bābur adopted from the Rūmī-Persian model.

³ Tahmāsp’s main objective, aimed at earlier than the Aūzbeg muster in Merv, was Herāt, near which ‘Ubaid Khān had been for 7 months. He did not take the shortest route for Mashhad, viz. the Dāmghān-Sabzawār-Nishāpūr road, but went from Dāmghān for Mashhad by way of Kālpūsh (‘Alam-ārāt lith. ed. p. 45) and Rādagān. Two military advantages are obvious on this route; (1) it approaches Mashhad by the descending road of the Kecheval-valley, thus avoiding the climb into that valley by a pass beyond Nishāpūr on the alternative route; and (2) it passes through the fertile lands of Rādagān. [For Kālpūsh and the route see Fr. military map, Sheets Astarābād and Merv, n.e. of Bastām.]

⁴ 7 m. from Kushan and 86 m. from Mashhad. As Lord Curzon reports (Persia, ii, 120) that his interlocutors on the spot were not able to explain the word “Rādagān,” it may be useful to note here that the town seems to borrow its name from the ancient tower standing near it, the Mi-i-rādagān, or, as Récclus gives it, Tour de méiemandan, both names meaning, Tower of the bounteous (or, beneficent, highly-distinguished,
himself there.\(^1\) Here-upon the Aüzbegs, with entire disregard of their opponents,\(^2\) left their counsels at this:—"Let all of us sultāns and khāns seat ourselves in Mashhad;\(^3\) let a few of us be told off with 20,000 men to go close to the Qizil-bāsh camp\(^4\) and not let them put head out; let us order magicians\(^5\) to work their magic directly Scorpio appears;\(^6\) by this stratagem the enemy will be enfeebled, and we shall overcome." So said, they march from Merv. Shāh-zāda gets out of Mashhad.\(^7\) He confronts them near Jām-and-Khirgird.\(^8\) There defeat befalls the Aüzbeg side.\(^9\) A mass of sultāns are overcome and slaughtered.

In one letter it (khūd) was written, "It is not known for certain that any sultān except Kūchūm Khān has escaped; not a man who went with the army has come back up to now." The

eetc.). (Cf. Vullers Dict. s.n. rād; Réclus' L'Asie Antérieure p. 219; and O'Donovan's Merv Oasis.) Perhaps light on the distinguished people (rādāgān) is given by the Dābisīn's notice of an ancient sect, the Rādiyān, seeming to be fire-worshippers whose chief was Rād-gīna, an eminently brave hero of the latter part of Jāmshīd's reign (800 B.C.?). Of the town Rādāgān Daulat Shāh makes frequent mention. A second town so-called and having a tower lies north of Ispahān.

\(^1\) In these days of trench-warfare it would give a wrong impression to say that Tāhmāsp entrenched himself; he did what Bābur did before his battles at Panipat and Kānwa (q.v.).

\(^2\) The Aüzbegs will have omitted from their purview of affairs that Tāhmāsp's men were veterans.

\(^3\) The holy city had been captured by 'Ubaid Khān in 933 AH. (1525 AD.), but nothing in Biān Shaikh's narrative indicates that they were now there in force.

\(^4\) Presumably the one in the Rādāgān-meadow.

\(^5\) using the yada-lāsh to ensure victory (Index s.n.).

\(^6\) If then, as now, Scorpio's appearance were expected in Oct.-Nov., the Aüzbegs had greatly over-estimated their power to check Tāhmāsp's movements; but it seems fairly clear that they expected Scorpio to follow Virgo in Sept.-Oct. according to the ancient view of the Zodiacal Signs which allotted two houses to the large Scorpio and, if it admitted Libra at all, placed it between Scorpio's claws (Virgil's Georgics i, 32 and Ovid's Metamorphoses, ii, 195.—H.B.).

\(^7\) It would appear that the Aüzbegs, after hearing that Tāhmāsp was encamped at Rādāgān, expected to interpose themselves in his way at Mashhad and to get their 20,000 to Rādāgān before he broke camp. Tāhmāsp's swiftness spoiled their plan; he will have stayed at Rādāgān a short time only, perhaps till he had further news of the Aüzbegs, perhaps also for commissariat purposes and to rest his force. He visited the shrine of Imām Reza, and had reached Jām in time to confront his adversaries as they came down to it from Zawarābād (Pilgrims'-town).

\(^8\) or, Khirjard, as many MSS. have it. It seems to be a hamlet or suburb of Jām. The 'Alam-ārāī (lith. ed. p. 40) writes Khusrau-jard-i-Jām (the Khusrau-throne of Jām), perhaps rhetorically. The hamlet is Maulānā 'Abdūr-rahmān Jāmī's birthplace (Daulat Shāh's Taṣkirat, E. G. Browne's ed. p. 483). Jām now appears on maps as Turbat-i-Shaikh Jāmī, the tomb (turbat) being that of the saintly ancestor of Akbar's mother Ḥāmida-bānū.

\(^9\) The 'Alam-ārāī (lith. ed. p. 31) says, but in grandiose language, that 'Ubaid Khān placed at the foot of his standard 40 of the most eminent men of Transoxania who prayed for his success, but that as his cause was not good, their supplications were turned backwards, and that all were slain where they had prayed.
sultāns who were in Ḥiṣār abandoned it. Ibrāhīm Jānī's son Chalma, whose real name is Ismā'īl, must be in the fort.  

(x. Letters written by Bābur.)

(Nov. 27th and 28th) This same Bān Shaikh was sent quite quickly back with letters for Humāyūn and Kāmrān. These and other writings being ready by Friday the 14th of the month (Nov. 27th) were entrusted to him, his leave was given, and on Saturday the 15th he got well out of Āgra.

COPY OF A LETTER TO HUMĀYŪN.  

"The first matter, after saying, 'Salutation' to Humāyūn whom I am longing to see, is this:—

Exact particulars of the state of affairs on that side and on this 3 have been made known by the letters and dutiful representations brought on Monday the 10th of the first Rabi' by Beg-gīna and Bān Shaikh.

(Turki) Thank God! a son is born to thee! A son to thee, to me a heart-enslaver (dil-bandī).

May the Most High ever allot to thee and to me tidings as joyful! So may it be, O Lord of the two worlds!"

"Thou sayest thou hast called him Al-amān; God bless and prosper this! Thou writest it so thyself (i.e. Al-amān), but hast

1 Here the 1st Pers. trs. (I.O. 215 f. 214) mentions that it was Chalma who wrote and despatched the exact particulars of the defeat of the Aūzbegs. This information explains the presumption Bābur expresses. It shows that Chalma was in Ḥiṣār where he may have written his letter to give news to Humāyūn. At the time Bān Shaikh left, the Mirzā was near Kishm; if he had been the enterprising man he was not, one would surmise that he had moved to seize the chance of the sultāns' abandonment of Ḥiṣār, without waiting for his father's urgency (f. 348b). Whether he had done so and was the cause of the sultāns' flight, is not known from any chronicle yet come to our hands. Chalma's father Ibrāhīm Jānī died fighting for Bābur against Shaibāq Khān in 906 AH. (f. 90b).

As the sense of the name-of-office Chalma is still in doubt, I suggest that it may be an equivalent of aflābāchī, bearer of the water-bottle on journeys. T. chalma can mean a water-vessel carried on the saddle-bow; one Chalma on record was a safārchi; if, in this word, safar be read to mean journey, an approach is made to aflābāchī (fol. 156 and note; Blochmann's A.-i-A. p. 378 and n.3).

2 The copies of Bābur's Turki letter to Humāyūn and the later one to Khwāja Kalān (f. 359) are in some MSS. of the Persian text translated only (I.O. 215 f. 214); in others appear in Turki only (I.O. 217 f. 240); in others appear in Turki and Persian (B.M. Add. 26,000 and I.O. 2989); while in Muḥ. Shīrāzī's lith. ed. they are omitted altogether (p. 228).

3 Trans- and Cis-Hindukush. Pāyanda-ḥasan (in one of his useful glosses to the 1st Pers. trs.) amplifies here by "Khurāsān, Mā warā'u'n-nahr and Kābul".
over-looked that common people mostly say alāmā or aīlāmān. Besides that, this Al is rare in names. May God bless and prosper him in name and person; may He grant us to keep Al-amān (peace) for many years and many decades of years! May He now order our affairs by His own mercy and favour; not in many decades comes such a chance as this! "

"Again:—On Tuesday the 11th of the month (Nov. 23rd) came the false rumour that the Balkhís had invited and were fetching Qurbān into Balkh."

"Again:—Kāmrān and the Kābul begs have orders to join thee; this done, move on Ḥīsār, Samarkand, Herī or to whatever side favours fortune. Mayst thou, by God's grace, crush foes and take lands to the joy of friends and the down-casting of adversaries! Thank God! now is your time to risk life and slash swords. Neglect not the work chance has brought; slothful life in retirement befits not sovereign rule:

(Persian) He grips the world who hastens; Empire yokes not with delay; All else, confronting marriage, stops, Save only sovereignty.

If through God's grace, the Balkh and Ḥīsār countries be won and held, put men of thine in Ḥīsār, Kāmrān's men in Balkh. Should Samarkand also be won, there make thy seat. Ḥīsār, God willing, I shall make a crown-domain. Should Kāmrān regard Balkh as small, represent the matter to me; please God! I will make its defects good at once out of those other countries."

"Again:—As thou knowest, the rule has always been that

1 The words Bābur gives as mispronunciations are somewhat uncertain in sense; manifestly both are of ill-omen:—Al-amān itself [of which the alāmā of the Hai. MS. and Ilminsky may be an abbreviation] is the cry of the vanquished, "Quarter! mercy!"; Ailāmān and also ālāman can represent a Turkmān raider.

2 Presumably amongst Timūrids.

3 Perhaps Bābur here makes a placatory little joke.

4 i.e. that offered by Ṭahmāsp's rout of the Aūzbegs at Jām.

5 He was an adherent of Bābur. Cf. f. 353.

6 The plural "your" will include Hūmayūn and Kāmrān. Neither had yet shewn himself the heritor of his father's personal dash and valour; they had lacked the stress which shaped his heroism.

7 My husband has traced these lines to Nizāmī's Khusrau and Shirīn. [They occur on f. 256b in his MS. of 317 folios.] Bābur may have quoted from memory, since his version varies. The lines need their context to be understood; they are part of Shirīn's address to Khusrau when she refuses to marry him because at the time he is fighting for his sovereign position; and they say, in effect, that while all other work stops for marriage (kadkhudāl), kingly rule does not.
when thou hadst six parts, Kāmran had five; this having been constant, make no change.”

“Aulughlar kūtārimlik kirāk; 2nd Pers. trs. buzurgān bardāshī mī bāid kardand. This dictum may be a quotation. I have translated it to agree with Bābur’s reference to the ages of the brothers, but aulūghlār expresses greatness of position as well as seniority in age, and the dictum may be taken as a Turkı version of “Noblesse oblige”, and may also mean “The great must be magnanimous”. (Cf. de C.’s Dict. s.n. kūtārimlik.) [It may be said of the verb bardāshīn used in the Pers. trs., that Abū’l-fażl, perhaps translating kūtārimlik reported to him, puts it into Bābur’s mouth when, after praying to take Ḥumayūn’s illness upon himself, he cried with conviction, “I have borne it away” (A.N. trs. H.B. i, 276).]

If Bābur had foreseen that his hard-won rule in Hindūstān was to be given to the winds of one son’s frivolities and the other’s disloyalty, his words of scant content with what the Hindūstān of his desires had brought him, would have expressed a yet keener pain (Rāmpūr Divān E.D.R.’s ed. p. 15 1.5 fr.ft.).

“Again :—As for the “retirement”, “retirement”, spoken of in thy letters,—retirement is a fault for sovereignty; as the honoured (Sa’dī) says:—

(Persian) If thy foot be fettered, choose to be resigned;
If thou ride alone, take thou thine own head.

No bondage equals that of sovereignty; retirement matches not with rule.”

“Again :—Thou hast written me a letter, as I ordered thee to do; but why not have read it over? If thou hadst thought of reading it, thou couldst not have done it, and, unable thyself to read it, wouldst certainly have made alteration in it. Though by taking trouble it can be read, it is very puzzling, and who ever saw an enigma in prose? Thy spelling, though not bad, is not quite correct; thou writest īltafāt with ṭā (īltafāt) and qūlinj with yā (qūlinj?). Although thy letter can be read if every sort

1 Aulūghlār kūtārimlik kirāk; 2nd Pers. trs. buzurgān bardāshī mī bāid kardand. This dictum may be a quotation. I have translated it to agree with Bābur’s reference to the ages of the brothers, but aulūghlār expresses greatness of position as well as seniority in age, and the dictum may be taken as a Turkı version of “Noblesse oblige”, and may also mean “The great must be magnanimous”. (Cf. de C.’s Dict. s.n. kūtārimlik.) [It may be said of the verb bardāshīn used in the Pers. trs., that Abū’l-fażl, perhaps translating kūtārimlik reported to him, puts it into Bābur’s mouth when, after praying to take Ḥumayūn’s illness upon himself, he cried with conviction, “I have borne it away” (A.N. trs. H.B. i, 276).]

2 If Bābur had foreseen that his hard-won rule in Hindūstān was to be given to the winds of one son’s frivolities and the other’s disloyalty, his words of scant content with what the Hindūstān of his desires had brought him, would have expressed a yet keener pain (Rāmpūr Divān E.D.R.’s ed. p. 15 1.5 fr.ft.).

3 Bostān, cap. Advice of Noshirwān to Huṭrān (H.B.).

4 A little joke at the expense of the mystifying letter.

5 For yā, Mr. Erskine writes be. What the mistake was is an open question; I have guessed an exchange of the for ā, because such an exchange is not infrequent amongst Turkı long vowels.
of pains be taken, yet it cannot be quite understood because of that obscure wording of thine. Thy remissness in letter-writing seems to be due to the thing which makes thee obscure, that is to say, to elaboration. In future write without elaboration; use plain, clear words. So will thy trouble and thy reader's be less."

"Again:—Thou art now to go on a great business; I take counsel with prudent and experienced begs, and act as they say. If thou seek to pleasure me, give up sitting alone and avoiding society. Summon thy younger brother and the begs twice daily to thy presence, not leaving their coming to choice; be the business what it may, take counsel and settle every word and act in agreement with those well-wishers."

"Again:—Khwāja Kalān has long had with me the housefriend's intimacy; have thou as much and even more with him. If, God willing, the work becomes less in those parts, so that thou wilt not need Kāmrān, let him leave disciplined men in Balkh and come to my presence."

"Again:—Seeing that there have been such victories, and such conquests, since Kābul has been held, I take it to be well-omened; I have made it a crown-domain; let no one of you covet it."

"Again:—Thou hast done well (yakhshī qilīb sin); thou hast won the heart of Sl. Wais; get him to thy presence; act by his counsel, for he knows business."

"Until there is a good muster of the army, do not move out."

"Bīān Shaikh is well-apprized of word-of-mouth matters, and will inform thee of them. These things said, I salute thee and am longing to see thee."—

The above was written on Thursday the 13th of the first Rabi' (Nov. 26th). To the same purport and with my own hand, I wrote also to Kāmrān and Khwāja Kalān, and sent off the letters (by Bīān Shaikh).

(Here the record fails from Rabi' 15th to 19th.)

(y. Plans of campaign.)

(Dec. 2nd) On Wednesday the 19th of the month (Rabi' I.) the mīrzsās, sultāns, Turk and Hind amīrs were summoned for...
counsel, and left the matter at this:—That this year the army must move in some direction; that 'Askari should go in advance towards the East, be joined by the sultāns and amīrs from beyond Gang (Ganges), and march in whatever direction favoured fortune. These particulars having been written down, Ghīāsu'd-dīn the armourer was given rendezvous for 16 days,¹ and sent galloping off, on Saturday the 22nd of the month, to the amirs of the East headed by Sl. Junaid Barlās. His word-of-mouth message was, that 'Askari was being sent on before the fighting apparatus, culverin, cart and matchlock, was ready; that it was the royal order for the sultāns and amīrs of the far side of Gang to muster in 'Askari's presence, and, after consultation with well-wishers on that side, to move in whatever direction, God willing! might favour fortune; that if there should be work needing me, please God! I would get to horse as soon as the person gone with the (16 days) tryst (mi‘ād) had returned; that explicit representation should be made as to whether the Bengali (Naṣrat Shāh) were friendly and single-minded; that, if nothing needed my presence in those parts, I should not make stay, but should move elsewhere at once;² and that after consulting with well-wishers, they were to take 'Askari with them, and, God willing! settle matters on that side.

(Here the record of 5 days is wanting.)

(z. 'Askari receives the insignia and rank of a royal commander.)

(Dec. 12th) On Saturday the 29th of the first Rabi', 'Askari was made to put on a jewelled dagger and belt, and a royal dress of honour, was presented with flag, horse-tail standard, drum, a set (6–8) of tūphchāq (horses), 10 elephants, a string of camels, one of mules, royal plenishing, and royal utensils. Moreover he was ordered to take his seat at the head of a Dīwān. On his mullā and two guardians were bestowed jackets having buttons;³ on his other servants, three sets of nine coats.

¹ aūn allī ġūniāk mījār bīla, as on f. 354b, and with exchange of T. mījār for P. mī‘ād, f. 355b.
² Probably into Rājput lands, notably into those of Śalāhu'd-dīn.
³ tukhmalīq chakmānlār; as tukhma means both button and gold-embroidery, it may be right, especially of Hindūstān articles, to translate sometimes in the second sense.
(aa. Bābur visits one of his officers.)

(Dec. 13th) On Sunday the last day of the month (Rabī‘ I. 30th) I went to Si. Muḥammad Baḥkshi’s house. After spreading a carpet, he brought gifts. His offering in money and goods was more than 2laks. When food and offering had been set out, we went into another room where sitting, we ate ma‘jūn. We came away at the 3rd watch (midnight?), crossed the water, and went to the private house.

(bb. The Āgra-Kābul road measured.)

(Dec. 17th) On Thursday the 4th of the latter Rabī‘, it was settled that Chīqmāq Beg with Shāhī ṭamghāchī’s clerkship, should measure the road between Āgra and Kābul. At every 9th kuroh (cir. 18 m.), a tower was to be erected 12 gārīs high and having a chār-dara on the top; at every 18th kuroh (cir. 36 m.), 6 post-horses were to be kept fastened; and arrangement was to be made for the payment of post-masters and grooms, and for horse-corn. The order was, “If the place where the horses are fastened up be near a crown-domain, let those there provide for the matters mentioned; if not, let the cost be charged on the beg

1 These statements of date are consistent with Bābur’s earlier explicit entries and with Erskine’s equivalents of the Christian Era, but at variance with Gladwin’s and with Wüstenfeld’s calculation that Rabī‘ II. 1st was Dec. 13th. Yet Gladwin (Revenue Accounts, ed. 1790 AD. p. 22) gives Rabī‘ I. 30 days. Without in the smallest degree questioning the two European calculations, I follow Bābur, because in his day there may have been allowed variation which finds no entry in methodical calendars. Erskine followed Bābur’s statements; he is likely nevertheless to have seen Gladwin’s book.

2 Erskine estimated this at £500, but later cast doubts on such estimates as being too low (History of India, vol. i, App. D.).

3 The bearer of the stamp (tamghā) who by impressing it gave quittance for the payment of tolls and other dues.

4 Either 24 ft. or 36 ft. (infra). These towers would provide resting-place, and some protection against ill-doers. They recall the two mil-i-rādagān of Persia (f. 347 n. 9), the purpose of which is uncertain. Bābur’s towers were not “kos mīnārs”, nor is it said that he ordered each kuroh to be marked on the road. Some of the kos mīnārs on the “old Mughal roads” were over 30 ft. high; a considerable number are entered and depicted in the Annual Progress Report of the Archeological Survey for 1914 (Northern Circle, p. 45 and Plates 44, 45). Some at least have a lower chamber.

5 Four-doored, open-on-all-sides. We have not found the word with this meaning in Dictionaries. It may translate H. chaukandi.

6 Erskine makes 9 kos (kurohs) to be 13–14 miles, perhaps on the basis of the smaller gaz of 24 inches.

7 alti yam-ātī bāghlāghātlār which, says one of Erskine’s manuscripts, is called a dāk-chēki.
in whose pargana the post-house may be." Chiqmaq Beg got out of Agra with Shahi on that same day.

(Author's note on the kuroh.) These kurohs were established in relation to the mil, in the way mentioned in the Mubin:—

(Turki) Four thousand paces (qadam) are one mil;
Know that Hind people call this a kuroh;
The pace (qadam) they say is a qari and a half (36 in.);
Know that each qari (24 in.) is six hand-breadths (tulam);
That each tulam is four fingers (ailik),
Each ailik, six barley-corns. Know this knowledge.

The measuring-cord (tanab) was fixed at 40 qari, each being the one-and-a-half qari mentioned above, that is to say, each is 9 hand-breadths.

(cc. A feast.)

(Dec. 18th) On Saturday the 6th of the month (Rabi' II.) there was a feast at which were present Qizil-bash (Red-head), and Auzbeg, and Hindu envoys. The Qizil-bash envoys sat

Neither Erskine (Mems. p. 394), nor de Courteille (Mems. ii, 370) recognized the word Mubin here, although each mentions the poem later (p. 431 and ii, 461), deriving his information about it from the Akbar-nama, Erskine direct, de Courteille by way of the Turki translation of the same Akbar-nama passage, which Ilinsky found in Kehr's volume and which is one of the much discussed "Fragments", at first taken to be extra writings of Babur's (cf. Index in loco s. n. Fragments). Ilinsky (p. 455) prints the word clearly, as one who knows it; he may have seen that part of the poem which is included in Beresine's Chrestomathie Turque (p. 226 to p. 272), under the title Fragment d'un poème inconnu de Babour, and have observed that Babur himself shews his title to be Mubin, in the lines of his colophon (p. 271),

Chu biin gildim andar shar'iyat,
Ni 'ajab gar Mubin didam al?

(Since in it I have made exposition of Laws, what wonder if I named it Mubin (exposition)?) Cf. Translator's Note, p. 437. [Beresine says (Ch. T.) that he prints half of his "unique manuscrit" of the poem.]

The passage Babur quotes comes from the Mubin section on tayammum masal (purification with sand), where he tells his son sand may be used, Sii yurag basla sindin air bir mil (if from thee water be one mil distant), and then interjects the above explanation of what the mil is. Two lines of his original are not with the Baburnama.


Babur's customary method of writing allows the inference that he recorded, in due place, the coming and reception of the somewhat surprising group of guests now mentioned as at this entertainment. That preliminary record will have been lost in one or more of the small gaps in his diary of 935 AH. The envoys from the Samarkand Auzbegs and from the Persian Court may have come in acknowledgment of the Fathnama which announced victory over Rana Sang; the guests from Farghana will have accepted the invitation sent, says Gul-badan, "in all directions," after Babur's defeat of Sj. Ibrahim Ludi, to urge hereditary servants and Timurid and Chingiz-khanid kinsfolk to come and see prosperity with him now when "the Most High has bestowed sovereignty" (f. 293a; Gul-badan's H. N. f. 11).

Hindu here will represent Raiput. D'Herbelot's explanation of the name Qizilbash (Red-head) comes in usefully here:—"Kezel basch or Kizil basch. Mot Turc qui signifie Tete rouge. Les Tures appellent les Persans de ce nom, depuis qu'Ismael Sofi, fondateur de la Dynastie des princes qui regnent aujourd'hui en Perse,
under an awning placed some 70–80 qārīs on my right, of the begs Yūnas-i-‘āli being ordered to sit with them. On my left the Aūzbeg envoys sat in the same way, of the begs ‘Abdu‘l-lāh being ordered to sit with them. I sat on the north side of a newly-erected octagonal pavilion (tālār) covered in with khas. Five or six qārīs on my right sat Tūkhtā-būgha Sl. and ‘Askārī, with Khwāja ‘Abdu‘sh-shahīd and Khwāja Kalān, descendants of his Reverence the Khwāja, and Khwāja Chishti (var. Husainī), and Khalīfa, together with the ḥāfizex and mullās dependent on the Khwājas who had come from Samarkand. Five or six qārīs on my left sat Muhammad-i-zamān M. and Tāng-ātmish Sl. and Sayyid Rāfī, Sayyid Rūmī, Shaikh Abūl-fath, Shaikh Jamālī, Shaikh Shihābu’d-dīn ‘Arab and Sayyid Daknī (var. Zaknī, Ruknī). Before food all the sulṭāns, khāns, grandees, and amirs brought gifts of red, of white, of black, of cloth and various other goods. They poured the red and white on a carpet I had ordered spread, and side by side with the gold and silver piled plenishing, white cotton piece-cloth and purses (badra) of money. While the gifts were being brought and before food, fierce camels and fierce elephants were set to fight on an island opposite, so too a few rams; thereafter wrestlers grappled. After the commanda à ses soldats de porter un bonnet rouge autour duquel il y a une écharpe ou Turban à douze plis, en mémoire et à l’honneur des 12 Imams, successeurs d’Ali, desquels il prétendoit descendre. Ce bonnet s’appelle en Persan, Ṭāfī, et fut institué l’an 907e de l’Hég. Ṭahmāsp himself uses the name Qızıl-bāsh; Bābur does so too. Other explanations of it are found (Steingass), but the one quoted above suits its use without contempt. (Cf. f. 354 n.3).

1 *cir. 140–150 ft. or more if the 36in. qārī be the unit.
2 *Andropogon muricatus*, the scented grass of which the roots are fitted into window spaces and moistened to mitigate dry, hot winds. Cf. Hobson-Jobson s.n. *Cuscuta*
3 A nephew and a grandson of Ahrāri’s second son Yahya (f. 347b) who had stood staunch to Bābur till murdered in 906AH.–1500AD. (80b). They are likely to be those to whom went a copy of the *Mubin* under cover of a letter addressed to lawyers of Māwarā’u’n-nahr (f. 351 n.1). The Khwājas were in Agra three weeks after Bābur finished his metrical version of their ancestor’s *Wālidīyyah-risāla*; whether their coming (which must have been announced some time before their arrival), had part in directing his attention to the tract can only be surmised (f. 346).
4 He was an Aūzbeg (f. 371) and from his association here with a Bāq-qarā, and, later with Qāsim-i-husain who was half Bāq-qarā, half Aūzbeg, seems likely to be of the latter’s family (Index s.nu.).
5 *sāhāq kīūrdī* (kīūrdī?) No record survives to tell the motive for this feast; perhaps the gifts made to Bābur were congratulatory on the birth of a grandson, the marriage of a son, and on the generally-prosperous state of his affairs.
6 Gold, silver and copper coins.
7 Made so by *bhāng* or other exciting drug.
8 *ārāl*, presumably one left by the winter-fall of the Jumna; or, a peninsula.
chief of the food had been set out, Khwâja 'Abdu’-sh-shahîd and Khwâja Kalân were made to put on surtouts (*jabbaḥ*) of fine muslin,\(^1\) spotted with gold-embroidery, and suitable dresses of honour, and those headed by Mûllâ Farrûkh and Hâfîz\(^2\) had jackets put on them. On Kûchûm Khân’s envoy\(^3\) and on Ḥasan Chalabi’s younger brother\(^4\) were bestowed silken head-wear (*bâshliq*) and gold-embroidered surtouts of fine muslin, with suitable dresses of honour. Gold-embroidered jackets and silk coats were presented to the envoys of Abû-sa‘îd Sl. (*Aûsbeg*), of Mîhr-bân Khânîm and her son Pulâd Sl., and of Shâh Ḥasan (*Arghûn*). The two Khwâjas and the two chief envoys, that is to say Kûchûm Khân’s retainer and Ḥasan Chalabi’s younger brother, were presented with a silver stone’s weight of gold and a gold stone’s weight of silver.

\(^{1}\) Scribes and translators have been puzzled here. My guess at the Turki clause is *aîrango àîralîk kish jabbab*. In reading *muslin*, I follow Erskine who worked in India and could take local opinion; moreover gifts made in Agra probably would be Indian.

\(^{2}\) For one Hâfîz of Samarkand see f. 237b.

\(^{3}\) Kûchûm was Khâqân of the Aûzbegs and had his seat in Samarkand. One of his sons, Abû-sa‘îd, mentioned below, had sent envoys. With Abû-sa‘îd is named Mîhr-bân who was one of Kûchûm’s wives; Pulâd was their son. Mîhr-bân was, I think, a half-sister of Bâbur, a daughter of ‘Umar Shaikh and Umid of Andîjân (f. 9), and a full-sister of Nâsir. No doubt she had been captured on one of the occasions when Bâbur lost to the Aûzbegs. In 925 AH.—1519 AD. (f. 237b) when he sent his earlier *Dîwân* to Pulâd Sl. (*Translator’s Note*, p. 438) he wrote a verse on its back which looks to be addressed to his half-sister through her son.

\(^{4}\) Tahmâsp’s envoy; the title Chalabî shews high birth.

\(^{5}\) This statement seems to imply that the weight made of silver and the weight made of gold were of the same size and that the differing specific gravity of the two metals,—that of silver being *cir.* 10 and that of gold *cir.* 20,—gave their equivalents the proportion Bâbur states. Persian Dictionaries give *sang* (*tâsh*), a weight, but without further information. We have not found mention of the *tâsh* as a recognized Turki weight; perhaps the word *tâsh* stands for an ingot of unworked metal of standard size. (Cf. *inter alios libros*, A.-i.-A. Blochmann p. 36, Codrington’s *Musalman Numismatics* p. 117, concerning the *mîsqâl*, *dînâr*, etc.)

\(^{6}\) *târîsh* *bîla*. These words are clear in the Hai. MS. but uncertain in some others. E. and de C. have no equivalent of them. Perhaps the coins were given by the quiverful; that a quiver of arrows was given is not expressed.

\(^{7}\) Bâbur’s half-nephew; he seems from his name Keepsake-of-nâşir to have been posthumous.
Muḥammad the raftsman who was deserving of reward for the excellent bridge he had made over the river Gang (Ganges),¹ a dagger was bestowed, so too on the matchlockmen Champion [pahlawān] Ḥāji Muḥammad and Champion Buhlūl and on Wālī the cheeta-keeper (pārschī); one was given to Ustād ‘Ali’s son also. Gold and silver were presented to Sayyid Daud Garm-sīrī. Jackets having buttons,² and silk dresses of honour were presented to the servants of my daughter Maṣūma ³ and my son Hind-āl. Again:—presents of jackets and silk dresses of honour, of gold and silver, of plenishing and various goods were given to those from Andijān, and to those who had come from Sūkh and Hushār, the places whither we had gone landless and homeless.⁴ Gifts of the same kind were given to the servants of Qurbān and Shaikhī and the peasants of Kāhmard.⁵ After food had been sent out, Hindūstānī players were ordered to come and show their tricks. Lūlīs came.⁶ Hindūstānī performers shew several feats not shewn by (Tramontane) ones. One is this:—They arrange seven rings, one on the forehead, two on the knees, two of the remaining four on fingers, two on toes, and in an instant set them turning rapidly. Another is this:—Imitating the port of the peacock, they place one hand on the ground, raise up the other and both legs, and then in an instant make rings on the uplifted hand and feet revolve rapidly. Another is this:—In those (Tramontane) countries two people grip one another and turn two somersaults, but Hindūstānī lūlīs, clinging together, go turning over three or four times. Another is this:—a lūlī sets the end of a 12 or 14 foot pole on his middle and holds it upright while another climbs up it and does his tricks up there. Another is this:—A small lūlī gets up on a big one’s head, and stands there upright while the big one moves

¹ 934AH.—1528AD. (l. 336).
² Or, gold-embroidered.
³ Wife of Muḥammad-i-zamān Mīrāz.
⁴ These Highlanders of Asfara will have come by invitation sent after the victory at Panpāt; their welcome shows remembrance of and gratitude for kindness received a quarter of a century earlier. Perhaps villagers from Dikh-kat will have come too, who had seen the Pādshāh run barefoot on their hills (Index s.nn.).
⁵ Here gratitude is shewn for protection given in 910AH.—1504AD. to the families of Bābur and his men when on the way to Kābul. Qurbān and Shaikhī were perhaps in Fort Ajar (l. 1226, l. 126).
⁶ Perhaps these acrobats were gypsies.
quickly from side to side shewing his tricks, the little one shewing his on the big one's head, quite upright and without tottering. Many dancing-girls came also and danced.

A mass of red, white, and black was scattered (sāchildī) on which followed amazing noise and pushing. Between the Evening and Bed-time Prayers I made five or six special people sit in my presence for over one watch. At the second watch of the day (9 a.m., Sunday, Rabi' II. 7th) having sat in a boat, I went to the Eight-Paradises.

(dd. 'Askārī starts eastwards.)

(Dec. 20th) On Monday (8th) 'Askārī who had got (his army) out (of Āgra) for the expedition, came to the Hot-bath, took leave of me and marched for the East.

(ee. A visit to Dhūlpūr.)

(Dec. 21st) On Tuesday (Rabī' II. 9th) I went to see the buildings for a reservoir and well at Dūlpūr.1 I rode from the (Āgra) garden at one watch (pahr) and one garī (9.22 a.m.), and I entered the Dūlpūr garden when 5 garīs of the 1st night-watch (pās)2 had gone (7.40p.m.).3

(Dec. 23rd) On Thursday the 11th day of the month the stone-well (sangīn-chāh), the 26 rock-spouts (tāsh-tār-nau) and rock-pillars (tāsh-sitīn), and the water-courses (āriqlār) cut on the solid slope (yak pāra qīā) were all ready.4 At the 3rd watch (pahr) of this same day preparation for drawing water from the well was made. On account of a smell (aīd) in the water, it was ordered, for prudence' sake, that they should turn the well-wheel without rest for 15 days-and-nights, and so draw off the water. Gifts were made to the stone-cutters, and labourers, and the whole body of workmen in the way customary for master-workmen and wage-earners of Āgra.

1 This may be the one with which Sayyid Daknī was concerned (f. 346).
2 Bābur obviously made the distinction between pahr and pās that he uses the first for day-watches, the second for those of the night.
3 Anglicē, Tuesday, Dec. 21st; by Muhammadan plan, Wednesday 22nd. Dhūlpūr is 34 m. s. of Āgra; the journey of 10hrs. 20m. would include the noon-ing and the time taken in crossing rivers.
4 The well was to fill a cistern; the 26 spouts with their 26 supports were to take water into (26?) conduits. Perhaps tāsh means that they were hewn in the solid rock; perhaps that they were on the outer side of the reservoir. They will not have been built of hewn stone, or the word would have been sangīn or tāshān.
(Dec. 24th) We rode from Düpür while one gari of the 1st watch (pahr) of Friday remained (cir. 8.40 a.m.), and we crossed the river (Jumna) before the Sun had set.

(Here the record of 3 days is wanting.)

(ff. A Persian account of the battle of Jâm.)

(Dec. 28th) On Tuesday the 16th of the month (Rabî' II.) came one of Dîv Sl.'s servants, a man who had been in the fight between the Qızıl-bâsh and Aızbeg, and who thus described it:—The battle between the Aızbegs and Turkmâns took place on 'Ashûr-day (Muh. 10th) near Jâm-and-Khirgird. They fought from the first dawn till the Mid-day Prayer. The Aızbegs were 300,000; the Turkmâns may have been (as is said?) 40 to 50,000; he said that he himself estimated their dark mass at 100,000; on the other hand, the Aızbegs said they themselves were 100,000. The Qızıl-bâsh leader (ādam) fought after arraying cart, culverin and matchlockmen in the Rûmî fashion, and after protecting himself.5 Shâh-zâda6 and Jûha Sl. stood behind the carts with 20,000 good braves. The rest of the begs were posted right and left beyond the carts. These the Aızbeg beat at once on coming up, dismounted and

1 One occupation of these now blank days is indicated by the date of the "Rümûr Dîwân", Thursday Rabî' II. 15th (Dec. 27th).
2 The demon (or, athlete) suljân of Rumelia (Rûmlû); once Tahmâsp's guardian (Taşkirit-i-Tahmâsp, Bib. Ind. ed. Philott, p. 2). Some writers say he was put to death by Tahmâsp (et. 12) in 933 AH.; if this were so, it is strange to find a servant described as his in 935 AH. (An account of the battle is given in the Sharaf-nâmâ, written in 1005 AH. by Sharaf Khân who was reared in Tahmâsp's house. The book has been edited by Veliaminof-Zernof and translated into French by Charmoy; cf. Trs. vol. ii, part i, p. 555.—H. Beveridge.)
3 This name, used by one who was with the Shâh's troops, attracts attention; it may show the composition of the Persian army; it may differentiate between the troops and their "Qızıl-bâsh leader".
4 Several writers give Sârû-qamsâ (Charmoy, roseau jaune) as the name of the village where the battle was fought; Sharaf Khân gives 'Umarâbâd and mentions that after the fight Tahmâsp spent some time in the meadow of Sârû-qamsâ.
5 The number of Tahmâsp's guns being a matter of interest, reference should be made to Bâbur's accounts of his own battles in which he arrayed in Rûmî (Ottoman) fashion; it will then be seen that the number of carts does not imply the number of guns (Index s.n. arâba, cart).
6 This cannot but represent Tahmâsp who was on the battle-field (see his own story infra). He was 14 years old; perhaps he was called Shâh-zâda, and not Shâh, on account of his youth, or because under guardianship (?). Readers of the Persian histories of his reign may know the reason. Bâbur hitherto has always called the boy Shâh-zâda; after the victory at Jâm, he styles him Shâh. Jûha Sl. (Taklû) who was with him on the field, was Governor of Isphâhn.
overcame many, making all scurry off. He then wheeled to the
(Qīzīl-bāsh) rear and took loot in camel and baggage. At length
those behind the carts loosed the chains and came out. Here
also the fight was hard. Thrice they flung the Āūzbeg back;
by God's grace they beat him. Nine sultāns, with Kūchūm
Khān, 'Ubaid Khān and Abū-sa'īd Sl. at their head, were
captured; one, Abū-sa'īd Sl. is said to be alive; the rest have
gone to death.† 'Ubaid Khān's body was found, but not his
head. Of Āūzbegs 50,000, and of Turkmāns 20,000 were slain.‡

(Here matter seems to have been lost.) ³

(Dec. 30th) On this same day (Thursday Rabī‘ II. 18th) came
Ghīāšu’d-din the armourer ⁴ who had gone to Jūna-pūr (Jūnpūr)
with tryst of 16 days,⁵ but as Sl. Juṣaid and the rest had led

---
¹ If this Persian account of the battle be in its right place in Bābur's diary, it is
singular that the narrator should be so ill-informed at a date allowing facts to be
known; the three sultāns he names as killed escaped to die, Kūchūm in 937/1530 AD.,
Abū-sa'īd in 940 AH.—1533 AD., 'Ubaid in 946 AH.—1539 AD. (Lane-
Poole's Muḥammadan Dynasties). It would be natural for Bābur to comment on the
mistake, since envys from two of the sultāns reported killed, were in Āgra. There
had been time for the facts to be known: the battle was fought on Sep. 26th; the
news of it was in Āgra on Nov. 23rd; envys from both adversaries were at Bābur's
entertainment on Dec. 19th. From this absence of comment and for the reasons
indicated in note 3 (infra), it appears that matter has been lost from the text.
² Ṣahāhs' account of the battle is as follows (T. i. T. p. 11): — "I marched against
the Āūzbegs. The battle took place outside Jām. At the first onset, Āūzbeg
prevailed over Qīzīl-bāsh. Ya'qūb Sl. fled and Sl. Wālāma Tāklū and other
officers of the right wing were defeated and put to flight. Putting my trust in God, I
prayed and advanced some paces. . . . One of my body-guard getting up with
'Ubaid struck him with a sword, passed on, and occupied himself with another.
Qūlj Bahādūr and other Āūzbegs carried off the wounded 'Ubaid; Kūchkūnjī (Kūchūm)
Khān and Jānī Khan Beg, when they became aware of this state of affairs, fled to Merv. Men
that had fled from our army rejoined us that day. That night I spent on the barren
plain (ṣāhra'). I did not know what had happened to 'Ubaid. I thought perhaps
they were devising some stratagem against me." The 'A.-'A. says that 'Ubaid's
assailant, on seeing his low stature and contemptible appearance, left him for a more
worthy foe.
³ Not only does some comment from Bābur seem needed on an account of deaths he
knew had not occurred, but loss of matter may be traced by working backward from
his next explicit date (Friday 19th), to do which shows fairly well that the "same
day" will be not Tuesday the 16th but Thursday the 18th. Ghīāshu’d-din's reception
was on the day preceding Friday 19th, so that part of Thursday's record (as shown
by "on this same day"), the whole of Wednesday's, and (to suit an expected comment
by Bābur on the discrepant story of the Āūzbeg deaths) part of Tuesday's are missing.
The gap may well have contained mention of Ijāsan Chalabi's coming (f. 357), or
explain why he had not been at the feast with his younger brother.
⁴ qūṛčī, perhaps body-guard, life-guardsman.
⁵ As on f. 350b (q.v. p. 628 n. 1) aūn alī guṇūk būlār (or, m. ljār) bīla.
out their army for Kharid,\(^1\) he (Ghīṣu’d-dīn) was not able to be back at the time fixed.\(^2\) Sl. Junaid said, by word-of-mouth, "Thank God! through His grace, no work worth the Ādshāh’s attention has shewn itself in these parts; if the honoured Mīrzā (‘Askari) come, and if the sultaṅs, khāns and amirs here-about be ordered to move in his steps, there is hope that everything in these parts will be arranged with ease." Though such was Sl. Junaid’s answer, yet, as people were saying that Mullā Muḥammad Mazhab, who had been sent as envoy to Bengal after the Holy-battle with Sangā the Pagan,\(^3\) would arrive today or tomorrow, his news also was awaited.

(Dec. 31st) On Friday the 19th of the month I had eaten *ma’jūn* and was sitting with a special few in the private house, when Mullā Mazhab who had arrived late, that is to say, in the night of Saturday,\(^4\) came and waited on me. By asking one particular after another, we got to know that the attitude of the Bengali\(^5\) was understood to be loyal and single-minded.

(Jan. 2nd) On Sunday (Rabī‘ II. 21st), I summoned the Turk and Hind amirs to the private house, when counsel was taken and the following matters were brought forward:—As the Bengali (Naṣrat Shāh) has sent us an envoy\(^6\) and is said to be loyal and single-minded, to go to Bengal itself would be improper; if the move be not on Bengal, no other place on that side has treasure helpful for the army; several places to the west are both rich and near,

*(Turki)* Abounding wealth, a pagan people, a short road; Far though the East lie, this is near.

At length the matter found settlement at this:—As our westward road is short, it will be all one if we delay a few days, so that our minds may be at ease about the East. Again Ghiāṣu’d-dīn,\(^7\) the armourer was made to gallop off, with tryst of 20 days,\(^7\) to

---

1 A sub-division of the Ballia district of the United Provinces, on the right bank of the Ghoğrā.

2 *i.e.* in 16 days; he was 24 or 25 days away.

3 The envoy had been long in returning; Kanwā was fought in March, 1527; it is now the end of 1528 AD.

4 Rabī‘ II. 20th—January 1st 1529 AD.; Angliçé, Friday, after 6 p.m.

5 This "Bengali" is territorial only; Naṣrat Shāh was a Sayyid’s son (f. 271).

6 Ismā’il Mitā (f. 357) who will have come with Mullā Mazhab.

7 *mi‘ād*, cf. f. 350\(^b\) and f. 354\(^b\). Ghiāṣu’d-dīn may have been a body-guard.
convey written orders to the eastern amīrs for all the sultāns, khāns, and amīrs who had assembled in ‘Askārī’s presence, to move against those rebels. The orders delivered, he was to return by the trysted day with what ever news there might be.

(hh. Balūchī incursions.)

In these days Muḥammādi Kūkūlḍāsh made dutiful representation that again Balūchīs had come and overrun several places. Chīn-tīmūr Sl. was appointed for the business; he was to gather to his presence the amīrs from beyond Sīhrind and Samānā and with them, equipped for 6 months, to proceed against the Balūchīs; namely, such amīrs as ‘Ādīl Sultān, Sl. Muh. Dūldār, Khusraw Kūkūlḍāsh, Muḥammād ‘Alī Jang-jang, ‘Abdū’l-‘azīz the Master-of-the-horse, Sayyid ‘Alī, Wāli Qizīl, Qarācha, Halāhil, ‘Āṣīq the House-steward, Shāiikh ‘Alī, Kitta (Beg Kuhbur), Gujūr Khān, Ḥasan ‘Alī Sīwādī. These were to present themselves at the Sultān’s call and muster and not to transgress his word by road or in halt. The messenger appointed to carry these orders was ‘Abdū’l-ghaffār; he was to deliver them first to Chīn-tīmūr Sl., then to go on and shew them to the afore-named begs who were to present themselves with their troops at whatever place the Sultān gave rendezvous (būljār); ‘Abdū’l-ghaffār himself was to remain with the army and was to make dutiful representation of slackness or carelessness if shewn by any person soever; this done, we should remove the offender from the circle of the approved (muwajjah-jirgāsī) and from his country or pargana. These orders having been entrusted to ‘Abdū’l-ghaffār, words-of-mouth were made known to him and he was given leave to go.

(The last explicit date is a week back.)

1 Lüdi Afghāns and their friends, including Bīban and Bāyāzīd.
2 yüllūq tārdīk; Memoirs, p. 398, “should act in every respect in perfect conformity to his commands”; Mémoires ii, 379, “chaqu’un suivant son rang et sa dignité.”
3 tawāchī. Bābūr’s uses of this word support Erskine in saying that “the tawāchī is an officer who corresponds very nearly to the Turkish chāwūsh, or special messenger” (Zenker, p. 346, col. iii) “but he was also often employed to act as a commissary for providing men and stores, as a commissioner in superintending important affairs, as an aide-de-camp in carrying orders, etc.”
4 Here the Hai. MS. has the full-vowelled form, būljār. Judging from what that Codex writes, būljār may be used for a rendezvous of troops, m:jār or b:jār for any other kind of tryst (f. 350, p. 628 n. 1; Index s. nn.), also for a shelter.
News of the loss of Bihār reaches Dhūlpūr.)

(Jan. 9th) On the eve of Sunday the 28th of the month (Rabi‘ II.) we crossed the Jūn (Jumna) at the 6th gari of the 3rd watch (2.15 a.m.) and started for the Lotus-garden of Dūlpūr. The 3rd watch was near (Sunday mid-day) when we reached it. Places were assigned on the border of the garden, where begs and the household might build or make camping-grounds for themselves.

(Jan. 13th) On Thursday the 3rd of the first Jumāda, a place was fixed in the s.e. of the garden for a Hot-bath; the ground was to be levelled; I ordered a plinth (?) (kursī) erected on the levelled ground, and a Bath to be arranged, in one room of which was to be a reservoir 10 × 10.

On this same day Khalīfa sent from Āgra dutiful letters of Qāzī Jiā and Bir-sing Deo, saying it had been heard said that Iskandar’s son Mahmūd (Lūdī) had taken Bihār (town). This news decided for getting the army to horse.

(Jan. 14th) On Friday (Jumāda I. 4th), we rode out from the Lotus-garden at the 6th gari (8.15 a.m.); at the Evening Prayer we reached Āgra. We met Muḥammad-i-zamān Mīrzā on the road who would have gone to Dūlpūr, Chīn-tīmūr also who must have been coming into Āgra.

(Jan. 15th) On Saturday (5th) the counselling begs having been summoned, it was settled to ride eastwards on Thursday the 10th of the month (Jan. 21st).

(jj. News of Badakhshān.)

On this same Saturday letters came from Kābul with news that Humāyūn, having mustered the army on that side (Tramontana), and joined Sl. Wais to himself, had set out with 40,000 men for Samarkand; 3 on this Sl. Wais’ younger brother

1 yāwūshūb aiddī, which I translate in accordance with other uses of the verb, as meaning approach, but is taken by some other workers to mean “near its end”.

2 Though it is not explicitly said, Chīn-tīmūr may have been met with on the road; as the “also” (ham) suggests.

3 To the above news the Akbar-nāma adds the important item reported by Humāyūn, that there was talk of peace. Bābur replied that, if the time for negotiation were not past, Humāyūn was to make peace until such time as the affairs of Hindūstān were cleared off. This is followed in the A.N. by a seeming quotation from Bābur’s letter, saying in effect that he was about to leave Hindūstān, and that his followers in Kābul and Tramontana must prepare for the expedition against Samarkand which would be made on his own arrival. None of the above matter is now with the Bābur-nāma;
Shāh-qūli goes and enters Ḥiṣār, Tarsūn Muḥammad leaves Tirmiz, takes Qabādīān and asks for help; Humāyūn sends Tūlik Kūkūldāsh and Mīr Khwurd ¹ with many of his men and what Mughūls there were, then follows himself.²

(Here 4 days record is wanting.)

(kk. Bābūr starts for the East.)

(Jan. 20th) On Thursday the 10th of the first Jumāda, I set out for the East after the 3rd garī (cir. 7.10 a.m.), crossed Jūn by boat a little above Jalāsīr, and went to the Gold-scattering-garden.³ It was ordered that the standard (tūgh), drum, stable and all the army-folk should remain on the other side of the water, opposite to the garden, and that persons coming for an interview ⁴ should cross by boat.

(ll. Arrivals.)

(Jan. 22nd) On Saturday (12th) Ismā'īl Mītā, the Bengal envoy brought the Bengali’s offering (Nasrat Shāh’s), and waited on me in Hindūstān fashion, advancing to within an arrow’s flight, making his reverence, and retiring. They then put on him the due dress of honour (khīlat) which people call ⁵, and either it was there once, was used by Abū’l-faḍl and lost before the Persian trss. were made; or Abū’l-faḍl used Bābūr’s original, or copied, letter itself. That desire for peace prevailed is shewn by several matters:—Tāhmāsp, the victor, asked and obtained the hand of an Aūzbeg in marriage; Aūzbeg envys came to Āgra, and with them Turk Khwājas having a mission likely to have been towards peace (f. 357b); Bābūr’s wish for peace is shewn above and on f. 359 in a summarized letter to Humāyūn. (Cf. Abū’l-ghāzī’s Shajarat-i-Turk [Histoire des Mongols, Desmason’s’ trs. p. 216]; Akbar-nāma, H.B.’s trs. i., 270.)

A here-useful slip of reference is made by the translator of the Akbar-nāma (l.c. n. 3) to the Fragment (Mémoires ii, 456) instead of to the Bābūr-nāma translation (Mémoires ii, 381). The utility of the slip lies in its accompanying comment that de C.’s translation is in closer agreement with the Akbar-nāma than with Bābūr’s words. Thus the Akbar-nāma passage is brought into comparison with what it is now safe to regard as its off-shoot, through Turki and French, in the Fragment. When the above comment on their resemblance was made, we were less assured than now as to the genesis of the Fragment (Index s.n. Fragment).

¹ Hind-āl’s guardian (G. B.’s Humāyūn-nāma trs. p. 106, n. 1).
² Nothing more about Humāyūn’s expedition is found in the B.N.; he left Badakhshān a few months later and arrived in Āgra, after his mother (f. 380b), at a date in August of which the record is wanting.
³ under 6 m. from Āgra. Gul-badan (f. 16) records a visit to the garden, during which her father said he was weary of sovereignty. Cf. f. 331b, p. 589 n. 2.
⁴ kūrūnšī kīlān kīshīlār.
⁵ MSS. vary or are indecisive as to the omitted word. I am unable to fill the gap. Erskine has “Sir Mūwineh (or hair-twist)” (p. 399), De Courteille, Sir-mouineh (ii, 382). Mūina means ermine, sable and other fine fur (Shamsul-lūghāt, p 274, col. 1).
brought him before me. He knelt thrice in our fashion, advanced, handed Naṣrat Shāh’s letter, set before me the offering he had brought, and retired.

(Jan. 24th) On Monday (14th) the honoured Khwāja ‘Abdu’l-ḥaqq having arrived, I crossed the water by boat, went to his tents and waited on him.1

(Jan. 25th) On Tuesday (15th) Hasan Chalabī arrived and waited on me.2

(mm. Incidents of the eastward march.)

On account of our aims (chāpdūq) for the army,3 some days were spent in the Chār-bāgh.

(Jan. 27th) On Thursday the 17th of the month, that ground was left after the 3rd gari (7.10a.m.), I going by boat. It was dismounted 7 kurohs (14 m.) from Āgra, at the village of Anwār.4

(Jan. 30th) On Sunday (Jumāda I. 20th), the Aūzbek envoys were given their leave. To Kūchūm Khān’s envoy Amīn Mīrzā were presented a dagger with belt, cloth of gold,5 and 70,000 tankas.6 Abū-sa‘īd’s servant Mullā Ṭaghāī and the servants of Mihr-bān Khānīm and her son Pūlād Sl. were made to put on dresses of honour with gold-embroidered jackets, and were presented also with money in accordance with their station.

(Jan. 31st?) Next morning7 (Monday 21st?) leave was given to Khwāja ‘Abdu’l-ḥaqq for stay in Āgra and to Khwāja Yahyā’s

---

1 His brother Ḥazrat Makhdūm Nūrā (Khwāja Khāwand Maḥmūd) is much celebrated by Ḥaidar Mīrzā, and Bābur describes his own visit in the words he uses of the visit of an inferior to himself. Cf. Tārīkh-i-rashīdī trs. pp. 395, 478; Akbar-nāma trs., i, 356, 360.

2 No record survives of the arrival of this envoy or of why he was later in coming than his brother who was at Bābur’s entertainment. Cf. f. 361b.

3 Presumably this refers to the appliances mentioned on f. 359b.

4 f. 332, n.3.

5 zarbaft m.l.k. Amongst gold stuffs imported into Hindūstān, Abū’l-fazl mentions milak which may be Bābur’s cloth. It came from Turkistan (A.-i-A. Blochmann, p. 92 and n.).

6 A tang is a small silver coin of the value of about a penny (Erskine).

7 tāŋgāsī, lit. at its dawning. It is not always clear whether tāŋgāsī means, Anglicé, next dawn or day, which here would be Monday, or whether it stands for the dawn (daylight) of the Muhammadan day which had begun at 6 p.m. on the previous evening, here Sunday. When Bābur records, e.g. a late audience, tāŋgāsī, following, will stand for the daylight of the day of audience. The point is of some importance as bearing on discrepancies of days, as these are stated in MSS., with European calendars; it is conspicuously so in Bābur’s diary sections.
grandson Khwaja Kalan for Samarkand, who had come by way of a mission from Auzbeg khans and sultans.

In congratulation on the birth of Humayun's son and Kamaran's marriage, Mulla Tabrizi and Mirza Beg Taghai were sent with gifts (sachaq) to each Mirza of 10,000 shahrukhs, a coat I had worn, and a belt with clasps. Through Mulla Bihishti were sent to Hind-al an inlaid dagger with belt, an inlaid ink-stand, a stool worked in mother-o'pearl, a tunic and a girdle, together with the alphabet of the Buburi script and fragments (qitadlar) written in that script. To Humayun were sent the translation (tarjuma) and verses made in Hindustan. To Hind-al and Khwaja Kalan also the translation and verses were sent. They were sent too to Kamaran, through Mirza Beg Taghai, together with head-lines (sar-khat) in the Buburi script.

(Feb. 1st) On Tuesday, after writing letters to be taken by those going to Kabul, the buildings in hand at Agra and Dulpur were recalled to mind, and entrusted to the charge of Mulla Qasim, Ustad Shah Muhammad the stone-cutter, Mirak, Mir Ghias, Mir Sang-tarash (stone-cutter) and Shah Baba the spadesman. Their leave was then given them.

(Feb. 2nd) The first watch (6a.m.) was near when we rode out from Anwar (Wednesday, Jumada I. 23rd); in the end, we dismounted, at the Mid-day Prayer, in the village of Abapur, one kuroh (2m.) from Chandawar.

(Feb. 3rd) On the eve of Thursday (24th) 'Abdu'l-maluk the armourer was joined with Hasan Chalabi and sent as envoy

---

1 risalat tarigi bila; their special mission may have been to work for peace (f. 359b, n. 1).
2 He may well be Kamaran's father-in-law Sh.Ali Mirza Taghai Begchik.
3 nima u takband. The tak-band is a silk or woollen girdle fastening with a "hook and eye" (Steingass), perhaps with a buckle.
4 This description is that of the contents of the "Rumpur Diwan"; the tarjuma being the Waliyyah-khisala (f. 361 and n.). What is said here shows that four copies went to Kabul or further north. Cf. Appendix Q.
5 Sar-khat may mean "copies" set for Kamaran to imitate.
6 bir pahra yowushub aidi; I.O. 215 f. 221, qarib yak pas roz bud.
7 akhar, a word which may reveal a bad start and uncertainty as to when and where to halt.
8 This, and not Chandwara (f. 331b), appears the correct form. Neither this place nor Abapur is mentioned in the G. of I.'s Index or shown in the I.S. Map of 1900 (cf. f. 331b n. 3). Chandwara lies s.w. of Firuzabad, and near a village called Shifipur.
9 Anglice, Wednesday after 6p.m.
10 or life-guardsman, body-guard.
to the Shāh; and Chāpūq was joined with the Aūzbeg envoys and sent to the Aūzbeg khāns and sultāns.

We moved from Ābāpūr while 4 garīs of the night remained (4.30a.m.). After passing Chandawār at the top of the dawn, I got into a boat. I landed in front of Rāpī and at the Bed-time Prayer got to the camp which was at Fathpūr.

(Feb. 4th and 5th) Having stayed one day (Friday) at Fathpūr, we got to horse on Saturday (26th) after making ablution (waṣū) at dawn. We went through the Morning Prayer in assembly near Rāpī, Maulānā Muḥammad of Fārāb being the leader (imām). At sun-rise I got into a boat below the great crook4 of Rāpī.

Today I put together a line-marker (mistār) of eleven lines5 in order to write the mixed hands of the translation.6

---

1 This higher title for Ţahmāsp, which first appears here in the B.N., may be an early slip in the Turki text, since it occurs in many MSS. and also because "Shāh-zāda" reappears on f. 359.

2 Slash-face, balafrē; perhaps Ibrāhīm Begchīk (Index s.n.), but it is long since he was mentioned by Bābur, at least by name. He may however have come, at this time of reunion in Agra, with Mīrzā Beg Ṭaghāī (his uncle or brother?), father-in-law of Kāmrān.

3 The army will have kept to the main road connecting the larger towns mentioned and avoiding the ravine district of the Jumna. What the boat-journey will have been between high banks and round remarkable bends can be learned from the G. of I. and Neave's District Gazetteer of Mainpūrī. Rāpī is on the road from Firūzābād to the ferry for Bateswar, where a large fair is held annually. (It is misplaced further east in the I.S. Map of 1900.) There are two Fathpūrs, n.e. of Rāpī.

4 aūlīgh tūghānīng tūbī. Here it suits to take the Turki word tūghā to mean bend of a river, and as referring to the one shaped (on the map) like a soda-water bottle, its neck close to Rāpī. Bābur avoided it by taking boat below its mouth.—

In neither Persian translation has tūghā been read to mean a bend of a river; the first has as pâyān rūţā Rāpī, perhaps referring to the important ford (pâyān); the second has as sīr bulaûtī kalān Rāpī, perhaps referring to a height at the meeting of the bank of the ravine down which the road to the ford comes, with the high bank of the river. Three examples of tūghā or tūgā [a synonym given by Dictionaries], can be seen in Ahūl-gāzī's Shajrat-i-Turk, Fraehn's imprint, pp. 106, 107, 119 (Désmaisons' trs. pp. 204, 205, 230). In each instance Désmaisons renders it by cuude, elbow, but one of the examples may need reconsideration, since the word has the further meanings of wood, dense forest by the side of a river (Vambéry), prairie (Zenker), and reedy plain (Shaw).

5 Blochmann describes the apparatus for marking lines to guide writing (A.-i-A. trs. p. 52 n. 5):—On a card of the size of the page to be written on, two vertical lines are drawn within an inch of the edges; along these lines small holes are pierced at regular intervals, and through these a string is laced backwards and forwards, care being taken that the horizontal strings are parallel. Over the lines of string the pages are placed and pressed down; the strings then mark the paper sufficiently to guide the writing.

6 tarkīb (ning) khaft bīla tarjuma bi'tūr aūchūn. The Rāmpūr Diwān may supply the explanation of the uncertain words tarkīb khaft. The "translation" (tarjuma), mentioned in the passage quoted above, is the Wālidīyyah-risāla, the first item of the Diwān, in which it is entered on crowded pages, specially insufficient for the larger hand of the chapter-headings. The number of lines per page is 13; Bābur now
the words of the honoured man-of-God admonished my heart.¹

(Feb. 6th) Opposite Jākin,² one of the Rāpri parganas, we had the boats drawn to the bank and just spent the night in them. We had them moved on from that place before the dawn (Sunday 27th), after having gone through the Morning Prayer. When I was again on board, Pay-master Sl. Muḥammad came, bringing a servant of Khwāja Kalān, Shamsu’d-din Muḥammad, from whose letters and information particulars about the affairs of Kābul became known.³ Mahdī Khwāja also came when I was in the boat.⁴ At the Mid-day Prayer I landed in a garden opposite Etāwa, there bathed (ghusl) in the Jūn, and fulfilled the duty of prayer. Moving nearer towards Etāwa, we sat down in that same garden under trees on a height over-looking the river, and there set the braves to amuse us.⁵ Food ordered by Mahdī Khwāja, was set before us. At the Evening Prayer we crossed the river; at the bed-time one we reached camp.

There was a two or three days’ delay on that ground both to collect the army, and to write letters in answer to those brought by Shamsu’d-din Muḥammad.

(nn. Letters various.)

(Feb. 9th) On Wednesday the last day (30th) of the 1st Jumāda, we marched from Etāwa, and after doing 8 kurohs (16m.), dismounted at Mūri-and-Adūsa.⁶

fashions a line-marker for 11. He has already despatched 4 copies of the translation (f. 357b); he will have judged them unsatisfactory; hence to give space for the mixture of hands (tārkāb khaft), i.e. the smaller hand of the poem and the larger of the headings, he makes an 11 line marker.

¹ Perhaps Ahrār’s in the Wālidiyyah-risāla, perhaps those of Muḥammad. A quatrain in the Rāmpūr Dīwān connects with this admonishment [Plate xiv, 2nd quatrain].
³ Jākhān (G. of Mainpūrī). The G. of Etāwa (Drake-Brockman) p. 213, gives this as some 18 m. n.w. of Etāwa and as lying amongst the ravines of the Jumna.
⁴ f. 359b allows some of the particulars to be known.
⁵ Mahdī may have come to invite Bābur to the luncheon he served shortly afterwards. The Ḥai. MS. gives him the honorific plural; either a second caller was with him or an early scribe has made a slip, since Bābur never so-honours Mahdī. This small point touches the larger one of how Bābur regarded him, and this in connection with the singular story Niẓāμu’d-din Ahmad tells in his Tabaqāt-i-akbari about Khalīfa’s wish to supplant Humāyūn by Mahdī Khwāja (Index s.n.).
⁶ yiğitlärni shokhlūqga sälüq, perhaps set them to make fun. Cf. f. 366, yiğitlär bir şara shokhlūq qildüür. Muh. Shīrāzī (p. 323 foot) makes the startling addition of dar ăb (andākhtım), i.e. he says that the royal party flung the braves into the river.
⁶ The Gazetteer of Etāwa (Drake-Brockman) p. 186, s.n. Bāburpūr, writes of two village sites [which from their position are Mūri-and-Adūsa], as known by the name
Several remaining letters for Kabul were written on this same ground. One to Humayun was to this purport:—If the work have not yet been done satisfactorily, stop the raiders and thieves thyself; do not let them embroil the peace now descending amongst the peoples. Again, there was this:—I have made Kabul a crown-domain, let no son of mine covet it. Again:—that I had summoned Hind-âl.

Kâmrân, for his part, was written to about taking the best of care in intercourse with the Shâh-zâda, about my bestowal on himself of Multân, making Kâbul a crown-domain, and the coming of my family and train.

As my letter to Khwâja Kalân makes several particulars known, it is copied in here without alteration:

[COPY OF A LETTER TO KHWÂJA KALÂN.]

"After saying ‘Salutation to Khwâja Kalân’, the first matter is that Shamsu’âl-din Muhammammad has reached Etâwa, and that the particulars about Kâbul are known."

"Boundless and infinite is my desire to go to those parts. Matters are coming to some sort of settlement in Hindûstân; there is hope, through the Most High, that the work here will soon be arranged. This work brought to order, God willing! my start will be made at once."

"How should a person forget the pleasant things of those countries, especially one who has repented and vowed to sin no more? How should he banish from his mind the permitted flavours of melons and grapes? Taking this opportunity, Sarâl Bâburpûr from having been Bâbur’s halting-place. They are 24 m. to the s.e. of Etâwa, on the old road for Kâlpî. Near the name Bâburpûr in the Gazetteer Map there is Muhuri (Mûrî ?); there is little or no doubt that Sarâl Bâburpûr represents the camping-ground Mûrî-and-Adûsâ.

1 This connects with Kitin-qara’s complaints of the frontier-begs (f. 361), and with the talk of peace (f. 356b).

2 This injunction may connect with the desired peace; it will have been prompted by at least a doubt in Bâbur’s mind as to Kâmrân’s behaviour perhaps e.g. in manifested dislike for a Shâî. Concerning the style Shâh-zâda see f. 358, p. 643, n. 1.

3 Kâmrân’s mother Gul-rukh Begchik will have been of the party who will have tried in Kâbul to forward her son’s interests.

4 f. 348, p. 624, n. 2.

5 Kâbul and Tramontana.

6 Presumably that of Shamsu’âl-din Muhammammad’s mission. One of Bâbur’s couplets expresses longing for the fruits, and also for the “running waters”, of lands other than Hindûstân, with conceits recalling those of his English contemporaries in verse, as indeed do several others of his short poems (Râmpûr Diwân Plate xvii A.).
a melon was brought to me; to cut and eat it affected me strangely; I was all tears!”

“The unsettled state of Kābul had already been written of to me. After thinking matters over, my choice fell on this:—

How should a country hold together and be strong (marbūṭ u mażbūṭ), if it have seven or eight Governors? Under this aspect of the affair, I have summoned my elder sister (Khān-zāda) and my wives to Hindūstān, have made Kābul and its neighbouring countries a crown-domain, and have written in this sense to both Humāyūn and Kāmūn. Let a capable person take those letters to the Mīrzsās. As you may know already, I had written earlier to them with the same purport. About the safeguarding and prosperity of the country, there will now be no excuse, and not a word, to say. Henceforth, if the town-wall be not solid or subjects not thriving, if provisions be not in store or the Treasury not full, it will all be laid on the back of the inefficiency of the Pillar-of-the State.”

“The things that must be done are specified below; for some of them orders have gone already, one of these being; ‘Let treasure accumulate.’ Thethingstwhichmust be done are these:—

First, the repair of the fort; again:—the provision of stores; again:—the daily allowance and lodging of envoys going backwards and forwards; again:—let money, taken legally from revenue, be spent for building the Congregational Mosque; again:—the repairs of the Kārwan-sarā (Caravan-sarai) and the Hot-baths; again:—the completion of the unfinished building made of burnt-brick which Ūstād Ḥasan ‘Alī was constructing in the citadel.

Let this work be ordered after taking counsel with Ūstād Sl. Muḥammad; if a design exist, drawn earlier by Ūstād

---

1 Ḥai. MS. nā marbūṭlīghī; so too the 2nd Pers. trs. but the 1st writes wairānī u karābī which suits the matter of defence.

2 gūrghān, walled-town; from the mażbūt following, the defences are meant.

3 viz. Governor Khwāja Kalān, on whose want of dominance his sovereign makes good-natured reflection.

4 ‘alīfā u gūnāl; cf. 364b.

5 Following aṭlīchī (envoys) there is in the Ḥai. MS. and in I.O. 217 a doubtful word, bīmlā, yāmlā; I.O. 215 (which contains a Persian trs. of the letter) is obscure, Ilminsky changes the wording slightly; Erskine has a free translation. Perhaps it is yaumī, daily, misplaced (see above).

6 Perhaps, endow the Mosque so as to leave no right of property in its revenues to their donor, here Bābur. Cf. Hughes’ Dict. of Islam s.nn. šarī‘, masji‘ and waqf.
Hasan 'Ali, let Üstād Sl. Muḥammad finish the building precisely according to it; if not, let him do so, after making a gracious and harmonious design, and in such a way that its floor shall be level with that of the Audience-hall; again:—the Khwurd-Kābul dam which is to hold up the But-khāk-water at its exit from the Khwurd-Kābul narrows; again:—the repair of the Ghaznī dam; again:—the Avenue-garden in which water is short and for which a one-mill stream must be diverted; again:—I had water brought from Tūtūm-dara to rising ground south-west of Khwāja Basta, there made a reservoir and planted young trees. The place got the name of Belvedere, because it faces the ford and gives a first-rate view. The best of young trees must be planted there, lawns arranged, and borders set with sweet-herbs and with flowers of beautiful colour and scent; again:—Sayyid Qāsim has been named to reinforce thee; again:—do not neglect the condition of matchlockmen and of Üstād Muḥammad Amin the armourer; again:—directly this letter arrives, thou must get my elder sister (Khān-zāda Begīm) and my wives right out of Kābul, and escort them to Nil-āb. However averse they may still be, they most certainly must start within a week of the arrival of this letter. Why? Both because the armies which have gone from Hindūstān to escort them are suffering hardship in a cramped place (tār yīrdī), and also because they are ruining the country.”

“Again:—I made it clear in a letter written to ‘Abdu’l-lāh (‘asas), that there had been very great confusion in my mind (dūghdugha), to counterbalance being in the oasis (zwādī) of penitence. This quatrain was somewhat dissuading (māni’):

1 f. 139. Khwāja Kalān himself had taken from Hindūstān the money for repairing this dam.
2 sāqūn āqīp; the 2nd Pers. trs. as if from sāqūn āqīp, kharīda, purchasing.
3 nazār-gāh, perhaps, theatre, as showing the play enacted at the ford. Cf. ff. 137, 236, 248b. Tūtūm-dara will be Masson’s Tūtūm-dara. Erskine locates Tūtūm-dara some 8 kos (16m.) n.w. of Hūpīnān (Upīnān). Masson shews that it was a charming place (journes in Biluchistan, Afghanistan and the Panj-āb, vol. iii, cap. vi and vii).
4 jībachī. Bābur’s injunction seems to refer to the maintaining of the corps and the manufacture of armour rather than to care for the individual men involved.
5 Either the armies in Nil-āb, or the women in the Kābul-country (f. 375).
6 Perhaps what Bābur means is, that both what he had said to ‘Abdu’l-lāh and what the quatrain expresses, are dissipative from repentance. Erskine writes (Mems. p. 403) but without textual warrant, “I had resolution enough to persevere”; de Courteille (Mems. ii, 390), “Voici un quatrain qui exprime au juste les difficultés de ma position.”
Through renunciation of wine bewildered am I;
How to work know I not, so distracted am I;
While others repent and make vow to abstain,
I have vowed to abstain, and repentant am I.

A witticism of Banâi's came back to my mind:—One day when he had been joking in 'Ali-sher Beg's presence, who must have been wearing a jacket with buttons, 2 'Ali-sher Beg said, 'Thou makest charming jokes; but for the buttons, I would give thee the jacket; they are the hindrance (mânî).' Said Banâi, 'What hindrance are buttons? It is button-holes (mâdagî) that hinder.' Let responsibility for this story lie on the teller! hold me excused for it; for God's sake do not be offended by it. 3 Again:—that quatrain was made before last year, and in truth the longing and craving for a wine-party has been infinite and endless for two years past, so much so that sometimes the craving for wine brought me to the verge of tears. Thank God! this year that trouble has passed from my mind, perhaps by virtue of the blessing and sustenance of versifying the translation. 4 Do thou also renounce wine! If had with equal associates and boon-companions, wine and company are pleasant things; but with whom canst thou now associate? with whom drink wine? If thy boon-companions are Sher-i-âähmad and Hâidar-qulî, it should not be hard for thee to forswear wine. So much said, I salute thee and long to see thee." 5

The above letter was written on Thursday the 1st of the latter Jumâda (Feb. 10th). It affected me greatly to write concerning

1 The surface retort seems connected with the jacket, perhaps with a request for the gift of it.
2 Clearly what recalled this joke of Banâi's long-silent, caustic tongue was that its point lay ostensibly in a baffled wish—in 'Ali-sher's professed desire to be generous and a professed impediment, which linked in thought with Bâbur's desire for wine, baffled by his abjuration. So much Banâi's smart verbal retort shows, but beneath this is the double entendre which cuts at the Beg as miserly and as physically impotent, a defect which gave point to another jeer at his expense, one chronicled by Sâm Mirzâ and translated in Hammer-Purgstall's Geschichtevon schônen Redekünte Persiens, art. CLV. (Cf. f. 179-8o.)—The word mâdagî is used metaphorically for a button-hole; like nâ-marâ, it carries secondary meanings, miserliness, impotence, etc. (Cf. Wollaston's English-Persian Dictionary s.n. button-hole, where only we have found mâdagî with this sense.)
3 The 1st Pers. trs. expresses "all these jokes", thus including with the double-meanings of mâdagî, the jests of the quatrain.
4 The 1st Pers. trs. fills out Bâbur's allusive phrase here with "of the Walîdiyyah". His wording allows the inference that what he versified was a prose Turki translation of a probably Arabic original.
5 Erskine comments here on the non-translation into Persian of Bâbur's letters. Many MSS., however, contain a translation (f. 348, p. 624, n. 2 and E.'s n. f. 377b).
those matters, with their mingling of counsel. The letters were
entrusted to Shamsu'd-din Muhammad on Friday night,\(^1\) he was
apprized of word-of-mouth messages and given leave to go.

(\textit{oo. Complaints from Balkh.})

(\textit{Feb. 11th}) On Friday (\textit{Jumāda II. 2nd}) we did \textit{8 kurohs (16m.)}
and dismounted at Jumandnā.\(^2\) Today a servant of Kitīn-qarā
Sl. arrived whom the Sultān had sent to his retainer and envoy
Kamālu’d-din Qiāq,\(^3\) with things written concerning the behaviour
of the begs of the (Balkh) border, their intercourse with himself,
and complaints of theft and raid. Leave to go was given to
Qiāq, and orders were issued to the begs of the border to put an
end to raiding and thieving, to behave well and to maintain
intercourse with Balkh. These orders were entrusted to Kitīn-
-qarā Sl.'s servant and he was dismissed from this ground.

A letter, accepting excuse for the belated arrival of Ḥasan
Chalabī,\(^4\) was sent to the Shāh today by one Shāh-quīlī who had
come to me from Ḥasan Chalabī and reported the details of the
battle (of Jām).\(^5\) Shāh-quīlī was given his leave on this same
day, the 2nd of the month.

(\textit{pp. Incidents of the eastward march resumed.})

(\textit{Feb. 12th}) On Saturday (\textit{3rd}) we did \textit{8 kurohs (16m.)} and
dismounted in the Kakūra and Chachāwalī \(^6\) parganas of Kālpī.

(\textit{Feb. 13th}) On Sunday the 4th of the month, we did \textit{9 kurohs (18m.)}
and dismounted in Dirapūr \(^7\) a \textit{pargana} of Kālpī. Here
I shaved my head,\(^8\) which I had not done for the past two
months, and bathed in the Singar-water (Sengar).

\(^1\) Anglicē, Thursday after 6 p.m.
\(^2\) What would suit measurement on maps and also Bābūr's route is "Jumohooven" which is marked where the Sarāl Bāburpūr-Atsu-Phaphand road turns south, east of Phaphand (I.S. Map of 1900, Sheet 68).
\(^3\) var. Qabāq, Qatāk, Qandāk, to each of which a meaning might be attached. Bābūr had written to Humāyūn about the frontier affair, as one touching the desired peace (f. 359).
\(^4\) This will refer to the late arrival in Āgra of the envoy named, who was not with his younger brother at the feast of f. 3516 (f. 357, p. 641, n. 2).—As to Tahmāsp's style, see f. 354, f. 358.
\(^5\) Shāh-quīlī may be the ill-informed narrator of f. 354.
\(^6\) Both are marked on the southward road from Jumohooven (Jumandnā?) for Auraiya.
\(^7\) The old Kālpī \textit{pargana} having been sub-divided, Dirapūr is now in the district of Cawnpore (Kānhpūr).
\(^8\) That this operation was not hair-cutting but head-shaving is shewn by the verbs T. \text{qirmāq} and its Pers. trs. \text{tarāsh kardan}. To shave the head frequently is common in Central Asia.
(Feb. 14th) On Monday (5th) we did 14 kurohs (28 m.), and
dismounted in Chaparkada \(^1\) one of the parganas of Kâlpî.

(Feb. 15th) At the dawn of Tuesday (6th), a Hindûstânî servant
of Qârâčha's arrived who had taken a command (farmân) from
Mâhim to Qârâčha from which it was understood that she was
on the road. She had summoned escort from people in Lâhor,
Bhira and those parts in the fashion I formerly wrote orders
(parvânas) with my own hand. Her command had been written
in Kâbul on the 7th of the 1st Jumâda (Jan. 17th).\(^2\)

(Feb. 16th) On Wednesday (7th) we did 7 kurohs (14 m.), and
dismounted in the Ædampûr pargana.\(^3\) Today I mounted before
dawn, took the road \(^4\) alone, reached the Jûn (Jumna), and went
on along its bank. When I came opposite Ædampûr, I had
awnings set up on an island (ârâl) near the camp and seated
there, ate majûn.

Today we set Sâdiq to wrestle with Kalâl who had come to
Agra with a challenge.\(^5\) In Agra he had asked respite for
20 days on the plea of fatigue from his journey; as now 40–50
days had passed since the end of his respite, he was obliged to
wrestle. Sâdiq did very well, throwing him easily. Sâdiq was
given 10,000 tankas, a saddled horse, a head-to-foot, and a jacket
with buttons; while Kalâl, to save him from despair, was given
3000 tankas, spite of his fall.

\(^1\) This will be Chaparghatta on the Dirâpur-Bhogilîpûr-Chaparghatta-Mûsanagar
road, the affixes kada and ghatta both meaning house, temple, etc.

\(^2\) Mâhim, and with her the child Gul-badan, came in advance of the main body of
women. Babûr seems to refer again to her assumption of royal style by calling her
Wall, Governor (f. 369 and n.). It is unusual that no march or halt is recorded on
this day.

\(^3\) or, Arampûr. We have not succeeded in finding this place; it seems to have
been on the west bank of the Jumna, since twice Babûr when on the east bank, writes
of coming opposite to it (supra and f. 379). If no move was made on Tuesday,
Jumâda II. 6th (cf. last note), the distance entered as done on Wednesday would
locate the halting-place somewhere near the Akbarpûr of later name, which stands on
a road and at a ferry. But if the army did a stage on Tuesday, of which Babûr omits
mention, Wednesday's march might well bring him opposite to Hamirpûr and to the
"Rampur"-ferry. The verbal approximation of Arampûr and "Rampur" arrests
attention.—Local encroachment by the river, which is recorded in the District
Gazetteers, may have something to do with the disappearance from these most useful
books and from maps, of pargana Adampûr (or, Arampûr).

\(^4\) tushlîb. It suits best here, since solitude is the speciality of the excursion, to
read tushmâk as meaning to take the road, Fr. cheminer.

\(^5\) dâ'wî biia; Mem. p. 404, challenge; Mem. ii, 391, il avait fait des façons,
a truth probably, but one inferred only.
The carts and mortar were ordered landed from the boats, and we spent 3 or 4 days on this same ground while the road was made ready, the ground levelled and the landing effected.

(Feb. 21st) On Monday the 12th of the month (Jumāda II.), we did 12 kurohs (24 m.) and dismounted at Kūrarah. Today I travelled by litter.

(Feb. 22nd-25th) After marching 12 kurohs (24 m.) from Kūrarah (13th), we dismounted in Kūria a pargana of Karrah. From Kūria we marched 8 kurohs (16 m.) and dismounted (14th) in Fathpūr–Aswa. After 8 kurohs (16 m.) done from Fathpūr, we dismounted (15th) at Sarāi Munda. . . . Today at the Bed-time Prayer (Friday 16th, after dark), Sl. Jalālu'd-dīn (Sharqī) came with his two young sons to wait on me.

(Feb. 26th) Next day, Saturday the 17th of the month, we did 8 kurohs (16 m.), and dismounted at Dugdugi a Karrah pargana on the bank of the Gang.

(Feb. 27th) On Sunday (18th) came to this ground Muḥammad Sl. M., Ni-khūb (or, Bi-khūb) Sl. and Tardika (or, Tardi yakka, champion).

(Feb. 28th) On Monday (19th) ‘Askarī also waited on me. They all came from the other side of Gang (Ganges). ‘Askarī and his various forces were ordered to march along the other bank of the river keeping opposite the army on this side, and wherever our camp might be, to dismount just opposite it.

(gg. News of the Afghāns.)

While we were in these parts news came again and again that Sl. Maḥmūd (Lūdī) had collected 10,000 Afghāns; that he had

---

1 This will be more to the south than Kūra Khaṣ, the headquarters of the large district; perhaps it is "Koora Khera" (Kūra-khirāj) which suits the route (I.S. Map, Sheet 88).

2 Perhaps Kunda Kanak, known also as "Kuria, Koria, Kura and Kunra Kanak" (D.G. of Fathpūr).

3 Haswa or Hanswa. The conjoint name represents two villages some 6 m. apart, and is today that of their railway-station.

4 almost due east of Fathpūr, on the old King’s Highway (Bādhshāhī Sar-rāh).

5 His ancestors had ruled in Jūnpūr from 1394 to 1476 A.D., his father Ḥusain Shāh having been conquered by Sl. Sikandar Lūdī at the latter date. He was one of three rivals for supremacy in the East (Sharq), the others being Jalālu'd-dīn Nūḥānī and Maḥmūd Lūdī,—Afghāns all three. Cf. Erskine's History of India, Bābur, i, 501.

6 This name appears on the I.S. Map, Sheet 88, but too far north to suit Bābur's distances, and also off the Sarāi Munda-Kusār-Karrah road. The position of Naubasta suits better.
detached Shaikh Bāyazīd and Biban with a mass of men towards Sarwār [Gorakhpūr]; that he himself with Fath Khān Sarwānī was on his way along the river for Chunār; that Sher Khān Sūr whom I had favoured last year with the gift of several parganas and had left in charge of this neighbourhood,1 had joined these Afghāns who thereupon had made him and a few other amirs cross the water; that Sl. Jalālu’d-din’s man in Benares had not been able to hold that place, had fled, and got away; what he was understood to have said being, that he had left soldiers (sipahīlār) in Benares-fort and gone along the river to fight Sl. Mahmūd.2

(rr. Incidents of the march resumed.)

(March 1st) Marching from Dugdugi (Tuesday, Jumāda II. 20th) the army did 6 kurohs (12 m.) and dismounted at Kusār,3 3 or 4 kurohs from Karrah. I went by boat. We stayed here 3 or 4 days because of hospitality offered by Sl. Jalālu’d-din.

(March 4th) On Friday (23rd), I dismounted at Sl. Jalālu’d-din’s house inside Karrah-fort where, host-like, he served me a portion of cooked meat and other viands.4 After the meal, he and his sons were dressed in unlined coats (yaktāī jāmah) and short tunics (nīmcha).5 At his request his elder son was given the style Sl. Mahmūd.6 On leaving Karrah, I rode about one kuroh (2 m.) and dismounted on the bank of Gang.

Here letters were written and leave was given to Shahrak Beg who had come from Māhim to our first camp on Gang (i.e. Dugdugi). As Khwāja Yaḥyā’s grandson Khwāja Kalān

1 Sher Khān was associated with Dūdū Bībī in the charge of her son’s affairs. Bābur’s favours to him, his son Humāyūn’s future conqueror, will have been done during the Eastern campaign in 934 AH., of which so much record is missing. Cf. Tārikh-i-sher-shāhī, E. & D.’s History of India, iv, 301 et seq. for particulars of Sher Khān (Farīd Khān Sūr Afgān).

2 In writing “Sl. Mahmūd”, Bābur is reporting his informant’s style, he himself calling Mahmūd “Khān” only (f. 363 and f. 363b).

3 This will be the more northerly of two Kusārs marked as in Karrah; even so, it is a very long 6 kurohs (12 m.) from the Dugdugi of the I.S. Map (cf. n. supra).

4 bīr pāra dsh u ta’ām, words which suggest one of those complete meals served, each item on its separate small dish, and all dishes fitting like mosaic into one tray. T. dsh is cooked meat (f. 2 n. 1 and f. 343b); Ar. ta’ām will be sweets, fruit, bread, perhaps rice also.

5 The yaktāī, one-fold coat, contrasts with the dū-lākhi, two-fold (A.-i-A. Bib. Ind. ed., p. 101, and Blochmann’s trs. p. 88).

6 This acknowledgement of right to the style Sulṭān recognized also supremacy of the Sharqī claim to rule over that of the Nūḥānī and Lādī competitors.
had been asking for the records I was writing, I sent him by Shahrak a copy I had made.

(March 5th) On Saturday move was made at dawn (24th), I going by boat direct, and after 4 kurohs done (8m.), halt was made at Koh. Our ground, being so near, was reached quite early. After awhile, we seated ourselves inside a boat where we ate ma'jūn. We invited the honoured Khwaja 'Abdu'sh-shahid 4 who was said to be in Nūr Beg's quarters (āvūd), invited also Mullā Māhmūd (Farābī?), bringing him from Mullā 'Ali Khān's. After staying for some time on that spot, we crossed the river, and on the other side, set wrestlers to wrestle. In opposition to the rule of gripping the strongest first, Dost-i-yāsīn Fol. 363b.-khair was told not to grapple with Champion Ṣādiq, but with others; he did so very well with eight.

(ss. News of the Afghān enemy.)

At the Afternoon Prayer, Sl. Muḥammad the Pay-master came by boat from the other side of the river, bringing news that the army of Sl. Iskandar's son Māhmūd Khān whom rebels style

1 mīndīn bītī tūrgān waqāī'. This passage Teufel used to support his view that Bābur's title for his book was Waqāī', and not Bābur-nāma which, indeed, Teufel describes as the Kasaner Ausgabe adoptierte Titel. Bābur-nāma, however, is the title [or perhaps, merely scribe's name] associated both with Kehr's text and with the Ḥaidarābād Codex.—I have found no indication of the selection by Bābur of any title; he makes no mention of the matter and where he uses the word waqāī' or its congeners, it can be read as a common noun. In his colophon to the Rāmpūr Dwān, it is a parallel of askār, poems. Judging from what is found in the Mubīn, it may be right to infer that, if he had lived to complete his book—now broken off s.a. 914 AH. (f. 216b)—he would have been explicit as to its title, perhaps also as to his grounds for choosing it. Such grounds would have found fitting mention in a preface to the now abrupt opening of the Bābur-nāma (f. 1b), and if the Malfūsāt-i-tūmūrī be Tūmūr's authentic autobiography, this book might have been named as an ancestral example influencing Bābur to write his own. Nothing against the authenticity of the Malfūsāt can be inferred from the circumstance that Bābur does not name it, because the preface in which such mention would be in harmony with e.g. his Walidīyyah preface, was never written. It might accredit the Malfūsāt to collate passages having common topics, as they appear in the Bābur-nāma, Malfūsāt-i-tūmūrī and Zafar-nāma (cf. E. & D.'s H. of I. iv, 559 for a discussion by Dr. Sachau and Prof. Dowson on the Malfūsāt). (Cf. Z.D.M. xxxvii, p. 154, Teufel's art. Bābur und 'Abūl-fazl; Smirnow's Cat. of Manuscripts Turcs, p. 142; Index in loco s.n. Mūbīn and Title.)


3 kīma aichīdā, which suggests a boat with a cabin, a bajrā (Hobson-Jobson s.n. budgetor).

4 He had stayed behind his kinsman Khwāja Kalān. Both, as Bābur has said, were descendants of Khwāja 'Ubaidu'l-lāh Ahrārī. Khwāja Kalān was a grandson of Ahrārī's second son Yaḥyā; Khwāja 'Abdu'sh-shahid was the son of his fifth, Khwāja 'Abdu'l-lāh (Khwājagān-khwāja). 'Abdu'sh-shahid returned to India under Akbar, received a sīf, maintained 2,000 poor persons, left after 20 years, and died in Samarkand in 982 AH.—1574-5 AD. (A.-i.-A., Blochmann's trs. and notes, pp. 423, 539).
Sl. Maḥmūd,¹ had broken up. The same news was brought in by a spy who had gone out at the Mid-day Prayer from where we were; and a dutiful letter, agreeing with what the spy had reported, came from Tāj Khān Sārang-khān between the Afternoon and Evening Prayers. Sl. Muḥammad gave the following particulars:—that the rebels on reaching Chunār seemed to have laid siege to it and to have done a little fighting, but had risen in disorderly fashion when they heard of our approach; that Afghāns who had crossed the river for Benares, had turned back in like disorder; that two of their boats had sunk in crossing and a body of their men been drowned.

(tt. Incidents of the eastward march resumed.)

(March 6th) After marching at Sunday's dawn (25th) and doing 6 kurohs (12 m.), Sir-auliya,² a pargana of Piāg *³ was reached. I went direct by boat.

Aīsan-tīmūr Sl. and Tūkhta-būghā Sl. had dismounted halfway, and were waiting to see me.⁴ I, for my part, invited them into the boat. Tūkhta-būghā Sl. must have wrought magic, for a bitter wind rose and rain began to fall. It became quite windy (?)⁵ on which account I ate ma'jūn, although I had done so on the previous day. Having come to the encamping-ground . . . ⁶

¹ f. 363, f. 363b.
² Not found on maps; OOjani or Ujahni about suits the measured distance.
³ Prayāq, Īlāhābād, Allāhābād. Between the asterisk in my text (supra) and the one following "ford" before the foliation mark f. 364, the Hai. MS. has a lacuna which, as being preceded and followed by broken sentences, can hardly be due to a scribe's skip, but may result from the loss of a folio. What I have entered above between the asterisks is translated from the Kehr-Ilinsky text; it is in the two Persian translations also. Close scrutiny of it suggests that down to the end of the swimming episode it is not in order and that the account of the swim across the Ganges may be a survival of the now missing record of 934 AH. (f. 339). It is singular that the Pers. trss. make no mention of Piāq or of Sir-auliya; their omission arouses speculation, as to in which text, the Turki or Persian, it was first tried to fill what remains a gap in the Hai. Codex. A second seeming sign of disorder is the incomplete sentence yūrīgha kīlāb, which is noted below. A third is the crowd of incidents now standing under "Tuesday". A fourth, and an important matter, is that on grounds noted at the end of the swimming passage (p. 655 n. 3) it is doubtful whether that passage is in its right place.—It may be that someone, at an early date after Bābur's death, tried to fill the lacuna discovered in his manuscript, with help from loose folios or parts of them. Cf. Index s. n. swimming, and f. 377b, p. 686 n. 2.
⁴ The Chaghatāi sultāns will have been 'Askari east of the Ganges.
⁵ tūr hawalsh; Mens. p. 406, violence of the wind; Mens. ii, 398, une température très agréable.
⁶ yūrīgha kīlāb, an incomplete sentence.
(March 7th?) Next day (Monday 26th?) we remained on the same ground.

(March 8th?) On Tuesday (27th?) we marched on.

Opposite the camp was what may be an island,¹ large and verdant. I went over by boat to visit it, returning to the boat during the 1st watch (6–9 a.m.). While I rode carelessly along the ravine (jar) of the river, my horse got to where it was fissured and had begun to give way. I leapt off at once and flung myself on the bank; even the horse did not go down; probably, however, if I had stayed on its back, it and I would have gone down together.

On this same day, I swam the Gang-river (Ganges), counting every stroke;² I crossed with 33, then, without resting, swam back. I had swum the other rivers, Gang had remained to do.³

We reached the meeting of the waters of Gang and Jūn at the Evening Prayer, had the boat drawn to the Piāg side, and got to camp at 1 watch, 4 garīs (10.30 p.m.).

(March 9th) On Wednesday (Jumāda II. 28th) from the 1st watch onwards, the army began to cross the river Jūn; there were 420 boats.⁴

(March 11th) On Friday, the 1st of the month of Rajab, I crossed the river.

(March 14th) On Monday, the 4th of the month, the march

¹ ārāl bōr aikāndār, phrasing implying uncertainty; there may have been an island, or such a peninsula as a narrow-mouthed bend of a river forms, or a spit or bluff projecting into the river. The word ārāl represents Aiki-sū-ārāsī, Miyān-dū-āb, Entre-eaux, Twixt-two-streams, Mesopotamia.

² qūl; Pers. trss. dast andākkhtan and dast. Presumably the 33 strokes carried the swimmer across the deep channel, or the Ganges was crossed higher than Piāg.

³ The above account of Bābur’s first swim across the Ganges which is entered under date Jumāda II. 27th, 935 AH. (March 8th, 1529 AD.), appears misplaced, since he mentions under date Rajab 25th, 935 AH. (April 4th, 1529 AD. f. 366b), that he had swum the Ganges at Baksara (Buxar) a year before, i.e. on or close to Rajab 25th, 934 AH. (April 15th, 1528 AD.). Nothing in his writings shews that he was near Piāg (Allāhābād) in 934 AH.; nothing indisputably connects the swimming episode with the “Tuesday” below which it now stands; there is no help given by dates. One supposes Bābur would take his first chance to swim the Ganges; this was offered at Qanauj (f. 336), but nothing in the short record of that time touches the topic. The next chance would be after he was in Aūd, when, by an unascertained route, perhaps down the Ghogrā, he made his way to Baksara where he says (f. 366b) he swam the river. Taking into consideration the various testimony noted, [Index.r.n. swimming] there seems warrant for supposing that this swimming passage is a survival of the missing record of 934 AH. (f. 339). Cf. f. 377b, p. 680 and n. 2 for another surmised survival of 934 AH.

⁴ “Friday” here stands for Anglice, Thursday after 6 p.m.; this, only, suiting Bābur’s next explicit date Sha‘bān 1st, Saturday.
for Bihār began along the bank of Jūn. After 5 kurohs (10 m.) done, halt was made at Lawān. I went by boat. The people of the army were crossing the Jūn up to today. They were ordered to put the culverin-carts which had been landed at Ādampūr, into boats again and to bring them on by water from Piāg.

On this ground we set wrestlers to wrestle. Dost-i-yāsīn-khair gripped the boatman Champion of Lāhor; the contest was stubborn; it was with great difficulty that Dost gave the throw. A head-to-foot was bestowed on each.

(March 15th and 16th) People said that ahead of us was a swampy, muddy, evil river called Tūs. In order to examine the ford and repair the road, we waited two days (Tuesday Ramzān 5th and Wednesday 6th) on this ground. For the horses and camels a ford was found higher up, but people said laden carts could not get through it because of its uneven, stony bottom. They were just ordered to get them through.

(March 17th) On Thursday (7th) we marched on. I myself went by boat down to where the Tūs meets the Gang (Ganges), there landed, thence rode up the Tūs, and, at the Other Prayer,

1 The march, beginning on the Jumna, is now along the united rivers.
2 zarb-santīk arābalār. Here the carts are those carrying the guns.
3 From the particulars Bābur gives about the Tūs (Tons) and Karmā-nāsā, it would seem that he had not passed them last year, an inference supported by what is known of his route in that year:—He came from Īlālār to the Kanār-passage (f. 336), there crossed the Jumna and went direct to Qanauj (f. 335), above Qanauj bridged the Ganges, went on to Bangarmāu (f. 338), crossed the Gūmtī and went near to the junction of the Ghogrā and Sardā (f. 338b). The next indication of his route is that he is at Baksara, but whether he reached it by water down the Ghogrā, as his meeting with Muh. Mārūf Farmūlī suggests (f. 377), or by land, nothing shews. From Baksara (f. 366) he went up-stream to Chausa (f. 365b), on perhaps to Sayyidpūr, 2 m. from the mouth of the Gūmtī, and there left the Ganges for Jūnpūr (f. 365). I have found nothing about his return route to Agra; it seems improbable that he would go so far south as to near Piāg; a more northerly and direct road to Fathpūr and Sarāī Bābūrpūr may have been taken.—Concerning Bābur’s acts in 934 AH. the following item, (met with since I was working on 934 AH.), continues his statement (f. 338b) that he spent a few days near Aūd (Ajādhyā) to settle its affairs. The D. G. of Fyzābād (H. E. Ne ville) p. 173 says “In 1528 AD. Bābūr came to Ajodhya (Aūd) and halted a week. He destroyed the ancient temple” (marking the birth-place of Rāma) “and on its site built a mosque, still known as Bābūr’s Mosque . . . It has two inscriptions, one on the outside, one on the pulpit; both are in Persian; and bear the date 935 AH.” This date may be that of the completion of the building.—(Corrigendum:—On f. 339 n. t, I have too narrowly restricted the use of the name Sarjū. Bābūr used it to describe what the maps of Arrowsmith and Johnson show, and not only what the Gazetteer of India map of the United Provinces does. It applies to the Sardā (f. 339) as Bābūr uses it when writing of the fords.)
4 Here the lacuna of the Hai Codex ends.
reached where the army had encamped after crossing the ford. Today 6 kurohs (12 m.) were done.

(March 18th) Next day (Friday 8th), we stayed on that ground.

(March 19th) On Saturday (9th), we marched 12 kurohs and got to the bank of Gang again at Nulibā.¹

(March 20th) Marching on (Sunday 10th), we did 6 kurohs of road, and dismounted at Kintit.²

(March 21st) Marching on (Monday 11th), we dismounted at Nānāpur.³ Tāj Khān Sārang-khānī came from Chunār to this ground with his two young sons, and waited on me.

In these days a dutiful letter came from Pay-master SI. Muḥammad, saying that my family and train were understood to be really on their way from Kābul.⁴

(March 23rd) On Wednesday (13th) we marched from that ground. I visited the fort of Chunār, and dismounted about one kuroh beyond it.

During the days we were marching from Piāg, painful boils had come out on my body. While we were on this ground, an Ottoman Turk (Rūmī) used a remedy which had been recently discovered in Rūm. He boiled pepper in a pipkin; I held the sores in the steam and, after steaming ceased, laved them with the hot water. The treatment lasted 2 sidereal hours.

While we were on this ground, a person said he had seen tiger and rhinoceros on an ārāl ⁵ by the side of the camp.

(March 24th?) In the morning (14th?), we made the hunting-circle ⁶ on that ārāl, elephants also being brought. Neither tiger nor rhino appeared; one wild buffalo came out at the end of the line. A bitter wind rising and the whirling dust being very troublesome, I went back to the boat and in it to the camp which was 2 kurohs (4 m.) above Banāras.

¹ Perhaps, where there is now the railway station of "Nulibai" (I.S. Map). The direct road on which the army moved, avoids the windings of the river.
² This has been read as T. kūnt, P. dīh, Eng. village and Fr. village.
³ "Nankunpur" lying to the north of Puhari railway-station suits the distance measured on maps.
⁴ These will be the women-travellers.
⁵ Perhaps jungle tracts lying in the curves of the river.
⁶ jīrga, which here stands for the beaters' incurving line, witness the exit of the buffalo at the end. Cf. f. 367b for a jīrga of boats.
(uu. News of the Afghans.)

(March 25th (?) and 26th) Having heard there were many elephants in the Chunär jungles, I had left (Thursday's) ground thinking to hunt them, but Tāj Khān bringing the news (Friday 15th(?)) that Mahmūd Khān (Lūdī) was near the Son-water, I summoned the begs and took counsel as to whether to fall upon him suddenly. In the end it was settled to march on continuously, fast and far.

(March 27th) Marching on (Sunday 17th), we did 9 kurohs (18m.), and disembarked at the Bilwah-ferry.2

(March 28th) On Monday night3 the 18th of the month, Tāhir was started for Āgra from this camp (Bilwah-ferry), taking money-drafts for the customary gifts of allowance and lodging4 to those on their way from Kābul.

Before dawn next morning (Monday) I went on by boat. When we came to where the Gūi-water (Gūmtī) which is the water of Jūnpūr, meets the Gang-water (Ganges), I went a little way up it and back. Narrower5 though it is, it has no ford; the army-folk crossed it (last year) by boat, by raft, or by swimming their horses.

To look at our ground of a year ago,6 from which we had started for Jūnpūr,7 I went to about a kuroh lower than the mouth of the Jūnpūr-water (Gūmtī). A favourable wind getting up behind, our larger boat was tied to a smaller Bengali one which, spreading its sail, made very quick going. Two garīs of day remained (5.15 p.m.) when we had reached that ground (Sayyidpur?), we went on without waiting there, and by the Bed-time Prayer had got to camp, which was a kuroh above Madan-Benāres,8 long before the boats following us. Mughul Beg had been ordered to

---

1 aūṣūn aūṣūqkh, many miles and many hours?
2 Bulloa? (I.S. Map).
3 Anglica, Sunday after 6 p.m.
4 'alufa 'u qunal (f. 359b).
5 than the Ganges perhaps; or narrowish compared with other rivers, e.g. Ganges, Ghoghrā, and Jūn.
6 yil-tūrgī yūrī, by which is meant, I think, close to the same day a year back, and not an indefinite reference to some time in the past year.
7 Maps make the starting-place likely to be Sayyidpur.
8 re-named Zamāniya, after Akbar's officer 'Alī-qlī Khan Khān-i-zamān, and now the head-quarters of the Zamāniya pargana of Ghāzipūr. Madan-Benāres was in Akbar's sarkār of Ghāzipūr. (It was not identified by E. or by de C.) Cf. D.G. of Ghāzipūr.
measure all marches from Chunār on the direct road, Luṭfī Beg to measure the river's bank whenever I went by boat. The direct road today was said to be 11 kurohs (22 m.), the distance along the river, 18 (36 m.).

(*March 29th*) Next day (*Tuesday 19th*), we stayed on that ground.

(*March 30th*) On Wednesday (*20th*), we dismounted a kuroh (2 m.) below Ghāzīpur, I going by boat.

(*March 31st*) On Thursday (*21st*) Mahmūd Khān Nuḥānī¹ waited on me on that ground. On this same day dutiful letters² came from Bihār Khān Bihāri’s son Jalāl Khān (Nuḥānī),³ from Naṣīr Khān (Nuḥānī)’s son Farīd Khān,⁴ from Sher Khān Sūr, from ‘Alāūl Khān Sūr also, and from other Afghān amīrs. Today came also a dutiful letter from ‘Abdu’ll-‘azīz Master-of-the-horse, which had been written in Lāhor on the 20th of the latter Jumāda (‡29th), the very day on which Qarācha’s Hindūstānī servant whom we had started off from near Kālpi,⁵ reached Lāhor. ‘Abdu’ll-‘azīz wrote that he had gone with the others assigned to meet my family at Nīl-āb, had met them there on the 9th of the latter Jumāda (‡18th), had accompanied them to Chīn-āb (Chan-āb), left them there, and come ahead to Lāhor where he was writing his letter.

(*April 1st*) We moved on, I going by boat, on Friday (*Rajab 22nd*). I landed opposite Chausā to look at the ground of a year ago⁶ where the Sun had been eclipsed and a fast kept.⁷ After I got back to the boat, Muḥammad-i-zamān Mīrzā, coming up behind by boat, overtook me; at his suggestion ma’jūn was eaten.

The army had dismounted on the bank of the Karmā-nāsā-river, about the water of which Hindūs are understood to be extremely scrupulous. They do not cross it, but go past its

---

¹ In the earlier part of the Hai. Codex this Afghān tribal-name is written Nuḥānī, but in this latter portion a different scribe occasionally writes it Lūḥānī (Index s.n.).
² ‘arsa-dāḥt, i.e. phrased as from one of lower station to a superior.
³ His letter may have announced his and his mother Dūdū Bībī’s approach (f. 368–9).
⁴ Naṣīr Khān had been an amīr of Sl. Sikandar Lāḏī. Sher Khān Sūr married his widow “Guhar Kusāin”, bringing him a large dowry (A.N.trs. p. 327; and Tārikh-i-shehr-shāhī, E. & D.’s History of India iv, 346).
⁵ He started from Chaparghatta (f. 361b, p. 650 n. 1).
⁶ yil-tūrgā yūrṭ.
⁷ “This must have been the Eclipse of the 10th of May 1528 AD.; a fast is enjoined on the day of an eclipse” (Erskine).
mouth by boat along the Gang (Ganges). They firmly believe that, if its water touch a person, the merit of his works is destroyed; with this belief its name accords. They went some way up it by boat, turned back, went over to the north bank of Gang, and tied up. There the braves made a little fun, some wrestling. Muḥsin the cup-bearer challenged, saying, "I will grapple with four or five." The first he gripped, he threw; the second, who was Shādmān (Joyous), threw him, to Muḥsin's shame and vexation.

(April 2nd) Next morning, Saturday (23rd) we moved, close to the 1st watch (6 a.m.), in order to get people off to look at the ford through the Kārmā-nāsā-water. I rode up it for not less than a kuroh (2 m.), but the ford being still far on, took boat and went to the camp below Chausā.

Today I used the pepper remedy again; it must have been somewhat hotter than before, for it blistered (qāpārdī) my body, giving me much pain.

(April 3rd) We waited a day for a road to be managed across a smallish, swampy rivulet heard to be ahead.

(April 4th) On the eve of Monday (25th), letters were written and sent off in answer to those brought by the Hindūstānī footman of 'Abdu'l-'azīz.

The boat I got into at Monday's dawn, had to be towed because of the wind. On reaching the ground opposite Baksara (Buxar) where the army had been seated many days last year, we went over to look at it. Between 40 and 50 landing-steps had been then made on the bank; of them the upper two only were left, the river having destroyed the rest. Ma'jūn was eaten after return to the boat. We tied up at an ārāl above the camp, set the champions to wrestle, and went on at the Bed-time Prayer. A year ago (yīl-tūr), an excursion had been made to look at the ground on which the camp now was, I passing through Gang

---

1 Kārmā-nāsā means loss of the merit acquired by good works.
2 The I.S. Map marks a main road leading to the mouth of the Kārmā-nāsā and no other leading to the river for a considerable distance up-stream.
3 Perhaps "Thora-nadee" (I.S. Map).
4 Anglicé, Sunday after 6 p.m.
5 aūṭkān yīl.
6 Perhaps the dū-āba between the Ganges and "Thora-nadee".
swimming (\textit{dastak bila}), some coming mounted on horses, some on camels. That day I had eaten opium.

(\textit{vv. Incidents of the military operations.})

\textit{(April 5th)} At Tuesday’s dawn (26th), we sent out for news not under 200 effective braves led by Karîm-bîrdî and Haidar the stirrup-holder’s son Muḥammad ‘Ali and Bābā Shaikh.

While we were on this ground, the Bengal envoy was commanded to set forth these three articles:—\textsuperscript{2}

\textit{(April 6th)} On Wednesday (27th) Yūnas-i-‘alî who had been sent to gather Muḥammad-i-zamān Mīrzā’s objections to Bihār, brought back rather a weak answer.

Dutiful letters from the (Farmūlī) Shaikh-zādas of Bihār gave news that the enemy had abandoned the place and gone off.

\textit{(April 7th)} On Thursday (28th) as many as 2000 men of the Turk and Hind amirs and quiver-wearers were joined to Muḥammad ‘Ali Jang-jang’s son Tardi-muḥammad, and he was given leave to go, taking letters of royal encouragement to people in Bihār. He was joined also by Khwāja Murshid ‘Irāqī who had been made Diwān of Bihār.

\textit{(April 8th (?))} Muḥammad-i-zamān M. who had consented to go to Bihār, made representation of several matters through

\textsuperscript{1} \textit{yīl-tūr . . . Gāng-sīl-dīn mīn dastak bīla aūṭūb, ba‘zī āt, ba‘zī tīwāh mīnīb, kīlīb, sa‘īr qīlīb aildī.} Some uncertainty as to the meaning of the phrase \textit{dastak bīla aūṭūb} is caused by finding that while here de Courtelle agrees with Erskine in taking it to mean swimming, he varies later (f. 373b) to \textit{appuyés sur une pièce de bois}. Taking the Persian translations of three passages about crossing water into consideration (p. 655 after f. 366b, f. 366b (here), f. 373b), and also the circumstances that E. and de C. are once in agreement and that Erskine worked with the help of Oriental \textit{munshīs}, I incline to think that \textit{dastak bīla} does express swimming.—The question of its precise meaning bears on one concerning Bābur’s first swim across the Ganges (p. 655, n. 3).—Perhaps I should say, however, that if the sentence quoted at the head of this note stood alone, without the extraneous circumstances supporting the reading of \textit{dastak bīla} to mean swimming, I should incline to read it as stating that Bābur went on foot through the water, feeling his footing with a pole (\textit{dastak}), and that his followers rode through the ford after him. Nothing in the quoted passage suggests that the horses and camels swam. But whether the Ganges was fordable at Baksara in Bābur’s time, is beyond surmise.

\textsuperscript{2} \textit{fasl sīn}, which, manifestly, were to be laid before the envoy’s master. The articles are nowhere specified; one is summarized merely on f. 365. The incomplete sentence of the Turkī text (\textit{sūfra}) needs their specification at this place, and an explicit statement of them would have made clearer the political relations of Bābur with Nasrat Shāh.—A folio may have been lost from Bābur’s manuscript; it might have specified the articles, and also have said something leading to the next topic of the diary, now needing preliminaries, \textit{viz.} that of the Mīrzā’s discontent with his new appointment, a matter not mentioned earlier.
Shaikh Zain and Yūnas-i-'alī. He asked for reinforcement; for this several braves were inscribed and several others were made his own retainers.

(April 9th) On Saturday the 1st of the month of Sha'bān, we left that ground where we had been for 3 or 4 days. I rode to visit Bhūjpur and Bihiya, thence went to camp.

Muḥammad 'Alī and the others, who had been sent out for news, after beating a body of pagans as they went along, reached the place where Sl. Maḥmūd (Lūdī) had been with perhaps 2000 men. He had heard of our reconnaissance, had broken up, killed two elephants of his, and marched off. He seemed to have left braves and an elephant scout-fashion; they made no stand when our men came up but took to flight. Ours unhorsed a few of his, cut one head off, brought in a few good men alive.

(ww. Incidents of the eastward march resumed.)

(April 10th) We moved on next day (Sunday 2nd), I going by boat. From our today's ground Muḥammad-i-zamān M. crossed (his army) over the river (Son), leaving none behind. We spent 2 or 3 days on this ground in order to put his work through and get him off.

(April 13th) On Wednesday the 4th of the month, Muḥammad-i-zamān M. was presented with a royal head-to-foot, a sword and belt, a tipūchāq horse and an umbrella. He also was made to kneel (yūkūndūrūldī) for the Bihār country. Of the Bihār revenues one krūr and 25 laks were reserved for the Royal Treasury; its Diwānī was entrusted to Murshid 'Irāqī.

(April 14th) I left that ground by boat on Thursday (6th). I had already ordered the boats to wait, and on getting up with them, I had them fastened together abreast in line. Though all

1 This suits Bābur's series, but Gladwin and Wüstefeld have 10th.
2 The first is near, the second on the direct road from Buxar for Arrah.
3 The Hai. MS. makes an elephant be posted as the sole scout; others post a sardār, or post braves; none post man and beast.
4 This should be 5th; perhaps the statement is confused through the gifts being given late, Anglice, on Tuesday 4th, Islamicī on Wednesday night.
5 The Mirāz's Timūrid birth and a desire in Bābur to give high status to a representative he will have wished to leave in Bihār when he himself went to his western dominions, sufficiently explain the bestowal of this sign of sovereignty.
6 jirgū. This instance of its use shews that Bābur had in mind not a completed circle, but a line, or in sporting parlance, not a hunting-circle but a beaters'-line. [Cf. f. 251, f. 364b and infra of the crocodile.] The word is used also for a governing-circle, a tribal-council.
were not collected there, those there were greatly exceeded the breadth of the river. They could not move on, however, so-arranged, because the water was here shallow, there deep, here swift, there still. A crocodile (gharāl) shewing itself, a terrified fish leaped so high as to fall into a boat; it was caught and brought to me.

When we were nearing our ground, we gave the boats names:—

a large\(^1\) one, formerly the Bāburi,\(^2\) which had been built in Āgra before the Holy-battle with Sangā, was named Asāish (Repose).\(^3\) Another, which Arāish Khān had built and presented to me this year before our army got to horse, one in which I had had a platform set up on our way to this ground, was named Arāish (Ornament). Another, a good-sized one presented to me by Jalālu'd-din Sharqī, was named the Gunjāish (Capacious); in it I had ordered a second platform set up, on the top of the one already in it. To a little skiff, having a chaukandi,\(^4\) one used for every task (har āish) and duty, was given the name Farmāish (Commissioned).

(April 15th) Next day, Friday (7th), no move was made. Muḥammad-i-zamān M. who, his preparations for Bihār complete, had dismounted one or two kurohs from the camp, came today to take leave of me.\(^5\)

(xx. News of the army of Bengal.)

Two spies, returned from the Bengal army, said that Bengalis\(^6\) under Makhdūm-i-'ālam were posted in 24 places on the Gandak and there raising defences; that they had hindered the Afghāns from carrying out their intention to get their families across the

\(^1\) aūlūgh (kīma). Does aūlūgh (aūlūq, ʻūlūq) connect with the “bulky Oolak or baggage-boat of Bengal”? (Hobson-Jobson s.n. Woolock, oolock).

\(^2\) De Courteille’s reading of Ilminsky’s “Bāburi” (p. 476) as Bārī, old servant, hardly suits the age of the boat.

\(^3\) Bābūr anticipated the custom followed e.g. by the White Star and Cunard lines, when he gave his boats names having the same terminal syllable; his is ārī; on it he makes the quip of the har āiš of the Farmāish.

\(^4\) As Vullers makes Ar. gharfūt a synonym of chaukandi, the Farmāish seems likely to have had a cabin, open at the sides. De Courteille understood it to have a rounded stern. [Cf. E. & D.’s History of India v, 347, 503 n.; and Gul-badan’s H. N. trs. p. 98, n. 2.]

\(^5\) mīnān rukhsat ʻālī; phrasing which bespeaks admitted equality, that of Timūrid birth.

\(^6\) i.e. subjects of the Afghān ruler of Bengal; many will have been Bihāris and Pūrbiyas. Makhdūm-i-ʻālam was Naṣrat Shāh’s Governor in Ḥājipūr.
river (Ganges?), and had joined them to themselves. 1 This news making fighting probable, we detained Muḥammad-i-zamān Mirzā, and sent Shāh Iskandar to Bihār with 3 or 400 men.

(33. Incidents of the eastward march resumed.)

(Fol. 368 b.) (April 16th) On Saturday (8th) a person came in from Dūdū and her son Jalāl Khān (son) of Bihār Khān 2 whom the Bengali (Naṣrat Shāh) must have held as if eye-bewitched. 3 After letting me know they were coming, 4 they had done some straight fighting to get away from the Bengalīs, had crossed the river, 5 reached Bihār, and were said now to be on their way to me.

This command was given today for the Bengal envoy Ismā'īl Mitā :—Concerning those three articles, about which letters have already been written and despatched, let him write that an answer is long in coming, and that if the honoured (Naṣrat Shāh) be loyal and of single-mind towards us, it ought to come soon.

(April 17th) In the night of Sunday (9th) 6 a man came in from Tārdī-muḥammad Jang-jang to say that when, on Wednesday the 5th of the month Sha'bān, his scouts reached Bihār from this side, the Shiqdār of the place went off by a gate on the other side.

On Sunday morning we marched on and dismantled in the pargana of Ārī (Ārrah). 7

(32. News and negociations.)

To this ground came the news that the Kharīd 8 army, with 100–150 boats, was said to be on the far side of the Sarū near the

1 This might imply that the Afghāns had been prevented from joining Maḥmūd Khān Lūdī near the Son.

2 Sl. Muḥammad Shāh Nūhānī Afghān, the former ruler of Bihār, dead within a year. He had trained Farīd Khān Sūr in the management of government affairs; had given him, for gallant encounter with a tiger, the title Sher Khān by which, or its higher form Sher Shāh, history knows him, and had made him his young son’s “deputy”, an office Sher Khān held after the father’s death in conjunction with the boy’s mother Dūdū Bībī (Tārīkh-i-sher-shāhī, E. & D.’s History of India iv, 325 et seq.).

3 gūz bāghī yūsūnlūg; by which I understand they were held fast from departure, as e.g. a mouse by the fascination of a snake.

4 f. 365 mentions a letter which may have announced their intention.

5 Ganges; they thus evaded the restriction made good on other Afghāns.

6 Anglicē, Saturday 8th after 6 p.m.

7 The D. G. of Shāhābād (pp. 20 and 127) mentions that “it is said Bābūr marched to Ārrah after his victory over Maḥmūd Lūdī”, and that “local tradition still points to a place near the Judge’s Court as that on which he pitched his camp”.

8 Kharīd which is now a pargana of the Ballīa district, lay formerly on both sides of the Ghogrā. When the army of Kharīd opposed Bābūr’s progress, it acted for Naṣrat Shāh, but this Bābūr diplomatically ignored in assuming that there was peace between
meeting of Sarū and Gang (Ghogrā and Ganges). As a sort of peace existed between us and the Bengali (Naṣrat Shāh Afghān), and as, for the sake of a benediction, peace was our firstendeavour whenever such work was toward as we were now on, we kept to our rule, notwithstanding his unmannerly conduct in setting himself on our road; we associated Mullā Mazhab with his envoy Ismā’īl Mītā, spoke once more about those three articles (fasl sos), and decided to let the envoy go.

(April 18th) On Monday (10th) when the Bengal envoy came to wait on me, he was let know that he had his leave, and what follows was mentioned:—"We shall be going to this side and that side, in pursuit of our foe, but no hurt or harm will be done to any dependency of yours. As one of those three articles said, when you have told the army of Kharid to rise off our road and to go back to Kharid, let a few Turks be joined with it to reassure these Kharid people and to escort them to their own place. If they quit not the ferry-head, if they cease not their unbecoming words, they must regard as their own act any ill that befalls them, must count any misfortune they confront as the fruit of their own words."

(April 20th) On Wednesday (12th) the usual dress of honour was put on the Bengal envoy, gifts were bestowed on him and his leave to go was given.

(April 21st) On Thursday (13th) Shaikh Jamālī was sent with royal letters of encouragement to Dūdū and her son Jalāl Khān.

Today a servant of Māhīm’s came, who will have parted from the Wālī (?) on the other side of the Bāgh-i-ṣafā.

Bengal and himself.—At this time Naṣrat Shāh held the riverain on the left bank of the Ghogrā but had lost Kharid of the right bank, which had been taken from him by Jūnāid Barlās. A record of his occupation still survives in Kharid-town, an inscription dated by his deputy as for 1529 AD. (District Gazetteer of Ballia (H. R. Nevill), and D. G. of Sāran (L. L. S. O’Malley), Historical Chapters).

It is possible that Naṣrat Shāh’s hostility is more clearly shewn here than in the verbal message of f. 369.

This will be an unceremonious summary of a word-of-mouth message.

Cf. f. 366b, p. 661 n. 2.

This shows that Bābur did not recognize the Sāran riverain down to the Ganges as belonging to Kharid. His offered escort of Turks would safe-guard the Kharidis if they returned to the right bank of the Ghogrā which was in Turk possession.

The Haï, MS. has wālī, clearly written; which, as a word representing Māhīm would suit the sentence best, may make playful reference to her royal commands (f. 361b), by styling her the Governor (wālī). Erskine read the word as a place-name Dipali, which I have not found; De Courteille omits Ilminsky’s wras (p. 478). The MSS. vary and are uncertain.
(April 23rd) On Saturday (15th) an envoy from ‘Irāq, Murād Qajar ¹ the life-guardsman, was seen.

(April 24th) On Sunday (16th) Mullā Mazhab received his usual keepsakes (yādgārlār) and was given leave to go.

(April 25th) On Monday (17th) Khalīfā was sent, with several begs, to see where the river (Ganges) could be crossed.

(April 27th) On Wednesday, (19th) Khalīfā again was sent out, to look at the ground between the two rivers (Ganges and Ghográ).

On this same day I rode southward in the Ārī (Ārrah) pargana to visit the sheets of lotus ² near Ārī. During the excursion Shaikh Gūran brought me fresh-set lotus-seeds, first-rate little things just like pistachios. The flower, that is to say, the nilāfar (lotus), Hindūstānis call kuwal-kikrī (lotus-pistachio), and its seed dūdah (soot).

As people said, “The Son is near,” we went to refresh ourselves on it. Masses of trees could be seen down-stream; “Munīr is there,” said they, “where the tomb is of Shaikh Yaḥyā the father of Shaikh Sharafu’d-din Munīrī.” ³ It being so close, I crossed the Son, went 2 or 3 kurohs down it, traversed the Munīr orchards, made the circuit of the tomb, returned to the Son-bank, made ablution, went through the Mid-day Prayer before time, and made for camp. Some of our horses, being fat, ⁴ had fallen behind; some were worn out; a few people were left to gather them together, water them, rest them, and bring them on without pressure; but for this many would have been ruined.

When we turned back from Munīr, I ordered that some-one should count a horse’s steps between the Son-bank and the camp. They amounted to 23,100, which is 46,200 paces, which is 11 ½

¹ This is the “Kadjar” of Réclus’ L’Asie antérieure and is the name of the Turkmān tribe to which the present ruling house of Persia belongs. “Turkmān” might be taken as applied to Shah Ṭahmāsp by Div Sulṭān’s servant on f. 354.

² Nelumbium speciosum, a water-bean of great beauty.

³ Shaikh Yaḥyā had been the head of the Chishti Order. His son (d. 782 AH — 1380-1 AD.) was the author of works named by Abī’l-fazl as read aloud to Akbar, a discursive detail which pleads in my excuse that those who know Bābur well cannot but see in his grandson’s character and success the fruition of his mental characteristics and of his labours in Hindūstān. (For Sharañu’d-din Munīrī, cf. Khasinātul-’asfiyā ii, 390—92; and Ayin-i-akbari s.n.)

⁴ Kostenko’s Turkestān Region describes a regimen for horses which Bābur will have seen in practice in his native land, one which prevented the defect that hindered his at Munīr from accomplishing more than some 30 miles before mid-day.
kurohs (23 m.) It is about half a kuroh from Munir to the Son; the return journey from Munir to the camp was therefore 12 kurohs (24 m.). In addition to this were some 15–16 kurohs done in visiting this and that place; so that the whole excursion was one of some 30 kurohs (60 m.). Six garis of the 1st night-watch had passed [8.15 p.m.] when we reached the camp.

(April 28th) At the dawn of Thursday (Sha'ban 19th) Sl. Junaid Barlās came in with the Jūnpūr braves from Jūnpūr. I let him know my blame and displeasure on account of his delay; I did not see him. Qāzī Jiā I sent for and saw.

(aa. Plan of the approaching battle with the Bengal army.)

On the same day the Turk and Hind amīrs were summoned for a consultation about crossing Gang (Ganges), and matters found settlement at this ²:—that Üstād ‘Ali-quili should collect mortar, firangi, and culverin to the point of rising ground between the rivers Sarū and Gang, and, having many matchlockmen with him, should incite to battle from that place; ⁵ that

¹ The distance from Munir to the bank of the Ganges will have been considerably longer in Bābur’s day than now because of the change of the river’s course through its desertion of the Burh-gangā channel (cf. next note).

² In trying to locate the site of Bābur’s coming battle with the forces of Nasrat Shāh, it should be kept in mind that previous to the 18th century, and therefore, presumably, in his day, the Ganges flowed in the “Burh-gangā” (Old Ganges) channel which now is closely followed by the western boundary of the Ballia pargana of Dū-āba; that the Ganges and Ghogrā will have met where this old channel entered the bed of the latter river; and also, as is seen from Bābur’s narrative, that above the confluence the Ghogrā will have been confined to a narrowed channel. When the Ganges flowed in the Burh-gangā channel, the now Ballia pargana of Dū-āba was a sub-division of Bihīya and continuous with Shāhābād. From it in Bihīya Bābur crossed the Ganges into Kharīd, doing this at a place his narrative locates as some 2 miles from the confluence. Cf. D.G. of Ballia, pp. 9, 192–3, 206, 213. It may be observed that the former northward extension of Bihīya to the Burh-gangā channel explains Bābur’s estimate (f. 370) of the distance from Munir to his camp on the Ganges; his 12‰ (24 m.) may then have been correct; it is now too high.

³ De Courteille, pierrier, which may be a balista. Bābur’s writings give no indication of other than stone-ammunition for any projectile-engine or fire-arm. Cf. R. W. F. Payne-Gallwey’s Projectile-throwing engines of the ancients.

⁴ Sir R. W. F. Payne-Gallwey writes in The Cross-bow (p. 40 and p. 41) what may apply to Bābur’s garb-zan (culverin?) and tufang (matchlock), when he describes the larger culverin as a heavy hand-gun of from 16–181b., as used by the foot-soldier and requiring the assistance of an attendant to work it; also when he says that it became the portable arquebus which was in extensive use in Europe by the Swiss in 1476 ad.; and that between 1510 and 1520 the arquebus described was superseded by what is still seen amongst remote tribes in India, a matchlock arquebus.

⁵ The two positions Bābur selected for his guns would seem to have been opposite two ferry-heads, those, presumably, which were blocked against his pursuit of Bīban and Bāyazid. ‘Ali-quili’s emplacement will have been on the high bank of old alluvium of south-eastern Kharīd, overlooking the narrowed channel demanded by Bābur’s
Muṣṭāfa, he also having many matchlockmen, should get his material and implements ready on the Bihār side of Gang, a little below the meeting of the waters and opposite to where on an island the Bengalīs had an elephant and a mass of boats tied up, and that he should engage battle from this place; that Muhammad-i-zamān Mīrzā and the others inscribed for the work should take post behind Muṣṭāfa as his reserve; that both for Īstād ʿAlī-qlī and Muṣṭāfa shelters (muljār) for the culverin-firers should be raised by a mass of spadesmen and coolies (kahār) under appointed overseers; that as soon as these shelters were ready, ‘Askārī and the sulṭāns inscribed for the work should cross quickly at the Haldī-passage and come down on the enemy; that meantime, as Sl. Junaid and Qāzī Jiā had given information about a crossing-place sikroha (16 m.) higher up, Zard-rūī (Pale-face?) should go with a few raftsmen and some of the people of the Sulṭān, Mahmūd Khān Nūhanī and Qāzī Jiā to look at that crossing; and that, if crossing there were, they should go over at once, because it was rumoured that the Bengalīs were planning to post men at the Haldi-passage.

A dutiful letter from Mahmūd Khān the Military-collector (shiqdār) of Sikandarpūr now came, saying that he had collected as many as 50 boats at the Haldi-passage and had given wages to the boatmen, but that these were much alarmed at the rumoured approach of the Bengalīs.

(April 30th) As time pressed for crossing the Sarū, I did not wait for the return of those who had gone to look at the passage, narrative, one pent in presumably by kankar reefs such as there are in the region. As illustrating what the channel might have been, the varying breadth of the Ghogrā along the ‘Azamgarh District may be quoted, viz. from 10 miles to 2/5 m., the latter being where, as in Kharīd, there is old alluvium with kankar reefs preserving the banks. Cf. Reid’s Report of Settlement Operations in ‘Azamgarh, Sikandarpur, and Bhadaon.—Firishta gives Bādrū as the name of one ferry (lith. ed. i. 210).

1 Muṣṭāfa, like ʿAlī-qlī, was to take the offensive by gun-fire directed on the opposite bank. Judging from maps and also from the course taken by the Ganges through the Burh-ganga channel and from Bābur’s narrative, there seems to have been a narrow reach of the Ghogrā just below the confluence, as well as above.

2 This ferry, bearing the common name Haldī (turmeric), is located by the course of events as at no great distance above the enemy’s encampment above the confluence. It cannot be the one of Sikandarpūr West.

3 gusr, which here may mean a casual ford through water low just before the Rains. As it was not found, it will have been temporary.

4 i.e. above Bābur’s positions.

5 sarwar (or dar) waqt.
but on Saturday (21st) summoned the begs for consultation and said, "As it has been reported that there are (no?) crossing-places (fords?) along the whole of the ground from Chatur-mük in Sikan-darpür to Barāich and Aūd,¹ let us, while seated here, assign the large force to cross at the Haldī-passage by boat and from there to come down on the enemy; let Üstād 'Ali-qlī and Muṣṭāfa engage battle with gun (top), matchlock, culverin and firingi, and by this draw the enemy out before 'Askarī comes up.² Let us after crossing the river (Ganges) and assigning reinforcement to Üstād 'Ali-qlī, take our stand ready for whatever comes; if 'Askarī's troops get near, let us fling attack from where we are, cross over and assault; let Muḥammad-i-zamān Mīrzā and those appointed to act with him, engage battle from near Muṣṭāfa on the other side of Gang."

The matter having been left at this, the force for the north of the Gang was formed into four divisions to start under 'Askarī's command for the Haldī-passage. One division was of 'Askarī and his retainers; another was Sl. Jalālu'd-din Sharqī; another was of the Aūzbeg sulṭāns Qāsim-i-ḥusain Sulṭān, Bi-khūb Sulṭān and Tāng-aītmīsh Sulṭān, together with Mahmūd Khān Nūhānī of Ghāzipūr, Bābā Qasḥqa's Kūkī, Tūlmīsh Aūzbeg, Qurbān of Chīrkh, and the Daryā-khānīs led by Ḩasan Khān; another was of Mūsā Sl. (Farmūlī) and Sl. Junaid with what-not of the Jūnpūr army, some 20,000 men. Officers were appointed to oversee the getting of the force to horse that very night, that is to say, the night of Sunday.³

(May 1st) The army began to cross Gang at the dawn of Sunday (Sha'bān 22nd); I went over by boat at the 1st watch (6a.m.). Zard-rūī and his party came in at mid-day; the ford itself they had not found but they brought news of boats and of having met on the road the army getting near them.⁴

¹ The preceding sentence is imperfect and varies in the MSS. The 1st Pers. trs., the wording of which is often explanatory, says that there were no passages, which, as there were many ferries, will mean fords. The Haldī-guţr where 'Askarī was to cross, will have been far below the lowest Bābūr mentions, viz. Chatur-mük (Chaupāra).
² This passage presupposes that guns in Kharīd could hit the hostile camp in Sāran. If the river narrowed here as it does further north, the Ghāzī mortar, which seems to have been the only one Bābūr had with him, would have carried across, since it threw a stone 1,600 paces (qadam, f. 309). Cf. Reid's Report quoted above.
³ Anglicé, Saturday after 6 p.m.
⁴ vagin būlghān fauj, var. tā'īn būlghān fauj, the army appointed (to cross). The boats will be those collected at the Haldī-ferry, and the army 'Askarī's.
(May 3rd) On Tuesday (Sha‘bān 24th) we marched from where the river had been crossed, went on for nearly one kuroh (2 m.) and dismounted on the fighting-ground at the confluence. I myself went to enjoy Īstād ‘Ali-quli’s firing of culverin and firingī; he hit two boats today with firingī-stones, broke them and sank them. Muṣṭafa did the same from his side. I had the large mortar² taken to the fighting-ground, left Mullā Ghulām to superintend the making of its position, appointed a body of vasāwals ³ and active braves to help him, went to an island facing the camp and there ate ma‘jūn.

Whilst still under the influence of the confection ⁴ I had the boat taken to near the tents and there slept. A strange thing happened in the night, a noise and disturbance arising about the 3rd watch (midnight) and the pages and others snatching up pieces of wood from the boat, and shouting “Strike! strike!” What was said to have led to the disturbance was that a night-guard who was in the Farmāīsh along-side the Asāīsh in which I was sleeping, ⁵ opening his eyes from slumber, sees a man with his hand on the Asāīsh as if meaning to climb into her. They fall on him ; ⁶ he dives, comes up again, cuts at the night-guard’s head, wounding it a little, then runs off at once towards the river. ⁷ Once before, on the night we returned from Munir, one or two night-guards had chased several Hindūstānis from near the boats, and had brought in two swords and a dagger of theirs. The Most High had me in His Keeping!

(Persian) Were the sword of the world to leap forth,
It would cut not a vein till God will. ⁸

---

¹ i.e. near ‘Ali-quli’s emplacement.
² Cf. f. 303, f. 309, f. 337 and n. 4.
³ "The yasāval is an officer who carries the commands of the prince, and sees them enforced" (Erskine). Here he will have been the superintendent of coolies moving earth.
⁴ ma‘jūn-nāk which, in these days of Bābur’s return to obedience, it may be right to translate in harmony with his psychical outlook of self-reproach, by ma‘jūn-polluted. Though he had long ceased to drink wine, he still sought cheer and comfort, in his laborious days, from inspiring and forbidden confections.
⁵ Probably owing to the less precise phrasing of his Persian archetype, Erskine here has reversed the statement, made in the Turki, that Bābur slept in the Asāīsh (not the Farmāīsh).
⁶ aūstidā tāshlār. An earlier reading of this, viz. that stones were thrown on the intruder is negatived by Bābur’s mention of wood as the weapon used.
⁷ sū sārī which, as the boats were between an island and the river’s bank, seems likely to mean that the man went off towards the main stream. Mem. p. 415, “made his escape in the river”; Mem. ii, 418, dans la direction du large.
⁸ This couplet is quoted by Jahāngīr also (Tūsūk, trs. Rogers & Beveridge, i, 348).
(May 4th) At the dawn of Wednesday (25th), I went in the boat Gunjāish to near the stone-firing ground (tāsh-ātār-yīr) and there posted each soever to his work.

(bb. Details of the engagement.)

Aūghān-bīrḍī Mughul, leading not less than 1,000 men, had been sent to get, in some way or other, across the river (Saru) one, two, three kurohs (2, 4, 6 m.) higher up. A mass of foot-soldiers, crossing from opposite 'Askari's camp, landed from 20–30 boats on his road, presumably thinking to show their superiority, but Aūghān-bīrḍī and his men charged them, put them to flight, took a few and cut their heads off, shot many with arrows, and got possession of 7 or 8 boats. Today also Bengalis crossed in a few boats to Muḥammad-i-zamān Mīrzā's side, there landed and provoked to fight. When attacked they fled, and three boat-loads of them were drowned. One boat was captured and brought to me. In this affair Bābā the Brave went forward and exerted himself excellently.

Orders were given that in the darkness of night the boats Aūghān-bīrḍī had captured should be drawn up-stream, and that in them there should cross Muḥammad-sl. Mīrzā, Yakka Khwāja, Yūnas-i-'ali, Aūghān-bīrḍī and those previously assigned to go with them.

Today came a man from 'Askari to say that he had crossed the [Saru]-water, leaving none behind, and that he would come down on the enemy at next day's dawn, that is to say, on Thursday's. Here-upon those already ordered to cross over were told to join 'Askari and to advance upon the enemy with him.

At the Mid-day Prayer a person came from Üstā, saying "The stone is ready; what is the order?" The order was, "Fire this stone off; keep the next till I come." Going at the Other Prayer in a very small Bengali skiff to where shelter (muljār) had been raised, I saw Üstā fire off one large stone and several

1 This, taken with the positions of other crossing-parties, serves to locate 'Askari's "Haldi-passage" at no great distance above 'Ali-qi'lī's emplacement at the confluence, and above the main Bengal force.

2 Perhaps, towed from the land. I have not found Bābūr using any word which clearly means to row, unless indeed a later rawān does so. The force meant to cross in the boats taken up under cover of night was part of Bābūr's own, no doubt.
small firangi ones. Bengalis have a reputation for fire-working; we tested it now; they do not fire counting to hit a particular spot, but fire at random.

At this same Other Prayer orders were given to draw a few boats up-stream along the enemy's front. A few were got past without a "God forbid!" from those who, all unprotected, drew them up. Aisân-tîmûr Sl. and Tükhta-bughâ Sl. were ordered to stay at the place those boats reached, and to keep watch over them. I got back to camp in the 1st night-watch of Thursday.

Near midnight came news from (Aûghân-bîrdi’s) boats which were being drawn up-stream, "The force appointed had gone somewhat ahead; we were following, drawing the boats, when the Bengalis got to know where we were drawing them and attacked. A stone hit a boatman in the leg and broke it, we could not pass on."

(May 5th) At dawn on Thursday (Shâ'bân 26th) came the news from those at the shelter, "All the boats have come from above. The enemy's horse has ridden to meet our approaching army." On this, I got our men mounted quickly and rode out to above those boats that had been drawn up in the night. A galloper was sent off with an order for Muhammad Sl. M. and those appointed to cross with him, to do it at once and join 'Askari. The order for Aisân-tîmûr Sl. and Tükhta-bughâ Sl. who were above these boats, was that they should busy themselves to cross. Bâbâ Sl. was not at his post.

1 ãtîsh-bâzî lit. fire-playing, if a purely Persian compound; if ãtîsh be Turki, it means discharge, shooting. The word "fire-working" is used above under the nearest to contemporary guidance known to me, viz. that of the list of persons who suffered in the Patna massacre "during the troubles of October 1763 AD." in which list are the names of four Lieutenants fire-workers (Calcutta Review, Oct. 1884, and Jan. 1885, art. The Patna Massacre, H. Beveridge).
2 bi tâhâshi, without protest or demur.
3 Anglicè; Wednesday after 6 p.m.
4 Perhaps those which had failed to pass in the darkness; perhaps those from Haldi-guér, which had been used by 'Askari's troops. There appear to be obvious reasons for their keeping abreast on the river with the troops in Sâran, in order to convey reinforcements or to provide retreat.
5 kîmalâr âûstîdâ, which may mean that he came, on the high bank, to where the boats lay below.
6 as in the previous note, kîmalâr âûstîdâ. These will have been the few drawn up-stream along the enemy's front.
7 The reproach conveyed by Bâbur's statement is borne out by the strictures of Hâdâir Mirzâ Dughlât on Bâbâ Sulţân's neglect of duty (Târikh-i-rashîdî trs. cap. lxxvii).
Aīsān-tīmūr Sl. at once crosses, in one boat with 30–40 of his retainers who hold their horses by the mane at the boat-side. A second boat follows. The Bengalīs see them crossing and start off a mass of foot-soldiers for them. To meet these go 7 or 8 of Aīsān-tīmūr Sl.'s retainers, keeping together, shooting off arrows, drawing those foot-soldiers towards the Sultān who meantime is getting his men mounted; meantime also the second boat is moving (rawān). When his 30–35 horsemen charge those foot-soldiers, they put them well to flight. Aīsān-tīmūr did distinguished work, first in crossing before the rest, swift, steady, and without a "God forbid!", secondly in his excellent advance, with so few men, on such a mass of foot, and by putting these to flight. Tūkhta-būghā Sl. also crossed. Then boats followed one after another. Lāhorīs and Hindūstānis began to cross from their usual posts 1 by swimming or on bundles of reeds. 2 Seeing how matters were going, the Bengalīs of the boats opposite the shelter (Muṣṭafā's), set their faces for flight down-stream.

Darvish-i-muḥammad Sārbaṇā, Dost Lord-of-the-gate, Nūr Beg and several braves also went across the river. I made a man gallop off to the Sultāns to say, "Gather well together those who cross, go close to the opposing army, take it in the flank, and get to grips." Accordingly the Sultāns collected those who crossed, formed up into 3 or 4 divisions, and started for the foe. As they draw near, the enemy-commander, without breaking his array, flings his foot-soldiers to the front and so comes on. Kūkī comes up with a troop from 'Askari's force and gets to grips on his side; the Sultāns get to grips on theirs; they get the upper hand, unhorse man after man, and make the enemy scurry off. Kūkī's men bring down a Pagan of repute named Basant Rāō and cut off his head; 10 or 15 of his people fall on Kūkī's, and are instantly cut to pieces. Tūkhta-būghā Sl. gallops along the enemy's front and gets his sword well in. Mughūl 'Abdu'l-

1 yūsānlaq tāshī, Pers. trs. tarf khād, i.e. their place in the array, a frequent phrase.
2 dastak bīla dasta-i-gāmīsh bīla. Cf. f. 363b and f. 366b, for passages and notes connected with swimming and dastak. Erskine twice translates dastak bīla by swimming; but here de Courteille changes from his earlier à la nage (f. 366b) to appuyés sur une pièce de bois. Perhaps the swift current was crossed by swimming with the support of a bundle of reeds, perhaps on rafts made of such bundles (cf. Illustrated London News, Sep. 16th, 1916, for a picture of Indian soldiers so crossing on rafts).
wahhāb and his younger brother gets theirs in well too. Mughūl
though he did not know how to swim, had crossed the river
holding to his horse's mane.

I sent for my own boats which were behind;¹ the Farmāish
coming up first, I went over in it to visit the Bengalis' encamping-
grounds. I then went into the Gunjāish. "Is there a crossing-
place higher up?" I asked. Mīr Muḥammad the raftsman
represented that the Sarū was better to cross higher up;²
accordingly the army-folk ³ were ordered to cross at the higher
place he named.

While those led by Muḥammad Sl. Mīrzā were crossing the
river,⁴ the boat in which Yakka Khwāja was, sank and he went
to God's mercy. His retainers and lands were bestowed on his
younger brother Qāsim Khwāja.

The Sulṭāns arrived while I was making ablution for the Mid-
day Prayer; I praised and thanked them and led them to expect
guerdon and kindness. 'Askarī also came; this was the first
affair he had seen; one well-omened for him!

As the camp had not yet crossed the river, I took my rest in
the boat Gunjāish, near an island.

(ccc. Various incidents of the days following the battle.)

(May 6th) During the day of Friday (Sha'bān 27th) we landed
at a village named Kūndīh ⁵ in the Nirhun pargana of Kharīd on
the north side of the Sarū.⁶

(May 8th) On Sunday (29th) Kūkī was sent to Ḥājipūr for
news.

¹ perhaps they were in the Burh-ganga channel, out of gun-fire.
² If the Ghogrā flowed at this point in a narrow channel, it would be the swifter,
and less easy to cross than where an open bed.
³ chirīk-āilī, a frequent compound, but one of which the use is better defined in the
latter than the earlier part of Bābūr's writings to represent what then answered to an
Army Service Corps. This corps now crosses into Sāran and joins the fighting force.
⁴ This appears to refer to the crossing effected before the fight.
⁵ or Kūndbah. I have not succeeded in finding this name in the Nirhun pargana;
it may have been at the southern end, near the "Domaigarh" of maps. In it was
Tīr-mūhānī, perhaps a village (f. 377, f. 381).
⁶ This passage justifies Erskine's surmise (Memoirs, p. 411, n. 4) that the Kharīd-
country lay on both banks of the Ghogrā. His further surmise that, on the east bank
of the Ghogrā, it extended to the Ganges would be correct also, since the Ganges
flowed, in Bābūr's day, through the Burh-ganga (Old Ganges) channel along the
southern edge of the present Kharīd, and thus joined the Ghogrā higher than it
now does.
Shāh Muḥammad (son) of Maʿrūf to whom in last year's campaign (934 AH.) I had shown great favour and had given the Sāran-country, had done well on several occasions, twice fighting and overcoming his father Maʿrūf. At the time when Sl. Mahmūd Lūdī perfidiously took possession of Bihār and was opposed by Shaikh Bāyazīd and Bīban, Shāh Muḥammad had no help for it, he had to join them; but even then, when people were saying wild words about him, he had written dutifully to me. When ‘Askārī crossed at the Haldi-passage, Shāh Muḥammad had come at once with a troop, seen him and with him gone against the Bengalis. He now came to this ground and waited on me.

During these days news came repeatedly that Bīban and Shaikh Bāyazīd were meaning to cross the Sarū-river.

In these days of respite came the surprising news from Sanbāl (Sambhal) where ‘Alī-i-yūṣuf had stayed in order to bring the place into some sort of order, that he and a physician who was by way of being a friend of his, had gone to God's mercy on one and the same day. ‘Abdu'l-lāh (kitābdār) was ordered to go and maintain order in Sanbāl.

(May 13th) On Friday the 5th of the month Ramzān, ‘Abdu'l-lāh was given leave for Sanbāl.

(Add. News from the westward.)

In these same days came a dutiful letter from Chīn-tīmūr Sl. saying that on account of the journey of the family from Kābul, several of the begs who had been appointed to reinforce him, had not been able to join him; also that he had gone out with Muḥammad and other begs and braves, not less than 100 kurohs

1 Bāyazīd and Maʿrūf Farmūlī were brothers. Bāyazīd had taken service with Bābur in 932 AH. (1526 AD.), left him in 934 AH. (end of 1527 AD.) and opposed him near Qānūj. Maʿrūf, long a rebel against Ibrāhīm Lūdī, had never joined Bābur; two of his sons did so; of the two, Muḥammad and Mūsā, the latter may be the one mentioned as at Qānūj, “Maʿrūf's son” (f. 336).—For an interesting sketch of Marīf's character and for the location in Hindūstān of the Farmūlī clan, see the Wāqī‘āt-i-muṣṭaqī, E. & D.'s History of India, iv, 584.—In connection with Qānūj, the discursive remark may be allowable, that Bābur's halt during the construction of the bridge of boats across the Ganges in 934 AH. is still commemorated by the name Bādshāh-nagar of a village between Bangarmau and Nānāmāu (Elliot's Onau, p. 45).

2 On f. 381 ‘Abdu'l-lāh's starting-place is mentioned as Tir-mūḥānī.

3 The failure to join would be one of the evils predicted by the dilatory start of the ladies from Kābul (f. 360b).
(200m.), attacked the Balūchis and given them a good beating. Orders were sent through 'Abdu'l-lāh (kitābdār) for the Sultān that he and Sl. Muḥammad Dūldāi, Muhammadi, and some of the begs and braves of that country-side should assemble in Āgra and there remain ready to move to wherever an enemy appeared.

(see. Settlement with the Nūhānī Afghāns.)

(May 16th) On Monday the 8th of the month, Daryā Khān's grandson Jalāl Khān to whom Shaikh Jamāli had gone, came in with his chief amīrs and waited on me. Yaḥyā Nūhānī also came, who had already sent his younger brother in sign of submission and had received a royal letter accepting his service. Not to make vain the hope with which some 7 or 8,000 Nūhānī Afghāns had come in to me, I bestowed 50 lakhs from Bihār on Mahmūd Khān Nūhānī, after reserving one krūr for Government uses (khalṣa), and gave the remainder of the Bihār revenues in trust for the above-mentioned Jalāl Khān who for his part agreed to pay one krūr of tribute. Mullā Ghulām yasāwal was sent to collect this tribute. Muḥammad-i-zamān Mīrzā received the Jūnapūr-country.

(May 19th) On the eve of Thursday (11th) that retainer of Khalīfa's, Ghulām-i-'alī by name, who in company with a retainer of the Shāh-zāda of Mungīr named Abū'l-fath, had gone earlier than Ismā'īl Mītā, to convey those three articles (faṣl sos), now returned, again in company with Abū'l-fath, bringing letters for Khalīfa written by the Shāh-zāda and by Ḥusain Khān Laskar(?) Wazīr, who, in those letters, gave assent to those three conditions, took upon themselves to act for Naṣrat Shāh and interjected a word for peace. As the object of this campaign was to put

---

1 The order for these operations is given on f. 355b.
2 f. 369. The former Nūhānī chiefs are now restored to Bihār as tributaries of Bābur.
3 Erskine estimated the krūr at about £25,000, and the 50 lakhs at about £12,500.
4 The Mīrzā thus supersedes Junaid Barlās in Jūnapūr.—The form Jūnapūr used above and elsewhere by Bābur and his Persian translators, supports the Gazetteer of India xlv, 74 as to the origin of the name Jūnapūr.
5 a son of Naṣrat Shāh. No record of this earlier legation is with the Bābur-nāma manuscripts; probably it has been lost. The only article found specified is the one asking for the removal of the Kharid army from a ferry-head Bābur wished to use; Naṣrat Shāh's assent to this is an anti-climax to Bābur's victory on the Ghogra.
down the rebel Afghāns of whom some had taken their heads and gone off, some had come in submissive and accepting my service, and the remaining few were in the hands of the Bengali (Naṣrat Shāh) who had taken them in charge, and as, moreover, the Rains were near, we in our turn wrote and despatched words for peace on the conditions mentioned.

(May 21st) On Saturday (13th) Ismā'il Jalāwānī, 'Alāūl Khān Nūhānī, Auliya Khān Ashrāqī (?) and 5 and 6 amīrs came in and waited on me.

Today guerdon was bestowed on Aīsān-timūr Sl. and Tūkhta-būghā Sl., of swords and daggers with belts, cuirasses, dresses of honour, and tipūchtāq horses; also they were made to kneel, Aīsān-timūr Sl. for the grant of 36 laks from the Nārnūl pargana, Tūkhta-būghā Sl. for 30 laks from that of Shamsābād.

(May 23rd) On Monday the 15th of the month (Ramzān), we marched from our ground belonging to Kūndbah (or Kūndīh) on the Sarū-river, with easy mind about Bihār and Bengal, and resolute to crush the traitors Biban and Shaikh Bāyazid.

(May 25th) On Wednesday (17th) after making two night-halts by the way, we disembowled at a passage across the Sarū, called Chaupārā-Chaturmūk of Sikandarpūr.1 From today people were busy in crossing the river.

As news began to come again and again that the traitors, after crossing Sarū and Gogar,2 were going toward Luknūr,3 the

1 Chaupārā is at the Sāran end of the ferry, at the Sikandarpūr one is Chatur-mūk (Four-faces, an epithet of Brahma and Vishnu).
2 It may be inferred from the earlier use of the phrase Gogar (or Gagar) and Sarū (Sīrū or Sīrd), on f. 338-86, that whereas the rebels were, earlier, for crossing Sarū only, i.e. the Ghogrā below its confluence with the Sarda, they had now changed for crossing above the confluence and further north. Such a change is explicable by desire to avoid encounter with Bābur's following, here perhaps the army of Aūd, and the same desire is manifested by their abandonment of a fort captured (f. 377b) some days before the rumour reached Bābur of their crossing Sarū and Gogar.—Since translating the passage on f. 338, I have been led, by enforced attention to the movement of the confluence of Ghogrā with Ganges (Sarū with Gang) to see that that translation, eased in obedience to distances shewn in maps, may be wrong and that Bābur's statement that he dismounted 2-3 kuroks (4-6 m.) above Aūd at the confluence of Gogar with Sarū, may have some geographical interest and indicate movement of the two affluents such e.g. as is indicated of the Ganges and Ghogrā by tradition and by the name Burh-ganga (cf. f. 370, p. 667, n. 2).
3 or Līknūr, perhaps Liknū or Liknür. The capricious variation in the MSS.
following leaders were appointed to bar (their) crossing:—The Turk and Hind amirs Jalālu’d-din Shārqī, ‘Alī Khān Farmūlī; Tardika (or, Tardī yakka), Nizām Khān of Biāna, together with Tūlmish Aūsbeg; Qurbān of Chirk and Daryā Khān (of Bhīra’s son) Hasan Khān. They were given leave to go on the night of Thursday.

(iii. Damage done to the Bābur-nāma writings.)

That same night when 1 watch (pās), 5 garīs had passed (cir. 10.55 p.m.) and the tarāvīh-prayers were over, such a storm burst, in the inside of a moment, from the up-piled clouds of the Rainy-season, and such a stiff gale rose, that few tents were left standing. I was in the Audience-tent, about to write (kitābat qilā dūr aīdim); before I could collect papers and sections, the tent came down, with its porch, right on my head. The tünglūq went to pieces. God preserved me! no harm befell me! Sections and book were drenched under water and gathered together with much difficulty. We laid them in the folds of a woollen throne-carpet, put this on the throne and on it piled blankets. The storm quieted down in about 2 garīs (45 m.); the between L.:knū and L.:knūr makes the movements of the rebels difficult to follow. Comment on these variants, tending to identify the places behind the words, is grouped in Appendix T, On L.:knū (Lakhnau) and L.:knūr (Lakhnūr).

1 Taking guzr in the sense it has had hitherto in the Bābur-nāma of ferry or ford, the detachment may have been intended to block the river-crossings of “Sarū and Gogar”. If so, however, the time for this was past, the rebels having taken a fort west of those rivers on Ramzān 13th. Nothing further is heard of the detachment.—That news of the rebel-crossing of the rivers did not reach Bābur before the 13th and news of their capture of L.:knū or L.:knūr before the 19th may indicate that they had crossed a good deal to the north of the confluence, and that the fort taken was one more remote than Lakhnau (Oude). Cf. Appendix T.

2 Anglicé, Wednesday after 6 p.m.

3 These are recited late in the night during Ramzān.

4 kahhāz u ajṣā’, perhaps writing-paper and the various sections of the Bābur-nāma writings, viz. biographical notices, descriptions of places, detached lengths of diary, fārmāns of Shaikh Zain. The lacunae of 934 AH., 935 AH., and perhaps earlier ones also may be attributed reasonably to this storm. It is easy to understand the loss of e.g. the conclusion of the Farghāna section, and the diary one of 934 AH., if they lay partly under water. The accident would be better realized in its disastrous results to the writings, if one knew whether Bābur wrote in a bound or unbound volume. From the minor losses of 935 AH., one guesses that the current diary at least had not reached the stage of binding.

5 The tünglūq is a flap in a tent-roof, allowing light and air to enter, or smoke to come out. 

6 ajṣā’ u kitāb. See last note but one. The kitāb (book) might well be Bābur’s composed narrative on which he was now working, as far as it had then gone towards its untimely end (Hai. MS. f. 216b).

7 saqarlāṭ, kut-zilūcha, where saqarlāṭ will mean warm and woollen.
bedding-tent was set up, a lamp lighted, and, after much trouble, a fire kindled. We, without sleep, were busy till shoot of day drying folios and sections.

(jjj. Pursuit of Biban and Bāyazīd resumed.)

(May 26th) I crossed the water on Thursday morning (Ramān 18th).

(May 27th) On Friday (19th) I rode out to visit Sikandarpūr and Kharid.1 Today came matters written by 'Abdu'll-lāh (kitābdār) and Bāqī about the taking of Luknūr.2

(May 28th) On Saturday (20th) Kūkī was sent ahead, with a troop, to join Bāqī.3

(May 29th) That nothing falling to be done before my arrival might be neglected, leave to join Bāqī was given on Sunday (21st) to Sl. Junaid Barlās, Khalifa's (son) Ḥasan, Mullā Āpāq's retainers, and the elder and younger brethren of Mumin Ātāka.

Today at the Other Prayer a special dress of honour and a tipūchāq horse were bestowed on Shāh Muḥammad (son) of Ma'rūf Farmūlī, and leave to go was given. As had been done last year (934 AH.), an allowance from Sāran and Kūndla4 was bestowed on him for the maintenance of quiver-wearers. Today too an allowance of 72laks 5 from Sarwār and a tipūchāq horse were bestowed on Ismā'īl Jalvānī, and his leave was given.

About the boats Gunjāīsh and Arāīsh it was settled with Bengalis that they should take them to Ghāzipūr by way of Tir-mūḥānī.6 The boats Asāīsh and Farmāīsh were ordered taken up the Sarū with the camp.

(May 30th) On Monday (Ramzān 22nd) we marched from the Chaupāra-Chaturmūk passage along the Sarū, with mind at ease about Bihār and Sarwār,7 and after doing as much as 10 kurohs

---

1 Kharid-town is some 4 m. s.e. of the town of Sikandarpūr.
2 Or L:knū. Cf. Appendix T. It is now 14 days since 'Abdu'll-lāh kitābdār had left Tir-mūḥānī (f. 380) for Sambhāl; as he was in haste, there had been time for him to go beyond Aūd (where Bāqī was) and yet get the news to Bābur on the 19th.
3 In a way not usual with him, Bābur seems to apply three epithets to this follower, viz. ming-begī, rāghavān, Tāshkindī (Index s.n.).
4 Or Kandla; cf. Revenue list f. 293; is it now Sāran Khās?
5 £18,000 (Erskine). For the total yield of Kūndla (or Kandla) and Sarwār, see Revenue list (f. 293).
6 f. 375, p. 675 n. 2 and f. 381, p. 687 n. 3.
7 A little earlier Bābur has recorded his ease of mind about Bihār and Bengal, the fruit doubtless of his victory over Mahmūd Lūdī and Naṣrat Shāh; he now does the
Fol. 377b. (20m.) dismounted on the Saru in a village called Kilirah (?) dependent on Fathpur.¹

(*kkk. A surmised survival of the record of 934 A.H.*)²

*After spending several days pleasantly in that place where there are gardens, running-waters, well-designed buildings, trees, particularly mango-trees, and various birds of coloured plumage, I ordered the march to be towards Ghazipur.*

Ismā'īl Khān Jalwānī and 'Alāū Khān Nūḥānī had it represented to me that they would come to Āgra after seeing their native land (zwatn). On this the command was, “I will give an order in a month.”³

same about Bihār and Sarwār, no doubt because he has replaced in Bihār, as his tributaries, the Nūḥānī chiefs and has settled other Afgāns, Jalwānīs and Farmūls in a Sarwār cleared of the Jalwānī (?) rebel Bīban and the Farmūl opponents Ḑāyazīd and Mā'rūf. The Farmūl Shaikh-żādas, it may be recalled, belonged by descent to Bābur’s Kābul district of Farmūl.—The Wāgi'āt-i-mushāqī (E. & D.’s H. of I. iv, 548) details the position of the clan under Sikandar Lādī.

¹ The MSS. write Fathpūr but Nathpūr suits the context, a pargana mentioned in the Āyīn-i-ahbār and now in the ‘Azamgarh district. There seems to be no Nathpūr within Bābur’s limit of distance. The D.G. of ‘Azamgarh mentions two now insignificant Fathpūrs, one as having a school, the other a market. The name G:l:r:h (K:1:r:h) I have not found.

² The passage contained in this section seems to be a survival of the lost record of 934 A.H. (f. 339). I have found it only in the Memoirs p. 420, and in Mr. Erskine’s own Codex of the Wāgi’āt-i-bābūrī (now B.M. Add. 26.200), f. 371 where however several circumstances isolate it from the context. It may be a Persian translation of an authentic Turkī fragment, found, perhaps with other such fragments, in the Royal Library. Its wording disassociates it, perhaps with other such fragments, in the Royal Library. Its wording disassociates it, perhaps from the ‘Abdu’r-rahīm text. The Codex (No. 26,200) breaks off at the foot of a page (supra, Fathpur) with a completed sentence. The supposedly-misplaced passage is entered on the next folio as a sort of ending of the Bābur-nāma writings; in a rough script, inferior to that of the Codex, and is followed by Tam, tam (Finis), and an incomplete date ḡ8—, in words. Beneath this a line is drawn, on which is subtended the triangle frequent with scribes; within this is what seems to be a completion of the date to ḡ90 A.H. and a pious wish, scrawled in an even rougher hand than the rest.—Not only in diction and in script but in contents also the passage is a misfit where it now stands; it can hardly describe a village on the Saru; Bābur in 935 A.H. did not march for Ghāzīpur but may have done so in 934 A.H. (p. 656, n. 3); Ismā‘īl Jalwānī had had leave given already in 935 A.H. (f. 377) under other conditions, ones bespeaking more trust and tried allegiance.—Possibly the place described as having fine buildings, gardens etc. is Āud (Ajodhya) where Bābur spent some days in 934 A.H. (cf. f. 363b, p. 655 n. 3).

³ “Here my Persian manuscript closes” (This is B.M. Add. 26,200). “The two additional fragments are given from Mr. Metcalfe’s manuscript alone” (now B.M. Add. 26,202) “and unluckily, it is extremely incorrect” (Erskine). This note will have been written perhaps a decade before 1826, in which year the Memoirs of Bābur was published, after long delay. Mr. Erskine’s own Codex (No. 26,200) was made good at a later date, perhaps when he was working on his History of India (pub. 1854), by a well-written supplement which carries the diary to its usual end s.a. 936 A.H. and also gives Persian translations of Bābur’s letters to Humāyūn and Khwāja Kalān.
(ill. The westward march resumed.)

(May 31st) Those who marched early (Tuesday, Ramzān 23rd), having lost their way, went to the great lake of Fathpūr (?). People were sent galloping off to fetch back such as were near and Kichīk Khwāja was ordered to spend the night on the lake-shore and to bring the rest on next morning to join the camp. We marched at dawn; I got into the Asāiš half-way and had it towed to our ground higher up.

(mmm. Details of the capture of a fort by Bīban and Bāyazīd.)

On the way up, Khalīfa brought Shāh Muhammad dīwāna's son who had come from Bāqī bringing this reliable news about Luknūr — They (i.e. Bīban and Bāyazīd) hurled their assault on Saturday the 13th of the month Ramzān (May 21st) but could do nothing by fighting; while the fighting was going on, a collection of wood-chips, hay, and thorns in the fort took fire, so that inside the walls it became as hot as an oven (tafsān); the garrison could not move round the rampart; the fort was lost. When the enemy heard, two or three days later, of our return (westwards), he fled towards Dalmau.

Today after doing as much as 10kurohs (20m.), we dismounted beside a village called Jalisir, on the Sarū-bank, in the Sagī pargāna.

(June 1st) We stayed on the same ground through Wednesday (24th), in order to rest our cattle.

(unn. Dispositions against Bīban and Bāyazīd.)

Some said they had heard that Bīban and Bāyazīd had crossed Gang, and thought of withdrawing themselves to their kinsfolk

1 Here, as earlier, Nathpūr suits the context better than Fathpūr. In the Nathpūr pargana, at a distance from Chaupāra approximately suiting Bābur's statement of distance, is the lake "Tal Ratoi", formerly larger and deeper than now. There is a second further west and now larger than Tal Ratoi; through this the Ghogrā once flowed, and through it has tried within the last half-century to break back. These changes in Tal Ratoi and in the course of the Ghogrā dictate caution in attempting to locate places which were on it in Bābur's day e.g. Kūr-h (supra).

2 Appendix T.

3 This name has the following variants in the Hai, MS. and in Kehr's:—Dalm-ū-ūū -ūr-ūd-ūt. The place was in Akbar's sarkār of Mānıkpūr and is now in the Rai Bareilly district.

4 Perhaps Chaksar, which was in Akbar's sarkār of Jūnpūr, and is now in the Azamgarh district.
(nisbahsilār) by way of . . . . . Here-upon the begs were summoned for a consultation and it was settled that Muḥammad-i-zamān Mirzā and Sl. Junaid Barlās who in place of Jūnpūr had been given Chunār with several parganas, Maḥmud Khān Nūhānī, Qāżī Jīā, and Tāj Khān Sarāng-khānī should block the enemy’s road at Chunār.2

(June 2nd) Marching early in the morning of Thursday (25th), we left the Sarū-river, did 11 kurohs (22 m.), crossed the Parsaru (Sarjū) and dismounted on its bank.

Here the begs were summoned, discussion was had, and the leaders named below were appointed to go detached from the army, in rapid pursuit of Bīban and Bāyazīd towards Dalmut (Dalmau) — Aīsān-tīmūr Sl., Muḥammad Sl. M., Tūkhta-būghā Sl., Qāsim-i-ḥusain Sl., Bī-khūb (Nī-khūb) Sl., Muẓaffar-i-ḥusain Sl., Qāsim Khwāja, Ja’far Khwāja, Zahid Khwāja, Jānī Beg, ‘Askari’s retainer Kīchik Khwāja, and, of Hind amirs, ‘Ālam Khān of Kālpī, Malik-dād Kararānī, and Rāo (Rāwū) Sarwānī.

(ooo. The march continued.)

When I went at night to make ablution in the Parsaru, people were catching a mass of fish that had gathered round a lamp on the surface of the water. I like others took fish in my hands.3

1 Ḫai. MS. J:nārā khānā tawābī sī bīla (perhaps tawābī’sī but not so written). The obscurity of these words is indicated by their variation in the manuscripts. Most scribes have them as Chunār and Jūnpūr, guided presumably by the despatch of a force to Chunār on receipt of the news, but another force was sent to Dalmau at the same time. The rebels were defeated s.w. of Dalmau and thence went to Mahūba; it is not certain that they had crossed the Ganges at Dalmau; there are difficulties in supposing the fort they captured and abandoned was Lakhnūr (Oude); they might have gone south to near Kālpī and Adampūr, which are at no great distance from where they were defeated by Bāqī shaghāwal, if Lakhnūr (now Shahābād in Rāmpūr) were the fort. (Cf. Appendix T.) — To take up the interpretation of the words quoted above, at another point, that of the kinsfolk or fellow-Afghāns the rebels planned to join: — these kinsfolk may have been, of Bāyazīd, the Farmūlīs in Sarwār, and of Bīban, the Jalwāns of the same place. The two may have trusted to relationship for harbourage during the Rains, disloyal though they were to their kinsmen’s accepted suzerain. Therefore if they were once across Ganges and Jumna, as they were in Mahūba, they may have thought of working eastwards south of the Ganges and of getting north into Sarwār through territory belonging to the Chunār and Jūnpūr governments. This however is not expressed by the words quoted above; perhaps Bābūr’s record was hastily and incompletely written. — Another reading may be Chunār and Jaund (in Akbar’s sarkār of Rohtās).

2 yūlīnī tūṣqātīlār. It may be observed concerning the despatch of Muḥammad-i-zamān M. and of Junaid Barlās that they went to their new appointments Jūnpūr and Chunār respectively; that their doing so was an orderly part of the winding-up of Bābūr’s Eastern operations; that they remained as part of the Eastern garrison, on duty apart from that of blocking the road of Bīban and Bāyazīd.

3 This mode of fishing is still practised in India (Erskine).
(June 3rd) On Friday (26th) we dismounted on a very slender stream, the head-water of a branch of the Parsarū. In order not to be disturbed by the comings and goings of the army-folk, I had it dammed higher up and had a place, 10 by 10, made for ablution. The night of the 27th was spent on this ground.

(June 4th) At the dawn of the same day (Saturday 27th) we left that water, crossed the Tūs and dismounted on its bank.

(June 5th) On Sunday (28th) we dismounted on the bank of the same water.

(June 6th) On Monday the 29th of the month (Ramzān), our station was on the bank of the same Tūs-water. Though tonight the sky was not quite clear, a few people saw the Moon, and so testifying to the Qāzī, fixed the end of the month (Ramzān).

(June 7th) On Tuesday (Shawwāl 1st) we made the Prayer of the Festival, at dawn rode on, did 10 kurohs (20m.), and dismounted on the bank of the Gūi (Gümṭi), a kuroh (2m.) from Māing. The sin of ma'jūn was committed (irtikāb qilīldī) near the Mid-day Prayer; I had sent this little couplet of invitation to Shaikh Zain, Mullā Shihāb and Khwānd-amīr:

(Turkī) Shaikh and Mullā Shihāb and Khwānd-amīr,
Come all three, or two, or one.

Darwīsh-i-muhammad (Sārbān), Yūnas-i-ʿalī and ʿAbdu'l-lāh (ʿasas) were also there. At the Other Prayer the wrestlers set to.

(June 8th) On Wednesday (2nd) we stayed on the same ground. Near breakfast-time ma'jūn was eaten. Today Malik Sharq came in who had been to get Tāj Khān out of Chunār. When the wrestlers set to today, the Champion of Aūd who had come earlier, grappled with and threw a Hindūstānī wrestler who had come in the interval.

Today Yaḥyā Nuḥānī was granted an allowance of 15 lakhs

1 Islāmic, Saturday night; Anglicic, Friday after 6 p.m.
2 This Tūs, “Tousin, or Tons, is a branch from the Ghogrā coming off above Faizābād and joining the Sarju or Parsarū below 'Azamgarh” (Erskine).
3 Kehr’s MS. p. 1132, Māng (or Mānk); Ḥai. MS. Tālk; I.O. 218 f. 328 Bāk; I.O. 217 f. 236b, Bāk. Māng in the Sultānpūr district seems suitably located (D.G. of Sultānpūr, p. 162).
4 This will be the night-guard (ʿasas); the librarian (kitābdār) is in Sambhál. I.O. 218 f. 325 inserts kitābdār after ʿAbdu'l-lāh’s name where he is recorded as sent to Sambhāl (f. 375).
5 He will have announced to Tāj Khān the transfer of the fort to Junāid Barlās.
from Parsarūr,\(^1\) made to put on a dress of honour, and given his leave.

\((June 9th)\) Next day (\textit{Thursday 3rd}) we did 1\textit{kurohs} (22 m.), crossed the Gūī-water (Gūmtī), and dismounted on its bank.

(\textit{ppp. Concerning the pursuit of Bīban and Bāyazīd.})

News came in about the sulṭāns and begs of the advance that they had reached Dalmūd (Dalmau), but were said not yet to have crossed the water (Ganges). Angered by this (delay), I sent orders, "Cross the water at once; follow the track of the rebels; cross Jūn (Jumna) also; join ʿĀlam Khān to yourselves; be energetic and get to grips with the adversary."

(\textit{qqq. The march continued.})

\((June 10th)\) After leaving this water (Gūmtī, \textit{Friday 4th}) we made two night-halts and reached Dalmūd (Dalmau), where most of the army-folk crossed Gang, there and then, by a ford. While the camp was being got over, \textit{ma{jūn} was eaten on an island (ārāl) below the ford.

\((June 13th)\) After crossing, we waited one day (\textit{Monday 7th}) for all the army-folk to get across. Today Bāqī Tāshkhīndī came in with the army of Āūd (Ajodhya) and waited on me.

\((June 14th)\) Leaving the Gang-water (Ganges, \textit{Tuesday 8th}), we made one night-halt, then dismounted (\textit{June 15th–Shawwāl 9th}) beside Kūrarah (Kūra Khāṣ) on the Arind-water. The distance from Dalmūd (Dalmau) to Kūrarah came out at 22\textit{kurohs} (44 m.).\(^2\)

\((June 16th)\) On Thursday (\textit{10th}) we marched early from that ground and dismounted opposite the Ādampūr \textit{pargana}.\(^3\)

To enable us to cross (Jūn) in pursuit of our adversaries, a few raftsmen had been sent forward to collect at Kālpi what boats were to be had; some boats arrived the night we dismounted, moreover a ford was found through the Jūn-river.

As the encamping-place was full of dust, we settled ourselves

---

\(^1\) \textit{f.375o. Parsarūr was in Akbar's \textit{sābah} of Lāhor; G. of I. xx, 23, Parsūr.}

\(^2\) The estimate may have been made by measurement (f. 356) or by counting a horse's steps (f. 370). Here the Hai. MS. and Kehr's have D:lmūd, but I.O. 218 f. 328b (D:lmūū).

\(^3\) As on f. 361b, so here, Bābur's wording tends to locate Ādampūr on the right (west) bank of the Jumna.
on an island and there stayed the several days we were on that ground.

(rrr. Concerning Biban and Bāyāzīd.)

Not getting reliable news about the enemy, we sent Bāqī shaghāwal with a few braves of the interior to get information about him.

(June 17th) Next day (Friday 11th) at the Other Prayer, one of Bāqī Beg's retainers came in. Bāqī had beaten scouts of Bīban and Bāyazid, killed one of their good men, Mubārak Khān Jālwānī, and some others, sent in several heads, and one man alive.

(June 18th) At dawn (Saturday 12th) Paymaster Shāh Ḥusain came in, told the story of the beating of the scouts, and gave various news.

Tonight, that is to say, the night of Sunday the 13th of the month, the river Jūn came down in flood, so that by the dawn, the whole of the island on which I was settled, was under water. I moved to another an arrow's-flight down-stream, there had a tent set up and settled down.

(June 20th) On Monday (14th) Jalāl Tāshkīndī came from the begs and sultāns of the advance. Shaikh Bāyazid and Bīban, on hearing of their expedition, had fled to the pargana of Mahūba.

As the Rains had set in and as after 5 or 6 months of active service, horses and cattle in the army were worn out, the sultāns and begs of the expedition were ordered to remain where they were till they received fresh supplies from Āgra and those parts. At the Other Prayer of the same day, leave was given to Bāqī and the army of Aūd (Ajodhya). Also an allowance of 30lāks from Amrohā was assigned to Mūsa (son) of Ma'rūf Farmūlī, who had waited on me at the time the returning army was crossing the Sarū-water, a special head-to-foot and saddled horse were bestowed on him, and he was given his leave.

1 Hai. MS. aūta, presumably for aūrta; Kehr's p. 1133, Aūd-dāghī, which, as Bāqī led the Aūd army, is ben trovato; both Persian translations, miāngānī, central, inner, i.e. aūrta, perhaps household troops of the Centre.
2 Anglicē, Saturday 12th after 6 p.m.
3 In Akbar's sarkār of Kālanjar, now in the Hamirpūr district.
4 47500 (Erskine). Amrohā is in the Morādābād district.
5 At the Chaupāra-Chaturmuk ferry (f. 376).—Corrigendum:—In the Index of the Bābur-nāma Facsimile, Mūsa Farmūlī and Mūsa Sl. are erroneously entered as if one man.
(sss. Bābur returns to Agra.)

(June 21st) With an easy mind about these parts, we set out for Agra, raid-fashion,¹ when 3pās 1gari of Tuesday night were past.² In the morning (Tuesday 15th) we did 16 kurohs (32 m.), near mid-day made our nooning in the pargana of Balādar, one of the dependencies of Kālpī, there gave our horses barley, at the Evening Prayer rode on, did 13 kurohs (26 m.) in the night, at the 3rd night-watch (mid-night, Shawwāl 15–16th) dismounted at Bahādur Khān Sarwānī's tomb at Sūgandpūr, a pargana of Kālpī, slept a little, went through the Morning Prayer and hurried on. After doing 16 kurohs (32 m.), we reached Etāwa at the fall of day, where Mahdī Khwāja came out to meet us.³ Riding on after the 1st night-watch (9 p.m.), we slept a little on the way, did 16 kurohs (32 m.), took our nooning at Fathpūr of Rāprī, rode on soon after the Mid-day Prayer (Thursday Shawwāl 17th), did 17 kurohs (34 m.), and in the 2nd night-watch ⁴ dismounted in the Garden-of-eight-paradises at Agra.

(June 24th) At the dawn of Friday (18th) Pay-master Sl. Muhammad came with several more to wait on me. Towards the Mid-day Prayer, having crossed Jūn, I waited on Khwāja 'Abdu'll-ḥaqq, went into the Fort and saw the begins my paternal-aunts.

(tti. Indian-grown fruits.)

A Balkhī melon-grower had been set to raise melons; he now brought a few first-rate small ones; on one or two bush-vines (būta-tāk) I had had planted in the Garden-of-eight-paradises very good grapes had grown; Shaikh Gūran sent me a basket of grapes which too were not bad. To have grapes and melons grown in this way in Hindūstān filled my measure of content.

(uuu. Arrival of Māhīm Begīm.)

(June 26th) Māhīm arrived while yet two watches of Sunday night (Shawwāl 20th) ⁵ remained. By a singular agreement

¹ i.e. riding light and fast. The distance done between Adampūr and Agra was some 157 miles, the time was from 12 a.m. on Tuesday morning to about 9 p.m. of Thursday. This exploit serves to show that three years of continuous activity in the plains of Hindūstān had not destroyed Bābur's capacity for sustained effort, spite of several attacks of (malarial?) fever.
² Anglicé, Tuesday 12.25 a.m.
³ He was governor of Etāwa.
⁴ Anglicé, Friday, Shawwāl 18th, Anglicé, Thursday, June 24th, soon after 9 p.m.
⁵ Anglicé, she arrived at mid-night of Saturday.—Gul-badan writes of Māhīm's arrival as unexpected and of Bābur's hurrying off on foot to meet her (Humāyun-nāma f. 14, trs. p. 100).
of things they had left Kābul on the very day, the 10th of the 1st Jumāda (Jan. 21st 1529) on which I rode out to the army.¹

(Here the record of 11 days is wanting.)

(July 7th) On Thursday the 1st of Zūl-qa‘da the offerings made by Humāyūn and Māhīm were set out while I sat in the large Hall of Audience.

Today also wages were given to 150 porters (kahār) and they were started off under a servant of Faghfūr Dīwān to fetch melons, grapes, and other fruits from Kābul.

(vvv. Concerning Sambhal.)

(July 9th) On Saturday the 3rd of the month, Hindu Beg who had come as escort from Kābul and must have been sent to Sambhal on account of the death of ‘Alī-i-yūsuf, came and waited on me.² Khalīfa’s (son) Ḥusāmu’d-din came also today from Alwār and waited on me.

(July 10th) On Sunday morning (4th) came ‘Abdu’l-lāh (kitābdār), who from Tir-mūhānī³ had been sent to Sambhal on account of the death of ‘Alī-i-yūsuf.

(Here the record of 7 days is wanting.)

(www. Sedition in Lāhor.)

People from Kābul were saying that Shaikh Sharaf of Qarābāgh, either incited by ‘Abdu’l-āzīz or out of liking for him, had written an attestation which attributed to me oppression I had not done, and outrage that had not happened; that he

¹ Māhīm’s journey from Kābul to Agra had occupied over 5 months.

² Hindu Beg gūchīn had been made Humāyūn’s retainer in 932 AH. (f. 297), and had taken possession of Sambhal for him. Hence, as it seems, he was ordered, while escorting the ladies from Kābul, to go to Sambhal. He seems to have gone before waiting on Bābur, probably not coming into Agra till now.—It may be noted here that in 933 AH. he transformed a Hindu temple into a mosque in Sambhal; it was done by Bābur’s orders and is commemorated by an inscription still existing on the Mosque, one seeming not to be of his own composition, judging by its praise of himself. (JASB. Proceedings, May 1873, p. 98, Blochmann’s art. where the inscription is given and translated; and Archæological Survey Reports, xii, p. 24–27, with Plates showing the Mosque).

³ Cf. f. 375, f. 377, with notes concerning ‘Abdu’l-lāh and Tir-mūhānī. I have not found the name Tir-mūhānī on maps; its position can be inferred from Bābur’s statement (f. 375) that he had sent ‘Abdu’l-lāh to Sambhal, he being then at Kunbā or Kunla in the Nurhun pargana.—The name Tir-mūhānī occurs also in Gorakhpūr.—It was at Tir-mūhānī (Three-months) that Khwānd-amir completed the Ḥabībā’s-siyyar (lith. ed. i, 83; Rieu’s Pers. Cat. p. 1079). If the name imply three watermouths, they might be those of Ganges, Ghogra and Dāhā.
had extorted the signatures of the Prayer-leaders (imāmlār) of Lāhor to this accusation, and had sent copies of it to the various towns; that 'Abdu’l-‘azīz himself had failed to give ear to several royal orders, had spoken unseemly words, and done acts which ought to have been left undone. On account of these matters Qāmbar-i-‘ali Arghān was started off on Sunday the 11th of the month (Ẓūl-qa’da), to arrest Shaikh Sharaf, the Lāhor imāms with their associates, and 'Abdu’l-‘azīz, and to bring them all to Court.

(xxx. Varia.)

(July 22nd) On Thursday the 15th of the month Chīn-tīmūr Sl. came in from Tijāra and waited on me. Today Champion Sādiq and the great champion-wrestler of Āūd wrestled. Sādiq gave a half-throw; he was much vexed.

(July 28th) On Monday the 19th of the month (Ẓūl-qa’da) the Qizil-bāsh envoy Murād the life-guardsman was made to put on an inlaid dagger with belt, and a befitting dress of honour, was presented with 2 lakhs of tankas and given leave to go.

(Here the record of 15 days is wanting.)

(yyv. Sedition in Gūālīār.)

(August 11th) Sayyid Mashhādī who had come from Gūālīār in these days, represented that Raḥīm-dād was stirring up sedition.² On account of this, Khalīfa’s servant Shaḥ Muḥammād the seal-bearer was sent to convey to Raḥīm-dād matters written with commingling of good counsel. He went; and in a few days came back bringing Raḥīm-dād’s son, but, though the son came, Raḥīm-dād himself had no thought of coming. On Wednesday the 5th of Zūl-hijja, Nur Beg was sent to Gūālīār.

¹ nim-kāra. E. and de C. however reverse the rōles.
² The Tārikh-i-gūālīārī (B. M. Add. 16,709, p. 18) supplements the fragmentary accounts which, above and s. a. 936 AH., are all that the Bābur-nāma now preserves concerning Khwāja Raḥīm-dād’s misconduct. It has several mistakes but the gist of its information is useful. It mentions that the Khwāja and his paternal-uncle Mahdī Khwāja had displeased Bābur; that Raḥīm-dād resolved to take refuge with the ruler of Mālwā (Muḥammād Khiljī) and to make over Gūālīār to a Rājpūt landholder of that country; that upon this Shaikh Muḥammād Ghānī went to Agra and interceded with Bābur and obtained his forgiveness for Raḥīm-dād. Gūālīār was given back to Raḥīm-dād but after a time he was superseded by Abūl-fath [Shaikh Gūrān]. For particulars about Mahdī Khwāja and a singular story told about him by Niğāmu’d-dīn Ahmad in the Tābiyāt-i-akbārī, vide Gul-badan’s Humāyūn-nāma, Appendix B, and Translator’s Note p. 702, Section f.
to allay Raḥīm-dād’s fears, came back in a few days, and laid requests from Raḥīm-dād before us. Orders in accordance with those requests had been written and were on the point of despatch when one of Raḥīm-dād’s servants arriving, represented that he had come to effect the escape of the son and that Raḥīm-dād himself had no thought of coming in. I was for riding out at once to Gūālīār, but Khalīfa set it forth to me, “Let me write one more letter commingled with good counsel; he may even yet come peacefully.” On this mission Khusrāu’s (son?) Shihābu’d-dīn was despatched.

(August 12th) On Thursday the 6th of the month mentioned (Zu’l-hijja) Mahdī Khwāja came in from Etāwa.¹

(August 16th) On the Festival-day² (Monday 10th) Hindū Beg was presented with a special head-to-foot, an inlaid dagger with belt; also a pargana worth 7laks³ was bestowed on Ḥasan-i-ʿalī, well-known among the Turkmāns ⁴ for a Chaghatāī.⁵

¹ He may have come about the misconduct of his nephew Raḥīm-dād.
² The ʿĪduʾl-kabīr, the Great Festival of 10th Zu’l-hijja.
³ Perhaps he was from the tract in Persia still called Chaghatāī Mountains. One Ibrāhīm Chaghatāī is mentioned by Bābur (i. 175b) with Turkmān begs who joined Husain Bāī-qarā. This Ḥasan-i-ʿalī Chaghatāī may have come in like manner, with Murād the Turkmān envoy from ‘Irāq (f. 369 and n. 1).
⁴ Several incidents recorded by Gul-badan (writing half a century later) as following Māhīm’s arrival in Agra, will belong to the record of 935 AH, because they preceded Humāyūn’s arrival from Badakhshān. Their omission from Bābur’s diary is explicable by its minor lacune. Such are:—(1) a visit to Dhūlpūr and Sikrī the interest of which lies in its showing that Bibi Mubārika had accompanied Māhīm Begīm to Agra from Kābul, and that there was in Sikrī a quiet retreat, a chaṭkandī, where Bābur “used to write his book”;—(2) the arrival of the main caravan of ladies from Kābul, which led Bābur to go four miles out, to Naugrām, in order to give honouring reception to his sister Khān-zāda Begīm;—(3) an excursion to the Gold-scattering garden (Bāgh-i-sar-afshān), where seated among his own people, Bābur said he was “bowed down by ruling and reigning”, longed to retire to that garden with a single attendant, and wished to make over his sovereignty to Humāyūn;—(4) the death of Dil-dār’s son Alwār (var. Anwār) whose birth may be assigned to the gap preceding 932 AH, because not chronicled later by Bābur, as is Farūq’s. As a distraction from the sorrow for this loss, a journey was “pleasantly made by water” to Dhūlpūr.
936 AH.—SEP. 5TH 1529 to AUGUST 25TH 1530 AD.

(a. Raḥīm-dād's affairs.)

(Sep. 7th) On Wednesday the 3rd of Muḥarram, Shaikh Muḥammad Ḡhaus ⁴ came in from Gūālīār with Khusrau's (son) Shihābu'd-dīn to plead for Raḥīm-dād. As Shaikh Muḥammad Ḡhaus was a pious and excellent person, Raḥīm-dād's faults were forgiven for his sake. Shaikh Gūran and Nūr Beg were sent off for Gūālīār, so that the place having been made over to their charge . . . ²

¹ Cf. f. 381b n. 2. For his earlier help to Raḥīm-dād see f. 304. For Biographies of him see Blochmann's A.-i.-A. trs. p. 446, and Badayuni's Muntakhabu'-t-tawārikh (Ranking's and Lowe's trss.).

² Beyond this broken passage, one presumably at the foot of a page in Bābur's own manuscript, nothing of his diary is now known to survive. What is missing seems likely to have been written and lost. It is known from a remark of Gul-badan's (H.N. p. 103) that he "used to write his book" after Māḥīm's arrival in Āgra, the place coming into her anecdote being Sikrī.
TRANSLATOR'S NOTE ON 936 TO 937 AH.—1529 TO 1530 AD.

It is difficult to find material for filling the lacuna of some 15 months, which occurs in Bābur's diary after the broken passage of Muharram 3rd 936 AH. (Sept. 7th 1529 AD.) and down to the date of his death on Jumāda I. 6th 937 AH. (Dec. 26th 1530 AD.). The known original sources are few, their historical matter scant, their contents mainly biographical. Gleanings may yet be made, however, in unexpected places, such gleanings as are provided by Aḥmad-i-yādgār's interpolation of Timūrid history amongst his lives of Afghan Sultanāns.

The earliest original source which helps to fill the gap of 936 AH. is Ḥaidar Mīrzā's Tārīkh-i-rashīdī, finished as to its Second Part which contains Bābur's biography, in 948 AH. (1541 AD.), 12 years therefore after the year of the gap 936 AH. It gives valuable information about the affairs of Badakhshān, based on its author's personal experience at 30 years of age, and was Abū'l-fazl's authority for the Akbar-nāma.

The next in date of the original sources is Gul-badan Begīm's Humāyūn-nāma, a chronicle of family affairs, which she wrote in obedience to her nephew Akbar's command, given in about 995 AH. (1587 AD.), some 57 years after her Father's death, that whatever any person knew of his father (Humāyūn) and grandfather (Bābur) should be written down for Abū'l-fazl's use. It embodies family memories and traditions, and presumably gives the recollections of several ladies of the royal circle.¹

¹ Jauhar's Humāyūn-nāma and Bāyazīd Bīyāṭ's work of the same title were written under the same royal command as the Begīm's. They contribute nothing towards filling the gap of 936 AH.; their authors, being Humāyūn's servants, write about him. It may be observed that criticism of these books, as recording trivialities, is disarmed if they were commanded because they would obey an order to set down whatever was known, selection amongst their contents resting with Abū'l-fazl. Even more completely must they be excluded from a verdict on the literary standard of their day.—Abū'l-fazl must have had a source of Bāburiana which has not found its way into European libraries. A man likely to have contributed his recollections, directly or transmitted, is Khwāja Muqīm Hārūwī. The date of Muqīm's death is conjectural only, but he lived long enough to impress the worth of historical writing on his son Niẓām'u'd-dīn Ahmad. (Cf. E. and D.'s H. of I. art. Taḥaqāt-i-akbarī v, 177 and 187; Ț. -i-A. lith. ed. p. 193; and for Bāyazīd Bīyāṭ's work, JASB. 1898, p. 296.)
TRANSLATOR'S NOTE

The *Akbar-nāma* derives much of its narrative for 936–937 AH. from Ḥaidar Mirzā and Gul-badan Begim, but its accounts of Bābur’s self-surrender and of his dying address to his chiefs presuppose the help of information from a contemporary witness. It is noticeable that the *Akbar-nāma* records no public events as occurring in Hindūstān during 936–937 AH., nothing of the sequel of rebellion by Rahīm-dād and ‘Abdu’l-‘azīz, nothing of the untiring Biban and Bāyazīd. That something could have been told is shown by what Ahmād-i-yādgār has preserved (*vide post*); but 50 years had passed since Bābur’s death and, manifestly, interest in filling the lacunae in his diary was then less keen than it is over 300 years later. What in the *Akbar-nāma* concerns Bābur is likely to have been written somewhat early in the cir. 15 years of its author’s labours on it, but, even so, the elder women of the royal circle had had rest after the miseries Humāyūn had wrought, the forgiveness of family affection would veil his past, and certainly has provided Abūl-fazl with an over-mellowed estimate of him, one ill-assorting with what is justified by his Bābur-nāma record.

The contribution made towards filling the gap of 936–937 AH. in the body of Niẓāmu’d-din Ahmād’s *Tabaqāt-i-akbari* is limited to a curious and doubtfully acceptable anecdote about a plan for the supersession of Humāyūn as Pādshāh, and about the part played by Khwāja Muqīm Harāwī in its abandonment. A further contribution is made, however, in Book VII which contains the history of the Muḥammadan Kings of Kashmir, namely, that Bābur despatched an expedition into that country. As no such expedition is recorded or referred to in surviving Bābur-nāma writings, it is likely to have been sent in 936 AH. during Bābur’s tour to and from Lāhor. If it were made with the aim of extending Timūrid authority in the Himālayan borderlands, a hint of similar policy elsewhere may be given by the ceremonious visit of the Rāja of Kahlūr to Bābur,

1 Ibn Batuta (Lee’s trs. p. 133) mentions that after his appointment to Gūllār, Rahīm-dād fell from favour ... but was restored later, on the representation of Muhammad Ghaus; held Gūllār again for a short time, (he went to Bahādur Shāh in Gujrāt) and was succeeded by Abūl-fath (i.e. Shaikh Gūrān) who held it till Bābur’s death.

2 Its translation and explanatory noting have filled two decades of hard-working years. *Tanti labores auctoris et traductoris!*
mentioned by Āhmād-i-yādgār (vide post). The T.-i-A. was written within the term of Abū'l-fażl's work on the Akbar-nāma, being begun later, and ended about 9 years earlier, in 1002 AH.—1593 AD. It appears to have been Abū'l-fażl's authority for his account of the campaign carried on in Kashmir by Bābur's chiefs (Āyīn-i-akbarī vol. ii, part i, Jarrett's trs. p. 389).

An important contribution, seeming to be authentic, is found interpolated in Āhmād-i-yādgār's Tārikh-i-salāţīn-i-afīghana, one which outlines a journey made by Bābur to Lāhor in 936 AH. and gives circumstantial details of a punitive expedition sent by him from Sihrind at the complaint of the Qāţī of Samāna against a certain Mundāhir Rājpūt. The whole contribution dovetails into matters found elsewhere. Its precision of detail bespeaks a closely-contemporary written source. As its fullest passage concerns the Samāna Qāţī's affair, its basis of record may have been found in Samāna. Some considerations about the date of Āhmād-i-yādgār's own book and what Niamatu'l-lāh says of Haibat Khān of Samāna, his own generous helper in the Tārikh-i-Khan-i-jahān Lūdī, point towards Haibat Khān as providing the details of the Qāţī's wrongs and avenging. The indication is strengthened by the circumstance that what precedes and what follows the account of the punitive expedition is outlined only. Āhmād-i-yādgār interpolates an account of Humāyūn also, which is a frank plagiarism from the Tabaqāt-i-akbarī. He tells too a story purporting to explain why Bābur "selected" Humāyūn to succeed him, one parallel with Nizāmu'd-dīn Āhmād's about what led Khalīfa to abandon his plan of setting the Mīrzā aside. Its sole value lies in its testimony to a belief, held by its first narrator whoever he was, that choice was exercised in the matter by Bābur. Reasons for thinking Nizāmu'd-dīn's story, as it stands, highly improbable, will be found later in this note.

1 I am indebted to my husband for acquaintance with Nizāmu'd-dīn Āhmād's record about Bābur and Kashmir.

2 In view of the vicissitudes to which under Humāyūn the royal library was subjected, it would be difficult to assert that this source was not the missing continuation of Bābur's diary.

Muḥammad Qāsim Hindū Shāh Firishta’s Tārīkh-i-firishta contains an interesting account of Bābur but contributes towards filling the gap in the events of 936–937 AH. little that is not in the earlier sources. In M. Jules Mohl’s opinion it was under revision as late as 1623 AD. (1032–3 AH.).

a. Humāyūn and Badakhshān.

An occurrence which had important results, was the arrival of Humāyūn in Āgra, unsummoned by his Father, from the outpost station of Badakhshān. It will have occurred early in 936 AH. (autumn 1529 AD.), because he was in Kābul in the first ten days of the last month of 935 AH. (vide post). Curiously enough his half-sister Gul-badan does not mention his coming, whether through avoidance of the topic or from inadvertence; the omission may be due however to the loss of a folio from the only known MS. of her book (that now owned by the British Museum), and this is the more likely that Abū’l-faẓl writes, at some length, about the arrival and its motive, what the Begīm might have provided, this especially by his attribution of filial affection as Humāyūn’s reason for coming to Āgra.

Ḥaidar Mīrzā is the authority for the Akbar-nāma account of Humāyūn’s departure from Qīlā’-i-zafar and its political and military sequel. He explains the departure by saying that when Bābur had subdued Hindūstān, his sons Humāyūn and Kāmrān were grown-up; and that wishing to have one of them at hand in case of his own death, he summoned Humāyūn, leaving Kāmrān in Qandahār. No doubt these were the contemporary impressions conveyed to Ḥaidar, and strengthened by the accomplished fact before he wrote some 12 years later; nevertheless there are two clear indications that there was no royal order for Humāyūn to leave Qīlā’-i-zafar, viz. that no-one had been appointed to relieve him even when he reached Āgra, and that Abū’l-faẓl mentions no summons but attributes the Mīrzā’s departure from his post to an overwhelming desire to see his Father. What appears probable is that Māhīm wrote to her son urging his coming to Āgra, and that this was represented as Bābur’s wish. However little weight may be due to the rumour, preserved in anecdotes recorded long after 935 AH., that any-one, Bābur or Khalīfa,
inclined against Humayun's succession, that rumour she would set herself to falsify by reconciliation.¹

When the Mirza's intention to leave Qila'-i-zafar became known there, the chiefs represented that they should not be able to withstand the Auzbeg on their frontier without him (his troops implied).² With this he agreed, said that still he must go, and that he would send a Mirza in his place as soon as possible. He then rode, in one day, to Kâbul, an item of rapid travel preserved by Abûl-fazîl.

Humayun's departure caused such anxiety in Qila'-i-zafar that some (if not all) of the Badakhshî chiefs hurried off an invitation to Sa'id Khân Chaghatâi, the then ruler in Kâshghar in whose service Hâidar Mirza was, to come at once and occupy the fort. They said that Faqîr-i-'alî who had been left in charge, was not strong enough to cope with the Auzbeg, begged Sa'id to come, and strengthened their petition by reminding him of his hereditary right to Badakhshan, derived from Shâh Begîm Badakhshî. Their urgency convincing the Khân that risk threatened the country, he started from Kâshghar in Muḥarram 936 AH. (Sept.–Oct. 1529 AD.). On reaching Sârîgh-chûpân which by the annexation of Abâ-bakr Mirzâ Dughlî was now his own most western territory ³ but which formerly was one of the upper districts of Badakhshân, he waited while Hâidar went on towards Qila'-i-zafar only to learn on his road, that Hind-âl (aet. 10) had been sent from Kâbul by Humayun and had entered the fort 12 days before.

The Kâshgharîs were thus placed in the difficulty that the fort was occupied by Bâbur's representative, and that the snows would prevent their return home across the mountains till winter was past. Winter-quarters were needed and asked for by Hâidar, certain districts being specified in which to await the re-opening of the Pâmîr routes. He failed in his request, "They did not trust us," he writes, "indeed suspected us of deceit." His own account of Sa'id's earlier invasion of Badakhshân (925 AH.—1519 AD.) during Khân Mirzâ's rule, serves to explain Badakhshî
distrust of Kashgharīs. Failing in his negotiations, he scoured and pillaged the country round the fort, and when a few days later the Khān arrived, his men took what Haidar's had left.

Saʿīd Khān is recorded to have besieged the fort for three months, but nothing serious seems to have been attempted since no mention of fighting is made, none of assault or sally, and towards the end of the winter he was waited on by those who had invited his presence, with apology for not having admitted him into the fort, which they said they would have done but for the arrival of Hind-āl Mīrzā. To this the Khān replied that for him to oppose Bābur Pādshāh was impossible; he reminded the chiefs that he was there by request, that it would be as hurtful for the Pādshāh as for himself to have the Aūzbeg in Badakhshān and, finally, he gave it as his opinion that, as matters stood, every man should go home. His view of the general duty may include that of Badakhshī auxiliaries such as Sultān Wais of Kūl-āb who had reinforced the garrison. So saying, he himself set out for Kāshghar, and at the beginning of Spring reached Yarkand.

b. Humāyūn's further action.

Humāyūn will have reached Kābul before Zūl-ḥijja 10th 935 AH. (Aug. 26th 1529 AD.) because it is on record that he met Kāmrān on the Kābul ʿĪd-gāh, and both will have been there to keep the ʿĪduʾl-kabīr, the Great Festival of Gifts, which is held on that day. Kāmrān had come from Qandahār, whether to keep the Feast, or because he had heard of Humāyūn's intended movement from Badakhshān, or because changes were foreseen and he coveted Kābul, as the Bābur-nāma and later records allow to be inferred. He asked Humāyūn, says Abūʾl-fazl, why he was there and was told of his brother's impending journey to Āgra under overwhelming desire to see their Father. Presumably the two Mīrzās discussed the position in which Badakhshān had been left; in the end Hind-āl was sent to Qilaʾ-i-ʿzafar, notwithstanding that he was under orders for Hindūstān.

Humāyūn may have stayed some weeks in Kābul, how many those familiar with the seasons and the routes between Yarkand

1 Abūʾl-fazl's record of Humāyūn's sayings and minor doings at this early date in his career, can hardly be anything more accurate than family-tradition.
and Qila'-i-zafar, might be able to surmise if the date of Hind-āl's start northward for which Humāyūn is likely to have waited, were found by dovetailing the Muḥarram of Saʿīd's start, the approximate length of his journey to Sārīgh-chūpān, and Ḥaidar's reception of news that Hind-āl had been 12 days in the fort.

Humāyūn's arrival in Āgra is said by Abū'l-faţīl to have been cheering to the royal family in their sadness for the death of Alwar (end of 935 AH.) and to have given pleasure to his Father. But the time is all too near the date of Bābur's letter (f.348) to Humāyūn, that of a dissatisfied parent, to allow the supposition that his desertion of his post would fail to displease.

That it was a desertion and not an act of obedience seems clear from the circumstance that the post had yet to be filled. Khalīfa is said to have been asked to take it and to have refused; Humāyūn to have been sounded as to return and to have expressed unwillingness. Bābur then did what was an honourable sequel to his acceptance in 926 AH. of the charge of the fatherless child Sulaimān, by sending him, now about 16, to take charge where his father Khān Mīrzā had ruled, and by still keeping him under his own protection.

Sulaimān's start from Āgra will not have been delayed, and (accepting Aḥmad-i-yādgār's record,) Bābur himself will have gone as far as Lāhor either with him or shortly after him, an expedition supporting Sulaimān, and menacing Saʿīd in his winter leaguer round Qila'-i-zafar. Meantime Humāyūn was ordered to his fief of Sambhal.

After Sulaimān's appointment Bābur wrote to Saʿīd a letter of which Ḥaidar gives the gist:—It expresses surprise at Saʿīd's doings in Badakhshān, says that Hind-āl has been recalled and Sulaimān sent, that if Saʿīd regard hereditary right, he will

1 The statement that Khalīfa was asked to go so far from where he was of the first importance as an administrator, leads to consideration of why it was done. So little is known explicitly of Bābur's intentions about his territories after his death that it is possible only to put that little together and read between its lines. It may be that he was now planning an immediate retirement to Kābul and an apportionment during life of his dominions, such as Abū-saʿīd had made of his own. If so, it would be desirable to have Badakhshān held in strength such as Khalīfa's family could command, and especially desirable because as Barlās Turks, that family would be one with Bābur in desire to regain Transoxiana. Such a political motive would worthily explain the offer of the appointment.
leave "Sulaimān Shāh Mīrzā"\(^1\) in possession, who is as a son to them both,\(^2\) that this would be well, that otherwise he (Bābur) will make over responsibility to the heir (Sulaimān);\(^3\) and, "The rest you know."\(^4\)

c. Bābur visits Lāhor.

If Aḥmad-i-yādgār’s account of a journey made by Bābur to Lāhor and the Panj-āb be accepted, the lacuna of 936 AH. is appropriately filled. He places the expedition in the 3rd year of Bābur’s rule in Hindūstān, which, counting from the first reading of the khutba for Bābur in Dihlī (f. 286), began on Rajab 15th 935 AH. (March 26th 1529 AD.). But as Bābur’s diary-record for 935 AH. is complete down to end of the year, (minor lacunae excepted), the time of his leaving Āgra for Lāhor is relegated to 936 AH. He must have left early in the year, (1) to allow time, before the occurrence of the known events preceding his own death, for the long expedition Aḥmad-i-yādgār calls one of a year, and (2) because an early start after Humāyūn’s arrival and Sulaimān’s departure would suit the position of affairs and the dates mentioned or implied by Ḥaidar’s and by Aḥmad-i-yādgār’s narratives.

Two reasons of policy are discernible, in the known events of the time, to recommend a journey in force towards the North-west; first, the sedition of ‘Abdu’l-‘azīz in Lāhor (f. 381), and secondly, the invasion of Badakhshān by Saʿīd Khān with its resulting need of supporting Sulaimān by a menace of armed intervention.\(^5\)

\(^1\) The "Shāh" of this style is derived from Sulaimān’s Badakhshī descent through Shāh Begīm; the "Mīrzā" from his Mīrān-shāhi descent through his father Wais Khān Mīrzā. The title Khān Mīrzā or Mīrzā Khān, presumably according to the outlook of the speaker, was similarly derived from forbears, as would be also Shāh Begīm’s; (her personal name is not mentioned in the sources).

\(^2\) Saʿīd, on the father’s, and Bābur, on the mother’s side, were of the same generation in descent from Yūnas Khān; Sulaimān was of a younger one, hence his pseudo-filial relation to the men of the elder one.

\(^3\) Saʿīd was Shāh Begīm’s grandson through her son Aḥmad, Sulaimān her great-grandson through her daughter Sultān-Nīgār, but Sulaimān could claim also as the heir of his father who was nominated to rule by Shāh Begīm; moreover, he could claim by right of conquest on the father’s side, through Abū-saʿīd the conqueror, his son Maḥmūd long the ruler, and so through Maḥmūd’s son Wais Khān Mīrzā.

\(^4\) The menace conveyed by these words would be made the more forceful by Bābur’s move to Lāhor, narrated by Aḥmad-i-yādgār. Some ill-result to Saʿīd of independent rule by Sulaimān seems foreshadowed; was it that if Bābur’s restraining hand were withdrawn, the Badakhshīs would try to regain their lost districts and would have help in so-doing from Bābur?

\(^5\) It is open to conjecture that if affairs in Hindūstān had allowed it, Bābur would now have returned to Kābul. Aḥmad-i-yādgār makes the expedition to be one for
In Sihrind the Rāja of Kahlūr, a place which may be one of the Simla hill-states, waited on Bābur, made offering of 7 falcons and 3 manus of gold, and was confirmed in his fief.¹

In Lāhor Kāmrān is said to have received his Father, in a garden of his own creation, and to have introduced the local chiefs as though he were the Governor of Lāhor some writers describe him as then being. The best sources, however, leave him still posted in Qandahār. He had been appointed to Multān (f. 359) when 'Askarī was summoned to Āgra (f. 339), but whether he actually went there is not assured; some months later (Zū'īl-hijja 10th 935 AH.) he is described by Abū'l-fazl as coming to Kābul from Qandahār. He took both Multān ³ and Lāhor by force from his (half-)brother Humāyūn in 935 AH. (1531 AD.) the year after their Father's death. That he should wait upon his Father in Lāhor would be natural, Hind-āl did so, coming from Kābul. Hind-āl will have come to Lāhor after making over charge of Qila'-i-zafar to Sulaimān, and he went back at the end of the cold season, going perhaps just before his Father started from Lāhor on his return journey, the gifts he received before leaving being 2 elephants, 4 horses, belts and jewelled daggers.⁴

Bābur is said to have left Lāhor on Rajab 4th (936 AH.)—March 4th, 1530 AD.). From Ahmad-i-yādgār's outline of Bābur's doings in Lāhor, he, or his original, must be taken as ill-informed pleasure only, and describes Bābur as hunting and sight-seeing for a year in Lāhor, the Panj-āb and near Dīhlī. This appears a mere flourish of words, in view of the purposes the expedition served, and of the difficulties which had arisen in Lāhor itself and with Sa'īd Khān. Part of the work effected may have been the despatch of an expedition to Kashmir.

¹ This appears a large amount.
² The precision with which the Rāja's gifts are stated, points to a closely-contemporary and written source. A second such indication occurs later where gifts made to Hind-āl are mentioned.
³ An account of the events in Multān after its occupation by Shāh Ḥasan Arghūn is found in the latter part of the Ṭabagāt-i-akbarī and in Erskine’s H. of I. i, 393 et seq.—It may be noted here that several instances of confusion amongst Bābur's sons occur in the extracts made by Sir H. Elliot and Professor Dowson in their History of India from the less authoritative sources [e.g. v, 35 Kāmrān for Humāyūn, 'Askarī said to be in Kābul (pp. 36 and 37); Hind-āl for Humāyūn etc.] and that these errors have slipped into several of the District Gazetters of the United Provinces.
⁴ As was said of the offering made by the Rāja of Kahlūr, the precision of statement as to what was given to Hind-āl, bespeaks a closely-contemporary written source. So too does the mention (text, infra) of the day on which Bābur began his return journey from Lāhor.
or indifferent about them. His interest becomes greater when he writes of Samāna.

d. Punishment of the Mundāhirs.

When Bābur, on his return journey, reached Sihrind, he received a complaint from the Qāzi of Samāna against one Mohan Mundāhir (or Mundhār)† Rājpūt who had attacked his estates, burning and plundering, and killed his son. Here-upon ‘Ali-quli of Hamadān² was sent with 3000 horse to avenge the Qāzi’s wrongs, and reached Mohan’s village, in the Kaithal pargana, early in the morning when the cold was such that the archers “could not pull their bows.”³ A marriage had been celebrated over-night; the villagers, issuing from warm houses, shot such flights of arrows that the royal troops could make no stand; many were killed and nothing was effected; they retired into the jungle, lit fires, warmed themselves(?), renewed the attack and were again repulsed. On hearing of their failure, Bābur sent off, perhaps again from Sihrind, Tarsam Bahādur and Naurang Beg with 6000 horse and many elephants. This force reached the village at night and when marriage festivities were in progress. Towards morning it was formed into three divisions,⁴ one of which was ordered to go to the west of the village and show itself. This having been done, the villagers advanced towards it, in the pride of their recent success. The royal troops, as ordered beforehand, turned their backs and fled, the Mundāhirs pursuing them some two miles. Meantime Tarsam Bahādur had attacked and fired the village, killing many of its inhabitants. The pursuers on the west saw the flames of their burning homes, ran back and were intercepted on their way. About 1000 men, women and children were made prisoner; there

¹ Cf. G. of I. xvi, 55; Ibbetson’s Report on Karnāl.
² It is noticeable that no one of the three royal officers named as sent against Mohan Mundāhir, is recognizable as mentioned in the Bābur-nāma. They may all have had local commands, and not have served further east. Perhaps this, their first appearance, points to the origin of the information as independent of Bābur, but he might have been found to name them, if his diary were complete for 936 AH.
³ The E. and D. translation writes twice as though the inability to “pull” the bows were due to feebleness in the men, but an appropriate reading would refer the difficulty to the hardening of sinews in the composite Turkish bows, which prevented the archers from bending the bows for stringing.
⁴ One infers that fires were burned all night in the bivouac.
was also great slaughter, and a pillar of heads was raised. Mohan was captured and later on was buried to the waist and shot to death with arrows.¹ News of the affair was sent to the Pādshāh.² As after being in Sihrind, Bābur is said to have spent two months hunting near Dihlī, it may be that he followed up the punitive expedition sent into the Kaithal pargana of the Karnāl District, by hunting in Nardak, a favourite ground of the Timūrids, which lies in that district. Thus the gap of 936 AH. with also perhaps a month of 937 AH. is filled by the “year’s” travel west of Dihlī. The record is a mere outline and in it are periods of months without mention of where Bābur was or what affairs of government were brought before him. At some time, on his return journey presumably, he will have despatched to Kashmir the expedition referred to in the opening section of this appendix. Something further may yet be gleaned from local chronicles, from unwritten tradition, or from the witness of place-names commemorating his visit.

e. Bābur’s self-surrender to save Humāyūn.

The few months, perhaps 4 to 5, between Bābur’s return to Āgra from his expedition towards the North-west, and the time of his death are filled by Gul-badan and Abū’l-fazīl with matters concerning family interests only. The first such matter these authors mention is an illness of Humāyūn during which Bābur devoted his own life to save his son’s.³ Of this the particulars are, briefly:—That Humāyūn, while still in Sambhāl, had had a violent attack of fever; that he was brought by water to Āgra, his mother meeting him in

¹ At this point the A.S.B. copy (No. 137) of the Tārīkh-i-salāṭīn-i-afghāna has a remark which may have been a marginal note originally, and which cannot be supposed made by Ahmad-i-yādgār himself because this would allot him too long a spell of life. It may show however that the interpolations about the two Timūrids were not inserted in his book by him. Its purport is that the Mundāhir village destroyed by Bābur’s troops in 936 AH.—1530 AD. was still in ruins at the time it was written 150 (lunar) years later (i.e. in 1096 AH.—1684–85 AD.). The better Codex (No. 3887) of the Imperial Library of Calcutta has the same passage.—Both that remark and its context show acquaintance with Samāna and Kaithal.—The writings now grouped under the title Tārīkh-i-salāṭīn-i-afghāna present difficulties both as to date and contents (cf. Rieu’s Persian Catalogue s.n.).

² Presumably in Sihrind.

Muttra; and that when the disease baffled medical skill, Bābur resolved to practisethe rite believed then and now in the East to be valid, of intercession and devotion of a suppliant’s most valued possession in exchange for a sick man’s life. Rejecting counsel to offer the Koh-i-nūr for pious uses, he resolved to supplicate for the acceptance of his life. He made intercession through a saint his daughter names, and moved thrice round Humāyūn’s bed, praying, in effect, “O God! if a life may be exchanged for a life, I, who am Bābur, give my life and my being for Humāyūn.” During the rite fever surged over him, and, convinced that his prayer and offering had prevailed, he cried out, “I have borne it away! I have borne it away!” Gul-badan says that he himself fell ill on that very day, while Humāyūn poured water on his head, came out and gave audience; and that they carried her Father within on account of his illness, where he kept his bed for 2 or 3 months.

There can be no doubt as to Bābur’s faith in the rite he had practised, or as to his belief that his offering of life was accepted; moreover actual facts would sustain his faith and belief. Onlookers also must have believed his prayer and offering to have prevailed, since Humāyūn went back to Sambhal, while Bābur fell ill at once and died in a few weeks.

f. A plan to set Bābur’s sons aside from the succession.

Reading the Akbar-nāma alone, there would seem to be no question about whether Bābur ever intended to give Hindūstān, at any rate, to Humāyūn, but, by piecing together various contributory matters, an opposite opinion is reached, viz. that not Khalīfa only whom Abūl-fażl names perhaps on Nizāmu’d-din Aḥmad’s warrant, but Bābur also, with some considerable number of chiefs, wished another ruler for Hindūstān. The starting-point of this opinion is a story in the Tabaqāt-i-akbarī and,

1 A closer translation would be, “I have taken up the burden.” The verb is bardāshṭan (cf. f. 349, p. 626 n. 1).
2 See Erskine’s History of India ii, 9.
3 At this point attention is asked to the value of the Aḥmad-i-yādgār interpolation which allows Bābur a year of active life before Humāyūn’s illness and his own which followed. With no chronicle known of 936AH, Bābur had been supposed ill all through the year, a supposition which destroys the worth of his self-sacrifice. Moreover several inferences have been drawn from the supposed year of illness which are disproved by the activities recorded in that interpolation.
BĀBUR IN PRAYER, DEVOTING HIMSELF FOR HIS SON.
with less detail, in the Akbar-nāma, of which the gist is that Khalifa planned to supersede Humāyūn and his three brothers in their Father's succession.¹

The story, in brief, is as follows:—At the time of Bābur's death Nizāmu’d-dīn Aḥmād's father Khwāja Muḥammad Muqīm Harāwī was in the service of the Office of Works.² Amir Nizāmu’d-dīn ‘Alī Khalifa, the Chief of the Administration, had dread and suspicion about Humāyūn and did not favour his succession as Pādshāh. Nor did he favour that of Bābur's other sons. He promised “Bābur Pādshāh's son-in-law (dāmād)” Mahdī Khwāja who was a generous young man, very friendly to himself, that he would make him Pādshāh. This promise becoming known, others made their salām to the Khwāja who put on airs and accepted the position. One day when Khalifa, accompanied by Muqīm, went to see Mahdī Khwāja in his tent, no-one else being present, Bābur, in the pangs of his disease, sent for him ³ when he had been seated a few minutes only. When Khalifa had gone out, Mahdī Khwāja remained standing in such a way that Muqīm could not follow but, the Khwāja unaware, waited respectfully behind him. The Khwāja, who was noted for the wildness of youth, said, stroking his beard, “Please God! first, I will flay thee!” turned round and saw Muqīm, took him by the ear, repeated a proverb of menace, “The red tongue gives the green head to the wind,” and let him go. Muqīm hurried to Khalifa, repeated the Khwāja's threat against him, and remonstrated about the plan to set all Bābur's sons aside in favour of a stranger-house.⁴ Here-upon Khalifa sent for Humāyūn,⁵ and despatched an officer with orders to the Khwāja to retire to his house, who found him about to dine and hurried him off without ceremony. Khalifa also issued a proclamation forbidding intercourse with him, excluded him from Court, and when Bābur died, supported Humāyūn.

¹ E. and D.'s History of India v, 187; G. B.'s Humāyūn-nāmatrs. p. 28.
² dar khidmat-i-diwān-i-buyūtāt; perhaps he was a Barrack-officer. His appointment explains his attendance on Khalifa.
³ Khalifa prescribed for the sick Bābur.
⁴ khānwāda-i-bigānah, perhaps, foreign dynasty.
⁵ From Sambhal; Gul-badan, by an anachronism made some 60 years later, writes Kālanjar, to which place Humāyūn moved 5 months after his accession.
As Nizāmu'd-din Ahmad was not born till 20 years after Bābur died, the story will have been old before he could appreciate it, and it was some 60 years old when it found way into the Tabaqāt-i-akbarī and, with less detail, into the Akbar-nāma.

Taken as it stands, it is incredible, because it represents Khalīfa, and him alone, planning to subject the four sons of Bābur to the suzerainty of Mahdī Khwāja who was not a Timūrid, who, so far as well-known sources show, was not of a ruling dynasty or personally illustrious,¹ and who had been associated, so lately as the autumn of 1529 AD., with his nephew Rahīm-dād in seditious action which had so angered Bābur that, whatever the punishment actually ordered, rumour had it both men were to die.² In two particulars the only Mahdī Khwāja then of Bābur's following, does not suit the story; he was not a young man in 1530 AD.,³ and was not a dāmād of Bābur, if that word be taken in its usual sense of son-in-law, but he was a yazna, husband of a Pādshāh's sister, in his case, of Khān-zāda Begīm.⁴ Some writers style him Sayyid Mahdī Khwāja, a double title which may indicate descent on both sides from religious houses; one is suggested to be that of Timīz by the circumstance that in his and Khān-zāda Begīm's mausoleum was buried a Timīz sayyid

¹ I am indebted to my husband's perusal of Sayyid Ahmad Khān's Aṣār-i-sanādīd (Dihli ed. 1854 p. 37, and Lakhnau ed. 1895 pp. 40, 41) for information that, perhaps in 935 AH., Mahdī Khwāja set up a tall slab of white marble near Amir Khusrau's tomb in Dihlī, which bears an inscription in praise of the poet, composed by that Shihābu'd-dīn the Enigmatist who reached Āgra with Khwānd-amir in Muḥarram 935 AH. (f. 339b). The inscription gives two chronograms of Khusrau's death (725 AH.), mentions that Mahdī Khwāja was the creator of the memorial, and gives its date in the words, "The beautiful effort of Mahdī Khwāja."—The Dihli ed. of the Aṣār-i-sanādīd depicts the slab with its inscription; the Lakhnau ed. depicts the tomb, may show the slab in situ, and contains interesting matter by Sayyid Ahmad Khān. The slab is mentioned without particulars in Murray's Hand-book to Bengal, p. 329.


³ In an anonymous Life of Shāh Ismā'īl Safawī, Mahdī Khwāja [who may be a son of the Mūsa Khwāja mentioned by Bābur on f. 216] is described as being, in what will be 916–7 AH., Bābur's Diwān-begi and as sent towards Buhkārā with 10,000 men. This was 29 years before the story calls him a young man. Even if the word javān (young man) be read, as T. yīgit is frequently to be read, in the sense of "efficient fighting man", Mahdī was over-age. Other details of the story, besides the word javān, bespeak a younger man.

⁴ G. B.'s H. N. trs. p. 128; Ḥabībū's siyar, B. M. Add. 16,679 f. 370, l. 16, lith. ed. Sec. III. iii, 372 (where a clerical error makes Bābur give Mahdī two of his full-sisters in marriage).—Another yasna of Bābur was Khalīfa's brother Junaid Bārlās, the husband of Shahr-bānū, a half-sister of Bābur.
of later date, Shāh Abū'1-ma'āli. But though he were of Tirmiz, it is doubtful if that religious house would be described by the word khānvwāda which so frequently denotes a ruling dynasty.

His name may have found its way into Niẓāmu'd-din Aḥmad's story as a gloss mistakenly amplifying the word dāmād, taken in its less usual sense of brother-in-law. To Bābur's contemporaries the expression "Bābur Pādshāh's dāmād" (son-in-law) would be explicit, because for some 11 years before he lay on his deathbed, he had one son-in-law only, viz. Muḥammad-i-zamān Mīrzā Bāī-qarā,† the husband of Ma'ṣūma Sulṭān Begīm. If that Mīrzā's name were where Mahdī Khwāja's is entered, the story of an exclusion of Bābur's sons from rule might have a core of truth.

It is incredible however that Khālīfa, with or without Bābur's concurrence, made the plan attributed to him of placing any man not a Timūrid in the position of Pādshāh over all Bābur's territory. I suggest that the plan concerned Hindūstān only and was one considered in connection with Bābur's intended return to Kābul, when he must have left that difficult country, hardly yet a possession, in charge of some man giving promise of power to hold it. Such a man Humāyūn was not. My suggestion rests on the following considerations:

(1) Bābur's outlook was not that of those in Āgra in 1587 AD. who gave Abū'1-fazīl his Bāburiana material, because at that date Dihlī had become the pivot of Timūrid power, so that not to hold Hindūstān would imply not to be Pādshāh. Bābur's outlook on his smaller Hindūstān was different; his position in it was precarious, Kābul, not Dihlī, was his chosen centre, and from Kābul his eyes looked northwards as well as to the East. If he had lost the Hindūstān which was approximately the modern United Provinces, he might still have held what lay west of it to the Indus, as well as Qandahār.

(2) For several years before his death he had wished to return to Kābul. Ample evidence of this wish is given by his diary, his letters, and some poems in his second Divān (that found in the Rāmpūr MS.). As he told his sons more than once, he kept Kābul

† Bābur, shortly before his death, married Gul-rang to Aisān-timūr and Gul-chihra to Tūkhta-būgḥā Chaghatāī. Cf. post, Section 4, Bābur's wives and children; and G. B.'s H. N. trs. Biographical Appendix s. nn. Dil-dār Begīm and Salīma Sulṭān Begīm Mīrān-shāhī.
for himself. If, instead of dying in Agra, he had returned to Kabul, had pushed his way on from Badakhshan, whether as far as Samarkand or less, had given Humayün a seat in those parts,—action foreshadowed by the records—a reasonable interpretation of the story that Humayün and his brothers were not to govern Hindustān, is that he had considered with Khalīfa the apportionment of his territories according to the example of his ancestors Chīngīz Khān, Timūr and Abū-sa‘īd; that by his plan of apportionment Humayün was not to have Hindustān but something Tramontane; Kāmrān had already Qandahār; Sulaimān, if Humayün had moved beyond the out-post of Badakhshan, would have replaced him there; and Hindustān would have gone to "Bābur Pādshāh's dāmād".

(3) Muḥammad-i-zamān had much to recommend him for Hindustān:—Timūrid-born, grandson and heir of Sl. Ḥusain Mīrzā, husband of Maʿṣūma who was a Timūrid by double descent, protected by Bābur after the Bāi-qarā débacle in Herāt, a landless man leading such other exiles as Muḥammad Sulṭān Mīrzā, ʻĀdil Sulṭān, and Qāsim-i-ḥusain Sulṭān, half-Timūrids all, who with their Khurāsānī following, had been Bābur's guests in Kabul, had pressed on its poor resources, and thus had helped in 932 AH. (1525 AD.) to drive him across the Indus. This Bāi-qarā group needed a location; Muḥammad-i-zamān's future had to be cared for and with his, Maʿṣūma's.

(4) It is significant of intention to give Muḥammad-i-zamān ruling status that in April 1529 AD. (Shaʿbān 935 AH.) Bābur bestowed on him royal insignia, including the umbrella-symbol of sovereignty. This was done after the Mīrzā had raised

---

2 She is the only adult daughter of a Timūrid mother named as being such by Bābur or Gul-badan, but various considerations incline to the opinion that Dil-dār Bēgīm also was a Timūrid, hence her three daughters, all named from the Rose, were so too. Cf. references of penultimate note.
3 It attaches interest to the Mīrzā that he can be taken reasonably as once the owner of the Elphinstone Codex (cf. JRAS. 1907, pp. 136 and 137).
4 Death did not threaten when this gift was made; life in Kabul was planned for.—Here attention is asked again to the value of Ahmad-i-yādgār's Bāburiana for removing the impression set on many writers by the blank year 936 AH. that it was one of illness, instead of being one of travel, hunting and sight-seeing. The details of the activities of that year have the further value that they enhance the worth of Bābur's sacrifice of life.—Haidar Mīrzā also fixes the date of the beginning of illness as 937 AH.
objections, unspecified now in the Bābur-nāma against Bihār; they were overcome, the insignia were given and, though for military reasons he was withheld from taking up that appointment, the recognition of his royal rank had been made. His next appointment was to Jūnpūr, the capital of the fallen Sharqī dynasty. No other chief is mentioned by Bābur as receiving the insignia of royalty.

(4) It appears to have been within a Padshāh's competence to select his successor; and it may be inferred that choice was made between Humāyūn and another from the wording of more than one writer that Khalīfa "supported" Humāyūn, and from the word "selected" used in Ahmad-i-yādgār's anecdote. Much more would there be freedom of choice in a division of territory such as there is a good deal to suggest was the basis of Nizāmu'd-dīn Ahmad's story. Whatever the extent of power proposed for the dāmād, whether, as it is difficult to believe, the Padshāh's whole supremacy, or whether the limited sovereignty of Hindūstān, it must have been known to Bābur as well as to Khalīfa. Whatever their earlier plan however, it was changed by the sequel of Humāyūn's illness which led to his becoming Padshāh. The dāmād was dropped, on grounds it is safe to believe more impressive than his threat to flay Khalīfa or than the remonstrance of that high official's subordinate Muqīm of Herāt.

Humāyūn's arrival and continued stay in Hindūstān modified earlier dispositions which included his remaining in Badakhshān. His actions may explain why Bābur, when in 936 AH. he went as far as Lāhor, did not go on to Kābul. Nothing in the sources excludes the surmise that Māhīm knew of the bestowal of royal insignia on the Bāi-qarā Mīrzā, that she summoned her son to Āgra and there kept him, that she would do this the more resolutely if the dāmād of the plan she must have heard of, were that Bāi-qarā, and that but for Humāyūn's presence in Āgra and its attendant difficulties, Bābur would have gone to Kābul, leaving his dāmād in charge of Hindūstān.

Bābur, however, turned back from Lāhor for Āgra, and there

---

1 The author, or embroiderer, of that anonymous story did not know the Bābur-nāma well, or he would not have described Bābur as a wine-drinker after 933 AH. The anecdote is parallel with Nizāmu'd-dīn Ahmad's, the one explaining why the Mīrzā was selected, the other why the dāmād was dropped.
he made the self-surrender which, resulting in Humāyūn’s “selection” as Pādshāh, became a turning point in history.

Humāyūn’s recovery and Bābur’s immediate illness will have made the son’s life seem Divinely preserved, the father’s as a debt to be paid. Bābur’s impressive personal experience will have dignified Humāyūn as one whom God willed should live. Such distinction would dictate the bestowal on him of all that fatherly generosity had yet to give. The imminence of death defeating all plans made for life, Humāyūn was nominated to supreme power as Pādshāh.

g. Bābur’s death.

Amongst other family matters mentioned by Gul-badan as occurring shortly before her Father’s death, was his arrangement of marriages for Gul-rang with Aīsān-tīmūr and for Gul-chihra with Tūkhta-būghā Chaghataī. She also writes of his anxiety to see Hind-āl who had been sent for from Kābul but did not arrive till the day after the death. When no remedies availed, Humāyūn was summoned from Saṃbhāl. He reached Āgra four days before the death; on the morrow Bābur gathered his chiefs together for the last of many times, addressed them, nominated Humāyūn his successor and bespoke their allegiance for him. Abū’l-faẓl thus summarizes his words, “Lofty counsels and weighty mandates were imparted. Advice was given (to Humāyūn) to be munificent and just, to acquire God’s favour, to cherish and protect subjects, to accept apologies from such as had failed in duty, and to pardon transgressors. And, he (Bābur) exclaimed, the cream of my testamentary dispositions is this, ‘Do naught against your brothers, even though they may deserve it.’ In truth,” continues the historian, “it was through obedience to this mandate that his Majesty Jannat-ashiyānī suffered so many injuries from his brothers without avenging himself.” Gul-badan’s account of her Father’s last address is simple:—“He spoke in this wise, ‘For years it has been in my heart to make over the throne to Humāyūn and to retire to the Gold-scattering Garden. By the Divine grace I have obtained in health of body everything but the fulfilment of this wish. Now that illness has laid me low,
I charge you all to acknowledge Humayûn in my stead. Fail not in loyalty towards him. Be of one heart and mind towards him. I hope to God that he, for his part, will bear himself well towards men. Moreover, Humayûn, I commit you and your brothers and all my kinsfolk and your people and my people to God’s keeping, and entrust them all to you.”

It was on Monday Jumâda I. 5th 937 AH. (Dec. 26th 1530 AD.) that Bâbur made answer to his summons with the Adsum of the Musalmân, “Lord! I am here for Thee.”

“It was on Monday Jumâda I. 5th 937 AH. (Dec. 26th 1530 AD.) that Bâbur made answer to his summons with the Adsum of the Musalmân, “Lord! I am here for Thee.”

“Black fell the day for children and kinsfolk and all,” writes his daughter;

“Alas! that time and the changeful heaven should exist without thee; Alas! and Alas! that time should remain and thou shouldst be gone;” mourns Khwâja Kalân in the funeral ode from which Badâyûnî quoted these lines.1

The body was laid in the Garden-of-rest (Arâm-bâgh) which is opposite to where the Tâj-i-mahâl now stands. Khwâja Muḥammad ‘Alî ‘asas 2 was made the guardian of the tomb, and many well-voiced readers and reciters were appointed to conduct the five daily Prayers and to offer supplication for the soul of the dead. The revenues of Sîkri and 5laks from Biâna were set aside for the endowment of the tomb, and Mâhîm Begîm, during the two and a half years of her remaining life, sent twice daily from her own estate, an allowance of food towards the support of its attendants.

In accordance with the directions of his will, Bâbur’s body was to be conveyed to Kâbul and there to be laid in the garden of his choice, in a grave open to the sky, with no building over it, no need of a door-keeper.

Precisely when it was removed from Ægra we have not found stated. It is known from Gul-badan that Kâmrân visited his Father’s tomb in Ægra in 1539 AD. (946 AH.) after the battle of Chausa; and it is known from Jauhar that the body had been brought to Kâbul before 1544 AD. (952 AH.), at which date Humâyûn, in Kâbul, spoke with displeasure of Kâmrân’s incivility to “Bega Begîm”, the “Bibi” who had conveyed their

1 Bib. Ind. i, 341; Ranking’s trs. p. 448.
2 The night-guard; perhaps Mâhîm Begîm’s brother (G. B.’s H. N. trs. pp. 27-8).
Father's body to that place. That the widow who performed this duty was the Afghān Lady, Bibi Mubārika is made probable by Gul-badan's details of the movements of the royal ladies. Bābur's family left Agra under Hind-āl's escort, after the defeat at Chausa (June 7th, 1539 A.D.); whoever took charge of the body on its journey to Kābul must have returned at some later date to fetch it. It would be in harmony with Sher Shāh's generous character if he safe-guarded her in her task.

The terraced garden Bābur chose for his burial-place lies on the slope of the hill Shāh-i-Kābul, the Sher-darwāza of European writers. It has been described as perhaps the most beautiful of the Kābul gardens, and as looking towards an unsurpassable view over the Chār-dīh plain towards the snows of Paghmān and the barren, rocky hills which have been the hunting-grounds of rulers in Kābul. Several of Bābur's descendants coming to Kābul from Agra have visited and embellished his burial-garden. Shāh-i-jahān built the beautiful mosque which stands near the grave; Jahāngīr seems to have been, if not the author, at least the prompter of the well-cut inscription adorning the upright slab of white marble of Māidān, which now stands at the grave-head. The tomb-stone itself is a low grave-covering, not less simple than those of relations and kin whose remains have been placed near Bābur's. In the thirties of the last century [the later Sir] Alexander Burnes visited and admirably described the garden and the tomb. With him was Munshi Mohan Lāl who added to his own account of the beauties of the spot, copies of the inscriptions on the monumental slab and on the portal of the Mosque. As is shown by the descriptions these two visitors give, and by Daniel's drawings of the garden and the tomb, there were in their time two upright slabs, one behind the other, near the head of the grave. Mr. H. H. Hayden who visited the garden in the first decade of the present century, shows in his photograph of the grave, one upright stone only, the place of

1 G. B.'s H. N. trs. f. 34b, p. 138; Jauhar's Memoirs of Humāyūn, Stewart's trs. p. 82.
one of the former two having been taken by a white-washed lamp holder (chirāghdān).

The purport of the verses inscribed on the standing-slab is as follows:—

A ruler from whose brow shone the Light of God was that \(^1\) Back-bone of the Faith (zahiru’d-dīn) Muhammad Bābur Pādshāh. Together with majesty, dominion, fortune, rectitude, the open-hand and the firm Faith, he had share in prosperity, abundance and the triumph of victorious arms. He won the material world and became a moving light; for his every conquest he looked, as for Light, towards the world of souls. When Paradise became his dwelling and Ruzwān \(^2\) asked me the date, I gave him for answer, “Paradise is forever Bābur Pādshāh’s abode.”

h. Bābur’s wives and children.\(^3\)

Bābur himself mentions several of his wives by name, but Gul-badan is the authority for complete lists of them and their children.

1. ‘Āyisha Sultan Begīm, daughter of Sl. Aḥmad Mirzā Mirān-shāhī was betrothed, when Bābur was cir. 5 years old, in 894 AH. (1488-89 AD.), bore Fakhru’n-nīsa’ in 906 AH. [who died in about one month], left Bābur before 909 AH. (1503 AD.).

2. Zainab Sl. Begīm, daughter of Sl. Maḥmūd Mīrzā Mirān-shāhī, was married in 910 AH. (1504-5 AD.), died childless two or three years later.

3. Māḥim Begīm, whose parentage is not found stated, was married in 912 AH. (1506 AD.), bore Bār-būd, Mihr-jān, Āisān-daulat, Farūq [who all died in infancy], and Humāyūn.

4. Ma’ṣūma Sl. Begīm, daughter of Sl. Ahmad Mīrzā Mirān-shāhī, was married in 913 AH. (1507 AD.), bore Ma’ṣūma and died at her birth, presumably early in the lacuna of 914-925 AH. (1508-19 AD.).

\(^{1}\) ān, a demonstrative suggesting that it refers to an original inscription on the second, but now absent, upright slab, which presumably would bear Bābur’s name.

\(^{2}\) Ruzwān is the door-keeper of Paradise.

\(^{3}\) Particulars of the women mentioned by Bābur, Ḥaidar, Gul-badan and other writers of their time, can be seen in my Biographical Appendix to the Begīm’s Humāyūn-nāma. As the Appendix was published in 1902, variants from it occurring in this work are corrections superseding earlier and less-informed statements.
5. Gul-rukh Begım, whose parentage is not found stated, was perhaps a Begchık Mughül, was married between 914AH. and 925AH. (1508–19AD.), probably early in the period, bore Shāh-rukh, Aḥmad [who both died young], Gul'izār [who also may have died young], Kamrān and 'Askarī.

6. Dil-dār Begım, whose parentage is not found stated, was married in the same period as Gul-rukh, bore Gul-rang, Gul-chihra, Hind-āl, Gul-badan and Alwar, [who died in childhood].

7. The Afghan Lady (Afgānī Āghācha), Bibi Mūbarīka Yūsuf-zāī, was married in 925AH. (1519AD.), and died childless.

The two Circassian slaves Gul-nār Āghācha and Nār-gul Āghācha of whom Ṭahmāsp made gift to Bābur in 933AH. (f.305), became recognized ladies of the royal household. They are mentioned several times by Gul-badan as taking part in festivities and in family conferences under Humāyūn. Gul-nār is said by Abū'īl-fāzīl to have been one of Gul-badan’s pilgrim band in 983AH. (1575AD.).

The above list contains the names of three wives whose parentage is not given or is vaguely given by the well-known sources,—namely, Māhīm, Gul-rukh and Dil-dār. What would sufficiently explain the absence of mention by Bābur of the parentage of Gul-rukh and Dil-dār is that his record of the years within which the two Begīms were married is not now with the Bābur-nāma. Presumably it has been lost, whether in diary or narrative form, in the lacuna of 914–25 AH. (1508–19 AD.). Gul-rukh appears to have belonged to the family of Begchık Mughūls described by Ḥaidar Mīrzā; her brothers are styled Mīrzā; she was of good but not royal birth. Dil-dār’s case is less simple. Nothing in her daughter Gul-badan’s book suggests that she and her children were other than of the highest rank; numerous details and shades of expression show their ease of equality with royal personages. It is consistent with Gul-badan’s method of enumerating her father’s wives that she should not state her own mother’s descent; she states it of none of her “mothers”. There is this interest in trying to trace Dil-dār’s parentage, that she may have been the third daughter of St. Māhmūd Mīrzā and Pasha Begım, and a daughter of hers may have been the mother of

1 Tārīkh-i-rashīdītrs. Ney Elias and Ross p. 308.
Salima Sultan Begim who was given in marriage by Humayun to Bairam Khan, later was married by Akbar, and was a woman of charm and literary accomplishments. Later historians, Abu'l-fazl amongst their number, say that Salima's mother was a daughter of Babur's wife Sahlia Sultan Begim, and vary that daughter's name as Gul-rang-rukh-barg or -'izâr (the last form being an equivalent of chihra, face). As there cannot have been a wife with her daughter growing up in Babur's household, who does not appear in some way in Gul-badan's chronicle, and as Salima's descent from Babur need not be questioned, the knot is most readily loosened by surmising that "Sahlia" is the real name of Gul-badan's "Dildar". Instances of double names are frequent, e.g. Mähim, Mäh-chichâm, Qărâ-gûz, Âq, (My Moon, My Moon sister, Black-eyed, Fair). "Heart-holding" (Dil-där) sounds like a home-name of affection. It is the Ma'âsir-i-rahimi which gives Sahlia as the name of Babur's wife, Pasha's third daughter. Its author may be wrong, writing so late as he did (1025AH.-1616AD.), or may have been unaware that Sahlia was (if she were) known as Dil-där. It would not war against seeming facts to take Pasha's third daughter to be Babur's wife Dil-där, and Dil-där's daughter Gul-chihra to be Salima's mother. Gul-chihra was born in about 1516 AD., married to Tükhta-bûghâ in 1530 AD., widowed in cir. 1533 AD., might have remarried with Nûru'd-din Chaqáníâni (Sayyid Amir), and in 945 AH. might have borne him Salima; she was married in 1547 AD. (954 AH.) to 'Abbâs Sultan Aüsübeg.1 Two matters, neither having much weight, make against taking Dil-där to be a Mirân-shâhî; the first being that the anonymous annotator who added to the archetype of Kehr's Codex what is entered in Appendix L. On Mähim's adoption of Hind-âl, styles her Dil-där Aghâcha; he, however, may have known no more than others knew of her descent; the second, that Mähim forcibly took Dil-där's child Hind-âl to rear; she was the older wife and the mother of the heir, but could she have taken the upper hand over a Mirân-shâhî? A circumstance complicating the question of Salima's maternal descent is, that historians searching the Babur-nâma or its Persian translation the Wâqi'ât-i-bâburi for information about the three daughters of Maḥmûd Mirân-shâhî

and Pasha Bahārlū Turkmān, would find an incomplete record, one in which the husbands of the first and second daughters are mentioned and nothing is said about the third who was Bābur's wife and the grandmother of Salima. Bābur himself appears to have left the record as it is, meaning to fill it in later; presumably he waited for the names of the elder two sisters to complete his details of the three. In the Ḥaidarabad Codex, which there is good ground for supposing a copy of his original manuscript, about three lines are left blank (f. 27) as if awaiting information; in most manuscripts, however, this indication of intention is destroyed by running the defective passage on to join the next sentence. Some chance remark of a less well-known writer, may clear up the obscurity and show that Sālḥa was Dil-dār.

Māḥīm's case seems one having a different cause for silence about her parentage. When she was married in Herāt, shortly after the death of Sl. Ḥusain Mīrzā, Bābur had neither wife nor child. What Abūl-faẓl tells about her is vague; her father's name is not told; she is said to have belonged to a noble Khurāsān family, to have been related (nisbat-i-khwesh) to Sl. Ḥusain Mīrzā and to have traced her descent to Shaikh Ahmad of Jām. If her birth had been high, even though not royal, it is strange that it is not stated by Bābur when he records the birth of her son Humāyūn, incidentally by Gul-badan, or more precisely by Abūl-faẓl. Her brothers belonged to Khost, and to judge from a considerable number of small records, seem to have been quiet, unwarlike Khwājas. Her marriage took place in a year of which a full record survives; it is one in the composed narrative, not in the diary. In the following year, this also being one included in the composed narrative, Bābur writes of his meeting with Mašūma Mīrān-shāhī in Herāt, of their mutual attraction, and of their marriage. If the marriage with Humāyūn's mother had been an equal alliance, it would agree with Bābur's custom to mention its occurrence, and to give particulars about Māḥīm's descent.¹

¹ The story of the later uprisings against Māḥīm's son Humāyūn by his brothers, by Muhammad-i-zamān Bāi-qarā and others of the same royal blood, and this in spite of Humāyūn's being his father's nominated successor, stirs surmise as to whether the rebels were not tempted by more than his defects of character to disregard his claim to supremacy; perhaps pride of higher maternal descent, this particularly amongst the Bāi-qarā group, may have deepened a disregard created by antagonisms of temperament.
i. Mr. William Erskine's estimate of Bābur.

"Zahiru'd-dīn Muḥammad Bābur was undoubtedly one of the most illustrious men of his age, and one of the most eminent and accomplished princes that ever adorned an Asiatic throne. He is represented as having been above the middle size, of great vigour of body, fond of all field and warlike sports, an excellent swordsman, and a skilful archer. As a proof of his bodily strength, it is mentioned, that he used to leap from one pinnacle to another of the pinnacled ramparts used in the East, in his double-soled boots; and that he even frequently took a man under each arm and went leaping along the rampart from one of the pointed pinnacles to another. Having been early trained to the conduct of business, and tutored in the school of adversity, the powers of his mind received full development. He ascended the throne at the age of twelve, and before he had attained his twentieth year, had shared every variety of fortune; he had not only been the ruler of subject provinces but had been in thraldom to his own ambitious nobles, and obliged to conceal every sentiment of his heart; he had been alternately hailed and obeyed as a conqueror and deliverer by rich and extensive kingdoms, and forced to lurk in the deserts and mountains of Farghāna as a houseless wanderer. Down to the last dregs of life, we perceive in him strong feelings of affection for his early friends and early enjoyments. * * * He had been taught betimes, by the voice of events that cannot lie, that he was a man dependent on the kindness and fidelity of other men; and, in his dangers and escapes with his followers, had learned that he was only one of an association. * * * The native benevolence and gaiety of his disposition seems ever to overflow on all around him; * * * of his companions in arms he speaks with the frank gaiety of a soldier. * * * Ambitious he was and fond of conquest and glory in all its shapes; the enterprise in which he was for a season engaged, seems to have absorbed his whole soul, and all his faculties were exerted to bring it to a fortunate issue. His elastic mind was not broken by discomfiture, and few who have achieved such glorious conquests, have suffered more numerous or more decisive defeats. His personal courage was conspicuous during his whole life. Upon the whole, if we review with impartiality the history
of Asia, we find few princes entitled to rank higher than Bābur in genius and accomplishments. * * * In activity of mind, in the gay equanimity and unbroken spirit with which he bore the extremes of good and bad fortune, in the possession of the manly and social virtues, in his love of letters and his success in the cultivation of them, we shall probably find no other Asiatic prince who can justly be placed beside him."

The End.
APPENDICES.

A.—THE SITE AND DISAPPEARANCE OF OLD AKHSI.

Some modern writers, amongst whom are Dr. Schuyler, General Nalivkine and Mr. Pumpelly, have inferred from the Bābur-nāma account of Akhsi (in its translations?) that the landslip through which Bābur's father died and the disappearance of old Akhsi were brought about by erosion. Seen by the light of modern information, this erosion theory does not seem to cover the whole ground and some other cause seems necessary in explanation of both events.

For convenience of reference, the Bābur-nāma passages required, are quoted here, with their translations.


Of this the translations are as follows:—


(b) Erskine (p. 5, translating from the Persian): 'The river Saiḥūn flows under the walls of the castle. The castle is situated on a high precipice, and the steep ravines around serve instead of a moat. When U. Sh. M. made it his capital he, in one or two instances, scarped the ravines outside the fort.'

(c) De Courteille (i, 8, translating from Ilminsky's imprint, p. 6): 'Le Seihoun coule au pied de la forteresse qui se dresse sur le sommet d'un ravin, dont les profondeurs lui tiennent lieu d'un fossé. 'U. Sh. M. à l'époque où il en avait fait son capitale, avait augmenté à une ou deux réprises, les escarpements qui la ceignent naturellement.'

Concerning 'Umar Shaikh's death, the words needed are (f. 6b):—

Māzkūr būlūb ādī kīm Akhsī qūrghānī buland jar austīdā wāqī būlūb tūr. 'Imāratlār jar yāqūsidā āīrdī. . . . Mirzā jardin khabūtar u
APPENDICES

*kabutar-khâna bîla aîchûb shunqâr bûldî;—* 'It has been mentioned that the walled-town of Akhsi is situated above ravine(s). The royal dwellings are along a ravine. The Mirzâ, having flown with his pigeons and their house from the ravine, became a falcon (*i.e.* died).'

A few particulars about Akhsi will shew that, in the translations just quoted, certain small changes of wording are dictated by what, amongst other writers, Kostenko and von Schwarz have written about the oases of Turkistân.

The name Akhsi, as used by Ibn Haukal, Yâqût and Bâbur, describes an oasis township, *i.e.* a walled-town with its adjacent cultivated lands. In Yâqût's time Akhsi had a second circumvallation, presumably less for defence than for the protection of crops against wild animals. The oasis was created by the Kâsân-water,*¹ upon the riverain loess of the right and higher bank of the Saihûn (Sir), on level ground west of the junction of the Nârîn and the Qarâ-daryâ, west too of spurs from the northern hills which now abut upon the river. Yâqût locates it in the 12th century, at one *farsâkh* (*circa* 4 m.) north of the river.*² Depending as it did solely on the Kâsân-water, nothing dictated its location close to the Sir, along which there is now, and there seems to have been in the 12th century, a strip of waste land. Bâbur says of Akhsi what Kostenko says (i, 321) of modern Tâshkint, that it stood above ravines (*jarlûr*). These were natural or artificial channels of the Kâsân-water.*³

To turn now to the translations;—Mr. Erskine imaged Akhsi as a castle, high on a precipice in process of erosion by the Sir. But Bâbur's word, *qûrghân* means the walled-town; his for a castle is *ark*, citadel; and his *jar*, a cleft, is not rendered by 'precipice.' Again;—it is no more necessary to understand that

---

¹ Until the Yangi-âriq was taken off the Sir, late in the last century, for Namangan, the oasis land of Farghâna was fertilized, not from the river but by its intercepted tributaries.

² Ujfalvy's translation of Yâqût (ii, 179) reads one *farsâkh* from the mountains instead of 'north of the river.'

³ Kostenko describes a division of Tâshkint, one in which is Ravine-lane (*jar-kuchâ*), as divided by a deep ravine; of another he says that it is cut by deep ravines (Bâbur's 'umîq *jarlûr*).
the Sir flowed close to the walls than it is to understand, when one says the Thames flows past below Richmond, that it washes the houses on the hill.

The key to the difficulties in the Turkī passage is provided by a special use of the word jar for not only natural ravines but artificial water-cuts for irrigation. This use of it makes clear that what 'Umar Shaikh did at Akhsī was not to make escarpments but to cut new water-channels. Presumably he joined those 'further out' on the deltaic fan, on the east and west of the town, so as to secure a continuous defensive cleft round the town\(^1\) or it may be, in order to bring it more water.

Concerning the historic pigeon-house (f. 6b), it can be said safely that it did not fall into the Sir; it fell from a jar, and in this part of its course, the river flows in a broad bed, with a low left bank. Moreover the Mīrzā's residence was in the walled-town (f. 110b) and there his son stayed 9 years after the accident. The slip did not affect the safety of the residence therefore; it may have been local to the birds' house. It will have been due to some ordinary circumstance since no cause for it is mentioned by Bābur, Ḥaidar or Abū'l-fazl. If it had marked the crisis of the Sir's approach, Akhsī could hardly have been described, 25 years later, as a strong fort.

Something is known of Akhsī, in the 10th, the 12th, the 15th and the 19th centuries, which testifies to sēcular decadence. Ibn Haukal and Yāqūt give the township an extent of 3 farsākh (12 miles), which may mean from one side to an opposite one. Yāqūt's description of it mentions four gates, each opening into well-watered lands extending a whole farsākh, in other words it had a ring of garden-suburb four miles wide.

Two meanings have been given to Bābur's words indicating the status of the oasis in the 15th century. They are,

\(^1\) Bābur writes as though Akhsī had one Gate only (f. 112b). It is unlikely that the town had come down to having a single exit; the Gate by which he got out of Akhsī was the one of military importance because served by a draw-bridge, presumably over the ravine-moat, and perhaps not close to that bridge.
maḥallahī ḍūrāgān-dīn bir shar‘ī yurāqrāq tūshūb tūr. They have been understood as saying that the suburbs were two miles from their urbs. This may be right but I hesitate to accept it without pointing out that the words may mean, 'Its suburbs extend two miles farther than the walled-town.' Whichever verbal reading is correct, reveals a decayed oasis.

In the 19th century, Nalivkine and Ujfalvy describe the place then bearing the name Akhsi, as a small village, a mere winter-station, at some distance from the river's bank, that bank then protected from denudation by a sand-bank.

Three distinctly-marked stages of decadence in the oasis township are thus indicated by Yāqūt, Bābur and the two modern travellers.

It is necessary to say something further about the position of the suburbs in the 15th century. Bābur quotes as especially suitable to Akhsi, the proverbial questions, 'Where is the village?'(qy. Akhsi-kīnt.) 'Where are the trees?' and these might be asked by some-one in the suburbs unable to see Akhsi or vice versa. But granting that there were no suburbs within two miles of the town, why had the whole inner circle, two miles of Yāqūt's four, gone out of cultivation? Erosion would have affected only land between the river and the town.

Again;—if the Sir only were working in the 15th century to destroy a town standing on the Kāsān-water, how is it that this stream does not yet reach the Sir?

Various ingatherings of information create the impression that failure of Kāsān-water has been the dominant factor in the loss of the Akhsi township. Such failure might be due to the general desiccation of Central Asia and also to increase of cultivation in the Kāsān-valley itself. There may have been erosion, and social and military change may have had its part, but for the loss of the oasis lands and for, as a sequel, the decay of the town, desiccation seems a sufficient cause.

For mention of upper villages see f. 110 and note 1.
A.—THE SITE AND DISAPPEARANCE OF OLD AKHSI

The Kāsān-water still supports an oasis on its riverain slope, the large Aūzbeq town of Tūpa-qūrghān (Town-of-the-hill), from the modern castle of which a superb view is had up the Kāsān-valley, now thickly studded with villages.¹

B.—THE BIRDS, QĪL QŪYIRŪḠH AND BĀGHRI QARĀ.

Describing a small bird (qūsh-qīna), abundant in the Qarshi district (f. 49b), Bābur names it the qīl-qūyirūḡh, horse-tail, and says it resembles the bāghri qarā.

Later on he writes (f. 280) that the bāghri qarā of India is smaller and more slender than ‘those’ i.e. of Transoxiana (f. 49b, n. 1), the blackness of its breast less deep, and its cry less piercing.

We have had difficulty in identifying the birds but at length conclude that the bāghri qarā of Transoxiana is Pterocles arenarius, Pallas’s black-bellied sand-grouse and that the Indian one is a smaller sand-grouse, perhaps a Syrrhaptes. As the qīl qūyirūḡh resembles the other two, it may be a yet smaller Syrrhaptes.

Muh. Šāliḥ, writing of sport Shaibāq Khān had in Qarshi (Shaibānī-nāma, Vambéry, p. 192) mentions the ‘Little bird (murgḥak) of Qarshi,’ as on all sides making lament. The Sang-lākh ² gives its Persian name as khar-pala, ass-hair, says it

¹ Cf. f. 114 for distances which would be useful in locating Akhsi if Bābur’s yihākh were not variable; Ritter, vii, 3 and 733; Récclus, vi, index s.n. Farghāna; Ujfalvy ii, 168, his quotation from Yāqūt and his authorities; Nalivkine’s Histoire du Khanat de Kokand, p. 14 and p. 53; Schuyler, i, 324; Kostenko, Tables of Contents for cognate general information and i, 320, for Tāshkint; von Schwarz, index under related names, and especially p. 345 and plates; Pumpelly, p. 18 and p. 115.

² This Turki-Persian Dictionary was compiled by Mīrzā Mahdī Khān, Nādīr Shāh’s secretary and historian, whose life of his master Sir William Jones translated into French (Rieu’s Turki Cat. p. 264b).
flies in large flocks and resembles the bāghrī qarā. Of the latter he writes as abundant in the open country and as making noise (bāghir).

The Sang-lākh (f. 119) gives the earliest and most informing account we have found of the bāghrī qarā. Its says the bird is larger than a pigeon, marked with various colours, yellow especially, black-breasted and a dweller in the stony and waterless desert. These details are followed by a quotation from 'Alī-sher Nawāʾi, in which he likens his own heart to that of the bird of the desert, presumably referring to the gloom of the bird's plumage. Three synonyms are then given; Ar. qiṭā, one due to its cry (Meninsky); Pers. sang-shikan, stone-eating, (Steingass, sang-khāwāra, stone-eating); and Turkī bāghir-tilāq which refers, I think, to its cry.

Morier (Ḥājī Bābā) in his Second journey through Persia (Lond. 1818, p. 181), mentions that a bird he calls the black-breasted partridge, (i.e. Francolinus vulgaris) is known in Turkish as bokara kara and in Persian as siyāh-sīna, both names, (he says), meaning black-breast; that it has a horse-shoe of black feathers round the forepart of the trunk, more strongly marked in the female than in the male; that they fly in flocks of which he saw immense numbers near Tabrīz (p. 283), have a soft note, inhabit the plains, and, once settled, do not run. Cock and hen alike have a small spur,—a characteristic, it may be said, identifying rather with Francolinus vulgaris than with Pterocles arenarius. Against this identification, however, is Mr. Blandford's statement that siyāh-sīna (Morier's bokara kara) is Pterocles arenarius (Report of the Persian Boundary Commission, ii, 271).

In Afghānistān and Bikanir, the sand-grouse is called tūtūrak and boora kurra (Jerdon, ii, 498). Scully explains baghīṭāq as Pterocles arenarius.

Perhaps I may mention something making me doubt whether it is correct to translate bāghrī qarā by black-liver and gorge-noir or other names in which the same meaning is expressed. To translate thus, is to understand a Turkī noun and adjective in
B.-THE BIRDS QIL QÜYİRÜGH AND BĀGHRI QARĀ

Persian construction, and to make exception to the rule, amply exemplified in lists of birds, that Turkī names of birds are commonly in Turkī construction, e.g. qarā bāsh (black-head), āq-bāsh (white-head), sārīgh-sūndūk (yellow-headed wagtail). Bāghir may refer to the cry of the bird. We learn from Mr. Ogilvie Grant that the Mongol name for the sand-grouse njūpterjūn, is derived from its cry in flight, truck, truck, and its Arabic name qiṭā is said by Meninsky to be derived from its cry kaetha, kaetha. Though the dissimilarity of the two cries is against taking the njūpterjūn and the qiṭā to be of one class of sand-grouse, the significance of the derivation of the names remains, and shows that there are examples in support of thinking that when a sand-grouse is known as bāghri qarā, it may be so known because of its cry (bāghir).

The word qarā finds suggestive interpretation in a B. N. phrase (f. 72b) Tambal-nīng qarā-sī, Tambal’s blackness, i.e. the dark mass of his moving men, seen at a distance. It is used also for an indefinite number, e.g. ‘family, servants, retainers, followers, qarā,’ and I think it may imply a massed flock.

Bābur’s words (f. 280) bāghrī-nīng qarā-sī ham kam dūr, [its belly (lit. liver) also is less black], do not necessarily contradict the view that the word bāghrī in the bird’s name means crying. The root bāgh has many and pliable derivatives; I suspect both Bābur (here) and Muḥ. Šāliḥ (l. c.) of ringing changes on words.

We are indebted for kind reply to our questions to Mr. Douglas Carruthers, Mr. Ogilvie Grant and to our friend, Mr. R. S. Whiteway.
C.—ON THE GOSHA-GIR.

I am indebted to my husband's examination of two Persian MSS. on archery for an explanation of the word gosha-gir, in its technical sense in archery. The works consulted are the Cyclopaedia of Archery (*Kulliyatu'r-rāmī* I. O. 2771) and the Archer's Guide (*Hidāyatu'r-rāmī* I. O. 2768).

It should be premised that in archery, the word gosha describes, in the arrow, the notch by which it grips and can be carried on the string, and, in the bow, both the tip (horn) and the notch near the tip in which the string catches. It is explained by Vollers as *cornu et crena arcus cui immittitur nervus*.

Two passages in the Cyclopaedia of Archery (f. 9 and f. 36b) shew gosha as the bow-tip. One says that to bend the bow, two men must grasp the two gosha; the other reports a tradition that the Archangel Gabriel brought a bow having its two gosha (tips) made of ruby. The same book directs that the gosha be made of seasoned ivory, the Archer's Guide prescribing seasoned mulberry wood.

The C. of A. (f. 125b) says that a bowman should never be without two things, his arrows and his gosha-gir. The gosha-gir may be called an item of the repairing kit; it is an implement (f. 53) for making good a warped bow-tip and for holding the string into a displaced notch. It is known also as the chaprās, brooch or buckle, and the kardāng; and is said to bear these names because it fastens in the string. Its shape is that of the upper part of the Ar. letter jīm, two converging lines of which the lower curves slightly outward. It serves to make good a warped bow, without the use of fire and it should be kept upon the bow-tip till this has reverted to its original state. Until the warp has been straightened by the gosha-gir, the bow must be kept from the action of fire because it, (composite of sinew and glutinous substance,) is of the nature of wax.

The same implement can be used to straighten the middle of the bow, the kamān khāna. It is then called kar-dāng. It can
be used there on condition that there are not two daur (curves) in the bow. If there are two the bow cannot be repaired without fire. The halāl daur is said to be characteristic of the Turkish bow. There are three daur. I am indebted to Mr. Inigo Simon for the suggestions that daur in this connection means warp and that the three twists (daur) may be those of one horn (gosha), of the whole bow warped in one curve, and of the two horns warped in opposite directions.

Of repair to the kamān-khāna it is said further that if no kardāng be available, its work can be done by means of a stick and string, and if the damage be slight only, the bow and the string can be tightly tied together till the bow comes straight. 'And the cure is with God!'

Both manuscripts named contain much technical information. Some parts of this are included in my husband's article, Oriental Crossbows (A.Q.R. 1911, p. 1). Sir Ralph Payne-Gallwey's interesting book on the Cross-bow allows insight into the fine handicraft of Turkish bow-making.

D.—ON THE RESCUE PASSAGE.

I have omitted from my translation an account of Bābur's rescue from expected death, although it is with the Haidarābād Codex, because closer acquaintance with its details has led both my husband and myself to judge it spurious. We had welcomed it because, being with the true Bābur-nāma text, it accredited the same account found in the Kehr-Ilminsky text, and also because, however inefficiently, it did something towards filling the gap found elsewhere within 908 AH.

It is in the Haidarābād MS. (f. 118b), in Kehr's MS. (p. 385), in Ilinsky's imprint (p. 144), in Les Mémoires de Bābour (i, 255) and with the St. P. University Codex, which is a copy of Kehr's.
On the other hand, it is not with the Elphinstone Codex (f. 89b); that it was not with the archetype of that codex the scribe's note shews (f. 90); it is with neither of the Wāqi'āt-i-bāburī (Pers. translations) nor with Leyden and Erskine's Memoirs (p. 122).¹

Before giving our grounds for rejecting what has been offered to fill the gap of 908 AH. a few words must be said about the lacuna itself. Nothing indicates that Bābur left it and, since both in the Elphinstone Codex and its archetype, the sentence preceding it lacks the terminal verb, it seems due merely to loss of pages. That the loss, if any, was of early date is clear,—the Elph. MS. itself being copied not later than 1567 AD. (JRAS. 1907, p. 137).

Two known circumstances, both of earlier date than that of the Elphinstone Codex, might have led to the loss,—the first is the storm which in 935 AH. scattered Bābur's papers (f. 376b), the second, the vicissitudes to which Humāyūn's library was exposed in his exile.² Of the two the first seems the more probable cause.

The rupture of a story at a point so critical as that of Bābur's danger in Karnān would tempt to its completion; so too would wish to make good the composed part of the Bābur-nāma. Humāyūn annotated the archetype of the Elphinstone Codex a good deal but he cannot have written the Rescue passage if only because he was in a position to avoid some of its inaccuracies.

CONTEXT AND TRANSLATION OF THE RESCUE PASSAGE.

To facilitate reference, I quote the last words preceding the gap purported to be filled by the Rescue passage, from several texts;—

¹ The Pādshāh-nāma whose author, 'Abdu'l-ḥamīd, the biographer of Shāh-jahān, died in 1065 AH. (1655 AD.) mentions the existence of lacunae in a copy of the Bābur-nāma, in the Imperial Library and allowed by his wording to be Bābur's autograph MS. (i, 42 and ii, 703).
² Akbar-nāma, Bib. Ind. ed. i, 305 ; H.B. i, 571.
The Rescue passage is introduced by a Persian couplet, identified by my husband as from Niżāmī’s Khusrau u Shīrīn, which is as follows;—

If you stay a hundred years, and if one year,
Forth you must go from this heart-delighting palace.

I steadied myself for death (qarār bîrdîm). In that garden a stream came flowing;¹ I made ablution; I recited the prayer of two inclinations (ra‘kat); having raised my head for silent prayer, I was making earnest petition when my eyes closed in sleep.² I am seeing³ that Khwāja Yaq’ūb, the son of

¹ Hai. MS. f. 118b; aŭshāl bâghdād sū āqīb kilā dūr aŭdī. Bâbur-nâma, sū āqīb, water flowed and aŭshāl is rare, but in the R.P. occurs 7 times.
² guzūm āwîqî-ghâ bârîb tûr. B.N. f. 117b, guzūm āwîqî-ghâ bârdî.
³ kûrā dûr min, B.N. f. 83, tûsh kûrdûm and tûsh kûrâr min.
Khwāja Yahyā and grandson of His Highness Khwāja ‘Ubaidu‘l-lāh, came
facing me, mounted on a piebald horse, with a large company of piebald horse-
men (sic). 1 He said: ‘Lay sorrow aside! Khwāja Aḥrār (i.e. ‘Ubaidu‘l-lāh)
has sent me to you; he said, “We, having asked help for him (i.e. Bābur),
will seat him on the royal throne; 2 wherever difficulty befalls him, let him
look towards us (lit. bring us to sight) and call us to mind; there will we be
present.” Now, in this hour, victory and success are on your side; lift up
your head! awake!’

At that time I awoke happy, when Yusuf and those with him 3 were giving
one another advice. ‘We will make a pretext to deceive; to seize and bind 4
is necessary.’ Hearing these words, I said, ‘Your words are of this sort,
but I will see which of you will come to my presence to take me.’ I was
saying this when outside the garden wall 5 came the noise of approaching
horsemen. Yusuf daroqa said, ‘If we had taken you to Tāmbal our affairs
would have gone forward. Now he has sent again many persons to seize
you.’ He was certain that this noise might be the footfall of the horses
of those sent by Tāmbal. On hearing those words anxiety grew upon me;
what to do I did not know. At this time those horsemen, not happening to
find the garden gate, broke down the wall where it was old (and) came in.
I saw (kūrsīm, lit. might see) that Qutluq Muh. Barlās and Bābā-i Parghāri,
my life-devoted servants, having arrived [with], it may be, ten, fifteen,
twenty persons, were approaching. Having flung themselves from their
horses, 6 bent the knee from afar and showed respect, they fell at my feet. In
that state (hāl) such ecstasy (ḥālā) came over me that you might say (goyā)
God gave me life from a new source (bāsh). I said, ‘Seize and bind that
Yusuf daroqa and these here (tārghān) hireling mannikins.’ These same
mannikins had taken to flight. They (i.e. the rescuers), having taken them,
one by one, here and there, brought them bound. I said, ‘Where do you
come from? How did you get news?’ Qutluq Muh. Barlās said: ‘When,
having fled from Akhsi, we were separated from you in the flight, we went to
Andijān when the Khāns also came to Andijān. I saw a vision that Khwāja
‘Ubaidu‘l-lāh said, “Bābur pādshāh” is in a village called Kārnān; go and
bring him, since the royal seat (masnad) has become his possession (ta‘lūq).’”
I having seen this vision and become happy, represented (the matter) to the
Elder Khān (and) the Younger Khān. I said to the Khāns, “I have five or
six younger brothers (and) sons; do you add a few soldiers. I will go
through the Kārnān side and bring news.” The Khāns said, “It occurs to our
minds also that (he) may have gone that same road (?).” They appointed ten
persons; they said, “Having gone in that direction (sārī) and made very sure,
bring news. Would to God you might get true news!” We were saying this
when Bābā-i Parghāri said, “I too will go and seek.” He also having agreed
with two young men, (his) younger brothers, we rode out. It is three days.

---

1 ablaq suwār bilān; P. suwār for T. āṭilīq or āṭilīq kīshī; bilān for B.N. bīla,
and an odd use of piebald (ablaq).
2 masnad, B.N. takhtī, throne. Masnad betrays Hindūstān.
3 Hamrā’ilāri (sic) bir bir ga (sic) maṣlaḥat āṭi dūrlār. Maṣlaḥat for B.N.
kingūsh or kingūsh; hamrāh, companion, for mīnīng bīla bār, etc.
4 bāghlāmāq and f. 119b bāghlāghānlār; B.N. ālmāk or tūtmāq to seize or
take prisoner.
5 diwār for tām.
6 f. 119, āṭ-ṭin āužlār-ṇi tāshklāb; B.N. tūshmāk, dismount. Tāshlāmaq is
not used in the sense of dismount by B.
7 pādshāh so used is an anachronism (f. 215); Bābur Mīrzā would be correct.
to-day that we are on the road. Thank God! we have found you.' They said (ādīlār, for dib). They spoke (aīlār), 'Make a move! Ride off! Take these bound ones with you! To stay here is not well; Tambal has had news of your coming here; go, in whatever way, and join yourself to the Khāns!' At that time we having ridden out, moved towards Andijān. It was two days that we had eaten no food; the evening prayer had come when we found a sheep, went on, dismounted, killed, and roasted. Of that same roast we ate as much as a feast. After that we rode on, hurried forward, made a five days' journey in a day and two nights, came and entered Andijān. I saluted my uncle the Elder Khān (and) my uncle the Younger Khān, and made recital of past days. With the Khāns I spent four months. My servants, who had gone looking in every place, gathered themselves together; there were more than 300 persons. It came to my mind (kim), 'How long must I wander, a vagabond (sar-gardān), in this Farghāna country? I will make search (talab) on every side (dib).' Having said, I rode out in the month of Muḥarram to seek Khurāsān, and I went out from the country of Farghāna.²

REASONS AGAINST THE REJECTION OF THE RESCUE PASSAGE.

Two circumstances have weight against rejecting the passage, its presence with the Ḥaidarābād Codex and its acceptance by Dr. Ilminskey and M. de Courteille.

That it is with the Codex is a matter needing consideration and this the more that it is the only extra matter there found. Not being with the Persian translations, it cannot be of early date. It seems likely to owe its place of honour to distinguished authorship and may well be one of the four portions (juzwē) mentioned by Jahāngīr in the Tuzūk-i-jahāngīrī,³ as added by himself to his ancestor's book. If so, it may be mentioned, it will have been with Bābur's autograph MS. [now not to be found], from which the Ḥaidarābād Codex shews signs of being a direct copy.⁴

[The incongruity of the Rescue passage with the true text has

1 ẓāhirān; B.N. yāqīn.
2 Ilminskey's imprint stops at dib; he may have taken kim-dib for signs of quotation merely. (This I did earlier, JRAS 1902, p. 749.)
3 Aligarh ed. p. 52; Rogers' trs. i, 109.
4 Cf. i. 63b, n. 3.
been indicated by foot-notes to the translation of it already given. What condemns it on historic and other grounds will follow.]

On linguistic grounds it is a strong argument in its favour that Dr. Ilminsky and M. de Courteille should have accepted it but the argument loses weight when some of the circumstances of their work are taken into account.

In the first place, it is not strictly accurate to regard Dr. Ilminsky as accepting it unquestioned, because it is covered by his depreciatory remarks, made in his preface, on Kehr's text. He, like M. de Courteille, worked with a single Turki MS. and neither of the two ever saw a complete true text. When their source (the Kehr-Ilminsky) was able to be collated with the Elph. and Hai. MSS. much and singular divergence was discovered.

I venture to suggest what appears to me to explain M. de Courteille's acceptance of the Rescue passage. Down to its insertion, the Kehr-Ilminsky text is so continuously and so curiously corrupt that it seems necessary to regard it as being a re-translation into Turki from one of the Persian translations of the Bābur-nāma. There being these textual defects in it, it would create on the mind of a reader initiated through it, only, in the book, an incorrect impression of Bābur's style and vocabulary, and such a reader would feel no transition when passing on from it to the Rescue passage.

In opposition to this explanation, it might be said that a wrong standard set up by the corrupt text, would or could be changed by the excellence of later parts of the Kehr-Ilminsky one. In words, this is sound, no doubt, and such reflex criticism is now easy, but more than the one defective MS. was wanted even to suggest the need of such reflex criticism. The Bābur-nāma is lengthy, ponderous to poise and grasp, and
work on it is still tentative, even with the literary gains since the Seventies.

Few of the grounds which weigh with us for the rejection of the Rescue passage were known to Dr. Ilminsky or M. de Courteille;—the two good Codices bring each its own and varied help; Teufel’s critique on the ‘Fragments,’ though made without acquaintance with those adjuncts as they stand in Kehr’s own volume, is of much collateral value; several useful oriental histories seem not to have been available for M. de Courteille’s use. I may add, for my own part, that I have the great advantage of my husband’s companionship and the guidance of his wide acquaintance with related oriental books. In truth, looking at the drawbacks now removed, an earlier acceptance of the passage appears as natural as does today’s rejection.

GROUND FOR REJECTING THE RESCUE PASSAGE.

The grounds for rejecting the passage need here little more than recapitulation from my husband’s article in the JASB. 1910, p. 221, and are as follows;—

i. The passage is in neither of the Wāqi‘āt-i-bāburī.

ii. The dreams detailed are too à propos and marvellous for credence.

iii. Khwāja Yaḥyā is not known to have had a son, named Ya‘qūb.

iv. The Bābur-nāma does not contain the names assigned to the rescuers.

v. The Khāns were not in Andijān and Bābur did not go there.

vi. He did not set out for Khurāsān after spending 4 months with The Khāns but after Aḥmad’s death (end of 909 Ḍh.), while Maḥmud was still in Eastern Turkistān and after about a year’s stay in Sūkh.
vii. The followers who gathered to him were not ‘more than 300’ but between 2 and 300.

viii. The ‘3 days,’ and the ‘day and two nights,’ and the ‘5 days’ journey was one of some 70 miles, and one recorded as made in far less time.

ix. The passage is singularly inadequate to fill a gap of 14 to 16 months, during which events of the first importance occurred to Bābur and to the Chaghataī dynasty.

x. Khwāja Ḍhrārī’s promises did nothing to fulfil Bābur’s wishes for 908 Ḍh. while those of Yaʿqūb for immediate victory were closely followed by defeat and exile. Bābur knew the facts; the passage cannot be his. It looks as though the writer saw Bābur in Karnān across Timūrid success in Hindūstān.

xi. The style and wording of the passage are not in harmony with those of the true text.

Other reasons for rejection are marked change in choice of the details chosen for commemoration, e.g. when Bābur mentions prayer, he does so simply; when he tells a dream, it seems a real one. The passage leaves the impression that the writer did not think in Turki, composed in it with difficulty, and looked at life from another view-point than Bābur’s.

On these various grounds, we have come to the conclusion that it is no part of the Bābur-nāma.
E.—NAGARAHĀR AND NĪNG-NAHĀR.

Those who consult books and maps about the riverain tract between the Safed-koh (Spin-ghur) and (Anglicé) the Kābul-river find its name in several forms, the most common being Nangrahār and Nangnahār (with variant vowels). It would be useful to establish a European book-name for the district. As European opinion differs about the origin and meaning of the names now in use, and as a good deal of interesting circumstance gathers round the small problem of a correct form (there may be two), I offer about the matter what has come into the restricted field of my own work, premising that I do this merely as one who drops a casual pebble on the cairn of observation already long rising for scholarly examination.

a. The origin and meaning of the names.

I have met with three opinions about the origin and meaning of the names found now and earlier. To each one of them obvious objection can be made. They are:—

1. That all forms now in use are corruptions of the Sanscrit word Nāgarahāra, the name of the Town-of-towns which in the dū-āb of the Bārān-sū and Sūrkh-rūd left the ruins Masson describes in Wilson's Ariana Antiqua. But if this is so, why is the Town-of-towns multiplied into the nine of Na-nagrahār (Nangrahār)?

2. That the names found represent Sanscrit navā vihāra, nine monasteries, an opinion the Gazetteer of India of 1907 has

1 Another but less obvious objection will be mentioned later.

3. That Nang (Ning or Nung) -nahār verbally means nine streams, (Bābur’s Ṭūqūz-rūd,) an interpretation of long standing (Section b infra). But whence nang, ning, nung, for nine? Such forms are not in Persian, Turkī or Pushtu dictionaries, and, as Sir G. A. Grierson assures me, do not come into the Linguistic Survey.

b. On nang, ning, nung for nine.

Spite of their absence from the natural homes of words, however, the above sounds have been heard and recorded as symbols of the number nine by careful men through a long space of time.

The following instances of the use of “Nangnahār” show this, and also show that behind the variant forms there may be not a single word but two of distinct origin and sense.

1. In Chinese annals two names appear as those of the district and town (I am not able to allocate their application with certainty). The first is Na-kie-lo-ho-lo, the second Nang-g-lo-ho-lo and these, I understand to represent Nagara-hāra and Nang-nahār, due allowance being made for Chinese idiosyncrasy.¹

2. Some 900 years later (1527-30 AD.) Bābur also gives two names, Nagarahār (as the book-name of his tūmān) and Ning-nahār.² He says the first is found in several histories (B.N. f. 131b); the second will have been what he heard and also presumably what appeared in revenue accounts; of it he says, “it is nine torrents” (tūqūz-rūd).

3. Some 300 years after Bābur, Elphinstone gives two

¹ Julien notes (Voyages des pèlerins Bouddhistes, ii, 96), “Dans les annales des Song on trouve Nang-go-lo-ho, qui répond exactement à l’orthographe indienne Nangarahāra, que fournit l’inscription découvert par le capitaine Kittoe” (JASB. 1848). The reference is to the Ghoswāra inscription, of which Professor Kielhorn has also written (Indian Antiquary, 1888), but with departure from Nangarahāra to Nagarahāra.

² The scribe of the Haidarābād Codex appears to have been somewhat uncertain as to the spelling of the name. What is found in histories is plain, N:ġːrːhār. The other name varies; on first appearance (fol. 131b) and also on fols. 144 and 154â, there is a vagrant dot below the word, which if it were above would make Ning-nahār. In all other cases the word reads Nːgːnahār. Nahār is a constant component, as is also the letter ġ (or k).
names for the district, neither of them being Bābur's book-name, "Nangrahaur" or Nungnahaur, from the nine streams which issue from the Safed-koh, nung in Pushtoo signifying nine, and nahaura, a stream" (Caubul, i, 160).

4. In 1881 Colonel H. S. Tanner had heard, in Nūr-valley on the north side of the Kābul-water, that the name of the opposite district was Ning-nahār and its meaning Nine-streams. He did not get a list of the nine and all he heard named do not flow from Safed-koh.

5. In 1884 Colonel H. G. McGregor gives two names with their explanation, "Ningrahār and Nungnihar; the former is a corruption of the latter word which in the Afghan language signifies nine rivers or rivulets." He names nine, but of them six only issue from Safed-koh.

6. I have come across the following instances in which the number nine is represented by other words than na (ni or nu); viz. the nenhan of the Chitrālí Kāfīr and the noun of the Panjābi, recorded by Leech,—the nyoh of the Khowārī and the huncha of the Boorishki, recorded by Colonel Biddulph.

The above instances allow opinion that in the region concerned and through a long period of time, nine has been expressed by nang (ning or nung) and other nasal or high palatal sounds, side by side with na (ni or nu). The whole matter may be one of nasal utterance, but since a large number of tribesmen express nine by a word containing a nasal sound, should that word not find place in lists of recognized symbols of sounds?

c. Are there two names of distinct origin?

1. Certainly it makes a well-connected story of decay in the Sanscrit word Nagarahāra to suppose that tribesmen, prone by their organism to nasal utterance, pronounced that word

\[1\] Some writers express the view that the medial \( r \) in this word indicates descent from Nagarahāra, and that the medial \( n \) of Elphinstone's second form is a corruption of it. Though this might be, it is true also that in local speech \( r \) and \( n \) often interchange, e.g. Chighār- and Chighān-sarāī, Sūhār and Sūhān (in Nūr-valley).

\[2\] This asserts \( n \) to be the correct consonant, and connects with the interchange of \( n \) and \( r \) already noted.

\[3\] Since writing the above I have seen Laidlaw's almost identical suggestion of a nasal interpolated in Nagarahāra (JASB. 1848, art. on Kittoe). The change is of course found elsewhere; is not Tānk for Tāq an instance?
Nangrahār, and by force of their numbers made this corruption current,—that this was recognized as the name of the town while the Town-of-towns was great or in men’s memory, and that when through the decay of the town its name became a meaningless husk, the wrong meaning of the Nine-streams should enter into possession.

But as another and better one can be put together, this fair-seeming story may be baseless. Its substitute has the advantage of explaining the double sequence of names shown in Section b.

The second story makes all the variant names represent one or other of two distinct originals. It leaves Nangrahār to represent Nagarahāra, the dead town; it makes the nine torrents of Safed-koh the primeval sponsors of Ning-nahār, the name of the riverain tract. Both names, it makes contemporary in the relatively brief interlude of the life of the town. For the fertilizing streams will have been the dominant factors of settlement and of revenue from the earliest times of population and government. They arrest the eye where they and their ribbons of cultivation space the riverain waste; they are obvious units for grouping into a sub-government. Their name has a counterpart in adjacent Panj-āb; the two may have been given by one dominant power, how long ago, in what tongue matters not. The riverain tract, by virtue of its place on a highway of transit, must have been inhabited long before the town Nagarahāra was built, and must have been known by a name. What better one than Nine-streams can be thought of?

2. Bellew is quoted by the Gazetteer of India (ed. 1907) as saying, in his argument in favour of navā vihāra, that no nine streams are found to stand sponsor, but modern maps shew nine outflows from Safed-koh to the Kābul-river between the Sūrkh-rūd and Daka, while if affluents to the former stream be reckoned, more than nine issue from the range.¹

Against Bellew’s view that there are not nine streams, is the long persistence of the number nine in the popular name (Sect. b).

¹ These affluents I omit from main consideration as sponsors because they are less obvious units of taxable land than the direct affluents of the Kābul-river, but they remain a reserve force of argument and may or may not have counted in Bābur’s nine.
It is also against his view that he supposes there were nine monasteries, because each of the nine must have had its fertilizing water.

Bābur says there were nine; there must have been nine of significance; he knew his tūmān not only by frequent transit but by his revenue accounts. A supporting point in those accounts is likely to have been that the individual names of the villages on the nine streams would appear, with each its payment of revenue.

3. In this also is some weight of circumstance against taking Nagarahāra to be the parent of Nīng-nahār:—An earlier name of the town is said to be Udyānapūra, Garden town.¹ Of this Bābur's Adinapūr is held to be a corruption; the same meaning of garden has survived on approximately the same ground in Bālā-bāgh and Rozābād.

Nagarahāra is seen, therefore, to be a parenthetical name between others which are all derived from gardens. It may shew the promotion of a "Garden-town" to a "Chief-town". If it did this, there was relapse of name when the Chief-town lost status. Was it ever applied beyond the delta? If it were, would it, when dead in the delta, persist along the riverain tract? If it were not, cadit questio; the suggestion of two names distinct in origin, is upheld.

Certainly the riverain tract would fall naturally under the government of any town flourishing in the delta, the richest and most populous part of the region. But for this very reason it must have had a name older than parenthetical Nagarahāra. That inevitable name would be appropriately Nīng-nahār (or Na-nahār) Nine-streams; and for a period Nagarahāra would be the Chief-town of the district of Na-nahār (Nine-streams).²

d. Bābur's statements about the name.

What the cautious Bābur says of his tūmān of Nīng-nahār has weight:—

1. That some histories write it Nagarahār (Ḥaidarābād Codex, f. 131 b);

1 Cunningham, i, 42. My topic does not reach across the Kābul-river to the greater Udyānapūra of Beal's Buddhist Records (p. 119) nor raise the question of the extent of that place.

2 The strong form Nīng-nahār is due to euphonic impulse.
2. ThatNING-nahār is nine torrents, *i.e.* mountain streams, *tūquz-rūd*;

3. That (the) nine torrents issue from Safed-koh (f. 132 b).

Of his first statement can be said, that he will have seen the book-name in histories he read, but will have heard Ning-nahār, probably also have seen it in current letters and accounts.

Of his second,—that it bears and may be meant to bear two senses, *(a)* that the *tūmān* consisted of nine torrents,—their lands implied; just as he says "Asfara is four *būlūks*" (subdivisions f. 3b)—*(b)* that *tūqūz rūd* translates ning-nahār.

Of his third,—that in English its sense varies as it is read with or without the definite article Turkī rarely writes, but that either sense helps out his first and second, to mean that verbally and by its constituent units Ning-nahār is nine-torrents; as verbally and by its constituents Panj-āb is five-waters.

e. Last words.

Detailed work on the Kābul section of the *Bābur-nāma* has stamped two impressions so deeply on me, that they claim mention, not as novel or as special to myself, but as set by the work.

The first is of extreme risk in swift decision on any problem of words arising in North Afghānistān, because of its local concourse of tongues, the varied utterance of its unlettered tribes resident or nomad, and the frequent translation of proper names in obedience to their verbal meanings. Names lie there too in strata, relics of successive occupation—Greek, Turkī, Hindi, Pushtū and tribes galore.

The second is that the region is an exceptionally fruitful field for first-hand observation of speech, the movent ocean of the uttered word, free of the desiccated symbolism of alphabets and books.

The following books, amongst others, have prompted the above note:—

F.—ON THE NAME DARA-I-NÛR

Some European writers have understood the name Dara-i-nûr to mean Valley of light, but natural features and also the artificial one mentioned by Colonel H. G. Tanner (infra), make it better to read the component nûr, not as Persian nûr, light, but, as Pushtû nûr, rock. Hence it translates as Valley of Rocks, or Rock-valley. The region in which the valley lies is rocky and boulder-strewn; its own waters flow to the Kâbul-river east of the water of Chitrâl. It shews other names composed with nûr, in which nûr suits if it means rock, but is inexplicable if it means light, e.g. Nûr-lâm (Nûr-fort), the master-fort in the mouth of Nûr-valley, standing high on a rock between two streams, as Bâbur and Tanner have both described it from eye-witness,—Nûr-gal (village), a little to the north-west of the valley,—Aülûgh-nûr (great rock), at a crossing mentioned by Bâbur, higher up the Bârân-water,—and Koh-i-nûr (Rocky-mountains),
which there is ground for taking as the correct form of the familiar "Kunar" of some European writers (Raverty's *Notes*, p. 106). The dominant feature in these places dictates reading nūr as rock; so too the work done in Nūr-valley with boulders, of which Colonel H. G. Tanner's interesting account is subjoined (P.R.G.S. 1881, p. 284).

"Some 10 miles from the source of the main stream of the Nur-valley the Dameneh stream enters, but the waters of the two never meet; they flow side by side about three-quarters of a mile apart for about 12 miles and empty themselves into the Kunar river by different mouths, each torrent hugging closely the foot of the hills at its own side of the valley. Now, except in countries where terracing has been practised continuously for thousands of years, such unnatural topography as exists in the valley of Nur is next to impossible. The forces which were sufficient to scoop out the valley in the first instance, would have kept a water-way at the lowest part, into which would have poured the drainage of the surrounding mountains; but in the Nur-valley long-continued terracing has gradually raised the centre of the valley high above the edges. The population has increased to its maximum limit and every available inch of ground is required for cultivation; the people, by means of terrace-walls built of ponderous boulders in the bed of the original single stream, have little by little pushed the waters out of their true course, until they run, where now found, in deep rocky cuttings at the foot of the hills on either side" (p. 280).

"I should like to go on and say a good deal more about boulders; and while I am about it I may as well mention one that lies back from a hamlet in Shulut, which is so big that a house is built in a fault or crack running across its face. Another pebble lies athwart the village and covers the whole of the houses from that side."
G.—ON THE NAMES OF TWO DARA-I-NŪR WINES.

From the two names, Arat-tāshī and Sūhān (Suhār) -tāshī, which Bābur gives as those of two wines of the Dara-i-nūr, it can be inferred that he read nūr to mean rock. For if in them Turki tāsh, rock, be replaced by Pushtū nūr, rock, two place-names emerge, Arat (-nūrī) and Sūhān (-nūrī), known in the Nūr-valley.

These may be villages where the wines were grown, but it would be quite exceptional for Bābur to say that wines are called from their villages, or indeed by any name. He says here not where they grow but what they are called.

I surmise that he is repeating a joke, perhaps his own, perhaps a standing local one, made on the quality of the wines. For whether with tāsh or with nūr (rock), the names can be translated as Rock-saw and Rock-file, and may refer to the rough and acid quality of the wines, rasping and setting the teeth on edge as does iron on stone.

The villages themselves may owe their names to a serrated edge or splintered pinnacle of weathered granite, in which local people, known as good craftsmen, have seen resemblance to tools of their trade.

H.—ON THE COUNTERMARK BIH BŪD
ON COINS.

As coins of Sl. Ḥusain Mīrzā Bāi-qarā and other rulers do actually bear the words Bih būd, Bābur's statement that the
name of Bihbūd Beg was on the Mīrzā's coins acquires a numismatic interest which may make serviceable the following particulars concerning the passage and the beg.\(^1\)

*a. The Turkī passage* (Elph. MS. f. 135b; Ĥaidarābād Codex f. 173b; Ilminsky p. 217).

For ease of reference the Turkī, Persian and English version are subjoined:


*Dīyar Bihbūd Beg būd. Auwalhā dar jīrga-i-chuhrahā khidmat mikard. Chūn dar qāsāqihā Mīrzārā khidmat karda būd u ānrā mulāḥāsa namūda, aīnrā ‘ināyat karda būd kah dar tamghānāt sikka\(^2\) nām-i-au būd.*

(3) A literal English translation of the Turkī:

Another was Bihbūd Beg. He served formerly in the chuhra-jīrga-sī (corps of braves). Looking to his service in the Mīrzā’s guerilla-times, the favour had been done to Bihbūd Beg that his name was on the stamp and coin.\(^3\)

*b. Of Bihbūd Beg.*

We have found little so far to add to what Bābur tells of Bihbūd Beg and what he tells we have not found elsewhere. The likely sources of his information are Daulat Shāh and Khwānd-amīr who have written at length of Ḥusain Bāī-qarā. Considerable search in the books of both men has failed to discover mention of signal service or public honour connected with the beg. Bābur may have heard what he tells in Harāt in 912 AH. (1506 AD.) when he would see Ḥusain’s coins.

---

\(^1\) Some discussion about these coins has already appeared in *JRAS.* 1913 and 1914 from Dr. Codrington, Mr. M. Longworth Dames and my husband.

\(^2\) This variant from the Turkī may be significant. Should *tamghānāt(-i-)sikka* be read and does this describe countermarking?

\(^3\) It will be observed that Bābur does not explicitly say that Ḥusain put the beg’s name on the coin.
presumably; but later opportunity to see them must have been frequent during his campaigns and visits north of Hindu-kush, notably in Balkh.

The sole mention we have found of Bihbūd Beg in the Ḥabību's-siyar is that he was one of Ḥusain's commanders at the battle of Chikmān-sarāī which was fought with Sl. Māhmūd Mīrzā Mīrānshāhī in Muḥarram 876 AH. (June–July 1471 AD.).¹ His place in the list shews him to have had importance.

"Amīr Niẓāmu'd-dīn 'Alī-sher's brother Darwesh-i-'ālī the librarian (q.v. Ḥai. Codex Index), and Amīr Bihbūd, and Muḥ. 'Alī ātāka, and Bakhshīka, and Shāh Walī Qīpchāq, and Dost-i-muḥammad chuhra, and Amīr Qul-i-'ālī, and" (another).

The total of our information about the man is therefore:—

(1) That when Ḥusain² from 861 to 873 AH. (1457 to 1469 AD.) was fighting his way up to the throne of Harāt, Bihbūd served him well in the corps of braves, (as many others will have done).

(2) That he was a beg and one of Ḥusain's commanders in 876 AH. (1471 AD.).

(3) That Bābur includes him amongst Ḥusain's begs and says of him what has been quoted, doing this circa 934 AH. (1528 AD.), some 56 years after Khwānd-amīr's mention of him s.a. 876 AH. (1471 AD.).

c. Of the term chuhra-jīrga-sī used by Bābur.

Of this term Bābur supplies an explicit explanation which I have not found in European writings. His own book amply exemplifies his explanation, as do also Khwānd-amīr's and Ḥайдar's.

He gives the explanation (f. 15b) when describing a retainer of his father's who afterwards became one of his own begs. It is as follows:—

"'Alī-darwesh of Khūrāsān served in the Khūrāsān chuhrā-jīrga-sī, one of two special corps (khasha tābin) of serviceable braves (yārār yiğītlâr) formed by Sl. Abū-sa'id Mīrzā when

¹ Ḥabību's-siyar lith. ed. iii, 228; Ḥайдarābād Codex text and trs. f. 26b and f. 169; Browne's Daulat Shāh p. 533.
² Ḥusain born 842 AH. (1438 AD.); d. 911 AH. (1506 AD.).
he first began to arrange the government of Khurāsān and Samarkand and, presumably, called by him the Khurāsān corps and the Samarkand corps.”

This shews the circle to have consisted of fighting-men, such serviceable braves as are frequently mentioned by Bābur; and his words “yārār ğīgit” make it safe to say that if instead of using a Persian phrase, he had used a Turki one, ğīgit, brave would have replaced chuhra, “young soldier” (Erskine). A considerable number of men on active service are styled chuhra, one at least is styled ğīgit, in the same way as others are styled beg.¹

Three military circles are mentioned in the Bābur-nāma, consisting respectively of braves, household begs (under Bābur’s own command), and great begs. Some men are mentioned who never rose from the rank of brave (īgīt), some who became household-begs, some who went through the three grades.

Of the corps of braves Bābur conveys the information that Abū-sa‘id founded it at a date which will have lain between 1451 and 1457 AD.; that ‘Umar Shaikh’s man ‘Ali-darwesh belonged to it; and that Hūsain’s man Bihbūd did so also. Both men, ‘Ali-darwesh and Bihbūd, when in its circle, would appropriately be styled chuhra as men of the beg-circle were styled beg; the Dost-i-muḥammad chuhra who was a commander, (he will have had a brave’s command,) at Chīkmān-sarāī (see list supra) will also have been of this circle. Instances of the use by Bābur of the name khaṣa-tābin and its equivalent būtīkīnī are shewn on f. 209 and f. 210b. A considerable number of Bābur’s fighting men, the braves he so frequently mentions as sent on service, are styled chuhra and inferentially belong to the same circle.²

¹ Cf. f. 7b note to braves (īgīltār). There may be instances, in the earlier Farghāna section where I have translated chuhra wrongly by phrase. My attention had not then been fixed on the passage about the coins, nor had I the same familiarity with the Kābul section. For a household page to be clearly recognizable as such from the context, is rare—other uses of the word are translated as their context dictates.

² They can be traced through my Index and in some cases their careers followed. Since I translated chuhra-jīrga-sī on f. 15b by cadet-corps, I have found in the Kābul section instances of long service in the corps which make the word cadet, as it is used in English, too young a name.
d. Of Bih būd on Ḥusain Bāi-qarā’s coins.

So far it does not seem safe to accept Bābur’s statement literally. He may tell a half-truth and obscure the rest by his brevity.

Nothing in the sources shows ground for signal and public honour to Bihbud Beg, but a good deal would allow surmise that jesting allusion to his name might decide for Bih būd as a coin mark when choice had to be made of one, in the flush of success, in an assembly of the begs, and, amongst those begs, lovers of word-play and enigma.

The personal name is found written Bihbūd, as one word and with medial h; the mark is Bih būd with the terminal h in the Bih. There have been discussions moreover as to whether to read on the coins Bih būd, it was good, or Bih buvad, let it be, or become, good (valid for currency?).

The question presents itself; would the beg’s name have appeared on the coins, if it had not coincided in form with a suitable coin-mark?

Against literal acceptance of Bābur’s statement there is also doubt of a thing at once so ben trovato and so unsupported by evidence.

Another doubt arises from finding Bih būd on coins of other rulers, one of Iskandar Khān’s being of a later date, of Timūr, Shāhrukh and Abū-sa’īd, with nothing to shew who counterstruck it on them.

On some of Husain’s coins the sentence Bih būd appears as part of the legend and not as a counterstrike. This is a good basis for finding a half-truth in Bābur’s statement. It does not allow of a whole-truth in his statement because, as it is written, it is a coin-mark, not a name.

An interesting matter as bearing on Ḥusain’s use of Bih būd is that in 865 AH. (1461 AD.) he had an incomparable horse named Bihbūd, one he gave in return for a falcon on making peace with Mustapha Khān.1

1 This Mr. M. Longworth Dames pointed out in JRAS. 1913.
2 Habību’s-siyar lith. ed. iii, 219; Ferté trs. p. 28. For the information about Husain’s coins given in this appendix I am indebted to Dr. Codrington and Mr. M. Longworth Dames.
e. Of Bābur’s vassal-coinage.

The following historical details narrow the field of numismatic observation on coins believed struck by Bābur as a vassal of Ismā’īl Șafawi. They are offered because not readily accessible.

The length of Bābur’s second term of rule in Transoxiana was not the three solar years of the B.M. Coin Catalogues but did not exceed eight months. He entered Samarkand in the middle of Rajab 917 AH. (c. Oct. 1st, 1511 AD.). He returned to it defeated and fled at once, after the battle of Kūl-i-malik which was fought in Šafar 918 AH. (mid-April to mid-May 1512 AD.). Previous to the entry he was in the field, without a fixed base; after his flight he was landless till at the end both of 920 AH. and of 1514 AD. he had returned to Kābul.

He would not find a full Treasury in Samarkand because the Aūzbegs evacuated the fort at their own time; eight months would not give him large tribute in kind. He failed in Transoxiana because he was the ally of a Shi’a; would coins bearing the Shi’a legend have passed current from a Samarkand mint? These various circumstances suggest that he could not have struck many coins of any kind in Samarkand.

The coins classed in the B.M. Catalogues as of Bābur’s vassalage, offer a point of difficulty to readers of his own writings, inasmuch as neither the “Sultān Muḥammad” of No. 652 (gold), nor the “Sultān Bābur Bahādur” of the silver coins enables confident acceptance of them as names he himself would use.

I.—ON THE WEEPING-WILLOWS OF f. 190b.

The passage omitted from f. 190b, which seems to describe something decorative done with weeping willows, (bed-i-mawallah) has been difficult to all translators. This may be due to inaccurate pointing in Bābur’s original MS. or may be what a traveller seeing other willows at another feast could explain.
The first Persian translation omits the passage (I.O. 215 f. 154b); the second varies from the Turki, notably by changing sāch and sāj to shākh throughout (I.O. 217 f. 150b). The English and French translations differ much (Memoirs p. 206, Mémoires i, 414), the latter taking the mawallah to be mūla, a hut, against which much is clear in the various MSS.

Three Turki sources agree in reading as follows:—

Mawallah-nī (or mawallah Hai. MS.) kiltürdīlār. Bilmān sāchlāri-ning yā 'amlī sāchlāri-ning ārālārīgha k:msān-nī (Ilminsky, kamān) shākh-ning (Hai. MS. sākh) aūzūnlūghi bīla aīnjīga aīnjīga kīsīb, qūūb tūrlār.

The English and French translations differ from the Turki and from one another:—

(Memoirs, p. 206) They brought in branching willow-trees. I do not know if they were in the natural state of the tree, or if the branches were formed artificially, but they had small twigs cut the length of the ears of a bow and inserted between them.

(Mémoires i, 434) On façonna des huttes (mouleks). Ils les établissent en taillant des baguettes minces, de la longeur du bout recourbé de l’arc, qu’on place entre des branches naturelles ou façonnées artificiellement, je l’ignore.

The construction of the sentence appears to be thus:—Mawallah-nī kiltürdīlār, they brought weeping-willows; k:msān-nī qūūbtūrlār, they had put k:msān-nī; aīnjīga aīnjīga kīsīb, cut very fine (or slender); shākh (or sākh)-ning aūzūnlūghi, of the length of a shākh, bow, or sākh . . . ; bilmān sāchlāri-ning yā 'amlī sāchlāri-ning ārālārīgha, to (or at) the spaces of the sāchlār whether their (i.e. the willows’) own or artificial sāchlār.

These translations clearly indicate felt difficulty. Mr. Erskine does not seem to have understood that the trees were Salix babylonica. The crux of the passage is the word k:msān-nī, which tells what was placed in the spaces. It has been read as kamān, bow, by all but the scribes of the two good Turki MSS. and as in a phrase horn of a bow. This however is not allowed by the Turki, for the reason that k:msan-nī is not in the genitive but in the accusative case. (I may say that Bābur does not use ni for ning; he keeps strictly to the prime uses of each enclitic,

1 Elphinstone MS. f. 190b; Hajdarābād MS. f. 190b; Ilminsky, imprint p. 241.
Moreover, if $k:msân-nî$ be taken as a genitive, the verbs $qîîub-tîlûr$ and $kîsîb$ have no object, no other accusative appearing in the sentence than $k:msân-nî$.

A weighty reason against changing $sâch$ into $shâkh$ is that Dr. Ilminsky has not done so. He must have attached meaning to $sâch$ since he uses it throughout the passage. He was nearer the region wherein the original willows were seen at a feast. Unfortunately nothing shows how he interpreted the word.

$Sâchmâq$ is a tassel; is it also a catkin and were there decorations, $kîmsân-nî$ (things $kîmsa$, or flowers Ar. $kim$, or something shining, $kîmcha$, gold brocade) hung in between the catkins?

Ilminsky writes $mû'lây$ (with $hâmza$) and this de Courteille translates by hut. The ʿ Hai. MS. writes $muwallah$ (marking the $ṣamma$).

In favour of reading $mawallah$ ($mulah$) as a tree and that tree $Salix babylonica$ the weeping-willow, there are annotations in the Second Persian translation and, perhaps following it, in the Elphinstone MS. of $nâm-i-dirakht$, name of a tree, $dîdân-i-bed$, sight of the willow, $bed-i-mawallah$, mournful-willow. Standing alone $mawallah$ means weeping-willow, in this use answering to majnûn the name Panj-âbîs give the tree, from Leila's lover the distracted i.e. Majnûn (Brandis).

The whole question may be solved by a chance remark from a traveller witnessing similar festive decoration at another feast in that conservative region.

J.—ON BĀBUR'S EXCAVATED CHAMBER AT QANDAHĀR (f. 208b).

Since making my note (f. 208b) on the wording of the passage in which Bābur mentions excavation done by him at Qandahār, I have learned that he must be speaking of the vaulted chamber
containing the celebrated inscriptions about which much has been written.¹

The primary inscription, the one commemorating Bābur’s final possession of Qandahār, gives the chamber the character of a Temple of Victory and speaks of it as Rawāq-i-jahān namāi, World-shewing-portal,² doubtless because of its conspicuous position and its extensive view, probably also in allusion to its declaration of victory. Mīr Maṣūm writes of it as a Pesh-ṭāq, frontal arch, which, coupled with Mohan Lall’s word arch (ṭāq) suggests that the chamber was entered through an arch pierced in a parallelogram smoothed on the rock and having resemblance to the pesh-ṭāq of buildings, a suggestion seeming the more probable that some inscriptions are on the “wings” of the arch. But by neither of the above-mentioned names do Mohan Lall and later travellers call the chamber or write of the place; all describe it by its approach of forty steps, Chihil-zīna.³

The excavation has been chipped out of the white-veined limestone of the bare ridge on and below which stood Old Qandahār.³ It does not appear from the descriptions to have been on the summit of the ridge; Bellew says that the forty steps start half-way up the height. I have found no estimate of the height of the ridge, or statement that the steps end at the chamber. The ridge however seems to have been of noticeably dominating height. It rises steeply to the north and there ends in the naze of which Bābur writes. The foot of the steps is guarded by two towers. Mohan Lall, unaccustomed to mountains, found their ascent steep and dizzy. The excavated chamber of the inscriptions, which Bellew describes as “bow-shaped and dome-roofed”, he estimated as 12 feet at the highest point,

¹ Muḥ. Maṣūm Bhakkari’s Tārīḵ-i-sind 1600, Malet’s Trs. 1855, p. 89; Mohan Lall’s Journal 1834, p. 279 and Travels 1846, p. 311; Bellew’s Political Mission to Afghanistan 1857, p. 232; Journal Asiatique 1890, Darmesteter’s La grande inscription de Qandahār; JRAS. 1898, Beames’ Geography of the Qandahār inscription. Murray’s Hand-book of the Punjab etc. 1883 has an account which as to the Inscriptions shares in the inaccuracies of its sources (Bellew & Lumsden).

² The plan of Qandahār given in the official account of the Second Afghan War, makes Chihil-zīna appear on the wrong side of the ridge, n.w. instead of n.e.

³ destroyed in 1714 A.D. It lay 3 m. west of the present Qandahār (not its immediate successor). It must be observed that Darmesteter’s insufficient help in plans and maps led him to identify Chihil-zīna with Chihil-dukhtārān (Forty-daughters).
12 feet deep and 8 feet wide. Two sculptured beasts guard the entrance; Bellew calls them leopards but tigers would better symbolize the watch and ward of the Tiger Bābūr. In truth the whole work, weary steps of approach, tiger guardians, commemorative chamber, laboriously incised words, are admirably symbolic of his long-sustained resolve and action, taken always with Hindūstān as the goal.

There are several inscriptions of varying date, within and without the chamber. Mohan Lall saw and copied them; Darmesteter worked on a copy; the two English observers Lumsden and Bellew made no attempt at correct interpretation. In the versions all give there are inaccuracies, arising from obvious causes, especially from want of historical data. The last word has not been said; revision awaits photography and the leisured expert. A part of the needed revision has been done by Beames, who deals with the geography of what Mīr Maʿṣūm himself added under Akbar after he had gone as Governor to Qandahār in 1007 AH. (1598 AD.). This commemorates not Bābūr's but Akbar's century of cities.

It is the primary inscription only which concerns this Appendix. This is one in relief in the dome of the chamber, recording in florid Persian that Abūl-ghāzī Bābūr took possession of Qandahār on Shawwāl 13th 928 AH. (Sep. 1st 1522 AD.), that in the same year he commanded the construction of this Rawāq-i-jahān-namāī, and that the work had been completed by his son Kāmrān at the time he made over charge of Qandahār to his brother 'Askārī in 9 . . (mutilated). After this the gravure changes in character.

In the above, Bābūr's title Abūl-ghāzī fixes the date of the inscription as later than the battle of Kanwāha (f. 324b), because it was assumed in consequence of this victory over a Hindū, in March 1527 (Jumāda II 933 AH.).

The mutilated date 9 . . is given by Mohan Lall as 952 AH. but this does not suit several circumstances, e.g. it puts completion too far beyond the time mentioned as consumed by the work, nine years,—and it was not that at which Kāmrān made over charge to 'Askārī, but followed the expulsion of both full-brothers from Qandahār by their half-brother Humāyūn.
J.—BĀBUR’S EXCAVATED CHAMBER AT QANDAHĀR

The mutilated date 9... is given by Darmesteter as 933 AH. but this again does not fit the historical circumstance that Kāmrān was in Qandahār after that date and till 937 AH. This date (937 AH.) we suggest as fitting to replace the lost figures, (1) because in that year and after his father’s death, Kāmrān gave the town to ‘Askarī and went himself to Hindūstān, and (2) because work begun in 928 AH. and recorded as occupying 70–80 men for nine years would be complete in 937 AH.¹ The inscription would be one of the last items of the work.

The following matters are added here because indirectly connected with what has been said and because not readily accessible.

a. Birth of Kāmrān.

Kāmrān’s birth falling in a year of one of the Bābur-nāma gaps, is nowhere mentioned. It can be closely inferred as 914 or 915 AH. from the circumstances that he was younger than Humāyūn born late in 913 AH., that it is not mentioned in the fragment of the annals of 914 AH., and that he was one of the children enumerated by Gul-badan as going with her father to Samarkand in 916 AH. (Probably the children did not start with their father in the depth of winter across the mountains.) Possibly the joyful name Kāmrān is linked to the happy issue of the Mughul rebellion of 914 AH. Kāmrān would thus be about 18 when left in charge of Kābul and Qandahār by Bābur in 932 AH. before the start for the fifth expedition to Hindūstān.

A letter from Bābur to Kāmrān in Qandahār is with Kehr’s Latin version of the Bābur-nāma, in Latin and entered on the lining of the cover. It is shewn by its main topic viz. the despatch of Ibrāhīm Lūdī’s son to Kāmrān’s charge, to date somewhere close to Jan. 3rd 1527 (Rabi‘u’l-awwal 29th 933 AH.) because on that day Bābur writes of the despatch (Ḥai. Codex f. 306b foot).

Presumably the letter was with Kāmrān’s own copy of the Bābur-nāma. That copy may have reached Humāyūn’s hands

¹ Tārīkh-i-rashīdī trs. p. 387; Akbar-nāma trs. i, 290.
(JRAS 1908 p. 828 et seq.). The next known indication of the letter is given in St. Petersburg by Dr. Kehr. He will have seen it or a copy of it with the B.N. Codex he copied (one of unequal correctness), and he, no doubt, copied it in its place on the fly-leaf or board of his own transcript, but if so, it has disappeared.

Fuller particulars of it and of other items accompanying it are given in JRAS 1908 p. 828 et seq.

K.—AN AFGHĀN LEGEND.

My husband’s article in the Asiatic Quarterly Review of April 1901 begins with an account of the two MSS. from which it is drawn, viz. I.O. 581 in Pushtū, I.O. 582 in Persian. Both are mainly occupied with an account of the Yūsuf-zāī. The second opens by telling of the power of the tribe in Afghanistān and of the kindness of Malik Shāh Sulaimān, one of their chiefs, to Aūlūgh Beg Mīrzā Kābulī, (Bābur’s paternal uncle,) when he was young and in trouble, presumably as a boy ruler.

It relates that one day a wise man of the tribe, Shaikh ‘Uṣmān saw Sulaimān sitting with the young Mīrzā on his knee and warned him that the boy had the eyes of Yazīd and would destroy him and his family as Yazīd had destroyed that of the Prophet. Sulaimān paid him no attention and gave the Mīrzā his daughter in marriage. Subsequently the Mīrzā having invited the Yūsuf-zāī to Kābul, treacherously killed Sulaimān and 700 of his followers. They were killed at the place called Siyāh-sang near Kābul; it is still known, writes the chronicler in about 1770 AD. (1184 AH.), as the Grave of the Martyrs. Their tombs are reverred and that of Shaikh ‘Uṣmān in particular.

Shāh Sulaimān was the eldest of the seven sons of Malik Tāju’d-dīn; the second was Sultān Shāh, the father of Malik Aḥmad. Before Sulaimān was killed he made three requests
of Aūlūgh Beg; one of them was that his nephew Aḥmad's life might be spared. This was granted.

Aūlūgh Beg died (after ruling from 865 to 907 AH.), and Bābur defeated his son-in-law and successor M. Muqīm (Arghūn, 910 AH.). Meantime the Yūsuf-zāī had migrated to Pashāwar but later on took Sawād from Sl. Wais (Ḥai. Codex ff. 219, 220b, 221).

When Bābur came to rule in Kābul, he at first professed friendship for the Yūsuf-zāī but became prejudiced against them through their enemies the Dilazāk who gave force to their charges by a promised subsidy of 70,000 shāhrukhī. Bābur therefore determined, says the Yūsuf-zāī chronicler, to kill Malik Aḥmad and so wrote him a friendly invitation to Kābul. Aḥmad agreed to go, and set out with four brothers who were famous musicians. Meanwhile the Dilazāk had persuaded Bābur to put Aḥmad to death at once, for they said Aḥmad was so clever and eloquent that if allowed to speak, he would induce the Pādshāh to pardon him.

On Aḥmad's arrival in Kābul, he is said to have learned that Bābur's real object was his death. His companions wanted to tie their turbans together and let him down over the wall of the fort, but he rejected their proposal as too dangerous for him and them, and resolved to await his fate. He told his companions however, except one of the musicians, to go into hiding in the town.

Next morning there was a great assembly and Bābur sat on the dais-throne. Aḥmad made his reverence on entering but Bābur's only acknowledgment was to make bow and arrow ready to shoot him. When Aḥmad saw that Bābur's intention was to shoot him down without allowing him to speak, he unbuttoned his jerkin and stood still before the Pādshāh. Bābur, astonished, relaxed the tension of his bow and asked Aḥmad what he meant. Aḥmad's only reply was to tell the Pādshāh not to question him but to do what he intended. Bābur again asked his meaning and again got the same reply.

1 Ḥai. Codex, Index sunn.
2 It is needless to say that a good deal in this story may be merely fear and supposition accepted as occurrence.
Bābur put the same question a third time, adding that he could not dispose of the matter without knowing more. Then Aḥmad opened the mouth of praise, expatiated on Bābur's excellencies and said that in this great assemblage many of his subjects were looking on to see the shooting; that his jerkin being very thick, the arrow might not pierce it; the shot might fail and the spectators blame the Pādshāh for missing his mark; for these reasons he had thought it best to bare his breast. Bābur was so pleased by this reply that he resolved to pardon Aḥmad at once, and laid down his bow.

Said he to Aḥmad, "What sort of man is Buhlūl Lūdī?"

"A giver of horses," said Aḥmad.

"And of what sort his son Sīkandar?" "A giver of robes."

"And of what sort is Bābur?" "He," said Aḥmad, "is a giver of heads."

"Then," rejoined Bābur, "I give you yours."

The Pādshāh now became quite friendly with Aḥmad, came down from his throne, took him by the hand and led him into another room where they drank together. Three times did Bābur have his cup filled, and after drinking a portion, give the rest to Aḥmad. At length the wine mounted to Bābur's head; he grew merry and began to dance. Meantime Aḥmad's musician played and Aḥmad who knew Persian well, poured out an eloquent harangue. When Bābur had danced for some time, he held out his hands to Aḥmad for a reward (bakhshīsh), saying, "I am your performer." Three times did he open his hands, and thrice did Aḥmad, with a profound reverence, drop a gold coin into them. Bābur took the coins, each time placing his hand on his head. He then took off his robe and gave it to Aḥmad; Aḥmad took off his own coat, gave it to Adu the musician, and put on what the Pādshāh had given.

Aḥmad returned safe to his tribe. He declined a second invitation to Kābul, and sent in his stead his brother Shāh Maṅṣūr. Maṅṣūr received speedy dismissal as Bābur was displeased at Aḥmad's not coming. On his return to his tribe Maṅṣūr advised them to retire to the mountains and make a strong sangur. This they did; as foretold, Bābur came into their country with a large army. He devastated their lands
but could make no impression on their fort. In order the better to judge of its character, he, as was his wont, disguised himself as a Qalandar, and went with friends one dark night to the Mahūra hill where the stronghold was, a day’s journey from the Pādshāh’s camp at Dīārūn.

It was the ’Īd-i-qurbān and there was a great assembly and feasting at Shāh Manṣūr’s house, at the back of the Mahūra-mountain, still known as Shāh Manṣūr’s throne. Bābur went in his disguise to the back of the house and stood among the crowd in the courtyard. He asked servants as they went to and fro about Shāh Manṣūr’s family and whether he had a daughter. They gave him straightforward answers.

At the time Musammat Bibī Mubāraka, Shāh Manṣūr’s daughter was sitting with other women in a tent. Her eye fell on the qalandars and she sent a servant to Bābur with some cooked meat folded between two loaves. Bābur asked who had sent it; the servant said it was Shāh Manṣūr’s daughter Bibī Mubāraka. “Where is she?” “That is she, sitting in front of you in the tent.” Bābur Pādshāh became entranced with her beauty and asked the woman-servant, what was her disposition and her age and whether she was betrothed. The servant replied by extolling her mistress, saying that her virtue equalled her beauty, that she was pious and brimful of rectitude and placidity; also that she was not betrothed. Bābur then left with his friends, and behind the house hid between two stones the food that had been sent to him.

He returned to camp in perplexity as to what to do; he saw he could not take the fort; he was ashamed to return to Kābul with nothing effected; moreover he was in the fetters of love. He therefore wrote in friendly fashion to Malīk Aḥmad and asked for the daughter of Shāh Manṣūr, son of Shāh Sulaimān. Great objection was made and earlier misfortunes accruing to Yūsuf-zāī chief who had given daughters to Aūlūgh Beg and Sl. Wais (Khān Mīrzā?) were quoted. They even said they had no daughter to give. Bābur replied with a “beautiful” royal letter, told of his visit disguised to Shāh Manṣūr’s house, of his seeing Bibī Mubāraka and as token of the truth of his story, asked them to search for the food he had hidden. They
searched and found. Ahmad and Maṇṣūr were still averse, but the tribesmen urged that as before they had always made sacrifice for the tribe so should they do now, for by giving the daughter in marriage, they would save the tribe from Bābur's anger. The Maliks then said that it should be done "for the good of the tribe".

When their consent was made known to Bābur, the drums of joy were beaten and preparations were made for the marriage; presents were sent to the bride, a sword of his also, and the two Maliks started out to escort her. They are said to have come from Thana by M'amūra (?), crossed the river at Chakdara, taken a narrow road between two hills and past Talāsh-village to the back of Tīrī (?) where the Pādshāh's escort met them. The Maliks returned, spent one night at Chakdara and next morning reached their homes at the Mahūra sangur.

Meanwhile Runa the nurse who had control of Malik Maṇṣūr's household, with two other nurses and many male and female servants, went on with Bibī Mubāraka to the royal camp. The bride was set down with all honour at a large tent in the middle of the camp.

That night and on the following day the wives of the officers came to visit her but she paid them no attention. So, they said to one another as they were returning to their tents, "Her beauty is beyond question, but she has shewn us no kindness, and has not spoken to us; we do not know what mystery there is about her."

Now Bibī Mubāraka had charged her servants to let her know when the Pādshāh was approaching in order that she might receive him according to Malik Aḥmad's instructions. They said to her, "That was the pomp just now of the Pādshāh's going to prayers at the general mosque." That same day after the Mid-day Prayer, the Pādshāh went towards her tent. Her servants informed her, she immediately left her divan and advancing, lighted up the carpet by her presence, and stood respectfully with folded hands. When the Pādshāh entered, she bowed herself before him. But her face remained entirely covered. At length the Pādshāh seated himself on the divan and said to her, "Come Afgāniya, be seated." Again she
A second time he said, "Afghāniya, be seated." Again she prostrated herself before him and came a little nearer, but still stood. Then the Pādshāh pulled the veil from her face and beheld incomparable beauty. He was entranced, he said again, "O, Afghāniya, sit down." Then she bowed herself again, and said, "I have a petition to make. If an order be given, I will make it." The Pādshāh said kindly, "Speak." Whereupon she with both hands took up her dress and said, "Think that the whole Yūsuf-zāi tribe is enfolded in my skirt, and pardon their offences for my sake." Said the Pādshāh, "I forgive the Yūsuf-zāi all their offences in thy presence, and cast them all into thy skirt. Hereafter I shall have no ill-feeling to the Yūsuf-zāi." Again she bowed before him; the Pādshāh took her hand and led her to the divan.

When the Afternoon Prayer time came and the Pādshāh rose from the divan to go to prayers, Bibi Mubaraka jumped up and fetched him his shoes. He put them on and said very pleasantly, "I am extremely pleased with you and your tribe and I have pardoned them all for your sake." Then he said with a smile, "We know it was Malik Ahmad taught you all these ways." He then went to prayers and the Bibi remained to say hers in the tent.

After some days the camp moved from Diarun and proceeded by Bajaur and Tanki to Kabul. Bibi Mubaraka, the Blessed Lady, is often mentioned by Gul-badan; she had no children; and lived an honoured life, as her chronicler says, until the beginning of Akbar's reign, when she died. Her brother Mir Jamāl rose to honour under Bābur, Humāyūn and Akbar.

---

1 Always left beyond the carpet on which a reception is held.
2 This is not in agreement with Bābur's movements.
L.—ON MĀḤĪM’S ADOPTION OF HIND-ĀL.

The passage quoted below about Māḥīm’s adoption of the unborn Hind-āl we have found so far only in Kehr’s transcript of the Bābur-nāma (i.e. the St. Petersburg Foreign Office Codex). Ilminsky reproduced it (Kāsān imprint p. 281) and de Courteille translated it (ii, 45), both with endeavour at emendation. It is interpolated in Kehr’s MS. at the wrong place, thus indicating that it was once marginal or apart from the text.

I incline to suppose the whole a note made by Humāyūn, although part of it might be an explanation made by Bābur, at a later date, of an over-brief passage in his diary. Of such passages there are several instances. What is strongly against its being Bābur’s where otherwise it might be his, is that Māḥīm, as he always calls her simply, is there written of as Ḥazrat Wālīda, Royal Mother and with the honorific plural. That plural Bābur uses for his own mother (dead 14 years before 925 AH.) and never for Māḥīm. The note is as follows:—

“The explanation is this:—As up to that time those of one birth (tūqqān, womb) with him (Humāyūn), that is to say a son Bār-būl, who was younger than he but older than the rest, and three daughters, Mihr-jān and two others, died in childhood, he had a great wish for one of the same birth with him.1 I had said ‘What it would have been if there had been one of the same birth with him!’ (Humāyūn). Said the Royal Mother, ‘If Dil-dār Āghācha bear a son, how is it if I take him and rear him?’ ‘It is very good’ said I.”

So far doubtfully might be Bābur’s but it may be Humāyūn’s written as a note for Bābur. What follows appears to be by some-one who knew the details of Māḥīm’s household talk and was in Kābul when Dil-dār’s child was taken from her.

“Seemingly women have the custom of taking omens in the following way:—When they have said, ‘Is it to be a boy? is it

1 i.e. Humāyūn wished for a full-brother or sister, another child in the house with him. The above names of his brother and sister are given elsewhere only by Gulbadan (f. 66).
to be a girl? they write ‘Alī or Ḥasan on one of two pieces of paper and Fāṭima on the other, put each paper into a ball of clay and throw both into a bowl of water. Whichever opens first is taken as an omen; if the man’s, they say a man-child will be born; if the woman’s, a girl will be born. They took the omen; it came out a man.”

“On this glad tidings we at once sent letters off. A few days later God’s mercy bestowed a son. Three days before the news and three days after the birth, they took the child from its mother, (she) willy-nilly, brought it to our house and took it in their charge. When we sent the news of the birth, Bhīra was being taken. They named him Hind-āl for a good omen and benediction.”

The whole may be Humāyūn’s, and prompted by a wish to remove an obscurity his father had left and by sentiment stirred through reminiscence of a cherished childhood.

Whether Humāyūn wrote the whole or not, how is it that the passage appears only in the Russian group of Bāburiana?

An apparent answer to this lies in the following little mosaic of circumstances:—The St. Petersburg group of Bāburiana is linked to Kāmrān’s own copy of the Bābur-nāma by having with it a letter of Bābur to Kāmrān and also what may be a note indicating its passage into Humāyūn’s hands (JRAS 1908 p. 830). If it did so pass, a note by Humāyūn may have become associated with it, in one of several obvious ways. This would be at a date earlier than that of the Elphinstone MS. and would explain why it is found in Russia and not in Indian MSS.

1 The “we” might be Māhīm and Humāyūn, to Bābur in camp.
2 Perhaps before announcing the birth anywhere.
3 Presumably this plural is honorific for the Honoured Mother Māhīm.
4 Māhīm’s and Humāyūn’s quarters.
5 Gul-badan’s Humāyūn-nāma, f. 8.
7 In all such matters of the Bābur-nāma Codices, it has to be remembered that their number has been small.
[APPENDICES TO THE HINDÚSTĀN SECTION.]

M.—ON THE TERM BAHṆṆI QŪṬĀS.

That the term bahri qūṭās is interpreted by Meninski, Erskine, and de Courteille in senses so widely differing as equus maritimus, mountain-cow, and bœuf vert de mer is due, no doubt, to their writing when the qūṭās, the yāk, was less well known than it now is.

The word qūṭās represents both the yāk itself and its neck-tassel and tail. Hence Meninski explains it by nodus fimbriatus ex cauda seu crinibus equi maritim. His "sea-horse" appears to render bahri qūṭās, and is explicable by the circumstance that the same purposes are served by horse-tails and by yāk-tails and tassels, namely, with both, standards are fashioned, horse-equipage is ornamented or perhaps furnished with fly-flappers, and the ordinary hand-fly-flappers are made, i.e. the chowries of Anglo-India.

Erskine’s "mountain-cow" (Memoirs p. 317) may well be due to his munshi’s giving the yāk an alternative name, viz. Kosh-gau (Vigne) or Khāsh-gau (Ney Elias), which appears to mean mountain-cow (cattle, oxen).¹

De Courteille’s Dictionary p. 422, explains qūṭās (qūṭās) as bœuf marin (bahri qūṭās) and his Mémoires ii, 191, renders Bābur’s bahri qūṭās by bœuf vert de mer (f. 276, p. 490 and n. 8).

The term bahri qūṭās could be interpreted with more confidence if one knew where the seemingly Arabic-Turkī compound originated.² Bābur uses it in Hindūstān where the neck-tassel

¹ Vigne’s Travels in Kāshmir ii, 277–8; Türük-i-rashīdī trs., p. 302 and n. and p. 466 and note.
² It is not likely to be one heard current in Hindūstān, any more than is Bābur’s Ar. bū-galamūn as a name of a bird (Index s.n.); both seem to be “book-words” and may be traced or known as he uses them in some ancient dictionary or book of travels originating outside Hindūstān.

[a]
and the tail of the domestic yak are articles of commerce, and where, as also probably in Kabul, he will have known of the same class of yak as a saddle-animal and as a beast of burden into Kashmir and other border-lands of sufficient altitude to allow its survival. A part of its wide Central Asian habitat abutting on Kashmir is Little Tibet, through which flows the upper Indus and in which tame yak are largely bred, Skardo being a place specially mentioned by travellers as having them plentifully. This suggests that the term bahri qūṭās is due to the great river (bahri) and that those of which Babur wrote in Hindūstān were from Little Tibet and its great river. But bahri may apply to another region where also the domestic yak abounds, that of the great lakes, inland seas such as Pangong, whence the yak comes and goes between e.g. Yārkand and the Hindūstān border.

The second suggestion, viz. that "bahri qūṭās" refers to the habitat of the domestic yak in lake and marsh lands of high altitude (the wild yak also but, as Tibetan, it is less likely to be concerned here) has support in Dozy's account of the bahri falcon, a bird mentioned also by Abū'l-fazl amongst sporting birds (Āyin-i-akbarī, Blochmann'strs. p.295) :—"Bahri, espèce de faucon le meilleur pour les oiseaux de marais. Ce renseignement explique peut-être l'origine du mot. Marguerite en donne la même étymologie que Tashmend et le Père Guagix. Selon lui ce faucon aurait été appelé ainsi parce qu'il vient de l'autre côté de la mer, mais peut-être dériva-t-il de bahri dans le sens de marais, flaque, étang."

Dr. E. Denison Ross' Polyglot List of Birds (Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal ii, 289) gives to the Qarā Qirghāwal (Black pheasant) the synonym "Sea-pheasant", this being the literal translation of its Chinese name, and quotes from the Manchū-Chinese "Mirror" the remark that this is a black pheasant but called "sea-pheasant" to distinguish it from other black ones.

It may be observed that Babur writes of the yak once only and then of the bahri qūṭās so that there is no warrant from him for taking the term to apply to the wild yak. His cousin and
contemporary Haidar Mīrzā, however, mentions the wild yāk twice and simply as the wild qūtās.

The following are random gleanings about “bahri” and the yāk:—

(1) An instance of the use of the Persian equivalent ḏaryāʾī of bahri, sea-borne or over-sea, is found in the Akbar-nāma (Bib. Ind. ed. ii, 216) where the African elephant is described as ṣiḥ-ʾi-daryāʾī.

(2) In Egypt the word bahri has acquired the sense of northern, presumably referring to what lies or is borne across its northern sea, the Mediterranean.

(3) Vigne (Travels in Kashmir. ii, 277–8) warns against confounding the qūch-ḡār i.e. the gigantic moufflon, Pallas’ Ovis ammon, with the Kosh-gau, the cow of the Caucasus, i.e. the yāk. He says, “Kaucasus (hodie Hindū-kush) was originally from Kosh, and Kosh is applied occasionally as a prefix, e.g. Kosh-gau, the yāk or ox of the mountain or Caucasus.” He wrote from Skardo in Little Tibet and on the upper Indus. He gives the name of the female yāk as yāk-mo and of the half-breeds with common cows as bsch, which class he says is common and of “all colours”.

(4) Mr. Ney Elias’ notes (Tārīkh-i-rashidi trs. pp. 302 and 466) on the qūtās are of great interest. He gives the following synonymous names for the wild yāk, Bos Poéphagus, Khāsh-gau, the Tibetan yāk or Dong.

(5) Hume and Henderson (Lāhor to Yārkand p. 59) write of the numerous black yāk-hair tents seen round the Pangong Lake, of fine saddle yāks, and of the tame ones as being some white or brown but mostly black.

(6) Olufsen’s Through the Unknown Pamirs (p. 118) speaks of the large numbers of Bos grunniens (yāk) domesticated by the Kirghiz in the Pamirs.

(7) Cf. Gazetteer of India s.n. yāk.

(8) Shaikh Zain applies the word bahri to the porpoise, when paraphrasing the Bābur-nāma f. 281b.
N.—NOTES ON A FEW BIRDS.

In attempting to identify some of the birds of Bābur's lists difficulty arises from the variety of names provided by the different tongues of the region concerned, and also in some cases by the application of one name to differing birds. The following random gleanings enlarge and, in part, revise some earlier notes and translations of Mr. Erskine's and my own. They are offered as material for the use of those better acquainted with bird-lore and with Himālayan dialects.

a. Concerning the lūkha, lūja, lūcha, kūja (f.135 and f.278b).

The nearest word I have found to lūkha and its similars is likkhā, a florican (Jerdon, ii, 615), but the florican has not the chameleon colours of the lūkha (var.). As Bābur when writing in Hindūstān, uses such "book-words" as Ar. bahri (ɡūfās) and Ar. bū-galamūn (chameleon), it would not be strange if his name for the "lūkha" bird represented Ar. awja, very beautiful, or connected with Ar. loh, shining splendour.

The form kūja is found in Ilminsky's imprint p.361 (Mémoires ii, 198, koudjeh).

What is confusing to translators is that (as it now seems to me) Bābur appears to use the name kābg-i-dari in both passages (f.135 and f.278b) to represent two birds; (1) he compares the lūkha as to size with the kābg-i-dari of the Kābul region, and (2) for size and colour with that of Hindūstān. But the bird of the Western Himālayas known by the name kābg-i-dari is the Himālayan snow-cock, Tetraogallus himālayensis, Turki, aūlār and in the Kābul region, chiūrtika (f.249, Jerdon, ii, 549–50); while the kābg-i-dari (syn. chikor) of Hindūstān, whether of hill or plain, is one or more of much smaller birds.

The snow-cock being 28 inches in length, the lūkha bird must be of this size. Such birds as to size and plumage of changing colour are the Lophophori and Trapagons, varieties of which are found in places suiting Bābur's account of the lūkha.
It may be noted that the Himalayan snow-cock is still called kabg-i-darī in Afgānistān (Jerdon, ii, 550) and in Kashmir (Vigne's Travels in Kashmir ii, 18). As its range is up to 18,000 feet, its Persian name describes it correctly whether read as “of the mountains” (darī), or as “royal” (darī) through its splendour.

I add here the following notes of Mr. Erskine's, which I have not quoted already where they occur (cf. f.135 and f.278b):

On f.135, “lokheh” is said to mean hill-chikor.

On f.278b, to “lujeh”, “The Persian has lūkheh.”

“” to “kepki durri”, “The kepki deri, or durri is much larger than the common kep  of Persia and is peculiar to Khorāsān. It is said to be a beautiful bird. The common kep of Persia and Khorāsān is the hill-chikor of India.”

“” to “higher up”, “The lujeh may be the chikor of the plains which Hunter calls bartavelle or Greek partridge.”

The following corrections are needed about my own notes:—
(1) on f.135 (p.213) n.7 is wrongly referred; it belongs to the first word, viz. kabg-i-darī, of p.214; (2) on f.279 (p.496) n.2 should refer to the second kabg-i-darī.

b. Birds called mūnāl (var. monāl and moonaul).

Yule writing in Hobson Jobson (p.580) of the “moonaul” which he identifies as Lophophorus Impeyanus, queries whether, on grounds he gives, the word moonaul is connected etymologically with Sanscrit muni, an “eremite”. In continuation of his topic, I give here the names of other birds called mūnāl, which I have noticed in various ornithological works while turning their pages for other information.

Besides L. Impeyanus and Trapagon Ceriornis satyra which Yule mentions as called “moonaul”, there are L. refulgens, mūnāl and Ghūr (mountain)-mūnāl; Trapagon Ceriornis satyra, called mūnāl in Nipāl; T. C. melanocephalus, called sing
(horned)-mūnāl in the N.W. Himalayas; *T. himālayensis*, the jer- or cher-mūnāl of the same region, known also as *chikor*; and *Lerwa nevicola*, the snow-partridge known in Garhwal as *Quoir- or Qūr-mūnāl*. Do all these birds behave in such a way as to suggest that mūnāl may imply the individual isolation related by Jerdon of *L. Impeyanus*, “In the autumnal and winter months numbers are generally collected in the same quarter of the forest, though often so widely scattered that each bird appears to be alone?” My own search amongst vocabularies of hill-dialects for the meaning of the word has been unsuccessful, spite of the long range mūnāls in the Himalayas.

c. Concerning the word chiūrtika, chourtka.

Jerdon’s entry (ii, 549, 554) of the name chourtka as a synonym of *Tetraogallus himālayensis* enables me to fill a gap I have left on f.249 (p.491 and n.6), with the name Himālayan snow-cock, and to allow Bābur’s statement to be that he, in January 1520 AD. when coming down from the Bād-i-pīch pass, saw many snow-cocks. The *Memoirs* (p.282) has “chikors”, which in India is a synonym for kabg-i-dari; the *Mémoires* (ii, 122) has sauterelles, but this meaning of chiūrtika does not suit wintry January. That month would suit for the descent from higher altitudes of snow-cocks. Griffith, a botanist who travelled in Afghānistān cir. 1838 AD., saw myriads of cicade between Qilat-i-ghilzai and Ghazni, but the month was July.


Mr. Erskine for qūtān enters khawāsil [gold-finch] which he will have seen interlined in the Elphinstone Codex (f.109b) in explanation of qūtān.

Shaikh Effendi (Kunos’ ed., p.139) explains qūtān to be the gold-finch, Steiglitz.

Ilminsky’s qūtān (p.175) is translated by M. de Courteille as pelicanne and certainly some copies of the 2nd Persian translation [Muh. Shīrāzi’s p.90] have hawāsil, pelican.

The pelican would class better than the small finch with the

---

1 My note 6 on p.421 shows my earlier difficulties, due to not knowing (when writing it) that kabg-i-dari represents the snow-cock in the Western Himalayas.
herons and egrets of Bābur's trio; it also would appear a more likely bird to be caught "with the cord."

That Bābur's qūṭān (ḥawāṣil) migrated in great numbers is however against supposing it to be Pelicanus onocrotatus which is seen in India during the winter, because it appears there in moderate numbers only, and Blanford with other ornithologists states that no western pelican migrates largely into India.

Perhaps the qūṭān was Linnæus' Pelicanus carbo of which one synonym is Carbo comoranus, the cormorant, a bird seen in India in large numbers of both the large and small varieties. As cormorants are not known to breed in that country, they will have migrated in the masses Bābur mentions.

A translation matter falls to mention here:—After saying that the aūqār (grey heron), qargara (egret), and qūṭān (cormorant) are taken with the cord, Bābur says that this method of bird-catching is unique (bū nūḥ qūsh tūtmāq ghair muqarrar dūr) and describes it. The Persian text omits to translate the tūtmāq (by P. giriftan); hence Erskine (Mem. p.153) writes, "The last mentioned fowl" (i.e. the qūṭān) "is rare," notwithstanding Bābur's statement that all three of the birds he names are caught in masses. De Courteille (p.313) writes, as though only of the qūṭān, "ces derniers toutefois ne se prennent qu'accidentelment," perhaps led to do so by knowledge of the circumstance that Pelicanus onocrotatus is rare in India.

O.—NOTES BY HUMĀYŪN ON SOME HINDŪSTĀN FRUITS.

The following notes, which may be accepted as made by Humāyūn and in the margin of the archetype of the Elphinstone Codex, are composed in Turki which differs in diction from his father's but is far closer to that classic model than is that of the producer [Jahāṅgīr?] of the "Fragments" (Index s.n.). Various circumstances make the notes difficult to decipher verbatim and, unfortunately, when writing in Jan. 1917, I am unable to collate.
with its original in the Advocates Library, the copy I made of them in 1910.

a. On the kadhil, jack-fruit, Artocarpus integrifolia (f.283b, p. 506; Elphinstone MS. f.235b).¹

The contents of the note are that the strange-looking pumpkin (qar', which is also Ibn Batuta's word for the fruit), yields excellent white juice, that the best fruit grows from the roots of the tree,² that many such grow in Bengal, and that in Bengal and Dihli there grows a kadhil-tree covered with hairs (Artocarpus hirsuta?).

b. On the amrit-phal, mandarin-orange, Citrus aurantium (f.287, p. 512; Elphinstone Codex, f.238b, l.12).

The interest of this note lies in its reference to Bābūr.

A Persian version of it is entered, without indication of what it is or of who was its translator, in one of the volumes of Mr. Erskine's manuscript remains, now in the British Museum (Add. 26,605, p. 88). Presumably it was made by his Turkish munshi for his note in the Memoirs (p. 329).

Various difficulties oppose the translation of the Turki note; it is written into the text of the Elphinstone Codex in two instalments, neither of them in place, the first being interpolated in the account of the amit-bid fruit, the second in that of the jāsūn flower; and there are verbal difficulties also. The Persian translation is not literal and in some particulars Mr. Erskine's rendering of this differs from what the Turki appears to state.

The note is, tentatively, as follows:³—"His honoured Majesty Firdaus-makān⁴—may God make his proof clear!—did not

¹ By over-sight mention of this note was omitted from my article on the Elphinstone Codex (JRAS. 1907, p. 131).
² Speede's Indian Hand-book (i, 212) published in 1841 A.D. thus writes, "It is a curious circumstance that the finest and most esteemed fruit are produced from the roots below the surface of the ground, and are betrayed by the cracking of the earth above them, and the effluvia issuing from the fissure; a high price is given by rich natives for fruit so produced."
³ In the margin of the Elphinstone Codex opposite the beginning of the note are the words, "This is a marginal note of Humāyūn Pādshāh's."
⁴ Every Emperor of Hindūstān has an epithet given him after his death to distinguish him, and prevent the necessity of repeating his name too familiarly. Thus Firdaus-makān (dweller-in-paradise) is Bābūr's; Humāyūn's is Jannat-askī-yānī, he whose nest is in Heaven; Muhammad Shāh's Firdaus-āramgāh, he whose place of rest is Paradise; etc. (Erskine).
favour the *amrit-phal*; as he considered it insipid, he likened it to the mild-flavoured orange and did not make choice of it. So much was the mild-flavoured orange despised that if any person had disgusted (him) by insipid flattery (?) he used to say, 'He is like orange-juice.'

"The *amrit-phal* is one of the very good fruits. Though its juice is not relishing (chuchūq), it is extremely pleasant-drinking. Later on, in my own time, its real merit became known. Its tartness may be that of the orange (nāranj) and *lemu.*"

The above passage is followed, in the text of the Elphinstone Codex, by Bābur's account of the *jāsūn* flower, and into this a further instalment of Humāyūn's notes is interpolated, having opposite its first line the marginal remark, "This extra note, seemingly made by Humāyūn Pādshāh, the scribe has mistakenly written into the text." Whether its first sentence refer to the *amrit-phal* or to the *amil-bīd* must be left for decision to those well acquainted with the orange-tribe. It is obscure in my copy and abbreviated in its Persian translation; summarized it may state that when the fruit is unripe, its acidity is harmful to the digestion, but that it is very good when ripe.—The note then continues as below:—

c. The kāmīla, *H. kaunīlā,* the orange.

"There are in Bengal two other fruits of the acid kind. Though the *amrit-phal* be not agreeable, they have resemblance to it (?)."

1 Here Mr. Erskine notes, "Literally, nectar-fruit, probably the mandarin orange, by the natives called nārīngī. The name *amrat,* or pear, in India is applied to the guava or *Psidium pyriferum*—(Spondias mangifera, Hort. Ben.—D. Wallich). . . . Mr. E. notes also that the note on the *amrit-phal* "is not found in either of the Persian translations".

2 chūchūmān, Pers. trs. shīrīnī bī maza, perhaps flat, sweet without relish. Bābur does not use the word, nor have I traced it in a dictionary.

3 chūchūk, savoury, nice-tasting, not acid (Shaw).

4 chūchūk nāranj āndāq (?) maṭ'īn aīdī kīn har kīn-nī shīrīn-kārlīghī bī māzā gīkāndī, nāranj-sū'ī dīk tīr dīlār aīdā.

5 The *lemu* may be *Citrus limona,* which has abundant juice of a mild acid flavour.

6 The kāmīla and samātara are the real oranges (kaunīlā and sangtāra), which are now (cir. 1816 A.D.) common all over India. Dr. Hunter conjectures that the samātara may take its name from Cintra, in Portugal. This early mention of it by Bābur and Humāyūn may be considered as subversive of that supposition. (This description of the samātara, vague as it is, applies closer to the *Citrus decumana* or *pampelmus,* than to any other.—D. Wallich.)—Erskine.
"One is the kāmilā which may be as large as an orange (nāranj); some took it to be a large nārangī (orange) but it is much pleasanter eating than the nārangī and is understood not to have the skin of that (fruit)."

d. The samṭara.¹

The other is the samṭara which is larger than the orange (nāranj) but is not tart; unlike the amrit-phal it is not of poor flavour (kam maza) or little relish (chūchūk). In short a better fruit is not seen. It is good to see, good to eat, good to digest. One does not forget it. If it be there, no other fruit is chosen. Its peel may be taken off by the hand. However much of the fruit be eaten, the heart craves for it again. Its juice does not soil the hand at all. Its skin separates easily from its flesh. It may be taken during and after food. In Bengal the samṭara is rare (ghārib) (or excellent, 'azīz). It is understood to grow in one village Sanārgām (Sonargaon) and even there in a special quarter. There seems to be no fruit so entirely good as the samṭara amongst fruits of its class or, rather, amongst fruits of all kinds."

Corrigendum:—In my note on the turunj bajāurī (p. 511, n. 3) for bijaurā read bījaurā; and on p. 510, l. 2, for palm read fingers.

Addendum:—p. 510, l. 5. After yūsūnlūk add:—"The natives of Hindūstān when not wearing their ear-rings, put into the large ear-ring holes, slips of the palm-leaf bought in the bāzārs, ready for the purpose. The trunk of this tree is handsomer and more stately than that of the date."

P.—REMARKS ON BĀBUR'S REVENUE LIST (fol. 292).

a. Concerning the date of the List.

The Revenue List is the last item of Bābur's account of Hindūstān and, with that account, is found s.a. 932 AH., manifestly

¹ Humāyūn writes of this fruit as though it were not the sang-tara described by his father on f. 287 (p. 511 and note).
too early, (1) because it includes districts and their revenues which did not come under Bābur's authority until subdued in his Eastern campaigns of 934 and 935 AH., (2) because Bābur's statement is that the "countries" of the List "are now in my possession" (in loco p. 520).

The List appears to be one of revenues realized in 936 or 937 AH. and not one of assessment or estimated revenue, (1) because Bābur's wording states as a fact that the revenue was 52 krūrs; (2) because the Persian heading of the (Persian) List is translatable as "Revenue (jama') of Hindūstān from what has so far come under the victorious standards".

b. The entry of the List into European Literature.

Readers of the L. and E. Memoirs of Bābur are aware that it does not contain the Revenue List (p. 334). The omission is due to the absence of the List from the Elphinstone Codex and from the 'Abdu'r-rahām Persian translation. Since the Memoirs of Bābur was published in 1826 AD., the List has come from the Bābur-nāma into European literature by three channels.

Of the three the one used earliest is Shaikh Zain's Tābāqāt-i-bāburī which is a Persian paraphrase of part of Bābur's Hindūstān section. This work provided Mr. Erskine with what he placed in his History of India (London 1854, i, 540, Appendix D), but his manuscript, now B.M. Add. 26,202, is not the best copy of Shaikh Zain's book, being of far less importance than B.M. Or. 1999, [as to which more will be said.]

The second channel is Dr. Ilminsky's imprint of the Turkī text (Kāsān 1837, p. 379), which is translated by the Mémoires de Bāber (Paris 1871, ii, 230).

The third channel is the Hāidarābād Codex, in the English translation of which [in loco] the List is on p. 521.

Shaikh Zain may have used Bābur's autograph manuscript for his paraphrase and with it the Revenue List. His own autograph manuscript was copied in 998 AH. (1589-90 AD.) by

1 M. de Courteille translated jama' in a general sense by totalitā instead of in its Indian technical one of revenue (as here) or of assessment. Hence Professor Dowson's "totality" (iv, 262 n.).

2 The B.M. has a third copy, Or. 5879, which my husband estimates as of little importance.
Khwānd-amīr’s grandson ‘Abdu’l-lāh who may be the scribe “Mīr ‘Abdu’l-lāh” of the Āyiḥn-i-akbarī (Blochmann’s trs. p. 109). ‘Abdu’l-lāh’s transcript (from which a portion is now absent,) after having been in Sir Henry Elliot’s possession, has become B.M. Or. 1999. It is noticed briefly by Professor Dowson (I.c. iv, 288), but he cannot have observed that the “old, worm-eaten” little volume contains Bābur’s Revenue List, since he does not refer to it.

c. Agreement and variation in copies of the List.

The figures in the two copies (Or. 1999 and Add. 26,202) of the Ṭabaqāt-i-bāburi are in close agreement. They differ, however, from those in the Ḥaidarābād Codex, not only in a negligible unit and a ten of tankas but in having 20,000 more tankas from Oudh and Baraich and 30 laks of tankas more from Transsutlej.

The figures in the two copies of the Bābur-nāma, viz. the Ḥaidarābād Codex and the Kehr-Ilminsky imprint are not in agreement throughout, but are identical in opposition to the variants (20,000 l. and 30 l.) mentioned above. As the two are independent, being collateral descendants of Bābur’s original papers, the authority of the Ḥaidarābād Codex in the matter of the List is still further enhanced.

d. Varia.

(1) The place-names of the List are all traceable, whatever their varied forms. About the entry L:knū [or L:knūr] and B:ks:r [or M:ks:r] a difficulty has been created by its variation in manuscripts, not only in the List but where the first name occurs s.a. 934 and 935AH. In the Ḥaidarābād List and in that of Or. 1999 L:knūr is clearly written and may represent (approximately) modern Shahābād in Rāmpūr. Erskine and de Courteille, however, have taken it to be Lakhnau in Oudh. [The distinction of Lakhnaur from Lakhnau in the historical narrative is discussed in Appendix T.]

(2) It may be noted, as of interest, that the name Sarwār is an abbreviation of Sarjūpār which means “other side of Sarjū” (Saru, Goghra; E. and D.’s H. of I. i, 56, n.4).
(3) Rūp-narāīn (Deo or Dev) is mentioned in Ajodhya Prasad’s short history of Tirhut and Darbhanga, the Gulzār-i-Bihār (Calcutta 1869, Cap. v, 88) as the 9th of the Brahman rulers of Tirhut and as having reigned for 25 years, from 917 to 942 Faslī (?). If the years were Ḥijrī, 917–42 AH. would be 1511–1535.¹

(4) Concerning the tanka the following modern description is quoted from Mr. R. Shaw’s High Tartary (London 1871, p.464) “The tanga” (or tanka) “is a nominal coin, being composed of 25 little copper cash, with holes pierced in them and called dahcheen. These are strung together and the quantity of them required to make up the value of one of these silver ingots” (“kooroos or yamboo, value nearly £17”) “weighs a considerable amount. I once sent to get change for a kooroos, and my servants were obliged to charter a donkey to bring it home.”

(5) The following interesting feature of Shaikh Zain’s Tabaqāt-i-bāburī has been mentioned to me by my husband:— Its author occasionally reproduces Bābur’s Turkī words instead of paraphrasing them in Persian, and does this for the noticeable passage in which Bābur records his dissatisfied view of Hindūstān (f.290b, in loco p.518), prefacing his quotation with the remark that it is best and will be nearest to accuracy not to attempt translation but to reproduce the Pādshāh’s own words. The main interest of the matter lies in the motive for reproducing the ipsissima verba. Was that motive deferential? Did the revelation of feeling and opinion made in the quoted passage clothe it with privacy so that Shaikh Zain reserved its perusal from the larger public of Hindūstān who might read Persian but not Turkī? Some such motive would explain the insertion untranslated of Bābur’s letters to Humāyūn and to Khwāja Kalān which are left in Turkī by ‘Abdu’r-rahīm Mīrzā.²

¹ Sir G. A. Grierson, writing in the Indian Antiquary (July 1885, p. 187), makes certain changes in Ajodhya Prasad’s list of the Brahman rulers of Tirhut, on grounds he states.

² Index s.n. Bābur’s letters. The passage Shaikh Zain quotes is found in Or. 1999, f. 65b, Add. 26,202, f. 66b, Or. 5879, f. 79b.
Q.—CONCERNING THE "RĀMPŪR DĪWĀN".

Pending the wide research work necessary to interpret Bābur’s Hindūstān poems which the Rāmpūr manuscript preserves, the following comments, some tentative and open to correction, may carry further in making the poems publicly known, what Dr. E. Denison Ross has effected by publishing his Facsimile of the manuscript.¹ It is legitimate to associate comment on the poems with the Bābur-nāma because many of them are in it with their context of narrative; most, if not all, connect with it; some without it, would be dull and vapid.

a. An authorized English title.

The contents of the Rāmpūr MS. are precisely what Bābur describes sending to four persons some three weeks after the date attached to the manuscript,² viz. “the Translation and what-not of poems made on coming to Hindūstān”;³ and a similar description may be meant in the curiously phrased first clause of the colophon, but without mention of the Translation (of the Wālidiyah-risāla).⁴ Hence, if the poems, including the Translation, became known as the Hindūstān Poems or Poems made in Hindūstān, such title would be justified by their author’s words. Bābur does not call the Hindūstān poems a dīwān even when, as in the above quotation, he speaks of them apart from his versified translation of the Tract. In what has come down to us of his autobiography, he applies the name Dīwān to poems of his own once only, this in 925 AH. (f. 237b) when he records sending “my dīwān” to Pūlād Sl. Aūzbek:

¹ Cf. Index in loco for references to Bābur’s metrical work, and for the Facsimile, JASB. 1910, Extra Number.
² Monday, Rabi’ II. 15th 935 AH.—Dec. 27th 1528 AD. At this date Bābur had just returned from Dhūlpūr to Agra (f. 354, p. 635, where in note 1 for Thursday read Monday).
³ Owing to a scribe’s “skip” from one yībārīldī (was sent) to another at the end of the next sentence, the passage is not in the Hindūstān MS. It is not well given in my translation (f. 357b, p. 642); what stands above is a closer rendering of the full Turkī, Humāyūngha tarjuma [u?] nī-kīm Hindūstāngha kīkānī aṭīqān asbānī yībārīldī (Ilmosoky p. 462, l. 4 fr. ft., where however there appears a slight clerical error).
⁴ Hesitation about accepting the colophon as unquestionably applying to the whole contents of the manuscript is due to its position of close association with one section only of the three in the manuscript (cf. post p. lx).
b. The contents of the Rāmpūr MS.

There are three separate items of composition in the manuscript, marked as distinct from one another by having each its ornamented frontispiece, each its scribe's sign (mīm) of Finis, each its division from its neighbour by a space without entry. The first and second sections bear also the official sign [sahh] that the copy has been inspected and found correct.

(1) The first section consists of Bābur's metrical translation of Khwāja 'Ubaidu'l-lāh Ḥvrārī's Parental Tract (Wālidiyyah-risāla), his prologue in which are his reasons for versifying the Tract and his epilogue which gives thanks for accomplishing the task. It ends with the date 935 (Hai. MS. f. 346). Below this are mīm and sah, the latter twice; they are in the scribe's handwriting, and thus make against supposing that Bābur wrote down this copy of the Tract or its archetype from which the official sah will have been copied. Moreover, spite of bearing two vouchers of being a correct copy, the Translation is emended, in a larger script which may be that of the writer of the marginal quatrain on the last page of the [Rāmpūr] MS. and there attested by Shāh-i-jahān as Bābur's autograph entry. His also may have been the now expunged writing on the half-page left empty of text at the end of the Tract. Expunged though it be, fragments of words are visible.

(2) The second section has in its frontispiece an inscription illegible (to me) in the Facsimile. It opens with a masnawi of 41 couplets which is followed by a ghazel and numerous poems in several measures, down to a triad of rhymed couplets (ma'tla?), the whole answering to descriptions of a Dīwān without formal arrangement. After the last couplet are mīm and sah in the scribe's hand-writing, and a blank quarter-page. Mistakes in this section have been left uncorrected, which supports the view that its sah avouches the accuracy of its archetype and not its own.

1 Plate XI, and p. 15 (mid-page) of the Facsimile booklet.—The Facsimile does not show the whole of the marginal quatrain, obviously because for the last page of the manuscript a larger photographic plate was needed than for the rest. With Dr. Ross' concurrence a photograph in which the defect is made good, accompanies this Appendix.

2 The second section ends on Plate XVII, and p. 21 of the Facsimile booklet.
(3) The third section shows no inscription on its frontispiece. It opens with the masnawi of eight couplets, found also in the Bābur-nāma (f.312), one of earlier date than many of the poems in the second section. It is followed by three rubāʿi which complete the collection of poems made in Hindūstān. A prose passage comes next, describing the composition and transposition-in-metre of a couplet of 16 feet, with examples in three measures, the last of which ends in l.4 of the photograph.— While fixing the date of this metrical game, Bābur incidentally allows that of his Treatise on Prosody to be inferred from the following allusive words:—“When going to Saṃbhal (f.330b) in the year (933 AH.) after the conquest of Hindūstān (932 AH.), two years after writing the ‘Arūz, I composed a couplet of 16 feet.”—From this the date of the Treatise is seen to be 931 AH., some two years later than that of the Mubīn. The above metrical exercise was done about the same time as another concerning which a Treatise was written, viz. that mentioned on f.330b, when a couplet was transposed into 504 measures (Section f, p. lxv).—The Facsimile, it will be noticed, shows something unusual in the last line of the prose passage on Plate XVIII B, where the scattering of the words suggests that the scribe was trying to copy page per page.

The colophon (which begins on l. 5 of the photograph) is curiously worded, as though the frequent fate of last pages had befallen its archetype, that of being mutilated and difficult for a scribe to make good; it suggests too that the archetype was verse.1 Its first clause, even if read as Hind-stān jānībī ‘azīmat qīlghānī (i.e. not qīlghālī, as it can be read), has an indirectness unlike Bābur’s corresponding “after coming to Hindūstān” (f.357b), and is not definite; (2) bū āirdī (these were) is not the complement suitting aūl dūrūr (those are); (3) Bābur does not use the form dūrūr in prose; (4) the undue space after dūrūr suggests connection with verse; (5) there is no final verb such as prose needs. The meaning, however, may be as follows:—The poems made after resolving on (the)

1 Needless to say that whatever the history of the manuscript, its value as preserving poems of which no other copy is known publicly, is untouched. This value would be great without the marginal entries on the last page; it finds confirmation in the identity of many of the shorter poems with counterparts in the Bābur-nāma.
محمد شاهان، به‌کم‌هم‌جواری به‌عهده‌الملک‌الساجد او برکحتی ثمین‌بی‌کارانه‌سیونه، قلما مولوی وچمن‌شکارانه‌م جورم‌ها، اکر سرو‌یاد آورم‌م بدن‌زادادا، سکاپ دیوان، فلول‌ن ۱۰ مادا مسیت‌شکسته‌م سال‌ال‌پیام سامان‌شناسان

هوای سرم‌خویرنده‌م، كم‌گیرنده‌م، دوست‌ماهی‌م

دارم‌م، شیراندی‌م، نوادگان‌م، غایب‌م

ما به‌نام وسیع‌دی‌م، مادرم، عزیز‌م، خانم‌م

سال‌ن ۸
Hindūstān parts (jānībī?) were these I have written down (taḥrīr qıldīm), and past events are those I have narrated (taqrīr) in the way that (nī-chūk kīm) (has been) written in these folios (aūrāq) and recorded in those sections (ajzā').—From this it would appear that sections of the Bābur-nāma (f. 376b, p. 678) accompanied the Hindūstān poems to the recipient of the message conveyed by the colophon.

Close under the colophon stands Ḥarara-hu Bābur and the date Monday, Rabī‘ II. 15th 935 (Monday, December 27th 1528 AD.), the whole presumably brought over from the archetype. To the question whether a signature in the above form would be copied by a scribe, the Elphinston Codex gives an affirmative answer by providing several examples of notes, made by Humāyūn in its archetype, so-signed and brought over either into its margin or interpolated in its text. Some others of Humāyūn’s notes are not so-signed, the scribe merely saying they are Humāyūn Pādshāh’s.—It makes against taking the above entry of Bābur’s name to be an autograph signature, (1) that it is enclosed in an ornamented border, as indeed is the case wherever it occurs throughout the manuscript; (2) that it is followed by the scribe’s mīm. [See end of following section.]

c. The marginal entries shown in the photograph.

The marginal note written length-wise by the side of the text is signed by Shāh-i-jahān and attests that the rubā‘ī and the signature to which it makes reference are in Bābur’s autograph hand-writing. His note translates as follows:—This quatrain and blessed name are in the actual hand-writing of that Majesty (ān ḥaṣrat) Firdaus-makānī Bābur Pādshāh Ghāzī—May God make his proof clear!—Signed (Ḥarārā-hu), Shāh-i-jahān son of Jahāngīr Pādshāh son of Akbar Pādshāh son of Humāyūn Pādshāh son of Bābur Pādshāh.¹

¹ Another autograph of Shāh-i-jahān’s is included in the translation volume (p. xiii) of Gul-badan Begam’s Humāyūn-nāma. It surprises one who works habitually on historical writings more nearly contemporary with Bābur, in which he is spoken of as Firdaus-makānī or as Gīh-sitānī Firdaus-makānī and not by the name used during his life, to find Shāh-i-jahān giving him the two styles (cf. Jahāngīr’s Memoirs trs. ii, 5). Those familiar with the writings of Shāh-i-jahān’s biographers will know whether this is usual at that date. There would seem no doubt as to the identity of ān ḥaṣrat.—The words ān ḥaṣrat by which Shāh-i-jahān refers to Bābur are used also in the epitaph placed by Jahāngīr at Bābur’s tomb (Trs. Note p. 710–711).
The second marginal entry is the curiously placed rubāʿi, which is now the only one on the page, and now has no signature attaching to it. It has the character of a personal message to the recipient of one of more books having identical contents. That these two entries are there while the text seems so clearly to be written by a scribe, is open to the explanation that when (as said about the colophon, p.lx) the rectangle of text was made good from a mutilated archetype, the original margin was placed round the rifacimento? This superposition would explain the entries and seal-like circles, discernible against a strong light, on the reverse of the margin only, through the rifacimento page. The upper edge of the rectangle shows sign that the margin has been adjusted to it [so far as one can judge from a photograph]. Nothing on the face of the margin hints that the text itself is autograph; the words of the colophon, tahrīr qildim (i.e. I have written down) cannot hold good against the cumulative testimony that a scribe copied the whole manuscript.—The position of the last syllable [nī] of the rubāʿi shows that the signature below the colophon was on the margin before the diagonal couplet of the rubāʿi was written,—therefore when the margin was fitted, as it looks to have been fitted, to the rifacimento. If this be the order of the two entries [i.e. the small-hand signature and the diagonal couplet], Shāh-i-jahān’s “blessed name” may represent the small-hand signature which certainly shows minute differences from the writing of the text of the MS. in the name Bābur (q.v. passim in the Rāmpūr MS.).

d. The Bāburī-khatt (Bābūr’s script).

So early as 910AH. the year of his conquest of Kābul, Bābur devised what was probably a variety of nakhs, and called it the Bāburī-khatt (f.144b), a name used later by Ḥaidar Mīrzā, Nīzāmu’d-din Ahmad and ‘Abdu'l-qādir Badāyūnī. He writes of it again (f. 179) s.a. 911AH. when describing an interview had in 912AH. with one of the Harāt Qāzīs, at which the script was discussed, its specialities (mufradāt) exhibited to, and read by the Qāzī who there and then wrote in it.1 In what remains to us

---

1 The Qāzī’s rapid acquirement of the mufradāt of the script allows the inference that few letters only and those of a well-known script were varied.—Mufradāt was translated by Erskine, de Courteille and myself (f. 357b) as alphabet but reconsideration
of the Bábur-náma it is not mentioned again till 935 AH. (fol. 357b) but at some intermediate date Bábur made in it a copy of the Qurán which he sent to Makka. In 935 AH. (f. 357b) it is mentioned in significant association with the despatch to each of four persons of a copy of the Translation (of the Wálidíyyah-risála) and the Hindústán poems, the significance of the association being that the simultaneous despatch with these copies of specimens of the Báburí-khatt points to its use in the manuscripts, and at least in Hind-ál's case, to help given for reading novel forms in their text. The above are the only instances now found in the Bábur-náma of mention of the script.

The little we have met with—we have made no search—about the character of the script comes from the Abúshqá, s.n. sighnāq, in the following entry:

\[ \text{Sighnāq ber nú'ah khatt der Chaghatáïda khatt Báburí ù ghairí kibí ki Bábur Mírzá ash'ár'nda kilür bair} \]

\[ \text{Khüblár khattí naşib'ng bûlmásá Bábur ní táng?} \]

\[ \text{Báburí khattí aímsás dür khatt sighnáqí mû dür?} \]

The old Osmanli-Turkish prose part of this appears to mean:—

"Sighnáq is a sort of hand-writing, in Chaghatáï the Báburí-khatt and others resembling it, as appears in Bábur Mírzá's poems. Couplet":

Without knowing the context of the couplet I make no attempt to translate it because its words khatt or khat and

by the light of more recent information about the Báburí-khatt leads me to think this is wrong because "alphabet" includes every letter.—On f. 357b three items of the Báburí-khatt are specified as despatched with the Hindústán poems, viz. mufradát, qita'ír and sar-i-khatt. Of these the first went to Hind-ál, the third to Kámrán, and no recipient is named for the second; all translators have sent the qita'ír to Hind-ál but I now think this wrong and that a name has been omitted, probably Humáyún's.

1 f. 144b, p. 228, n. 3. Another interesting matter missing from the Bábur-náma by the gap between 914 and 925 AH. is the despatch of an embassy to Czar Vassili III. in Moscow, mentioned in Schuyler's Turkistan ii, 394, Appendix IV, Grigoriel's Russian Policy in Central Asia. The mission went after "Sultán Bábur" had established himself in Kábul; as Bábur does not write of it before his narrative breaks off abruptly in 914 AH. it will have gone after that date.

2 I quote from the Veliaminof-Zernov edition (p. 287) from which de Courteille's plan of work involved extract only; he translates the couplet, giving to khat the double-meanings of script and down of youth (Dictionnaire Turque s.n. sighnáq). The Sanglákh (p. 252) s.n. sighnáq has the following as Bábur's:

\[ \text{Chá balai khattí naşib'ng bûlmásá Bábur ní táng?} \]

\[ \text{Bare khattí almansúr khatt sighnáqí mû dür?} \]
sighnāq lend themselves to the kind of pun (īhām) "which consists in the employment of a word or phrase having more than one appropriate meaning, whereby the reader is often left in doubt as to the real significance of the passage." ¹ The rest of the rubā‘i may be given [together with the six other quotations of Bābur's verse now known only through the Abūshqā], in early Tažkīratū 'sh-shu‘āra of date earlier than 967 AH.

The root of the word sighnāq will be sig, pressed together, crowded, included, etc.; taking with this notion of compression, the explanations feine Schrift of Shaikh Effendi (Kunos) and Vambéry's petite écriture, the Sighnāqī and Bāburī Scripts are allowed to have been what that of the Rāmpūr MS. is, a small, compact, elegant hand-writing.—A town in the Caucasus named Sighnākh, "située à peu près à 800 mètres d'altitude, commença par être une forteresse et un lieu de refuge, car telle est la signification de son nom tartare." ² Sighnāqī is given by de Courteille (Dict. p. 368) as meaning a place of refuge or shelter.

The Bāburī-khatt will be only one of the several hands Bābur is reputed to have practised; its description matches it with other niceties he took pleasure in, fine distinctions of eye and ear in measure and music.

e. Is the Rāmpūr MS. an example of the Bāburī-khatt?

Though only those well-acquainted with Oriental manuscripts dating before 910 AH. (1504 AD.) can judge whether novelties appear in the script of the Rāmpūr MS. and this particularly in its head-lines, there are certain grounds for thinking that though the manuscript be not Bābur's autograph, it may be in his script and the work of a specially trained scribe.

I set these grounds down because although the signs of a scribe's work on the manuscript seem clear, it is "locally" held to be Bābur's autograph. Has a tradition of its being in the Bāburī-khatt glided into its being in the khatt-i-Bābur? Several circumstances suggest that it may be written in the Bāburī-khatt :— (i) the script is specially associated with the four transcripts

¹ Gibb's History of Ottoman Poetry i, 113 and ii, 137.
² Réclus' L'Asie Russe p. 238.
of the Hindūstān poems (f. 357b), for though many letters must have gone to his sons, some indeed are mentioned in the Bābur-nāma, it is only with the poems that specimens of it are recorded as sent; (2) another matter shows his personal interest in the arrangement of manuscripts, namely, that as he himself about a month after the four books had gone off, made a new ruler, particularly on account of the head-lines of the Translation, it may be inferred that he had made or had adopted the one he superseded, and that his plan of arranging the poems was the model for copyists; the Rāmpūr MS. bearing, in the Translation section, corrections which may be his own, bears also a date earlier than that at which the four gifts started; it has its head-lines ill-arranged and has throughout 13 lines to the page; his new ruler had 11; (3) perhaps the words tahrīr qildīm used in the colophon of the Rāmpūr MS. should be read with their full connotation of careful and elegant writing, or, put modestly, as saying, “I wrote down in my best manner,” which for poems is likely to be in the Bāburī-khatt.1

Perhaps an example of Bābur’s script exists in the colophon, if not in the whole of the Mubīn manuscript once owned by Berézine, by him used for his Chrēstomathie Turque, and described by him as “unique”. If this be the actual manuscript Bābur sent into Mā warā’u’n-nahr (presumably to Khwāja Ahrārī’s family), its colophon which is a personal message addressed to the recipients, is likely to be autograph.

f. Metrical amusements.

(1) Of two instances of metrical amusements belonging to the end of 933 AH. and seeming to have been the distractions of illness, one is a simple transposition “in the fashion of the circles” (dawā‘īr) into three measures (Rāmpūr MS. Facsimile, Plate XVIII and p. 22); the other is difficult because of the high number of 504 into which Bābur says (f. 330b) he cut up the following couplet:—

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Gūz u gāsh u soz u tilīnī mū dī ?} \\
\text{Qad u khadd u saj u bīlīnī mū dī ?}
\end{align*}
\]

1 On this same tahrīr qildīm may perhaps rest the opinion that the Rāmpūr MS. is autograph.
All manuscripts agree in having 504, and Babur wrote a tract (risāla) upon the transpositions. None of the modern treatises on Oriental Prosody allow a number so high to be practicable, but Maulānā Saiñ of Bukhārā, of Babur's own time (f. 180b) makes 504 seem even moderate, since after giving much detail about rubā'ī measures, he observes, "Some say there are 10,000" (Aruz-i-Saifī, Ranking's trs. p. 122). Presumably similar possibilities were open for the couplet in question. It looks like one made for the game, asks two foolish questions and gives no reply, lends itself to poetic license, and, if permutation of words have part in such a game, allows much without change of sense. Was Babur's cessation of effort at 504 capricious or enforced by the exhaustion of possible changes? Is the arithmetical statement $9 \times 8 \times 7 = 504$ the formula of the practicable permutations?

(2) To improvise verse having a given rhyme and topic must have demanded quick wits and much practice. Babur gives at least one example of it (f. 252b) but Jahāngīr gives a fuller and more interesting one, not only because a rubā'ī of Babur's was the model but from the circumstances of the game:—It was in 1024 AH. (1615 AD.) that a letter reached him from Māwarā'u'n-nahr written by Khwāja Hāshim Naqsh-bandī [who by the story is shown to have been of Ahrārī's line], and recounting the long devotion of his family to Jahāngīr's ancestors. He sent gifts and enclosed in his letter a copy of one of Babur's quatrains which he said Ḥazrat Firdaus-makānī had written for Ḥazrat Khwājagī (Ahrārī's eldest son; f. 36b, p. 62 n. 2). Jahāngīr quotes a final hemistich only, "Khwājagīra māndā'īm, Khwājagīrā banda'īm," and thereafter made an impromptu verse upon the one sent to him.

A curious thing is that the line he quotes is not part of the quatrain he answered, but belongs to another not appropriate for a message between darwesh and pādshāh, though likely to have been sent by Babur to Khwājagī. I will quote both because

1 I have found no further mention of the tract; it may be noted however that whereas Babur calls his Treatise on Prosody (written in 931 AH.) the 'Aruz, Abū'ī-faṣl writes of a Muṣaṣṣal, a suitable name for 504 details of transposition.
2 Tūsak-i-jahāngīr lith.ed. p. 149; and Memoirs of Jahāngīr trs. i, 304. [In both books the passage requires amending.]
the matter will come up again for who works on the Hindūstān poems.¹

(1) The quatrain from the Hindūstān Poems is:—

Dar hawlā'ī nafs gumrah 'unr zi' karda'īm [kanda'īm ?];
Pesh ahl-i-āllāh az afāl-i-khūd sharmanda'īm;
Vak nazr bā mukhlašān-i-khasta-dil farnā ki mā
Khwājagirā māndā'īm u Khwājagirā bandā'īm.

(2) That from the Akbar-nāma is:—

Darweshānārā agarcha nah az khweshānīm,
Lek az dil u jān mu'taqid eshānīm ;
Dūr ast magū'ī shāhī az darweshī,
Shāhīm wali banda-i-darweshānīm.

The greater suitability of the second is seen from Jahāngīr's answering impromptu for which by sense and rhyme it sets the model; the meaning, however, of the fourth line in each may be identical, namely, "I remain the ruler but am the servant of the darwesh." Jahāngīr's impromptu is as follows:—

Āī ānki marā mihr-i-tū besh az besh ast,
Az daulat yād-i-būdat āī darwesh ast;
Chandānki'z mushdahāt dilam shād shavad
Shādīm az ānki laṭīf az hadd besh ast.

He then called on those who had a turn for verse to "speak one" i.e. to improvise on his own; it was done as follows:—

Dārīm agarcha shaghal-i-shāhī dar pesh,
Har laхаza kunīm yād-i-darweshān besh ;
Gar shād shavad 'z mā dil-i-yak darwesh,
Ānra shumarīm ḥāsil-i-shāhī khwesh.

R.—CHANDĪRĪ AND GŪĀLĪĀR.

The courtesy of the Government of India enables me to reproduce from the Archeological Survey Reports of 1871, Sir Alexander Cunningham's plans of Chandīrī and Gūālīār, which illustrate Bābur's narrative on f.333, p.592, and f.340, p.607.

¹ Rāmpūr MS. Facsimile Plate XIV and p. 16, verse 3; Akbar-nāma trs. i, 279, and lith. ed. p. 91.
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S.—CONCERNING THE BĀBUR-NĀMA DATING OF 935 AH.

The dating of the diary of 935 AH. (f. 339 et seq.) is several times in opposition to what may be distinguished as the "book-rule" that the 12 lunar months of the Hijra year alternate in length between 30 and 29 days (intercalary years excepted), and that Muḥarram starts the alternation with 30 days. An early book stating the rule is Gladwin's *Bengal Revenue Accounts*; a recent one, Ranking's ed. of Platts' *Persian Grammar*.

As to what day of the week was the initial day of some of the months in 935 AH. Bābur's days differ from Wüstenfeld's who gives the full list of twelve, and from Cunningham's single one of Muḥarram 1st.

It seems worth while to draw attention to the flexibility, within limits, of Bābur's dating, [not with the object of adversely criticizing a rigid and convenient rule for common use, but as supplementary to that rule from a somewhat special source], because he was careful and observant, his record was contemporary, his record, as being *de die in diem*, provides a check of consecutive narrative on his dates, which, moreover, are all held together by the external fixtures of Feasts and by the marked recurrence of Fridays observed. Few such writings as the Bābur-nāma diaries appear to be available for showing variation within a year's limit.

In 935 AH. Bābur enters few full dates, *i.e.* days of the week and month. Often he gives only the day of the week, the safest, however, in a diary. He is precise in saying at what time of the night or the day an action was done; this is useful not only as helping to get over difficulties caused by minor losses of text, but in the more general matter of the transference of a Hijra night-and-day which begins after sunset, to its Julian equivalent, of a day-and-night which begins at 12 a.m. This sometimes difficult transference affords a probable explanation of a good number of the discrepant dates found in Oriental-Occidental books.

Two matters of difference between the Bābur-nāma dating and that of some European calendars are as follows:—
S.—CONCERNING THE BĀBUR-NĀMA DATING OF 935 A.H. lxxi

a. Discrepancy as to the day of the week on which Muḥ. 935 A.H. began.

This discrepancy is not a trivial matter when a year's diary is concerned. The record of Muḥ. 1st and 2nd is missing from the Bābur-nāma; Friday the 3rd day of Muḥarram is the first day specified; the 1st was a Wednesday therefore. Erskine accepted this day; Cunningham and Wüstenfeld give Tuesday. On three grounds Wednesday seems right—at any rate at that period and place:—(1) The second Friday in Muḥarram was 'Āshūr, the 10th (f.240); (2) Wednesday is in serial order if reckoning be made from the last surviving date of 934 A.H. with due allowance of an intercalary day to Zūl-hijja (Gladwin), i.e. from Thursday Rajab 12th (April 2nd 1528 AD. f.339, p.602); (3) Wednesday is supported by the daily record of far into the year.

b. Variation in the length of the months of 935 A.H.

There is singular variation between the Bābur-nāma and Wüstenfeld's Tables, both as to the day of the week on which months began, and as to the length of some months. This variation is shown in the following table, where asterisks mark agreement as to the days of the week, and the capital letters, quoted from W.'s Tables, denote A, Sunday; B, Tuesday, etc. (the bracketed names being of my entry).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muḥarram . . . 29 Wednesday</td>
<td>30 C (Tuesday).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṣafar . . . 30 Thursday *</td>
<td>29 E (Thursday).*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabī' I. . . 30 Saturday</td>
<td>30 F (Friday).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; II . . . 29 Monday</td>
<td>29 A (Sunday).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumāda I . . 30 Tuesday</td>
<td>30 B (Monday).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; II . . . 29 Thursday</td>
<td>29 D (Wednesday).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajab . . . 29 Friday</td>
<td>30 E (Thursday).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sha'bān . . 30 Saturday *</td>
<td>29 G (Saturday).*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramzān . . 29 Monday</td>
<td>30 A (Sunday).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāwal . . 30 Tuesday *</td>
<td>29 C (Tuesday).*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zūl-qa'da . . 29 Thursday</td>
<td>30 D (Wednesday).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zūl-hijja . . 30 Friday *</td>
<td>29 T (Friday).*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table shows that notwithstanding the discrepancy discussed in section a, of Bābur's making 935 AH. begin on a Wednesday, and Wüstenfeld on a Tuesday, the two authorities agree as to the initial week-day of four months out of twelve, viz. Şafar, Sha'bān, Shawwal and Zu'l-hijja.

Again:—In eight of the months the Bābur-nāma reverses the "book-rule" of alternative Muḥarram 30 days, Şafar 29 days et seq. by giving Muḥarram 29, Şafar 30. (This is seen readily by following the initial days of the week.) Again:—these eight months are in pairs having respectively 29 and 30 days, and the year's total is 364.—Four months follow the fixed rule, i.e. as though the year had begun Muḥ. 30 days, Şafar 29 days—namely, the two months of Rabī' and the two of Jumāda.—Ramzān to which under "book-rule" 30 days are due, had 29 days, because, as Bābur records, the Moon was seen on the 29th.—In the other three instances of the reversed 30 and 29, one thing is common, viz. Muḥarram, Rajab, Zu'l-qa'da (as also Zu'l-hijja) are "honoured" months.—It would be interesting if some expert in this Musalmān matter would give the reasons dictating the changes from rule noted above as occurring in 935 AH.

c. Varia.

(1) On f.367 Saturday is entered as the 1st day of Sha'bān and Wednesday as the 4th, but on f.368b stands Wednesday 5th, as suits the serial dating. If the mistake be not a mere slip, it may be due to confusion of hours, the ceremony chronicled being accomplished on the eve of the 5th, Anglicé, after sunset on the 4th.

(2) A fragment only survives of the record of Zu'l-ĥijja 935 AH. It contains a date, Thursday 7th, and mentions a Feast which will be that of the 'Īdull-kabīr on the 10th (Sunday). Working on from this to the first-mentioned day of 936 AH. viz. Tuesday, Muḥarram 3rd, the month (which is the second of a pair having 29 and 30 days) is seen to have 30 days and so to fit on to 936 AH. The series is Sunday 10th, 17th, 24th (Sat. 30th) Sunday 1st, Tuesday 3rd.
Two clerical errors of mine in dates connecting with this Appendix are corrected here:—(1) On p. 614 n. 5, for Oct. 2nd read Oct. 3rd; (2) on p. 619 penultimate line of the text, for Nov. 28th read Nov. 8th.

T.—ON L:KNŪ (LAKHNAU) AND L:KNŪR (LAKHNŪR, NOW SHĀHĀBĀD IN RĀMPŪR).

One or other of the above-mentioned names occurs eight times in the Bābur-nāma (s.a. 932, 934, 935 AH.), some instances being shown by their context to represent Lakhnau in Oudh, others inferentially and by the verbal agreement of the Ḥaidarābād Codex and Kehr’s Codex to stand for Lakhnūr (now Shāhābād in Rāmpūr). It is necessary to reconsider the identification of those not decided by their context, both because there is so much variation in the copies of the ‘Abdu’r-rahīm Persian translation that they give no verbal help, and because Mr. Erskine and M. de Courteille are in agreement about them and took the whole eight to represent Lakhnau. This they did on different grounds, but in each case their agreement has behind it a defective textual basis.—Mr. Erskine, as is well known, translated the ‘Abdu’r-rahīm Persian text without access to the original Turkī but, if he had had the Elphinstone Codex when translating, it would have given him no help because all the eight instances occur on folios not preserved by that codex. His only sources were not-first-rate Persian MSS. in which he found casual variation from terminal ṉū to ṉūr, which latter form may have been read by him as ṉūū (whence perhaps the old Anglo-Indian transliteration he uses, Luknow).—M. de Courteille’s position is different; his uniform Lakhnau obeyed the same uniformity in his source the Kāsān Imprint, and would appear to him the

1 Cf. Index s.n. Dalmau and Bangarmau for the termination in double ū.
more assured for the concurrence of the Memoirs. His textual basis, however, for these words is Dr. Ilminsky's and not Kehr's. No doubt the uniform Lakhnū of the Kāsān Imprint is the result of Dr. Ilminsky's uncertainty as to the accuracy of his single Turki archetype [Kehr's MS.], and also of his acceptance of Mr. Erskine's uniform Luknow. Since the Ḥaidarābād Codex became available and its collation with Kehr's Codex has been made, a better basis for distinguishing between the L:knū and L:knūr of the Persian MSS. has been obtained. The results of the collation are entered in the following table, together with what is found in the Kāsān Imprint and the Memoirs. [N.B. The two sets of bracketed instances refer each to one place; the asterisks show where Ilminsky varies from Kehr.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hai. MS.</th>
<th>Kehr's MS.</th>
<th>Kāsān Imprint.</th>
<th>Memoirs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f. 338</td>
<td>L:knū</td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 334</td>
<td>L:knū</td>
<td>L:knū</td>
<td>p. 432*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 376</td>
<td>L:knū</td>
<td>L:knūr</td>
<td>p. 486*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 376b</td>
<td>L:knūr</td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 487*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 377b</td>
<td>L:knū</td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 488*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following notes give some grounds for accepting the names as the two Turki codices agree in giving them:—

The first and second instances of the above table, those of the Hai. Codex f. 278b and f. 338, are shown by their context to represent Lakhnau.

The third (f. 292b) is an item of Bābur's Revenue List. The Turki codices are supported by B.M. Or. 1999, which is a direct copy of Shaikh Zain's autograph Tābaqāt-i-bāburi, all three having L:knūr. Kehr's MS. and Or. 1999 are descendants of the second degree from the original List; that the Hai. Codex is a direct copy is suggested by its pseudo-tabular arrangement

---

1 Dr. Ilminsky says of the Leyden & Erskine Memoirs of Bābur that it was a constant and indispensable help.

2 My examination of Kehr's Codex has been made practicable by the courtesy of the Russian Foreign Office in lending it for my use, under the charge of the Librarian of the India Office, Dr. F. W. Thomas.—It should be observed that in this Codex the Hindūstān Section contains the purely Turki text found in the Ḥaidarābād Codex (cf. JRAS. 1908, p. 78).
of the various items.—An important consideration supporting L:knūr, is that the List is in Persian and may reasonably be accepted as the one furnished officially for the Pādshāh's information when he was writing his account of Hindūstān (cf. Appendix P, p. liv). This official character disassociates it from any such doubtful spelling by the foreign Pādshāh as cannot but suggest itself when the variants of e.g. Dalmau and Bangarmau are considered. L:knūr is what three persons copying independently read in the official List, and so set down that careful scribes i.e. Kehr and 'Abdu'l-lāh (App. P) again wrote L:knūr.3—Another circumstance favouring L:knūr (Lakhnūr) is that the place assigned to it in the List is its geographical one between Sambhal and Khairābād.—Something for [or perhaps against] accepting Lakhnūr as the sarkār of the List may be known in local records or traditions. It had been an important place, and later on it paid a large revenue to Akbar [as part of Sambhal].—It appears to have been worth the attention of Bīban Jalwānī (f.329).—Another place is associated with L:knūr in the Revenue List, the forms of which are open to a considerable number of interpretations besides that of Baksar shown in loco on p.521. Only those well acquainted with the United Provinces or their bye-gone history can offer useful suggestion about it. Maps show a "Madkar" 6m. south of old Lakhnūr; there are in the United Provinces two Baksars and as many other Lakhnūrs (none however being so suitable as what is now Shāhābād). Perhaps in the archives of some old families there may be help found to interpret the entry L:knūr u B:ks:r (var.), a conjecture the less improbable that the Gazetteer of the Province of Oude (ii, 58) mentions a farmān of Bābur Pādshāh's dated 1527 AD, and upholding a grant to Shaikh Qāzī of Bilgrām.

The fourth instance (f.329) is fairly confirmed as Lakhnūr by its context, viz. an officer received the district of Badāyūn from the Pādshāh and was sent against Bīban who had laid siege to L:knūr on which Badāyūn bordered.—At the time Lakhnau may have been held from Bābur by Shaikh Bāyazīd

3 It may indicate that the List was not copied by Bābur but lay loose with his papers, that it is not with the Elphinstone Codex, and is not with the 'Abdu'r-raḥīm Persian translation made from a manuscript of that same annotated line.
Farmūlī in conjunction with Aūd. Its estates are recorded as still in Farmūlī possession, that of the widow of “Kala Pahār” Farmūlī.—(See infra.)

The fifth instance (f.334) connects with Aūd (Oudh) because royal troops abandoning the place L:knu were those who had been sent against Shaikh Bāyazīd in Aūd.

The remaining three instances (f.376, f.376b, f.377b) appear to concern one place, to which Bībān and Bāyazīd were rumoured to intend going, which they captured and abandoned. As the table of variants shows, Kehr’s MS. reads Lakhnūr in all three places, the Hāi. MS. once only, varying from itself as it does in Nos. 1 and 2.—A circumstance supporting Lakhnūr is that one of the messengers sent to Bābur with details of the capture was the son of Shāh Muḥ. Dīwāna whose record associates him rather with Badakhshān, and with Humāyūn and Sambhal [perhaps with Lakhnūr itself] than with Bābur’s own army.—Supplementing my notes on these three instances, much could be said in favour of reading Lakhnūr, about time and distance done by the messengers and by ‘Abdu’l-lah kitābdār, on his way to Sambhal and passing near Lakhnūr; much too about the various rumours and Bābur’s immediate counter-action. But to go into it fully would need lengthy treatment which the historical unimportance of the little problem appears not to demand.—Against taking the place to be Lakhnau there are the considerations (a) that Lakhnūr was the safer harbourage for the Rains and less near the westward march of the royal troops returning from the battle of the Goghrā; (b) that the fort of Lakhnau was the renowned old Machchi-bawan (cf. Gazetteer of the Province of Oude, 3 vols., 1877, ii, 366).—So far as I have been able to fit dates and transactions together, there seems no reason why the two Afghāns should not have gone to Lakhnūr, have crossed the Ganges near it, dropped down south [perhaps even intending to recross at Dalmau] with the intention of getting back to the Farmūlīs and Jalwānīs perhaps in Sārwār, perhaps elsewhere to Bāyazīd’s brother Ma’rūf.
U.—THE INSCRIPTIONS ON BĀBUR’S MOSQUE IN AJODHYA (OUDH).

Thanks to the kind response made by the Deputy-Commissioner of Fyzābād to my husband’s enquiry about two inscriptions mentioned by several Gazetteers as still existing on “Bābur’s Mosque” in Oudh, I am able to quote copies of both.¹

a. The inscription inside the Mosque is as follows:

1. Bāpurviudh-i-Shāh Bābur ki ‘ādilash
Banā ‘ist tā kākh-i-gardān mulāqī

2. Banā kard in mubīt-i-qudsiyān
Amīr-i-sa‘ādat-nishān Mir Bāqī

3. Bavad khair bāqī! chū sāl-i-banā’īsh
‘Iyān shud ki guftam,—Buvad khair bāqī (935).

The translation and explanation of the above, manifestly made by a Musalmān and as such having special value, are as follows:—²

1. By the command of the Emperor Bābur whose justice is an edifice reaching up to the very height of the heavens,

2. The good-hearted Mir Bāqī built this alighting-place of angels;³

3. Bavad khāir bāqī! (May this goodness last for ever!)⁴

¹ Cf. in loco p. 656, n. 3.
² A few slight changes in the turn of expressions have been made for clearness sake.
³ Index s.n. Mir Bāqī of Tāshkint. Perhaps a better epithet for sa‘ādat-nishān than “good-hearted” would be one implying his good fortune in being designated to build a mosque on the site of the ancient Hindū temple.
⁴ There is a play here on Bāqī’s name; perhaps a good wish is expressed for his prosperity together with one for the long permanence of the sacred building khair (khairat).
The year of building it was made clear likewise when I said, *Buvad khaır bāqī* (=935).¹

The explanation of this is:—

1st couplet:—The poet begins by praising the Emperor Bābur under whose orders the mosque was erected. As justice is the (chief) virtue of kings, he naturally compares his (Bābur’s) justice to a palace reaching up to the very heavens, signifying thereby that the fame of that justice had not only spread in the wide world but had gone up to the heavens.

2nd couplet:—In the second couplet, the poet tells who was entrusted with the work of construction. Mīr Bāqī was evidently some nobleman of distinction at Bābur’s Court.—The noble height, the pure religious atmosphere, and the scrupulous cleanliness and neatness of the mosque are beautifully suggested by saying that it was to be the abode of angels.

3rd couplet:—The third couplet begins and ends with the expression *Buvad khaır bāqī*. The letters forming it by their numerical values represent the number 935, thus:—

\[
\begin{align*}
B &= 2, \quad v = 6, \quad d = 4 \quad \text{total 12} \\
K &= 600, \quad a = 10, \quad r = 200 \quad \text{810} \\
B &= 2, \quad a = 1, \quad q = 100, \quad t = 10 \quad \text{113} \\
\text{Total} &= 935
\end{align*}
\]

The poet indirectly refers to a religious commandment (*dictum?*) of the Qorān that a man’s good deeds live after his death, and signifies that this noble mosque is verily such a one.

b. The inscription outside the Mosque is as follows:—

1. بناه انك انهاست أكبر * كخالق جمله علم لامكاني
2. درود مصطفى بعد از ستایش * ک سرور اینیائی دو جهانی
3. فسانه در جهان ابرقلندر * ک شد در دورگیتی کامرانی

¹ Presumably the order for building the mosque was given during Bābur’s stay in Aūd (Ajdhyā) in 934 AH. at which time he would be impressed by the dignity and sanctity of the ancient Hindī shrine it (at least in part) displaced, and like the obedient follower of Muhammad he was in intolerance of another Faith, would regard the substitution of a temple by a mosque as dutiful and worthy.—The mosque was finished in 935 AH. but no mention of its completion is in the Bābur-nāma. The diary for 935 AH. has many minor *lacenae*; that of the year 934 AH. has lost much matter, breaking off before where the account of Aūd might be looked for.
The explanation of the above is as follows:—

In the first couplet the poet praises God, in the second Muḥammad, in the third Bābur.—There is a peculiar literary beauty in the use of the word lā-makānī in the 1st couplet. The author hints that the mosque is meant to be the abode of God, although He has no fixed abiding-place.—In the first hemistich of the 3rd couplet the poet gives Bābur the appellation of qalandar, which means a perfect devotee, indifferent to all worldly pleasures. In the second hemistich he gives as the reason for his being so, that Bābur became and was known all the world over as a qalandar, because having become Emperor of India and having thus reached the summit of worldly success, he had nothing to wish for on this earth.¹

The inscription is incomplete and the above is the plain interpretation which can be given to the couplets that are to hand. Attempts may be made to read further meaning into them but the language would not warrant it.

V.—BĀBUR'S GARDENS IN AND NEAR KĀBUL.

The following particulars about gardens made by Bābur in or near Kābul, are given in Muḥammad Amīr of Kazwīn’s Pādshāh-nāma (Bib. Ind. ed. p. 585, p. 588).

¹ The meaning of this couplet is incomplete without the couplet that followed it and is (now) not legible.
² Firishta gives a different reason for Bābur’s sobriquet of qalandar, namely, that he kept for himself none of the treasure he acquired in Hindūstān (Lith. ed. p. 206).
Ten gardens are mentioned as made:—the Shahr-ārā (Town-adorning) which when Shāh-i-jahān first visited Kābul in the 12th year of his reign (1048 AH.—1638 AD.) contained very fine plane-trees Bābur had planted, beautiful trees having magnificent trunks,\(^1\) — the Chār-bāgh, — the Bāgh-i-jalau-khāna,\(^2\) — the Āūrta-bāgh (Middle-garden), — the Šaurat-bāgh,—the Bāgh-i-maḥtāb (Moonlight-garden), — the Bāgh-i-āhū-khāna (Garden-of-the-deer-house), — and three smaller ones. Round these gardens rough-cast walls were made (renewed?) by Jahāngīr (1016 AH.).

The above list does not specify the garden Bābur made and selected for his burial; this is described apart (L.c. p. 588) with details of its restoration and embellishment by Shāh-i-jahān the master-builder of his time, as follows:—

The burial-garden was 500 yards (gas) long; its ground was in 15 terraces, 30 yards apart (?). On the 15th terrace is the tomb of Ruqaiya Sultan Begam\(^3\); as a small marble platform (chabūṭra) had been made near it by Jahāngīr's command, Shāh-i-jahān ordered (both) to be enclosed by a marble screen three yards high.—Bābur's tomb is on the 14th terrace. In accordance with his will, no building was erected over it, but Shāh-i-jahān built a small marble mosque on the terrace below.\(^4\) It was begun in the 17th year (of Shāh-i-jahān's reign) and was finished in the 19th, after the conquest of Balkh and Badakhshān, at a cost of 30,000 rūpīs. It is admirably constructed. —From the 12th terrace running-water flows along the line (rasta) of the avenue;\(^5\) but its 12 water-falls, because not

---

\(^1\) Jahāngīr who encamped in the Shahr-ārā-garden in Şafar 1016 AH. (May 1607 AD.) says it was made by Bābur's aunt, Abū-sa'id's daughter Shahr-bānū (Rogers and Beveridge's Memoirs of Jahāngīr i, 106).

\(^2\) A jalau-khāna might be where horse-head-gear, bridles and reins are kept, but Ayn 60 (A. i.-A.) suggests there may be another interpretation.

\(^3\) She was a daughter of Hind-al, was a grand-daughter therefore of Bābur, was Akbar's first wife, and brought up Shāh-i-jahān. Jahāngīr mentions that she made her first pilgrimage to her father’s tomb on the day he made his to Bābur's, Friday Şafar 26th 1016 AH. (June 12th 1607 AD.). She died et. 84 on Jumāda I. 7th 1035 AH. (Jan. 25th 1626 AD.). Cf. Tāzkāt-i-jahāngīrī, Muḥ. Ḥādi's Supplement lith. ed. p. 401.

\(^4\) Mr. H. H. Hayden's photograph of the mosque shows pinnacles and thus enables its corner to be identified in his second of the tomb itself.

\(^5\) One of Daniel’s drawings (which I hope to reproduce) illuminates this otherwise somewhat obscure passage, by showing the avenue, the borders of running-water and the little water-falls,—all reminding of Madeira.
constructed with cemented stone, had crumbled away and their charm was lost; orders were given therefore to renew them entirely and lastingly, to make a small reservoir below each fall, and to finish with Kābul marble the edges of the channel and the waterfalls, and the borders of the reservoirs.—And on the 9th terrace there was to be a reservoir $11 \times 11$ yards, bordered with Kābul marble, and on the 10th terrace one $15 \times 15$, and at the entrance to the garden another $15 \times 15$, also with a marble border.—And there was to be a gateway adorned with gilded cupolas befitting that place, and beyond (pesk) the gateway a square station,¹ one side of which should be the garden-wall and the other three filled with cells; that running-water should pass through the middle of it, so that the destitute and poor people who might gather there should eat their food in those cells, sheltered from the hardship of snow and rain.²

¹ choki, perhaps "shelter"; see Hobson-Jobson s.n.
² If told with leisurely context, the story of the visits of Bābur’s descendants to Kābul and of their pilgrimages to his tomb, could hardly fail to interest its readers.
THE HISTORY OF BABUR
OR BABUR-NAMA

Index I. Personal

Abā-bikr Mīrzā Mirān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Abū-sa‘id and a Badakhshī begīm—particulars 22, 26; his attack on Hisār 51; defeated by Husain Bāī-qarā and his death (884) 260; his Bāī-qarā marriage 266; a Badakhshī connection 51; [†884 AH.–1479 AD.].

Abā-bikr Mīrzā Dūghlāt Kāšgharī, son of Sāniz and a Chirās (var. Jarās) begīm—invases Farghāna (899) 32; his annexations in Badakhshān 695; his Mirānshāhī wife 48; [†920 AH.–1514 AD.].

‘Abbās, a slave—murderer of Aūlīg (Ûlīg) Beg Shāh-rūkhī (853) 85.

‘Abbās Sulṭān Aūsbeg—marries Gul-chihra Mirān-shāhī, Bābūr’s daughter (954) 713.

‘Abdu’l-‘ālī Tarkhān Arghūn Chīṅgīz Khānid—particulars 38, 39; [†cir. 899 AH.–1494 AD.].

‘Abdu’l-‘azīz mīr-akhīyr ordered to catch pheasants (925) 404; posted in Lāhor (930) 442; sent into Milwat (932) 460; on service 465–6, 471, 530; the reserve at Pānīpat 472–3; reinforces the right 473; surprised and defeated by Sangā (933) 549, 550; in the left wing at Kānwā 567, 570; pursues Sangā 576; ordered against Balūchīs (935) 638; writes from Lāhor about the journey of Bābūr’s family 659, 660; arrested 688; sequel to his sedition not given in the Akbar-nāma 692; reference to his sedition 698.


‘Abdu’l-bāqī Mīrzā Mirān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of ‘Uṣmān—particulars 280; referred to 266 n. 6; goes to Herī (908) 336; his wife Sulṭānim Bāī-qarā 265 n. 5, 280.
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tomb visited by Bābur (912) 285, 305; Bābur’s reverential mention of him 283, 286; his example followed by production of the Wālidīyyah-risāla (935) 620; his birth-place 623 n. 8; his disciple ‘Abdul-ghafūr 284; [898 AH.–1492 AD.].

‘Abdu’r-rahmān Khān Barak-sā‘ī Afgān, Amir of Afgānīstān—mentioned in connection with Jāmi’s tomb 305 n. 6; [†1319 AH.–1901 AD.].

‘Abdu’r-razzāk Mirzā Mirān-shāhī Ţīmūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Aūlūgh Beg Kābulī—loses Kābul (910) 195, 365; out with Bābur 234; surmised part-vendor of Bābur’s mother’s burial-ground 246 n. 2; in Herāt (912) 298; escapes Shaibānī and joins Bābur (913) 331; in the left wing at Qandahār 334; his loot 337–8; deserts Qalāt in fear of Shaibānī 340; left in charge of Kābul ḫāt; given Ningnahār 344; rebels (914) 345; his position stated 345 n. 6; [†915 AH.–1509 AD.].

Khwāja ‘Abdu’sh-shahīd, son of Ahrārī’s fifth son Khwājagān-khwāja (‘Abdul-lāh)—placed on Bābur’s right-hand (935) 631; gifts made to him 632; invited to a majīn-party 653; particulars 653 n. 4; a likely recipient of the Mubīn 438, 631 n. 3; [†982 AH.–1574 AD.].

‘Abdu’sh-shukūr Mughūl, son of Qambar-i-‘ālī Silākh—serving Jahāngīr Mirān-shāhī (after 910) 192; in the right wing at Kānwa (933) 566.

‘Abdu’l-wahhāb Mughūl—given Shaikh Pūrān to loot (913) 328.

‘Abdu’l-wahhāb Shaghāwal, servant of ‘Umar-shaikh and Ahmad Mirān-shāhī—forwards news (899) 25; gives Khujand to Bābur 54; his son Mir Mughūl q.v.

Abraha Yemenī, an Abyssinian Christian—his defeat (571 AD.) 563 n. 3.

Imām Abū Hanīfa—his followers’ respect for the Hidāyat 76; his ruling that peacock-meat is lawful food 493.

Khwāja Abū’l-barka Farāqī—criticizes Banā’ī’s verse (906) 137.

Shaikh Abū’l-fath, servant of the Shāh-zāda of Mungīr—envoy from Bengal to Bābur (934, 935) 676; placed on Bābur’s right-hand (935) 631.

Abū’l-fath Sa’īd Khān, see Sa’īd Khān Chaghatāī.

Abū’l-fath Turkmān, son of ‘Umar—his joining Bābur from ‘Irāq 280; made military-collector of Dhūlpūr (933) 540; Bābur visits his hamnām (935) 615.
Abu'al-fazl, see Akbar-nama.

Abu'1-hasan qur-begi—in the right wing at Qandahar (913) 334; does well (925) 404; his brother Muhammad Husain q.v.

Abu'1-hasan qurchi—in the centre at Qandahar (913) 335.

Abu'l-haShim, servant of SL 'Ali [Taghāī Begchik]—overtakes Bābur with ill news (925) 412.

Abu'l-Hasan Qiir-begi—in the right wing at Qandahar (913) 334; does well (925) 404; his brother Muhammad Husain q.v.

Abu'l-hasan Qiirchī—in the centre at Qandahar (913) 335.

Abu'l-haShim, servant of SL 'Ali [Taghāī Begchik]—overtakes Bābur with ill news (925) 412.

Abu'l-maʿāli Tirmīzī—his burial-place has significance as to Mahdī Khwāja's family 705; [+971 AH.–1564 AD.].

Khwāja Abu'1-makāram—supports Bái-sunghar Mirān-shāhī (901) 62, (902) 65; acts for peace (903) 91; meets Bābur, both exiles (904) 99; at Bābur's capture of Samarkand (906) 132, 141; leaves it with him 147 n. 2; speaks for him (908) 157–8; fails to recognize him 161; at Archān 184; [+908 AH.–1502 AD.].

Shaikh Abu'1-manṣūr Mātārīdī—his birthplace Samarkand 75, 76; [+333 AH.–944 AD.].

Abu’1-muḥammad nesa-bāz—in the tūlghuma of the left wing at Pānīpat (932) 473; on service (933) 582, (934) 589, 598.

Abu’1-muḥammad Khujandī—his sextant 74 n.4.

Abu’1-muḥsin Mirzā Bái-qarā Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Ḥusain and Laṭīf—particulars 262 (where for “husain” read muḥsin), 269; serving his father (901) 58; defeats his brother Bādi’u’z-zamān (902) 69, 70; defeated by his father at Halwā-spring (904) 260; his men take Qarākūl from Aūzbeqs (906) 135; co-operates against Shaibānī (912) 296; rides out to meet Bābur 297; they share a divan 298; presses him to winter in Herī 300; returns to his district (Merv) 301; his later action and death 329–30, 331; [+913 AH.–1507 AD.].

Abu’1-muslim Kūkuldāsh—brings an Arghūn gift to Bābur (925) 401, 402.

Abu’1-qāsim Jalāīr—tells Bābur a parrot story (935) 494.

Abu’1-qāsim—a musician (923) 387, 388 (here Qāsim only).

Abu’1-qāsim Kohbūr Chaghatāī, son of Ḥaider-i-qāsim—on service with Bābur (902) 68, (906) 130, 131, 133; in the right wing at Sar-i-pul (Khwāja Kārdzan) 139; killed 141; [+906 AH.–1501 AD.].

Shaikh Abu’1-wajd Fārīghī, maternal-uncle of Zain Khawāfī—makes verse on the Kābul-river (932) 448; his chronogram on Al-amān’s birth (935) 621; [+940 AH.–1533 AD.].

1 The date 935 AH. is inferred from p. 483.
2 Cf. Badāyūnī’s Muntakhabūt-tawārīkh and Ranking’s trs. i, 616 and n. 4, 617.
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Shaikh Abū-sa'īd Khān Dar-miyan—particulars 276.

Sulṭān Abū-sa'īd Mirzā Mirān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk—his descent 14; asserts Timūrid supremacy over Chaghatāī Khāqāns (855) 20, 344, 352; takes Māwarā'u'n-nahr (855) 86; forms his Corps of Braves 28, 50; a single combat in his presence (857) 50; defeats Husain Bāi-qarā (868) 259; a swift courier to him 25; joined by the Black-sheep Turkmāns (872) 25, 46, 49; a single combat in his presence (857) 50; defeats Hūsain Bāi-qarā (868) 259; his banishment of Nawa'I 271; reserves a Chaghatāī wife for a son 21, 36; his Badakhshī wife and their son 22, 260; his Tarkhān Arghīcī wife and their sons, 33, 45; his mistress Khādīja q.v.; his daughters Payanda-sultan, Shahr-banu, Rabi'a-sultan, Khudrā-sultan, Fakhr-i-jahan, Aqa-sultan, Aq Bēlg q.v.; his marriage connection Nuyān Tirmızī q.v.; [†873 AH.–1469 AD.].

Abū-sa'īd Pūrān, see Jamālū'd-dīn.

Abū-sa'īd Sulṭān Auzbeg-Shaibān, Chingīz-khānid, son of Kūchūm— at Ghaj-davān (918) 360; at Jām (935) 622, 636; sends an envoy to Bābūr 631, 632, 641; [†940 AH.–1533–4 AD.].

Shaikh Abū-sa'īd Tarkhān (var. Bū-sa'īd)—his house Mirzā Khān's loot in Qandahār (913) 338.

Abū-turāb Mirzā Bāi-qarā Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Hūsain and Mīnglī—particulars 262, 269; his son Sohrab q.v.; [† before 911 AH.–1505–6 AD.].

Adīk Sulṭān Qassāq, Jūfī Chingīz-khānid (var. Āung Sulṭān), son of Jānī Beg Khān (T.R. trs. 373)—husband of Sulṭānnīgār Chaghatāī q.v.

'Ādīl Sulṭān Auzbeg-Shaibān (?), Chingīz-khānid (?), son of Mahdī and a Bāi-qarā begīm—marries Shād Bāi-qarā 263; suggestions as to his descent 264 n. 1; waits on Bābūr at Kalānūr (932) 458; on Bābūr's service 468, 471, 475, 530; in the left wing at Pānīpat 472, and at Kānwa (933) 567, 570; ordered against Balūchīs (935) 638; mentioned as a landless man 706.

Sayyida Afāq, a legendary wife of Bābūr 358 n. 2; her son and grandson ib.

1 Ferté translates this sobriquet by le dévout (Vie de St. Hossein Baikara p. 40 n. 3).
2 At p. 22 n. 8 fill out to Cf. f. 66 (p. 13) n. 5.
Afghānī Āghāchā, see Mubārika.

Sayyid Afzal Beg, son of 'Ali Khwāb-bīn—conveys Ḥusain Bāī-qara’s summons to Bābur for help against Shaibānī (911) 255; particulars 282; takes news to Herāt of Bābur’s start from Kābul (912) 294; sends him news of Ḥusain’s death 295; [†921 AH.—1516 AD.].

Āghā Begīm Bāī-qara Tīmūrid, Barlās Turk, daughter of Ḥusain and Pāyanda-sultān—parentage and marriage (or betrothal, H.S. iii, 327) 266; [† died in childhood].

Āghā-sultān, ghūnchachi of ‘Umar Shaikh—her daughter Yādgār-i-sultān q.v.

Āhī—his feet frost-bitten (912) 311.

Āhī, a poet—particulars 289; [†907 AH.—1501–2].

Ahlī, a poet—particulars 290; (for 4 writers using Āhlī as their pen-name see 290 n. 6).

Sultān Ahmad Aīlchī-būghā, Mughul—one of four daring much (912) 315; in the left wing at Qandahār (913) 334.

Pīr Ahmad—leaves Samarkand with the Tarkhāns (905) 121; fights for Bābur at Sar-i-pul (Khwāja Kārdzan) (906) 139.

Ahmad Afshār Turk—a letter to him endorsed by Bābur (935) 617.

Mīrzā Ahmad ‘ʿAlī Farsī, Barlās—particulars 273.

Ahmad ‘ʿAlī Tarkhān Arghūn, brother of Qulī Beg—favours Bābur and admits him to Qandahār (913) 337.

Mullā Ahmad Balkhī—conveys treasure to Balkh (932) 446.

Mīrzā Sayyidī Ahmad Mīrān-shāhī Tīmūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Mīrān-shāh—particulars 257 n. 5; named in a line of descent 280 n. 1; his son Ahmad and grandson ‘Abdu’ll-bāqī q.v.

Mīr Ahmad Beg Itārajī Mughūl, paternal-uncle of Tambal—guardian of a son of The Khan (Mahmūd) 115; reinforces Bābur (903) 92; acts against him (905) 115, 116; acts against ‘ʿAlī Mīrān-shāhī 112; makes a contemptuous speech about Tambal (906) 145.

Ahmad Beg Safawī—leads a reinforcement to help Bābur (917) 353.

Sultān Ahmad Chār-shamba’ī, see Chār-shamba.

Ahmad chāshnīgīr—helps in poisoning Bābur (933) 541; [†933 AH.—1526 AD.].

Ahmad Ḥāji Beg Dūldāī, Barlās Turk—particulars 25, 37, 38; his pen-name Wafā’ī and a couplet of his 38; his
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hospitality to ‘Ali-sher Nawārī 38, 271; drives Khusrau Shāh from Samarkand (900) 51; supports Bāī-sunghar Mirān-shāhī in the Tarkhān rebellion (901) 62, 63; his death at the hands of slaves and slave-women 63–4; [†901 AH.–1496 AD.].

Ahmādi parwānchi—on service (925) 377, (932) 458, 460, (933) 540; sent to surprise Ibrāhīm Lūdī (932) 468 (his name is omitted in my text); in the left centre at Pānīpat 472, 473; his ill-behaviour in the heats 524.

Sultan Ahmād Khān—Alacha Khān—Chaghatāī Chingiz-khānid, son of Yūnas and Shāh Begīm—particulars 23, 160; meaning of his sobriquet Alacha Khān 23; younger Khānwādā, Bābur’s name for him 129; considered as a refuge for Bābur (899) 29, (903) 92, (906) 129, (908) 158; visits Tāshkīnt (908) 159; ceremonies of meeting 160–1, 171–2; moves with his elder brother Mahmūd against Tamlak 161, 168, 171; his kindness to Bābur 159, 166–7, 169, 171; is given Bābur’s lands and why 168; retires from Andijān in fear of Shaibānī 172; defeated by Shaibānī at Archān (908 or 909) 7, 23; his death (909) reported to Bābur (911) 246 and n. 4: his sons Mansūr, Sa’īd, Bābā (T.R. trs. 160, Bābājāk), Chīn-timūr, Tūkhtā-būghā, and Aīsun-timūr q.v.; his grandson Bābā q.v.; followers of his return from forced migration (908) when Shaibānī is killed (916) 351; [† end of 909 AH.–1504 AD.].

Ahmād Khān Háji-tarkhānī (Astrakhānī)—marries Bādī’u’ll-jamāl (Badka) Bāī-qarā (899?) 257, 258; their sons (Mahmūd and Bahādūr) 258; their daughter Khān-zāda q.v.

Sultan Ahmād Mirzā Dūghlāt—sent by the Khān (Mahmūd) to help Bābur (908) 161.

Sultan Ahmād Mirzā Mirān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Abū-sa’īd—the lands his father gave him 35, 86; his brother Mahmūd taken to his care (873 or 4) 46; his disaster on the Chir (895) 17, 25, 31, 34; a swift courier to him 25; defeats ‘Umar Shaikh 17, 34; 12 n. 2, 53; invades Fārgānā (899) 13, 30; given Aūrā-tipā 27; dreaded for Bābur 29; retires and dies 31, 33; particulars 33, 40; referred to by Ḥusain Bāī-qarā (910) 190; his wives and children 35–6; an honoured Beg Nūyān Tirmīzī q.v.; [†899 AH.–1494 AD.].

Sultan Ahmād Mirzā, Mirān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Mirzā Sayyidī Ahmād—particulars 257 n. 5; his wife Akā Begīm Bāī-qarā and their son Kīchīk Mirzā q.v.; 266 n. 6; a building of his at Herī 305.
Ahmad mushtaq, Turkmān—takes Māhmūd Mirān-shāhī to Ḥiṣār (873 or 4) 46–7.

Sultān Ahmad qarāwal, father of Qūch (Qūj) Beg, Tārdī Beg and Sher-āfgān Beg q.v.—defends Ḥiṣār (901) 58; enters Bābur’s service (905) 112; in the left wing at Khūbān (905) 113; holds Marghīnān 123.

Ahmad-i-qāsim Kohbur Chaghdatāī, son of Ḥaider-i-qāsim—with Bābur (906) 133; invited to a disastrous entertainment (907) 152; joins Jahāngīr and Tambal 156; in Akhsī (908) 171; defeats an Āūzbeg raider (910) 195; helps to hold Kābul for Bābur (912) 313; pursues Mīrzā Khān 317, 320; holding Tāshkint against Āūzbegs (918) 356, 358, 396, 397; a Kābulī servant of his 351.

Ahmad-i-qāsim Qibchāq Turk, (grand-?) son of Bāqī Chaghānānī and a sister of Khusrau Shāh, perhaps son of Bāqī’s son Muḥammad-i-qāsim (189 n. 3)—holding Kāhmard and Bāmīān (910) 189; given charge of the families of Bābur’s expeditionary force 189; ill-treats them and is forced to flee 197, 243; goes to Ḥusain Bāī-qarā ib.; killed at Qūndūz 244; [†910 AH.–1505 AD.].

Sultan Ahmad Qāzī Qīlīch—particulars 29; his son Khwāja Maulānā-i-qāzī q.v.

Ahmad qūshchī—seen by the fugitive Bābur (908) 180.

Khwāja Ahmad Sajāwandī—his birthplace 217.

Ahmad Shāh Khiljī Turk—dispossessed of Chandīrī by Ibrāhīm Lūdī 593; restored by Bābur (934) 598.

Ahmad Shāh Durrānī, Abdālī Afghān—his victory at Pānipat (1174) 472; [†1182 AH.–1772 AD.].

Ahmad Tarkhān Arghūn Chīngīz-khānid (?)—joins Bābur in Samarkand (906) 133; loses Dābūsī to Shaibānī 137; [†906 AH.–1500 AD.].

Ahmad (son of) Tawkakkal Barlās, amir of Ḥusain Bāī-qarā—particulars 272.

Ahmad yāsāwal—conveys a message from Bābur to the begs of Kābul Fort (912) 314.

Khwāja Ahmad Yawawī—Sayyid Āṭā—Shaibānī’s vow at his shrine 348, 356; [†514 AH.–1120–1 AD.].

Ahmad-i-yūsuf Beg Aūghlāqchī, son of Ḥasan, nephew of Yūsuf—managing Yār-yilāq for ‘Alī Mirān-shāhī (904) 98; dismissed on suspicion of favouring Bābur 98; probably

1 For an account of his tomb see Schuyler’s Turkistān, 1, 70–72.
joins Bābur with his uncle (910) 196; remonstrated with him for fighting unmailed (911) 252; helping loyalists in Kabul (912) 313; saves Bābur a blow 315, 316; at Bājaur (925) 369, 401 (here Ahmad Beg); joins Bābur in Hindūstān (933) 550; in the right wing at Kānwa 566 (where in n. 1 for “may” read is), 569; governor of Sīākot 98.

Malik Aḥmad Yūsuf-zāi ḴⒸghān, nephew of Sulaimān q.v.— particulars App. K.

Ai Begīm Mīrān-shāhī Tīmūrid, Barlās Turk, daughter of Māhmūd and Khān-zāda II.—betrothed to Jahāngīr. (cir. 895) 48; married (910) 189; their daughter 48.

Aīkū-sālam Mughūl—rebels against Bābur (914) 345.

Aīkū-tīmūr Beg Tarkhān Arghūn—his descendant Dar-wesh Beg q.v.; [†793 AH.-1391 AD.].

Sultān Aīlīk Māzī Aūīghūr (Ūīghūr)—his descendant Khwāja Maulānā-i-qāżī q.v.

Aīrzīn Beg (var. Aīrāzān) Bārīn Mughūl—supports Yūnas Chaghatāī (cir. 830), takes him to Aūūgh Beg Shāh-rukhī (cir. 832) 19; ill-received and his followers scattered 20; [†832 AH.-1428 AD.].

Aīsān-būghā Khān Chaghatāī Chīṅgīz-khanīd, son of Dāwā—named in Yūnas Khān’s genealogy 19; [†cir. 718 AH.-1318 AD.].

Aīsān-būghā Khān II. Chaghatāī Chīṅgīz-khanīd, son of Wais—particulars 19; invades Farghāna and defeated at Aspara (cir. 855) 20; quarrels with the begs of the Sāghārīchī tūmān and leads to the elevation of Yūnas ib. ; [†866 AH.-1462 AD.].

Aīsān-daulat Begīm Kūnjī (or Kūnchī) Mughūl, wife of Yūnas Chaghatāī—particulars 20, 21; her good judgment (900) 43; entreats Bābur’s help for Andijān (903) 88-9; joins him in Khujand after the loss of Andijān 92, and in Dikh-kat after that of Samarkand (907) 151; news of her death reaches Kābul (911) 246; rears one of ‘Umar Shaikh’s daughters 18; her kinsmen ‘Alī-dost, Sherīm, Ghiyāṣ q.v.; [†910 AH.-1505 AD.].

Aīsān-qulī Sultān Aūzbeg-Shaibān, Chīṅgīz-khanīd—his Bād-qarā marriage, 265, 397.

Aīsān-tīmūr Sultān Chaghatāī Chīṅgīz-khanīd, son of Aḥmad (Alacha Khān)—on Bābur’s service 318, 682; meets

Or Aigū (Āyāgū) from āyāgk, foot, perhaps expressing close following of Tīmūr, whose friend the Beg was.
Bābūr (935) 654; in the battle of the Ghogrā 672, 673; thanked 677; angers Bābūr 684.

Ākā Begīm Barlās Turk, daughter of Timūr—an ancestress of Ḥusain Bāi-qarā 256.

Ākā Begīm Bāi-qarā Timūrid, daughter of Manṣūr and Fīrüza—particulars 257; her husband Aḥmad and their son Kīchīk Mīrzā q.v.

Abūl-fath Jalālūd-din Muhammad Akbar Mīrān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, grandson of Bābūr and Māhīm—184; an addition about him made to the Chihilzīna inscription 432; his visit to Pānīpāt (963) 472; his change in the name of the cherry explained by Bābūr’s words 501, n. 6; [†1014 AH.—1605 AD.]

Alacha Khān, see Aḥmad Chaghataī.

Al-amān, son of Humāyūn—his birth and name (935) 621, 624, 642; [† in infancy].

‘Ālam Khān Kālpī, son of Jalāl Khān Jīk-hat (or Jīg-hat)—holding Kālpī and not submissive to Bābūr (932) 523; goes to Court (933) 544; disobeys orders 557; is Bābūr’s host in Kālpī (934) 590; on service (935) 682; an order about him 684.

‘Alā’u’ud-dīn ‘Ālam Khān Lūdī Afghān, son of Buhlul—27 a principal actor between 926–32 AH. 428; asks and obtains Bābūr’s help against his nephew Ibrāhīm (929) 439–441: placed by Bābūr in charge of Dībālpūr (930) 442; defeated by Daulat Khān Yūsuf-khail (931) 444; flees to Kābul and is again set forth 444, 455; defeated by Ibrāhīm and returns to Bābūr (932) 454–8; his relations with Bābūr reviewed 455, n. 1; in Fort Gingūta 457, 463; in the left centre at Kānwa (933) 565; his sons Jalāl, Kamāl, and Sher Khān (Lūdī) q.v.

Sultān ‘Alā’u’ud-dīn ‘Ālam Khān Sayyīdī—holding Dīhī 481; [†855 AH.—1451 AD.].

‘Ālam Khān Tahangarī, brother of Nizām Khān of Bīāna—works badly with Bābūr’s force (933) 538; defeated by his brother 539; sent out of the way before Kānwa 547.

‘Alā’u’ud-dīn Husain Shāh, ruler in Bengal—the circumstances of his succession 483; his son Naṣrat q.v.; [†925 AH.—1518 AD.].

‘Alā’u’ud-dīn Husain Jahān-soz Ghūrī—his destruction in Ghaznī (550) 219; [†556 AH.—1161 AD.].
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Sultan 'Aläu'u'd-dīn Muhammad Shāh Khiljī Türk—Bābur visits his tomb and minār (932) 476; his bringing of the Koh-i-nūr from the Dakhhin 477; [†715 AH.—1315 AD.].


'Alāūl Khān Sūr Afghān—writes dutifully to Bābur (935) 659.

'Alāūl Khān Nūhānī Afghān—his waitings on Bābur (934, 935) 677, 680.

Sharafu'd-dīn Muhammad al Busiri—a Qasidatī ilbirdā an example for the Wālidiyyah-risāla 620; [cir. 693 AH.—1294 AD.].

Alexander of Macedon, see Iskandar Fīlqūs (Fīlaqūs).

Sayyid 'Alī—escapes from a defeat (909) 102; out with Bābur (925) 403; sent against Balūchīs (935) 638.

Sultan 'Alī asghar Mirzā Shāh-rukhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Mas'ūd Kābulī—particulars 382.

'Alī Āṭāka, servant of Khalifa—reinforces the right wing (tūlghma) at Kānwa (933) 569.

Shaikh 'Alī Bahādur, one of Timūrs chiefs—his descendant Bābā 'Alī 27.

Khwāja 'Alī Bāī—mentioned (906) 127; fights for Bābur at Sar-i-pul (Khwāja Kārdzan) 139; his son Jān-i-'alī q.v.

Shaikh 'Alī Bārin Mughūl, son of Shaikh Jamāl—in the left wing (tūlghma) at Pānipat (932) 473; sent against Balūchīs (935) 638.

'Alī Barlās Turk—his son Muhammad Barandūq q.v.

'Alī Beg Jalāīr Chaghatāī, father of Hasan-i-'Alī and Apāq Bega—his Shāh-rukhī service 278.¹

Mīr (Shaikh) 'Alī Beg Turk (inferred 389), governor of Kābul for Shāh-rukh Timūrid—his sons Bābā Kābulī, Daryā Khān, and Ghaźī (Apāq) Khān (q.v.) cherished by Mas'ūd Shāh-rukhī 382; (see his son Ghaźī's grandson Minūchīhr for a Turk relation 386).
Mir 'Ali-dost Ţaghāī Künji Mughul, a Sāghārīchī-tūmān beg—particulars 27–8; his appointment on Bābur's accession (899) 32; has part in a conference (900) 43; surrenders Andijān (903) 88–9; asks Bābur's pardon (904) 99; gives him Marghīnān 100; defeated by Tāmbal 106; in the right wing at Khūbān (905) 113; his ill-timed pacifism 118; his self-aggrandizement 119, 123; joins Bābur against Samarkand 123; in fear of his victims, goes to Tāmbal 125; his death ib.; his brother Ghiyās, his son Muḥammad-dost, and his servant Yūl-chūq q.v.; [†a few years after 905 AH.–1500 AD.].

Mir Sayyid ‘Ali Hamadānī—his death and burial 211; [†786 AH.–1384 AD.].

Mullā ‘Ali-jān (var. Khān)—fetches his wife from Samarkand (925) 403; is taught a rain-spell (926) 423; makes verse on the Kābul-river (932) 448; a satirical couplet on him made and repented by Bābur 448; host of Mullā Maḥmūd Farābī (935) 653.


Shaikh-zāda ‘Ali Khān Farmūlī Afghān—his family - train captured (932) 526; waits on Bābur 526–7; in the left wing at Kānwā (933) 567; on service 576, 582, 678.

‘Ali Khān Istiljū—leads Ismā‘īl Ṣafawī's reinforcement to Bābur (917) 353.

Sayyid ‘Ali Khān Turk, son of Ghāzī (Apāq) Khān and grandson of Mir (Shaikh) ‘Ali Beg—one of Sikandar Lūdī's Governors in the Panjāb (910) 382; leaves Bhīrā on Bābur’s approach ib.; his lands made over to him by Daulat Khān Yūsuf-khail 382–3; his son Minūchihr and their Turk relation (389) q.v.


‘Ali Khān Yūsuf-khail Lūdī Afghān—eldest son of Daulat Khān—his servants wait on Bābur (925) 382; comes out of Milwat (Malot) to Bābur (932) 459–60; sent under guard to Bhīrā 461; his son Ismā‘īl q.v.
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'Ali-mazid Beg qūchīn—particulars 26; leaves Bābur for home (903) 91.

Mîr 'Alî mîr-akhwur'—particulars 279; helps Husain Bāî-gara to surprise Yādgār-i-muḥammad Shāh-rukḥī in Heri (875) 134, 279.

Sultān 'Alî Mîrzâ Mîrān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Mahmûd and Zuhra—particulars 47; serving his half-brother Bāî-sunghar (900) 27, 55; made pādshāh in Samarkand by the Tarkhāns (901) 62–3, 86; meets Bābur 64; their arrangement 66; (902) 65, 82, 86; gives no protection to his blind half-brother Mas'ūd (903) 95; suspects a favoured beg (904) 98; quarrels with the Tarkhāns (905) 121; desertions from him 122; defeats Mîrzâ Khān's Mughuls ib.; is warned of Bābur's approach 125; gives Samarkand to Shaibanî and by him is murdered (906) 125–7; his wife Sultānim Mîrān-shâhī and sister Makhdûm-sultan q.v.; [†906 AH.–1500 AD.]

Sultān 'Alî Mîrzâ Ṭaghâî Begchīk (Mîrzâ Beg Ṭaghâî), brother (?) of Bābur's wife Gul-rukhh—movements of his which bear on the lacuna of 914–924 AH. 408; arrives in Kābul (925) ib.; Kāmrān marries his daughter (934) 619; conveys Bābur's wedding gifts to Kāmrān (935) 642; takes also a copy of the Wâlidiyyah-risâla and of the Hindūstān poems, with writings (sar-khat) in the Bāburī script 642.

Ustād 'Alî-quli—his match-lock shooting at Bajaur (925) 369; shoots prisoners (932) 466; ordered to make Rûmî defences at Pānîpāt 469; fires fîringîs from the front of the centre 473; casts a large mortar (933) 536, 547; his jealousy of Muṣṭâfa Rûmî 550; his post previous to Kānwa 558; his valiant deeds in the battle 570–1; a new mortar bursts (934) 588; his choice of ground at Chandīrī 593; his stone-discharge interests Bābur 595, 670–1–2; uses the Ghāzī mortar while the Ganges bridge is in building 599; a gift to his son (935) 633; his post in the battle of the Ghogrā 667, 668, 669.

'Alî-quli Hamadānī—sent by Bābur to punish the Mundāhirs, and fails (936) 700.

Mîr 'Alî qûrchī—conveys playing-cards to Shāh Ḥasan Arghān (933) 584.

Malik 'Alî quînî (?)—in the left centre at Bajaur (925) 369.

1 See H.S. lith. ed. iii, 224, for three men who conveyed helpful information to Husain.
'Ali Sayyid *Mughul*—in the right wing at Qandahār (913) 334; rebels (914) 345; his connection Aūrūs-i-'Ali Sayyid 335.

'Ali *shab-kūr* (night-blind)—one of five champions defeated in single combat by Bābur (914) 349.

Mīr 'Ali-sher Beg *Chaghatāi*, pen-names Nāwā'ī and Fanā'ī—his obligations to Ahmad Hājī Beg and return to Herāt 38; fails in a mission of Ḥusain Bá-i-qrā's (902) 69; his Turkī that of Andijān 4; checks Ḥusain in Shī'a action 258; opposes administrative reform 282; particulars 271–2; his relations with Bāna'ī 286–7, 648; corresponds with Bābur (906) 106; exchanges quatrains with Pahlawān Bū-sa'id 292; some of his poems transcribed by Bābur (925) 419; his restoration of the Rabāt-i-sang-bast 301 n. 1; his flower-garden (bāghche) and buildings visited or occupied by Bābur (912) 301, 305, 306; his brother Darwesh-i-'alī q.v.; a favoured person 278; a mystic of his circle 280–1; his scribe 271; [†906 AH.–Dec. 1500 AD.].

'Ali-shukr Beg, of the Bahārīl-aīmāq of the Āq-qūlūq3 Turkmāns—his daughter Pasha, grandson Yār-i-'alī Balāl, and descendant Bārām Khān-i-khānān q.v.

Sūltān 'Ali Sistānī Arghūn—his help against Shaibānī counselled (913) 326; one of five champions worsted by Bābur in single combat (914) 349; with Bābur and chaps at a tiger (925) 393.

Shaikh 'Ali Tāghāi Mervī (?)—holding Balkh for Bādī'u'-z-zamān Bāi-qrā (902) 70; joint-dārogha in Herāt (911) 293.

Allāh-birdī (var. qūlī)—serving Bābur (910) 234.

Allāh-wairān Turkmān—in the van at Qandahār (913) 335.

Alūr or Alwar,4 son of Bābur and Dīl-dār—mentioned 689 n. 5, 712; [†died an infant].

Amin Mīrzā—an Aūzbeg envoy to Bābur (935) 631; receives gifts 632, 641.

Amin-i-muhammad Tarkhān Arghūn—punished for disobedience (925) 390–1; deals with a drunken companion 415.

Amīr Khān, chief guardian of Ṭahmāsp Safawī—negociates with Bābur (927) 433.

---

1 Later consideration has cast doubts on his identification with Darwesh-i-'alī suggested, p. 345 n. 4.

2 On p. 69 n. 2 for aṁūlīng read aṁūtūng and reverse bākunīd with nakunīd.

3 On p. 49 l. 3 for “Black Sheep” read White Sheep.

4 Like his brother Hind-āl's name, Alūr's may be due to the taking (al) of Hind.
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Mullā Apāq—particulars 526; on Bābur’s service (932) 526, 528, (933) 539, (934) 590; surprised by Sangā (933) 549; made shiqdār of Chandīrī 598; his retainers on service (935) 679.

Apāq Begā Jalā’īr Chaghatāi, sister of Ḥusān-i-‘alī—a poet 286.

Sayyida Apāq Begīm Andikhūdī—particulars 267, 268, 269; visited in Herāt by Bābur (912) 301.

Apāq Khān, see Ghāzi Khān.

Apāq Khān Yūsuf-khail, see Ghāzi Khān.

Apāq-sultān Begīm Mirān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, daughter of Abū-saʿīd—one of the paternal aunts visited by Bābur (912) 301 n. 3.

Āq Begīm (1), Bāī-qarā Timūrid, Barlās Turk, daughter of Husain and Pāyanda-sultān—particulars 265; [pre-deceased her husband who died †911 AH.—1504 AD.].

Āq Begīm (2), Mirān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk—daughter of Abū-saʿīd and Khadija—particulars 262, 268; waited on by Bābur (935) 606.

Āq Begīm (3), ut supra, daughter of Mahmūd and Khān-zāda II.—brought to join Bābur’s march (910) 48.

Āq Begīm (4), see Sāliḥa-sultān.

Āq-būghā Beg, one of Timūr’s chiefs—collateral ancestor of Khudāi-birdī Timūr-tāsh 24.

‘Āqil Sultān Aūsbeg-Shaibān, son of ‘Ādil and Shād Bāī-qarā—his conjectured descent 264 n. 1 (where in I. 4 for “ʿaqil” read ʿādil).

Arāish Khān—proffers support to Bābur against Ibrāhīm Lūdī (932) 463; in the left centre at Kānwa (933) 565; negotiates about surrendering Chandīrī (934) 594; his gift of a boat to Bābur 663.

Arghūn Sultān, elder brother of Muhammad ‘Āli Jang-jang—deputed to hold Milwat (Malot., 932) 461.

Shaikh ʿĀrif Āgārī, nephew of Timūr’s story-teller, see Index s.n. Aūlūgh Beg Shāh-rukhī; [†866 AH.—1461–2 AD. æt. 82, Beale].

Arslān Jazāla—his building of the Rabāţ-i-sang-bast 301 n. 1.

Asad Beg Turkmān—joins Husain Bāī-qarā 279; his brother Taham-tan q.v.

Khwāja and Khwājagī Asadūl-lāh Jān-dār, Khawāfī—with Bābur in Dikh-kat (907) 150; envoy to Tahmāsp Ṣafawi...
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(933) 540, 583; has charge of Ibrāhīm Lūdī's mother 543; in the right wing at Kānwā 566, 569.

Khwājā Āsaf—particulars 286; waits on Bābur (912) 286: [†920 or 926 AH.–1514 or 1520 AD.].

'Asas, see Khwājā Muḥammad 'Ali 'asas.

'Āshiq bakāwal—with advance-troops for Chandīrī (934) 590; ordered on service (935) 638.

'Āshiq-i-muhammad Kūkūldāsh Arghūn, son of "Amīr Tarkhān Junaid" (H.S. lith. ed. iii, 359)—defends Ālā-qūrgān against Shaibānī (913) 328; his brother Mazīd Beg q.v.

'Āshiqu'l-lāh Arghūn—killed fighting against Bābur at Qandahār (913) 333 (where for "Ashaq" read 'Āshiq).

Aṣiru’d-din Akhsikiti, a poet—his birthplace Akhsī-village (kit-kint) 9–10; [†608 AH.–1211–2 AD.].

Muḥammad ‘Askari Mirrū’l-lāh Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Bābur and Gul-rukh—his birth (922) 364; gifts to him (932) 523, (933) 628; his recall from Multān (934) 603–4–5, 699; his command (et. cir. 12) of the army of the East 628, 637; at a feast 631; takes leave 634; waits on his father at Dugdugi 651; east of the Ganges 654; in the battle of the Ghogrā 668–9, 671–3; waits on Bābur after the victory 674; [†965 AH.–1557–8 AD.].

Asūk Mal Rājpūt—negociates with Bābur for Sangā's son (934–5) 612–3.

Sayyid ‘Atā, see Khwājā Aḥmad Yasa'eī.

Khwājā Jamālu’d-din ‘Atā—particulars 282 (where in n. 3 for (H.S. iii), "345" read 348–9).

Atākā bakhshī (var. Ātikā, Pers. Atka)—a surgeon who dresses a wound of Bābur's (908) 169.

Atā mīr-ākhwur—gives Bābur a meal (925) 418.

Mīr Burhānu’d-din ‘Atā’u’l-lāh Mashhādī—particulars 285 (H.S. iii, 345); [†926 AH.–1520 AD.].

Atūn Māmā, a governess—walks from Samarkand to Pashāghar (907) 148; mentioned? (925) 407 l. 4.

Aūghān-bīrdī Mughūl (var. Afgān-bīrdī and -tārdī) — on service (925) 376, 377; of a boat-party 387; in the battle of the Ghogrā (935) 671, 672.

Sayyid Āūghlāqchī, see Murād.

1 See the Ṭabaqāt-i-abharī account of the rulers of Multān.
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Auliya Khan Ishraqi—waits on Babur (935) 677.

Aulugh Beg Mirza Bai-qarar Timurid, Barlas Turk, son of Muhammad Sultan Mirza — his (?) journey to Hindustan (933) 265.

Aulugh Beg Mirza Kabuli, Mirdn-shahi, ut supra, son of Abu-said—particulars 95; his earliest guardians amusing his designs against them 270; his dealings with the Yusuf-zai App. K. xxxvi; his co-operation with Husain Bai-qarar against the Auzbegs 190; his praise of Istalif 216; his death (907) 185; gardens of his bought by Babur (perhaps one only) 216, (911) 246; another garden 315; houses of his 247, 251; his almshouse 315; referred to 284; his joint-guardians Muhammad Baranduq and Jahangir Barlas, his later one Wais Ataka q.v.; his sons 'Abdu'r-razzaq and Miran-shah, his daughter Bega Begilm and daughter-in-law Manauwar q.v. [†907 AH.—1501-2 AD.].

Aulugh Beg Mirza Shdh-rukhi, ut supra (Ulugh), son of Shah-rukh—his Trans-oxus rule 85; receives Yunas Chaghatai badly (832-3?) 19-20; defeated by Abä-bikr Miran-shahi 260; his family dissensions 20; his constructions, Astronomical and other 74, 77, 78-9; his sportsmanship 34; his murder and its chronograms 85; Babur resides in his College (906) 142; his sons 'Abdu'l-latif and 'Abdu'l-'aziz q.v.; a favoured beg Yusuf Aughtlqchi q.v.; Preface, q.v. On the misnomer “Mughul Dynasty”. [†853 AH.—1449 AD.].

Aulas Agha (Ülus), daughter of Khwaja Husain q.v.—particulars 24.

Aurdubugh Tarkhan Arghun (Urdu) — his son-in-law Abu-said Miran-shahi and son Darwesh-i-muhammad q.v.

Aurdushah—murdered as an envoy (923) 463 n. 3.

Aurang-zib Padshah Miran-shahi Timurid, Barlas Turk—referred to as of Babur’s line 184; [†1118 AH.—O.S. 1707 AD.].

Amir Aurus—flees from his post on Shaibani’s death (916) 350.


1 On p. 851. 9 for “872 AH.—1467 AD.”, read 851 AH.—1447 AD.

2 On p. 79 transfer the note-reference “3” to qibla.

3 See Daulat-shah (Browne’s ed. p. 362) for an entertaining record of the Mirza’s zeal as a sportsman and an illustrative anecdote by Shaikh ‘Arif ‘azar q.v. (H.B.).
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Aūrūs Arghūn—his son Muḥammad-i-aūrūs q.v.

Aūzbek Bahādūr (Üzbek)—one of five champions worsted in single combat by Bābur (914) 349 n. 1.

Aūzūn Ḥasan Beg Āq-qūilūq Turkmān—his defeat of the Qara-qūilūq Turkmāns and of Abū-saʿīd Mīrān-shāhī 49; [†883 AH.—1478 AD.].

Khwāja Aūzūn Ḥasan (Üzūn)—negociates for Bābur (899) 30; his appointment 32; confers in Bābur’s interests (900) 43 (where add his name after ‘Aḷī-dost’s); acts for Jahāngīr against Bābur (903) 87, 88, 91, (904) 100, 101, 102; his servant’s mischievous report of Bābur’s illness (903) 89; his men defeated by Bābur’s allies 102; loses Akhšī and Andijān 102–3; captured and released by Bābur 104; goes into Samarkand to help Bābur (907) 146; his brother Husain and adopted son Mīrīm q.v.

‘Ayisha-sultān Begı̄m Bāi-qarā Timūrid, Barlās Turk, daughter of Husain—particulars 267; her husbands Qāsim Aūzbek-Shaibdān and Būrān, her sons Qāsim-i-ḥusain and ‘Abdu’l-lāḥ q.v.

‘Ayisha-sultān Begı̄m Mīrān-shāhī, ut supra, daughter of Ahmad (Alacha Khān) and first wife of Bābur—particulars 35, 36; married (905) 35, 120, 711; joins Bābur in Samarkand (906) 135–6; her child 136; leaves Bābur 36.

Mīr Ayūb Beg Begchık—particulars 50; sent by The Khān (Mahmūd) to help Bābur (903) 92, (906) 138, 161, 170; his Mughāls misbehave at Sar-i-pul (Khwāja Kārdzan) 140; claims post in the right wing (tūlghuma) 155; his Mughāls confuse pass-words 164; in the right wing at Qandahār (913) 334; vainly tempts Saʿīd Chaghatalī to betray Bābur (916) 351; does not then desert 352, 362; rebels in Hisār (918) 362; dying, repents his disloyalty (920) 362; his sons Buhlūl-i-ayūb, Yaʿqūb-i-ayūb and Yūsuf-i-ayūb q.v.; [†920 AH.—1514 AD.].

‘Azīm Humāyūn Sarwānī—invests Gūāliār 477; his title changed and why (933) 537; his son Fath Khān q.v.

Mīr ‘Azū, a musical composer—particulars 292.

I have found no statement of his tribe or race; he and his brother are styled Khwāja (H.S. lith. ed. iii, 272); he is associated closely with Ahmad Taṁbāl Mughāl and Mughāls of the Horde; also his niece’s name Aūlūs Aḡhā translates as Lady of the Horde (aūlūs, aūlūs). But he may have been a Turkmān.
Bābā 'Alī aīshīk-āghā (ishīk), a Lord-of-the-Gate of Ḫusain Bāī-qarā—particulars 278; his son Yūnas-i-'āli and friend Badru’d-din q.v.

Bābā-qull’s Sulṭān Bābā ‘Alī Beg 1—particulars 27; his sons Bābā-qull, Šayyidīm ‘Alī and Dost-i-anjū (?) Shaikh q.v.; [†900 AH.—1495 AD.].

Bābā-aūghūlī, see Pāpā-aūghūlī.

Bābā Chuhra, a household brave—reprieved from death (914) 344; on Bābur’s service (932) 474, 534, (934) 590, 602; does well in the battle of the Ghogrā (935) 671.

Bābā Ḫusain, see Ḫusain.

Bābā Jān akhtachi, a groom or squire—Bābur dislocates his own thumb in striking him (925) 409.

Bābā Jān qābūzī—musician at entertainments (925) 386–7, 388.

Bābā Kābulī Turk, son of Mīr ‘Alī, Shāh-rukh (Tīmūrid)'s Governor of Kābul—nominated ‘Umar Shaikh’s guardian when Kābul was allotted to the boy 14; particulars 382; his brothers Daryā Khān and Ghāzi (Apāq) Khān q.v.

Bābā Khān Sulṭān Chaghatāī Chīngis-khānīd, (Bābājāk), son of Ahmad (Alacha Khan)—his ceremonious meeting with Bābur (908) 159; [living in 948 AH.—1542—T.R.].

Bābā Khān Chaghatāī, son of The Khān (Maḥmūd)—murdered with his father and brothers by Shaibānī (914) 35.

Bābā Qashqa Mughūl (perhaps identical with Qashqa Maḥmūd Chīrās q.v.)—out with Bābur (925) 404, 405; in charge of Dībālpūr (930) 442; his brothers Malik Qāsim and Kūkī; his sons Shāh Muhammad, Dost-i-muḥammad and Ḥāji Muḥammad Khān Kūkī q.v.; [†cir. 940 AH.—1553 AD.].

Sulṭān Bābā-qullī Beg, son of Sulṭān Bābā ‘Alī Beg—serving under Khusrau Shāh (901) 60, 61; with Bābur and captured (903) 72; staunch to him 91; in the centre at Qandahār (913) 335; conveys royal letters (932) 529.3

Bābā Sairāmī—pursues Bābur in his flight from Akhsī (908) 178; promised fidelity but seems to have been false 179–182.

1 The MS. variants between ‘Alī and -qullī are confusing. What stands in my text (p. 27) may be less safe than the above.

2 Bābā Qashqa was murdered by Muḥammad-i-zamān Bāī-qarā. For further particulars of his family group see Add. Notes under p. 404.

3 Sulṭān Bābā-qullī Beg is found variously designated Quli Beg, Quli Bābā, Sl. ‘Alī Bābā-qullī, Sulṭān-qullī Bābā and Bābā-qullī Beg. Several forms appear to express his filial relationship with Sulṭān Bābā ‘Alī (q.v.).
Bābā Shaikh Chaghātāī, brother of Mullā Bābā Pashāgharī—in the left centre at Qandahār (913) 335; rebels at Ghaznī (921) 363; forgiven (925) 397; deserts Humāyūn (932) 546; his capture and death 545; a reward given for his head id.; [†932 or 933 AH.–1526 AD.].

Bābā Shaikh—sent out for news (935) 661.

Bābā Sher-zād—one of three with Bābur against Tambal (908) 163; does well at Akhsi 174; fights against rebels at Kābul (912) 315; at Qandahār (913) 335.

Bābā Sultan Chaghātāī Chīngīz-ḵānīd, son of Khalīl son of Ahmad (Alacha Khān)—waits on Bābur near Kālpī (934) 590; particulars 590; on service 318, (934) 599; not at his post (935) 672.

Bābā Yāsāwal—at the siege of Bajaur (925) 370; chops at a tiger’s head 393.

Bābū Khān—holding Kalanjar and looking towards Ḥāṭī Kākar (925) 387.
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91, 130-52-57-78; consideration for dependants 91-9, 158-78-96, 469; distrust of the world 95, 144-56; silent humiliation 119; fairness 15, 24, 91, 105, 469; fearlessness 163-5-73; fidelity:—to word 104, 129 (see 118-9), 172-3, 194, to salt 125, to family-relation,—filial 88-9, 135-49-57-58-88,—fraternal see Jahāngīr and Nāṣir,—Tīmūrid 41, 149-57-68, Chaghatāi 54, 169-72, Mughūl 27, 119-25, Aūzbeg 37;—friendship see Nūyān and Khw. Kalān; good judgment 43, 87, 91, 134-37-55; gratitude 99, 633; insouciance 150; joy at release from stress 99, 134-35-48-81; bashfulness and passion 120; persistence 92-7 and passim; promptitude 117, 170; reprobation of vice, tyranny and cruelty 42-5-6, 50, 66, 70, 90-6, 102-10-25-97, 290 and of an unmotherly woman 125-28; self-reproach 147; self-comment on inexperienced action 165-67-73; dislike of talkativeness 28, 97, 143-92-93; vexation at loss of rule (et. 14) 90-1-9, 129-30-57; truth for truth sake 135, 318; seeking and weighing counsel 73, 100-14-31-41-65-70-73-97-98, 229-30-31-48, 340-76-78, 410-12-69, 524-30-77, 628-39-67-69-82; enjoins Humāyūn to take counsel 627;

Occupations (non-military):—archery i.a.175; calligraphy see infra; literary composition see infra; metrical amuse-ments see verse; Natural History passim; travel, excursions, sight-seeing, social intercourse passim; building 5, 217-9, 375-98, in Dūlpūr 585, 606-07-42, in Āgra 642, in Kābul 646-7, in Sīkri 588, Ajodhyā mosque 656 n. 3, App. U, Pānīpat mosque 472 n. 1; gardening and garden-making passim;—Bābur's script (Bāburī-khatt) devised 910 AH. 228, Qorān transcribed by him in it 228 n. 4; studied by an enquirer 285; alphabet and specimens sent to Bābur's sons 642; Abūshqā account of, App. Q, lxii to lxv;

Observance and breaches of Muh. Law:—signs of his Sunnī mind e.g. 25, 44, 111, 262, 370-7, 483, 547-51-74-89-96, in the Mubīn and Wālidīyyah-risāla q.v.; his orthodox reputation 711; his heterodox seeming 354, and arrow-292 spaced disclaimer 361;—his boyish obedience as to wine 302, up to his 23rd year 299, 302-3-4; for breach see Law and Wine;

Writings:—a. Verses in the B.N. down to 926 AH. see infra; b. First Diwān 402; * perhaps containing the Abūshqā quotations 438; c. Diary of 925 and 926 q.v. AH. (probably a survival of more) * 438; d. The Mubīn (928 AH.) 426-37-38-49; quoted 630-31 n. 3; e. Treatise on Prosody (931 AH.)
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Bābur’s verse quoted in the Bābur-nāma:—(Turkī,) love-sickness 120–1; the worldling 130; granting a request 137; respite from stress 148; praise of a beloved 153; Fortune’s cruelty 309; ? Turkmān Hazāra raid 312; Spring 321; God only is strength 337; dealing with tribesmen 393; greeting to absent convives 401; message to a kinswoman 402; his broken vow 449, 450 n.; reply to Khw. Kalān 526; disobedience to Law (T. & P.) 556; Death inevitable (T. & P.) 556 (?); the Ghāzi’s task 575; to those who have left him 584; couplet used in metrical amusement 586, App. 2, sect. 2; fever 588; Chandirī 596; on his first grandson’s birth 624; Mūbīn quoted 637; Pagan lands 637; pain in renunciation 648; an invitation 683; [Persian,] good in everything 311; insight of Age 340; on casting off his Shī’a seeming 361; parting from Khw. Kalān 372; a message 411; satirical couplet 448; before Panipat 470; Biāna warned 529. See Table of Contents, On Bābur’s Naming.

Bābur Mīrāzā Arlāt, son of Muḥammad-i-qāsim and Rābi’a-sulṭān Mīrān-shāhī—his Bāi-qarā marriage 266.

‘Abdu’l-qāsim Bābur Mīrāzā Shah-rukhlī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Bāi-sunghār—his sister 265; his retainers Muhammad Barandūq and Mazīd q.v.; his pleasure-house 302; [†861 AH.—1457 AD.].

Bābūri—a bāzār-boy (905) 120.

Badī’u’l-jamāl Begīm Mīrān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, daughter of Abū-sa’īd—waited on by Bābur near Āgra (935) 616.

Badī’u’l-jamāl Badka Begīm Bāi-qarā, ut supra, daughter of Maṃsūr and Firūza—particulars 257, 258; her husband Ahmad Ḥājītarkhānī, their sons Maḥmüd and Bahādur and daughter Khān-zāda q.v.

Badī’u’z-zamān Mīrāzā Bāi-qarā, ut supra, son of Huṣain and Bega Mervī—serving his father against Khusrav Shāh (901) 57; defeated 61; takes offence with his father 61, 69; in arms and defeated by his father 69, 70; his retort on
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Nawā'ī (q.v.); goes destitute to Khusrau Shāh and is well-treated 70, 130; on Khusrau Shāh’s service 71; moves with Arghūn chiefs against his father (903), 95, 261; gives Bābur no help against Shaibānī (906) 138; his co-operation sought by his father (910) 190, 191; takes refuge with his father 243; has fear for himself (911) 292–3; joint-ruler in Herät 293; concerts and abandons action against Shaibānī (912) 296–7, 301; his social relations with Bābur 297, 8, 9, 300, 2, 4; courteous to Bābur as a non-drinker 303; a false report of him in Kabul (912) 313; irresolute against Shaibānī (913) 326; his army defeated 275, 327; abandons his family and flees (1) to Shah Beg Arghūn, (2) to Ismā’īl Ṣafawī 327; captured in Tabrīz by Sultan Sālim Rūmī (920) 327; his host-facility 304; his son Muhammad-i-zamān, his sons Wais and Iskandar q.v. joined by Sayyidīm Dārbān q.v.; his College in Herät 306; [†923 AH.–1517 AD.]

Sayyid Badr—particulars 276; safe-guards Ṭaḥmūḏ Mirān-shāhi 46–7; seen by Bābur in Herät (912) 299; (see H.S. lith. ed. iii, 233).

Badrū’l-dīn—particulars 278; his friend Bābā ʿAlī g.v.; his son (?) receives Kachwa (934) 590.

Maulānā Badrū’l-dīn Hilālī, Chaghatā’—particulars 290; his poet-daughter 286 n. 1; [†939 AH.–1532–3 AD.]

Bahādur Khān Sarwānī—Bābur halts at his tomb (935) 686.

Bahādur Khān Gujurātī, Tānq Rājpūt—ill-received by Ibrāhīm Lūdī (932); exchanges friendly letters with Bābur 534; becomes Shāh in Gujrāt 535; is given the Khīlji jewels 613 n. 1; [†943 AH.–1547 AD.]

Bahjat Khān (or Bihjat), a Governor of Chandīrī—Bābur halts near his tank (934) 592, 594.


Bāi-qarā Mīrzā ‘Umar-shaikḥī, ut supra, son of Mansūr and Firūza—particulars 257; his brother Ḥusain, and sons Wais and Iskandar q.v.

Bairām Beg†—reinforces Bābur from Balkh (918) 359; serving Najm Ṣānī 360.

† He may be the father of Mun‘im Khān (Blochmann’s Biographies A.-i-A. trs. 317 and n. 2).
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Bairām Khān Bahārlū-Qarā-ğülůq Turkmān (Akbar’s Khān-i-khānān), son of Saif-‘āli—his ancestry 91 n. 3, 109 n. 5 (where for “father” read “grandfather”); mention of a witness of his assassination 348; quotation of his remarks on Ḥasan Khān Mewātī 523 n. 3; [†968 AH.—1561 AD.].

Bairām-sultān Begim Bāī-qarā Timūrid, Barlās Turk, daughter of Ḥusain and Minglī—particulars 266; her husband ‘Abdu’l-lāh Andikhudl, q.v.

Bāi-sunghar Mīrāz Mīrān-shāhī, ut supra, son of Maḥmūd and Pasha—particulars 47, 110–112; succeeds in Samarkand (900) 52, 86; withstands The Khān (Maḥmūd) 52; the khutba read for him in Bābur’s lands 52; his man surrenders Aurā-tipā 55–6; his favouritism incites the Tarkhān rebellion (901) 38, 61; escapes from Tarkhān imprisonment 62, 86; defeated by his half-brother ‘Ali 38, 63; prosperous (902) 65; moves against ‘Ali 65; retires before Bābur 66; at grips with him 67; asks Shaibānī’s help (903) 73; goes to Khusrau Shāh 74; made ruler in Hisār 93, 5, 6, 261; murdered (905) 110; his death referred to 50, 112; his pen-name ‘Ādili 111; his sister’s marriage 41; his brother Mas’ūd, his guardian Ayūb q.v.; [†905 AH.—1499 AD.].

Bāi-sunghar Mīrāz Shāh-rukhī Timūrid, son of Shāh-rukh—his servant Yūsuf Andijānī 4; [†837 AH.—1433–4 AD.].

Balkhī falīs-kārī—grows melons in Āgra (935) 686.

Bāltū—rescues Khalīfa’s son Muḥibb-‘alī (933) 550.

Mullā Banā’i—Maulānā Jamālūd-dīn Bānā’i—in Khwāja Yahyā’s service and seen by Bābur (901) 64, in Shaibānī’s (906) 136, in Bābur’s 64, 136; particular 286–7; given the Herī’s authors to loot (913) 328; Bābur recalls a joke of his (935) 648; two of his quatrains quoted 137; his musical composition 286, 292; [murdered 918 AH.—1512 AD.].

Banda-i-‘alī, dāroghā of Karnān—pursues Bābur from Akhsī (908) 178–9, 180, 181.

Banda-i-‘alī Yāragī Mughūl, son of Ḥaidar Kūkūlādsh—sent to reinforce Bābur (904) 101; in the van at Sar-i-pul (906) 139; his mistimed zeal (908) 176; his son-in-law Qāsim Beg qūchīn q.v.

Bāqī Beg Chaghānīānī, Qībchāq Turk—his influence on Mas’ūd Mīrān-shāhī (901) 57, (903) 95; defends Hisār for him (901) 58; acts against him (902) 71; joins Bābur (910) 48,188–9; advises sensibly 190, 197; leaves his family with Bābur’s 191; dislikes Qambar-i-‘alī Silākh 192; helps his...

741
Index I. Personal

brother Khusrau to make favourable terms with Bābur 192–3; quotes a couplet on seeing Suhail 195; his Mughūls oppose Khusrau 197; mediates for Muqim Arghūn (910) 199; Bābur acts on his advice 230–1, 239, (911) 246, 249; particulars 249–50; dismissed towards Hindūstān 250; killed on his road 231, 251; his son Muhammad-i-qāsīm and grandson (?) Ahmad-i-qāsīm q.v.; [†911 AH.–1505–6 AD.].

Bāqī Gāgiānī Afghān—his caravan through the Khaibar (911) 250.

Bāqī (khīs)īs—opposes Bābur (908) 174, 396.

Khwāja Bāqī, son of Yahyā son of Ahrārī—murdered 128; [†906 AH.–1500 AD.].

Bāqī Beg Tāshkīndī, shaghāwal and (later) mīng-bāshi (= hasārī)—sent to Balkh with promise of head-money (932) 463, 546; on service (934) 590, 601, 2; reports from Aūd (Oudh) (935) 679; on service with the Aūd (Oudh) army 684, 5; leave given him for home 685.

Bāqī Tarkhān, Arghūn Chīngiz-khānid, son of ‘Abdu’l-‘alī and a daughter of Aūrdū-būghā—particulars 38, 40; consumes the Bukhārā revenues (905) 121; defeated by Shaibānī 124; occupies Qarshi (qy. Kesh) (906) 135; plans to join Bābur 138; goes to Shaibānī and dies in misery 40.

Bārāq Khān, Chaghhatā’ī Chīngiz-khānid—mentioned in the genealogy of Yūnas 19.

Bārāq Sūltān Aūsbeg-Shaibān Chīngiz-khānid, son of Siūnjuk—at Jām (934) 622.

Sayyid Barka Andikhūdī, Timūr’s exhumation of his body 266 n 4.

Sayyid Barka Andikhūdī, descendant of the last-entered, son of ‘Abdu’l-lāh—particulars 266; serving Bābur (917) 266.

Bār-mal Īdī—his force at Kānwa (933) 562.

Bā-sa’īd Tarkhānī, see Abū-sa’īd Tarkhānī.

Basant Rāo—killed by (Bābā Qashqa’s brother ?) Kūkī in the battle of the Ghogrā 673; [†935 AH.–1529 AD.].

Bātalmiūs (Ptolemy)—mentioned as constructor of an observatory 79.

Sūltān Bāyazīd—urges attack on the Afrīdī (925) 411, 412.

1 See note, Index, s.n. Muhammad Zakārīā.
2 He is likely to have been introduced with some particulars of tribe, in one of the now unchronicled years after Bābur’s return from his Trans-oxus campaign.
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Shaikh Bāyazīd, Farmūlī Afghān—acts for his dead brother Muṣṭafā¹ (932) 527; waits on Bābur and receives Aūd (Oudh) 527; on service 530; in Aūd (933) 544; his loyalty tested (934) 589; with Biban, opposing Bābur 594, 598–601, 2, (935) 638; serving Mahmūd Lūdī against Bābur 652, 673; Bābur resolves to crush him and Biban 677–8; mentioned 679, 692; takes Luknūr (?) 681, App. T; action continued against him 681, 2, 5; his comrade Biban q.v.; [†937 AH.–1531 AD.]

Shaikh Bāyazīd ʿItārachī Ṭūghūl, brother of Aḥmad Tambal—holding Akhsī for Jahāngīr (908) 170; sends a force against Pāp 171; receives Bābur in Akhsī 171–2; made prisoner against Bābur's wish 173; escapes 175; reported as sending Yusuf dāroghā to Bābur's hiding-place 182.

Bega Begīm (1), Bāī-qarā Timūrid, Barlās Turk, daughter of Ḫusain and Pāyandā—particulars 266; [† before Ḫusain 911 AH.–1505 AD.]

Bega Begīm (2), Mīrān-shāhī ut supra, daughter of Aūlūgh Beg Kābulī—her marriage with Muḥammad Maʿṣūm Bāī-qarā (902) 264.

Bega Begīm (3), Mīrān-shāhī ut supra, daughter of Mahmūd and Khān-zāda II—betrothed to Ḥaidar Bāī-qarā (901) 48, 61, 263; married (903) 48; their child 263.

Bega Begīm (4), Shāh-rukhī ut supra, daughter of Bāi-sunghar (Shāh-rukhī)—her grandson's marriage 265.

Bega Begīm (5),—Ḥājī Begīm—daughter of Yādgār Ṭaghāī, wife of Ḥumāyūn—her son Al-amān q.v.

Bega Begīm (6),—“the Bibi”—, see Mubārika.

Bega Sultān Begīm Mervī, wife of Ḫusain Bāī-qarā—particulars 261, 7, 8; divorced 268; her son Bādīʿuʾz-zamān q.v.; [893 AH.–1488 AD.]

Wais Lāghari's Beg-gīna,—brings Bābur news of Al-amān's birth (935) 621, 4.²

The Begims, Bābur's paternal aunts—waited on by him 301, 616, 686.

Begīm Sultān, see Saʿādat-bakht.

Begī Sultān ʿAghācha, ghūnchachī of Ḫusain Bāī-qarā—particulars 269.

¹ His wife, daughter of a wealthy man and on the mother's side niece of Sultān Buhlūl Lūdī, financed the military efforts of Bāyazīd and Biban (Ṭārīkh-i-sher-shāhī, E. and D. iv, 353 ff.).
² My translation on p. 621 l. 12 is inaccurate inasmuch as it hides the circumstance that Beg-gīna alone was the "messenger of good tidings".
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Beg Mirak Mughul—brings Bābur good news (932) 466; on service (933) 548.

Beg Mirak Turkmān, a beg of the Chirās (Mughul) tumān—acts for Yūnas Khān 191; [†832 AH.—1428–9 AD.].

Beg Tilba Itārachī Mughul, brother of Aḥmad Tāmbal—induces the Khān (Māhmūd) not to help Bābur (903) 91, (905) 115; his light departure perplexes his brother 116; invites Shaibānī into Farghāna (908) 172.

Bhupat Rao, son of Ṣalāhu'd-dīn—killed at Kānwa 573; [†933 AH.—1527 AD.].

Bīān Shaikh (Biyan)—his rapid journeys 621, 624; brings news of the battle of Jām (935) 622, 623 n. 3; the source of his news 624 n. 1; hurried back 624, 627.

Bīān-quli—his son Khān-quli q.v.

Malik Biban Jilwānī? 1 Ṭafghān—deserts ‘Alam Khān Lūdī (932) 457 and n. 2; writes dutifully to Bābur 464; is presuming at an audience 466; deserts Bābur 468, 528; is defeated 528–9; with Bāyazīd, besieges Luknūr (933) 582; defeats Bābur's troops 594, 598; opposes Bābur in person (934) 598–601; referred to as a rebel (935) 638; serving Māhmūd Lūdī 652, 675; Bābur resolves to crush him 677–8; mentioned 679 n. 7, 692; takes Luknūr (?) 681, App. T; action taken against him 681, 2, 5; his constant associate Bāyazīd Farmūlī q.v.

Muhammad Shāh, Bihār Khān Bihārī, Nūhānī Ṭafghān, son of Daryā Khān—declared independent in Bihār (932) 523; particulars 664; his widow Dūdū and son Jalāl q.v.; [†934 AH.—1527 AD.].

Bihār Khān Lūdī (or Pahār Khān,) 2 a Panj-āb amīr of Ibrāhīm Lūdī's in 930 AH.—3 defeated by Bābur (930) 208, 441 (where add "or Pahār"), 578; a chronogram which fixes the date 575.

Bihjat, see Bahjat.


Ustād Kamālu'd-dīn Bih-zād—particulars 291; his training due to Nawā'ī 272; is instructed in drawing by Shaibānī (913) 329.

1 In taking Biban for a Jilwānī, I follow Erskine, (as inferences also warrant,) but he may be a Lūdī.

2 For the same uncertainty between Bihār and Pahār see E. and D.'s History of India iv, 352 n. 2.

3 Firishta lith. ed. i, 202.
Rāja of Bījānagar (Vijāyanagar) — mentioned as ruling in 932 AH. 483.

Rāja Bikam-deo, named in the Hindūstān Revenue List.

Rāja Bikam-chand, ut supra.

Rāja Bikramājit, ut supra.

Bi-khūb Sūltān (var. Nī- or Naī-khūb) ? Aūsbeq-Shaibān—on Bābur’s service (934) 589, 602, (935) 651, 682; in the battle of the Ghogrā 669.

Rānā Bikramājit, son of Sangā and Padmāwati—negotiations for him with Bābur (934) 603, 612, (935) 612-3, 615, 616; pact made with him 616-7; possessor of Khilji jewels 613; his mother Padmāwati and her kinsman Asūk Mal q.v.

Rājā Bikramājit Gūāliārī, Tunwar Rājpūt — his ancestral fortress 477; his Koh-i-nūr (932) 477; his buildings 607-610 and nn.; his palace Bābur’s quarters (935) 607; his death (932) 477; [†932 AH.—1526 AD.].

Rājā Bikramājit (Vikramāditya) — his Observatory and Tables 79.

Bīrīm Deo Malinhās—on Bābur’s service (932) 462.

Rājā Bir-sing Deo—named in the Revenue List (935) 521; his force at Kānwa (933) 562; serving Bābur 639.

Khalīfa's Bishka (?)—a woman who leaves Samarkand with Bābur’s mother (907) 147.

Bishka Mīrzā Itārachi Mughūl—brings and receives gifts (925) 415, 416.

Brethren of Bābur—removal of their opposition to his aim on Hindūstān 478.

Buhlūl-i-ayūb Begchik, son of Ayūb—Bābur warned against him (910) 190; joins Bābur 196; his misconduct 241, (911) 254.

Sultān Buhlūl, Sāhū-khail Lūdī, Afghān—grandfather of Ibrāhīm 463; his treasure 470; his tomb visited by Bābur 476; his capture of Jūnpūr and Dīhūl 481; his sons Sikandar and ‘Alau’u’d-dīn q.v.; [†894 AH.—1488 AD.].

Pahlawān Buhlūl, tufang-andāzī—receives gifts (935) 633.

Būjka, a household bravo—on Bābur’s service (932) 458, 474, 534, (933) 545; his success at Bīāna 547.

Malik Bū Khān Dīlah-sāk (Dīlasāk) Afghān—receives gifts from Bābur (925) 394; brings tribute 409.
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Būrān Sultān Aūşbeg-Shaibān—his marriage with 'Āyishasultān Bāi-qarā 267; their son 'Abdu'l-lāh q.v.

Shaikh Burhānu’d-dīn ‘Āli Qīlīch, Marghīnānī, author of the Hīdāyat—his birthplace Rashdān 7; a descendant 29, 89; [†593 AH.-1197 AD.]

Malik Bū-sa’īd Kamarī—a guide (910) 230, 231; doubted 233.

Chaghatā’i Khān, second son of Chīngiz Khān—his yūrt (camping-ground) occupied by his descendant Yūnas 12; mentioned in the genealogy of Yūnas 19; [†638 AH.-1241 AD.]

Chākū Barlās, one of Tīmūr’s noted men—an ancestor of Muḥammad Barandūq 270; descent of his line to Akbar’s day 270 n. 2.

Rāi Chandrabān, Chauhān Rājpūt—killed at Kānwa (933) 573; [†933 AH.-1527 A.D.]

Chāpūq (Slash-face), see Ibrāhīm Begchik.

Sultān Ahmad Chār-shamba—unhorses Muḥammad Mūmin Bāi-qarā (902) 71; coincident occurrences of “Chār-shamba” 71.

Ismā’īl Chīlma (or Chalma), son of Ibrāhīm Jānī—writes particulars of the battle of Jām (935) 624.

Chīlma Mughūl (or Chalma) — in the centre at Qandahār (913) 335; rebels in Kābul (914) 345.

Chīlma tāghchī Mughūl (?shoeing-smith) — in the centre at Qandahār (913) 335.

Chīngiz Khān Mughūl—counted back to in Yūnas Khān’s genealogy 12, 19; his capture of Samarkand (619 AH.-1222 AD.) 75; referred to concerning the name Qarshī 84; his Rules (Tūrā) 155, 298; [†624 AH.-1227 AD.]

Chīn Sūfī—defends Khwārizm for Ḥusain Bāi-qarā against Shaibānī (910) 242 n. 3, 244; killed in the surrender 255-6; [†911 AH.-1505-6 AD.]

Chīntīmūr Sultān Chaghatā’ī Chīngiz-khānid, son of Aḥmad—mentioned s.a. 912 as serving Bābur 318; succeeds against Ibrāhīm Lūdī’s advance (932) 467; in the right centre at Pānpat 472, and at Kānwa (933) 565, 568 n. 3; rewarded 527, 578-9; on service (933) 540; at Chandīrī (934) 590; pursues Bīban and Bāyazīd 601, 602; in command against Balūchīs (935) 638, 676; met on a journey 639; writes of

1 For “Mū’mīn” read Mūmin, which form is constant in the Hai. MS.
loss of reinforcement 675; ordered to Āgra 676; waits on Bābur 688; his brothers Mańṣūr, Aisān-timūr, Tūkhtā-būghā, Saʿīd, Khālil q.v.; [†936 AH.-1530 AD.].

Chiqmāq Beg—sent on road-surveyor's work (935) 629-30; the Mubīn quoted in connection with his orders 630; his clerk Shāhi q.v.

Chirkas qizlār (Circassian girls), see Gulnār and Nār-gul.

Chuli Begim, Azāq Turkmān—particulars 265, 268; her husband Husain Bāj-garā and their daughter Sultānim q.v.; [†before 911 AH.-1505 AD.].

Dāmāchī Mughūl—in the centre at Qandahār (913) 335.

Dankūsi var. Nigarsī—killed at Kānwa 573; [†933 AH.-1527 AD.].

Darwesh-i-ʿali—serving Humāyūn in Sambhal (934) 587.

Darwesh-i-ʿali Beg Chaghataī, brother of Nawāʿī—particulars 275; in Bābur’s service (916) 275 and (917) 277; his poet-wife Āpāq Bega q.v.

Darwesh-i-ʿali pāda and, later, tūfān-andāz—takes news of Hind-āl’s birth to Bābur (925) 385.

Darwesh-i ʿAlī Sayyid Mughūl—in the centre at Qandahār (913) 335.

Darwesh Beg Tarkhān, Arghūn—particulars 39; [†895 AH.-1490 AD.].

Darwesh Gāū Andijānī—put to death as seditious (899) 30.

Shaikh Darwesh Kūkūldāsh qūr-begi—at a household-party (906) 131; his death, successor in office, and avengence 251, 253; [†911 AH.-1505-6 AD.].

Darwesh-i-muhammad Faṣlī—defeated (910) 241; degraded for not supporting a comrade (925) 405.

Darwesh-i-muhammad Sārbān—Mīrzā Khān’s envoy to Bābur (925) 402; a non-drinker not pressed to disobey 406; replaces a china cup 407; enters Bābur’s service 408; over-pressed to break the Law 410; eats a strange fruit 410-1; at maʿjūn-parties 412, (935) 683; asks a fruitful question (932) 470-1; in the right-centre at Pānī-pat 472 and at Kānwa (933) 565; recalls a vow to Bābur 553; in the battle of the Ghograh (935) 673.

Darwesh-i-muhammad Tarkhān Arghūn Chingiz-khānid—particulars 38; envoy to the Andijān begs (899) 31; his part in the Tarkhān rebellion (901) 62; his death 38, 63;
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his relationship to Mīrān-shāhīs 13 n. 5, 33, 38, and his kinsman 'Abdu'l-'alī q.v.; [†901 AH.—1496 AD.].

Darwesh Sultan (? Chaghatāi)—on Bābur’s service (934) 599.

Daryā Khān Türk, son of Mīr (Shaikh) ‘Alī Beg—particulars 382, his sons Yār-i-ḥusain and Ḥasan q.v.

Daryā Khān Nūhān, Afghān—his sons Saīf Khān and Bihār Khān, his grandson Jalāl q.v.

Mullā Dāūd—killed serving Bābur 549; [†933 AH.—1527 AD.].

Sayyid Dāūd Garm-serī—receives gifts (935) 633.

Dāūd Khān Nukdm, Afghan—his sons Salf Khan and Bihar Khan, his grandson Jalāl q.v.

Mulla Daud—serving Bābur 549; [†933 AH.—1527 AD.].

Sayyid Daud—receives gifts (935) 633.

Daud Khān Ludi—defeated by Bābur’s troops (932) 467–8.

Daulat Khān, Yūsuf-khail Lūdī, Afghan, son of Tātār—is given Bihra etc. 382, 383; concerning his lands, Author’s Note 383; a principal actor from 926 to 932 AH. 428; dreads Ibrāhīm Lūdī 439; proffers allegiance to Bābur (929?) 439, 440; his gift of an Indian fruit decides Bābur to help him 440, 503 n. 6; his action causes the return to Kābul of Bābur’s fourth expedition into Hindūstān 442; his strength and action 443–4; his rumoured attack on Lāhor (932) 451, 453; negotiates with ‘Alam Khān (931?) 455–6; loses Mīhwat to Bābur (932) 459; his death 461; his sons ‘Ali, Ḍilawār q.v.; his relations with Nānak 461 n. 3; [†932 AH.—1526 AD.].

Daulat-i-muḥammad Kūkūldāsh, see Qutluq-i-muḥammad.

Daulat-qadam?—his son Mir Mughul q.v.

Daulat-shāh Isfarāyīnī, author of the Taẓkīratu’sh-shu‘ārā— at the battle of Chīkmān-sarāī (876) 46 n. 2; [†895 AH.—1490 AD.?].

Daulat-sultān Khānim, Chaghatāi Chingīz-khānid, daughter of Yūnas Khān and Shāh Begīm—particulars 24; her long family separation (907) 149; meets her brother Ahmad (908) 159; married as a captive by Tīmūr Aūz-beg (909) 24; rejoins Bābur (917) 2b. and 358 n. 1; letters from her reach Bābur (925) 409; sends letters and gifts to him (932) 446.

Dāwā Khān, Chaghatāī Chingīz-khānid—mentioned in Yūnas Khān’s genealogy 19; [†706 AH.—1306–7 AD.].

Dejal, the false Messiah 563 n. 1.

Deo Sultan, see Div.

Rāja Dharmankat Gūālīārī—stirs trouble (933) 539; lays siege to Gūālīār 557.

Dharm-deo—his force at Kānwa (933) 562.
Dilāwar Khān *Yūṣuf-khail Lūdī*, Afghān, son of Daulat Khān — ill-received by Ibrāhīm Lūdī (929?) 439; goes to Kābul to ask help from Bābur 439–40; imprisoned by his father (931) 442, 443; escapes and joins 'Ālam Khān 455, 456; joins Bābur 457, 461; location of his mother's family 462; does not sit in Bābur's presence 466; entrusted by Bābur with care for the corpse of Ibrāhīm Lūdī 474 n. 1; in the right wing at Kānwa (933) 567 (here styled Khān-i-khānān); [†946 AH.–1539 AD.].

Dil-dār Begim (?Šalḥa-sūltān 3rd daughter of Maḥmūd Mīrān-shāhī and Pasha), wife of Bābur—her unborn child forcibly adopted (925) 347, and App. L; her son Alwar (Alūr)'s death (935) 689 n. 5; particulars 712–4; her sons Hind-āl and Alūr, her daughters Gul-rang, Gul-chihra and Gul-badan q.v.

Dilpat Rāo—killed at Kānwa 573; [†933 AH.–1527 AD.].

Div Sulṭān *Rūmlū* (or Deo)—recaptures Balkh (cir. 919) 363; particulars 635 n. 2; his servant describes the battle of Jām (935) 635–6.

Diwa Hindū, son of Siktū—waits on Bābur in Bhīra (925) 382; made prisoner and ransomed 399.

Diwāna jāma-bāf—put to retaliatory death 73; [†903 AH.–1497 AD.].

Bābā Dost—put in charge of Humāyūn's Trans-Indus district (925) 391; conveys wine to Bābur's camp (933) 551 (here sūchi). ¹

Dost, son of Muḥammad Bāqir—drunk (925) 415.


Dost Beg *Mugḥūl*, son of Bābā Qashqā and brother (p. 588) of Shāh Muḥammad—at a social gathering and sent to Bhīra 388 (here muhrdār); made a diwān (932) 476; in charge of Biāna (933) 539 and made its shiqdār 579 (here Lord-of-the Gate); in the right centre at Kānwa 565, 569; waits on Bābur 581; pursues rebels (934) 601 (here Dost-i-muḥammad); in the battle of the Ghogrā (935) 673; for his kinsmen see s.n. Bābā Qashqā.

Khwāja Dost-i-khāwand—lets himself down over the wall of Qandahār (913) 343; at boat-parties (925) 385, 388; comes

¹ He may be Ḥamīda-bānū's father and, if so, became grandfather of Akbar.

² Ilminstery, anlī, Erskine, angū. Daulat-shāh mentions a Muḥammad Shāh anjū (see Brown's ed. Index s.n.).
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from Kābul to Āgra (933) 544; in the left-centre at Kānwa 565; sent on Bābūr’s family affairs to Humayūn in Badakhshān (934) 603; delayed in Kābul till Kāmrān’s arrival 618 and nn. 2–6; his letters reach Bābūr (935) 618.

Dost-kildī Mughul—in the centre at Qandahār (913) 335.
Dost-i-nāsir Beg—Dost Beg—(Nāsir’s Dost), son of Nāsir—enters Bābūr’s service (904) 103; on service (906) 131, (908) 163, 165; one of three standing by Bābūr 166, 167, 396; with him at Akhārī 174, 396; one of the eight in the flight 177, 396; at the recapture of Kābul (912) 315; in the left centre at Qandahār (913) 335, 338; at Tashkint (918) 356 n. 1, 358, 396–7; opposing rebels (921) 364, 397; leading the left at Bajaur (925) 368 (here first styled Beg), 369, 370, 397; his revenue work 384; at wine parties 387, 388; at Parhāla 390; attacked by fever 394; his death and his burial at Ghaznī 395–6; his brother Mīrīm q.v.; particulars 395–7; [+925 AH.–1519 AD.].

Dost Sar-i-pulī, piāda and (later) kotwāl—attacks Bābūr blindly (912) 316–7; wounded (913) 324; [+913 AH.–1507 AD.].
Dost-i-yāsīn-khair—wrestles well with eight in successive (935) 653; 656.

Dūdū Bibī, widow of Bihār Khān Bihārī—news of her bringing her son to Bābūr (935) 664; encouraging letters sent to her 665; Sher Khān Sūr her co-guardian for her son 664 n. 2; her son Jalālū’d-dīm Nuhānī q.v.

Fagḥfūr Diwān—on service (933) 551; his servants sent for fruit to Kābul (935) 687. Hai. MS. reads Maghfūr.
Fajji Gāgānī, Afghān—guides Bābūr’s first passage of the Khaibar (910) 229.
Fakhrū’n-nisā’, daughter of Bābūr and ‘Āyisha—died an infant 35–6, 136; [+906 AH.–1500–1 AD.].
Faqi-i-‘ali—reprieved (914) 345; with Bābūr and left in charge of Balkh (923) 463; left in charge of Qila’i-żafar by Humayūn (936) 695.

Farīd Khān Nuhānī, Afghān, son of Naṣīr—writes dutifully to Bābūr (935) 659.
Farīdūn, (an ancient Shāh of Persia)—mentioned in a verse 85.
Farīdūn-i-ḥusain Mīrzā Bāi-qarā Timūrid, son of Ḥusain and Mīnglī—particulars 263, 269; [+915 AH.–1509 AD.].
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Faridun qabizi—summoned by Babur (935) 617.
Mulla Farrukh—placed on Babur’s left at a feast (935) 631; gifts made to him 632.
Farrukh Arghun—surrenders Qalat-i-ghilzai to Babur (911) 248-9.
Mizra Farrukh Aighlaqchi, son of Hasan—mentioned for his qualities 279.
Farrukh-i-husain Mizra, Bait-qara Timurid, Barlas Turk, son of Husain and Pappa—particulars 264; [915 AH.-1509 AD.].
Farrukh-zad Beg—Babur dismounts in his garden at Qandahar (913) 337.
Faruq, son of Babur and Maim—his birth (932) announced to Babur (933) 536, 689 n. 5; [933 AH.-1526-7 AD.].
Fath Khan Sarwani Khan-i-jahan, son of Azim-humayun—is escorted to Babur (932) 534; well-received (933) 537; his hereditary title superseded ib.; invited to a wine-party ib.; serving Mahmud Ludi (935) 652; his son Mahmud q.v.; a kinsman Daud q.v.
Fatima-sultan Agha Mughul—first wife of ‘Umar Shaikh Miran-shahi 17, 24; their son Jahangir q.v.
Fatima-sultan Begim Bait-qara Timurid, Barlas Turk, daughter of Husain and Mingli—particulars 266; her husband Yadgar-i-farrukh Miran-shahi q.v.; [before 911 AH.-1505 AD.].
Fazil Kukuldash—serving Shah Beg Arghun (910) 238; a good account of him named 443; his death a crushing grief to Shah Beg ib.; [930 AH.-1514 AD.].
Fazil Tarkhan—a Turkistan merchant created a Tarkhan by Shaibanl, [Author’s Note] 133; his death ib.; [906 AH.-1500 AD.].
Fazli, see Darwesh-i-muhammad.
Ferdinand the Catholic—his action in 1504 (910 AH.) 187 n. 2 (Erskine).
Firuz Begim Qanjut, wife of Mansur Bait-qara her Timurid ancestry 256; her children Bait-qara (II), Husain, Akä and Badka q.v.; [974 AH.-1469-70 AD.].
Firuz Khan Mewati—reprieved (932) 477-8.
Firuz Khan, Sarang-khanë, Afghân—on Ibrahim Ludi’s service 527; waits on Babur (932) 527, and on his service 530.
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Sułtân Firūz Shāh, Tūghlūq Turk—his servants’ dynasties 481, 482; his relations with the rulers of Mālwa 482 (where in n. 3 for “Gujrat” read Mālwa); [†790 AH.–1388 AD.].

Firūz Shāh Beg—his grandson ‘Abdu’l-khaļiḳ q.v.

Gadāī Balāl—rejoins Bābūr (913) 330–1.
Gadāī biḥjat—misbehaves (925) 414.
Gadāī Ṭagḥāī—shares a confection (925) 414.
Gadāī biḥjat—misbehaves (925) 414.
Gadāī Tāqhīḥ—rejoins Bābūr (913) 330–1.
Gadāī Tāqhīḥ—rejoins Bābūr (913) 330–1.
Gauhar-shād Begim, wife of Shāh-ruḵh Timūrid—Bābūr visits her college and tomb (912) 305; [†861 AH.–1457 AD.].
Gauhar-shād Begim Mirdn-shād Timūrid, Barlās Turk, daughter of Abū-sa’īd—visited by Bābūr (935) 616.
Mir Gesū—finds chronogram identical with Shaikh Zain’s 575.
Apāq Ghāzi Khān Turk, son of Mir (Shaikh) ‘Alī Beg—particulars 382; his brothers Bābā Kābulī and Daryā Khān, his son ‘Alī and his relation Naẓar-i-‘alī Turk q.v.
Apāq Ghāzi Khān Yusuf-khail Lūḍī Afghān, son of Daulat Khān—arrested by Bābūr (930) 442; moves against Bābūr (932) 451, 453; not trusted 455; agrees to help ‘Alam Khān 455–6; receives him ill on defeat 457–8; pursued for Bābūr 458, 460, 461, 462, 463; Bābūr’s reproach for his abandonment of his family 460–1; his forts in the Dūn 462; his library less valuable than was expected by Bābūr 460; his kinsman Ḥājī Khān and his own son 465.
Ghiyāṣ, a buffoon 400 (where erroneously Ghīaṣ).
Mir Ghiyāṣ, building entrusted to him (935) 642.
Mir Ghiyāṣ Tāgḥāī Kūnjī Mughul, brother of ‘Alī-dost—particulars 28; enters the Khān (Mahmūd)’s service (899) 28, 32; [† before 914 AH.–1507–8 AD.].
Amīr Ghiyāṣu’d-dīn, patron of Khwānd-amīr and supposed ally of Bābūr—killed in Herāt (927) 432.
Ghiyāṣu’d-dīn, nephew of Khwānd-amīr—conveys the keys of Qandahār to Bābūr (928) 432, 435, 436.
Sūltān Ghiyāṣu’d-dīn Balban—Bābūr visits his tomb (932) 475; [†686 AH.–1287 AD.].
Ghiyāṣu’d-dīn qūrčī—takes campaigning orders to Junaid Barlās (935) 628; returns to Court 636; takes orders to the Eastern amirs 638.
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Ghulām-i-‘alī—returns from taking Bābur’s three articles to Naṣrat Shāh (935) 676.

Ghulām bacha, a musician—heard by Bābur in Herāt (912) 303.

Ghulām-i-shādī, a musician—particulars 292; his younger brother Ghulām bacha q.v.

Mullā Ghulām Yasāwal—makes an emplacement for the Ghāzī mortar (935) 670; sent to collect the Bihār tribute 676.

Ghūrī Barlās—on Bābur’s service (905) 125; in the left wing at Qandahār (913) 334; wounded 336; [†919 AH.–1513 AD.].

Gūjūr Khān—ordered on service (935) 638.

Gul-badan Begīm Mīrān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, daughter of Bābur and Dil-dār— her birth (929 or 930) and her book (cir. 995) 441; her journey to Āgra (935) 650 n. 2; her parentage 712; [†1011 AH.–1603 AD.].

Gul-barg Barlās Turk, daughter of Khalīfa— betrothed (?) to Shāh Hasan Arghūn (924–5) 366; married (930) 443.

Gul-chihra Begīm, full sister of Gul-badan supra — her marriage with Tūkhta-būghā Chaghātāī 705 n. 1, 708; her parentage 712; perhaps the mother of Salīma Chaghānīānī 713.

Gul-rang Begīm Mīrān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, daughter of Bābur and Dil-dār— born in Khwāst (920) 363; married to Aisān-timūr Chaghātāī (937) 705 n. 1, 708; parentage 712.

Gul-rukh Begīm Begchīk, wife of Bābur— with Bābur on the Trans-oxus campaign (916–20) 358; particulars 712; her sons Kāmran and ‘Askarī and her brother (?) Sultān ʿAlī Mirzā Taghāī q.v.

Mīrak Gūr dīwān (or Kūr) captured by Shaibānī (913) 328.

Shaikh Abū’l-fath Gūran (G’hūran)—serving Bābur (932) 526, 528–9, (933) 539, 567, (934) 590; in the right wing at Kānwa (933) 567; host to Bābur in Kūl (Koel) (934) 587; takes lotus-seeds to him 666; sends him grapes (935) 686; given Gūālīār (936) 688, 690; holds it till Bābur’s death 692 n. 1.

Hābība-sultān Begīm Arghūn, wife of Ahmad Mīrān-shāhī —particulars 36, 37; arranges her daughter Ma’sūma’s marriage with Bābur (912) 306, (913) 330.
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Hābība-sultān Khānīsh Dūghlāt, daughter of Muhammad Husain and Khūb-nigār Chaghatāi—her marriages 21–2; depends on Bābur (917) 22.

Hāfiz Háji, a musician—heard by Bābur in Herī (912) 303.

Hāfiz kabar-kātib—his brother conveys Bābur’s earliest Diwān to Samarkand (925) 482; at a feast (935) 631, 632.

Hāfiz Mīrak—composes an inscription (913) 343.

Hāfiz-i-muhammad Beg Dūldāi Barlās—particulars 25; in Aūrā-tipā (893) 17, 25; joint-guardian of Mīrzā Khān (905) 25, 122; his death 26; his sons Muhammad mīskīn and Tāhir q.v.; his (?) Chār-bāgh 108; [†cir. 909–10 AH.–1504 AD.].

Khwāja Shamsu’d-dīn Muḥammad Ḥāfiz Shīrāzī—parodied (910) 201; [†791 AH.–1389 AD.].

Hāfiz Tāshkīndī—gifts made to him (935) 632.

Haibat Khān karg-andāz, Hindūstānī—leaves Bābur (933) 557.

Haibat Khān Samanā’ī—perhaps the provider of matter to fill the lacuna of 936 AH., 693.

Mullā Ḥaidar—his sons ‘Abdu’l-minān and Mūmin q.v.

Ḥaidar ‘Alamādār—on Bābur’s service (925) 383, (926) 421.

Ḥaidar-‘ali Sultān Bajaurī—obeys custom in testing his dead mother’s virtue 212; his Gibrī fort taken by Bābur (924) 366, 7, 8.

Ḥaidar Kūkūldāsh Yāragī Mughūl, Mahmūd Khān’s “looser and binder”—defeated 35, (900) and killed 52, 111–2; his garden 54; his son Banda-i-‘ali and a descendant (?) Ḥusain Yāragī q.v.

Ḥaidar-Mīrza Bā’-qarā Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Ḥusain and Pāyanda-sultān—his Mīrān-shāhī betrothal at Hisār (901) 48, 61; rejoins his father opportunely (903) 261; particulars 263; his wife Bega q.v.; [†908 AH.–1502–3 AD.].

Muhammad Ḥāidar Mīrza Kūrkān Dūghlāt, author of the Ṭārikh-i-rashīdī—particulars 21–2,1 348; takes refuge with Bābur (916) 350; his first battle (917) 353; ill when Kūl-i-malik was fought (918) 357–8; goes to Sa’īd Khān in Kāshgar 22, 362; on Sa’īd’s service (933) 590, (936) 695–6; [†958 AH.–1551 AD.].

1 On p. 22 n. 2 delete “Chaghatāi Mughūl” on grounds given in Additional Note, Page 22.
Index I. Personal

Hāidār-i-qāsīm Beg Kohbur Chaghataī — father of Abū’l-qāsīm, Āḥmad-i-qāsīm and Qūch (Qūj) Beg q.v.

Hāidār-quli—on Aūzūn Ḥasan’s service (904) 102.

Hāidār-quli, servant of Khwāja Kalān—on service (932) 467; mentioned by Bābur in writing to the Khwāja (935) 648.

Hāidār rikābdār—stays with Bābur at a crisis (903) 91; his son Muhammad ‘Alī q.v.

Hāidār tāqī—his garden near Kābul 198 n. 1.

Hājī Ghāzī Manghīt—sent to help Bābur (904) 101 where in n. 3 add Vambéry’s Note 29 to the references.


Hājī pīāda—killed at the Lovers’-cave 68; [902 AH.—1497 AD.]

Hājī Pir bakāwal—negociates for Ḥusain Bāī-qarā with the Ḥiṣār begs (901) 61.

Halāhil—on service (925) 391, (925) 638.

Halwāchī Tarkhān Arghūn—engages Bābur’s left wing at Qandāhar (913) 336.

Sayyid Mīr Ḥamah—gets the better of two traitors (932–3) 546; receives head-money (933) 546; in the right wing at Kānwa 566.

Hāmīd Khān Khāṣa-khāl Sārang - khānī Lūdī — opposes Bābur (932) 465; defeated by Humāyūn 466; defeated (633) 540; sent out of the way before Kānwa 547.

Hāmūsī, son of Dīwa—sent to make a Hindū pact with Sanga’s son (935) 616.

Amīr Ḥamza—a poem mentioned imitating that in which he is celebrated 280; [†3 AH.—625 AD.].

Ḥamza Beg qūchīn, son of Qāsim and a daughter of Banda-i-‘ali—his wedding gifts to Bābur on his marriage with Khalīfa’s daughter (925) 400; joins Bābur on summons from Qūndūz 406, 410.

Ḥamza Bī Mangfīṭ Aūsbeg — defeated, when raiding, by Bābur’s men (910) 195.

Ḥamza Khān, Malik of ‘Alī-shang—made over to the avengers of blood (926) 425; [†926 AH.—1520 AD.].

Ḥamza Sulṭān Aūsbeg — his various service 58, 59, 131; defeated by Ḥusain Bāī-qarā (901) 58; enters Bābur’s service 59; given leave 64; his Mughūls rebel against Bābur (904) 105; serving Shaibānī (906) 131, 139, (910) 244;
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holding Hisar and comes out against Babur (916) 352; defeated at Pul-i-sangin and put to death by Babur (917) 18, 37, 262, 353; his defeat announced to Isma'il Safawi 354; his sons in the battle of Jam (935) 622; his sons 'Abdu'lla'tif and Mamāq q.v., his Mīrān-shāhī wife 37; [+917 AH.-1511 AD.].

Haq-dād, headman of Dūr-namā—makes offering of his garden to Babur (926) 420.

Haq-nazar—finds the body of his nephew (Nūyān) Kūkūldāsh (907) 152.

Haq-nazir chapā—to punish his raid, beyond the power of the Herāt Mīrzās (912) 300.

Harunu'r-rashid Khalifa—his second son Māmūn Khalifa (d. 218 AH.) 79; [+193 AH.-809 AD.].

Ustad Hasan-i-'ali—orders given for the completion of work he had begun in Kābul (935) 646-7.

Hasan-i-'ali Chaghatāi—receives a pargana (935) 689.

Hasan-i-'ali Jalā'ir Chaghatāi, son of 'Ali (q.v.)—particulars 278, 286; meets Bābūr (912) 299; his poet-sister 286 n. 1; [+925 AH.-1519 AD.].

Sayyid Hasan Aūghlāqchī Mughūl, son of Murād—particulars 279; serving Bābūr (917) 279; his son Farrukh q.v.; [+918 AH.-1522 AD.].

Hasan Barlās—his rough dealing with Babur (910) 194.

Shāh Hasan Beg Arghūn, son of Shāh (Shuja') Beg—quarrels with his father and goes to Bābūr (924) 365, 430; his betrothal (?) to Gul-barg (924-6) 366 and marriage (930) 443; in the left centre at Bajaur (925) 369; sent to claim ancient lands of the Turks 383-4; is successful 388; out with Bābūr 395; gifts to him ib. 414, 584; social matters 400, 7, 10, 12; Bābūr sends him a quatrain 401; [see s.n. Shāh-zāda], a principal actor between 930 and 932 AH. 427; his attack on Multān 437, 442 and s.n. 'Askari; accedes in Sind (930) 443; reads the khuṭba for Bābūr 430; his envoy to Bābūr (935) 632; [+962 AH.-1555 AD.].

Hasan Chalabī—Tahmāsp Safawi's envoy to Bābūr (935), arrives late 631, 632 n. 3, 641; Bābūr accepts excuse for his delay 649; Bābūr's envoy accompanies him on his return 641; his servant gives Bābūr an account of the battle of Jam 649.
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Hasan-dikcha of Akhsi—supports Bābur (904) 101.

Hasan-i-khalīfa, son of Nizāmu’d-dīn ‘Alī—sent on service 679.

Hasan Khān Bāriwāl Hindūstānī—leaves Bābur for Sangā (933) 557.

Hasan Khān Daryā-khānī, son of Daryā Khān son of Mīr ‘Alī Beg—on service for Bābur (933) 582; in the battle of the Ghogra (935) 669; pursuing rebels 678.

Hasan-i-makān, loses Kandar to Sanga (932) 529-30.

Hasan-i-makān, loses Kandar to Sanga (932) 529-30.

Hasan Khān Meivdti—his change of capital (930) 578; his opposition to Bābur (932) 523 and n. 3, (933) 545, 547; his force at Kānwa 562 and death 573; Bairām Khān’s remarks on him 523 n. 3; his son Nāhar q.v.; [†933 AH.-1527 AD.].

Hasan Nabīra, grandson of Muhammad Sīghal—waits on Bābur (902) 66; captures his elder brother (903) 72; leaves ‘Alī for Mirzā Khān (905) 122; goes as envoy (?) to Bābur from Mirzā Khān (925) 415; his elder brother Muhammad Qasim Nabīra q.v.

Mullā Hasan ʿsarrāf—given custody of gifts for Kābul (932) 525.

Hasan sharbatchi—helps Bāi-sunghar Mirān-shāhī’s escape (901) 62.

Hasan-i-yaqʿūb Beg, son of Nūyān Beg?—particulars 26; supports Bābur (899) 30, 31; his appointments 32; shows disloyalty (900) 43; his death 44; his sobriquet Nūyān’s Hasan 273; [†900 AH.-1494 AD.].

Malik Hast ʿjanjūha—receives an envoy from Bābur (925) 380; serving Bābur 380, 389; his injuries from Hāti Kakar 391.

Hāti Kakar—particulars 387; his misdeeds provoke punishment (925) 387, 9, 91; abandons Parhāla 390; sends Bābur tribute and is sent an envoy 391-2; referred to 452.


Hātim gūrchi—promoted to be qūr-begī (911) 252; in the centre at Qandahār (913) 335.

Hazarāspi, see Pir-i-muhammad.

Henry VII of England—his Intercurrus malus contemporary with 910 AH. 187 n. 2.

Henry of Navarre—his difficulties, as to creed, less than those of Bābur in 917 AH.-1511 AD., 356.

Hilālī, see Badru’d-dīn Hilālī.
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Abūl-nāṣir Muhammad Hind-āl Mīrzā Mīrān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Bābur and Dīl-dār—his pre-natal adoption (925) 374; meaning of his name Hind-āl 385; gifts to him or his servants 522, (935) 633, 642; the Wālidīyyah-risāla and Hindūstān verses sent to him 642; under summons to Hind 645, ➥ 696; ➥ sent by Humāyūn to Qila‘-i-żafar (936) 695; referred to 697; ➥ waits on his father in Lāhor 699; ➥ his dying father's wish to see him (937) 708; his escort of Bābur's family in 946 AH. referred to 710; [†958 AH.—1551 AD.].

Hindī—Mindi,—Mahndi, see Mahndi.

Hindū Beg gūchīn—leaves 'Alī Mīrān-shāhī for Mīrzā Khān (905)122; sent to raid Panj-kūra (925) 374; in Bhira.(386–8; leaves it 399; out with Bābur 403; serving under Humāyūn (932) 465–6, 528–9; in the right wing at Pānīpat 472 and at Kānwa (933) 556 and n. 2, 569; escorts Māhīm from Kābul (935) 687; sent to Sambhal īb. ; waits on Bābur īb. and n. 2, 689; his mosque in Sambhal 687 n. 2.

Hulākū Khān Aīl-khānī (Īl-khānī) — referred to 79; [†663 AH.—1264 AD.].

Hul-hul Anīga—a woman drinker 417.

Naṣiru’d-dīn Muhammad Humāyūn Mīrzā Mīrān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Bābur and Māhīm—his birth (913) 344; his mother's parentage 344 n. 3, ➥ 712–3; death of elder brethren referred to 374; a Trans-indus district given to him (925) 391; carried in haste to meet his father 395; makes a good shot 417; prefers not to go to Lamghān (926) 421; ➥ appointed to Badakhshān (927) 427; with his father in the Trans-oxus campaign(916–20) 358; his delay in joining the Hindūstān expedition (932) 444,446 n. 3, 447; a desertion from him 545; first sight of a rhinoceros 451; books given to him at Milwat 460; his story-teller killed īb. ; a successful first military affair 466–7; on service 471; in the right wing at Pānīpat 472; sent to take possession of Āgra 475, 476, 526; becomes owner of the Koh-i-nūr 477; receives Sambhal and other gifts 522, 7, 8; appointed against the Eastern Afghāns, his campaign 534, 544; mentioned in connection with the title ‘Azam-humāyūn (933) 537; his return to Āgra 544; his dislike of wine 545; in the right wing at Kānwa 566, 568–9; his departure for Kābul (and Badakhshān) 579–80; misappropriates treasure 583, ➥ 695 n. 1; a daughter born (934 or 5) 618; his father's messenger, detained a year by
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him, arrives in Āgra (935) 621, 626; birth of a son (934) 621, 624–5; letter to him from his father quoted 624–27; ordered to act with Kāmrān against the Aūzbegs 625–6; news of his action reaches Bābur 639, 640; gifts sent to him on his son’s birth and with them the Wālidiyyah-risāla and the Hindustān poems 642; topics of a letter to him enumerated 645; the letter despatched 649; gifts from him to his father 687; a family tradition that his father wished to abdicate in his favour 689 n. 5; misery of his creation 692; concerning a plan to set him aside from the succession 644 n. 4, 688 n. 2, 692–3, 702–7; deserts his post in Badakhshān (936) 694; its sequel 695, 6, 7–8; ordered by his father to Sambhal 697; his illness and his father’s self-surrender (937) 701–2; goes back to Sambhal 702; summoned and is declared successor at his father’s last audience 708; [†963 AH.–1555 AD.].

Bāba Ḥūsain—his murder of Aūlūgh Beg Shāh-rukhī (853) 85 and n. 3.


Ḥūsain Aīkrak (?) (or Ḥasan)—receives the Chīn-āb country from Bābur (925) 386; misbehaves (926) 423.

Sayyid Ḥūsain Akbar Tīrmīzī, a maternal relative of Maṣ‘ūd Mihrān-shāhī—attacks the fugitive Bāi-sunghar (903) 74; out with Bābur (910) 234; suspected 239; in the left wing at Qandahār (913) 334.

Sultān Ḥūsain Arghūn Qara-kūlī—particulars 40; leaves Samarkand with the Tarkhans (905) 121; fights for Bābur at Sar-i-pul (Khwāja Kārdzan) (906) 139; his great-niece Ma’sūma a wife of Bābur 36.

Ḥūsain Āqā Sīstānī—in the right wing at Kānwa (933) 566.

Ḥūsain ‘aūdī, lutanist of Ḥūsain Bāī-qarā—particulars 292; owed his training to ‘Alī-sher Nawā’ī 272.

Shāh Ḥūsain bakhshī—brings Bābur news of a success (935) 685.

Khwāja Ḥūsain Beg, brother of Aūzūn Ḥasan—particulars 26; his daughter a wife of ‘Umar Shaikh 24, 146 n. 3; leaves Samarkand with the Tarkhāns (905) 121; fights for Bābur at Sar-i-pul (Khwāja Kārdzan) (906) 139; one of eight in the flight from Akhšī (908) 177 (here Khwāja Ḥūsainī); his lameness causes him to leave Bābur 178; sends Lāhor revenues

---

1 For Humāyūn’s annotation of the Bābur-nāma, see General Index s.n. Humāyūn’s Notes.
2 For a correction of dates, see s.n. Aūlūgh Beg.
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to Kabul (932) 446; waits on Babur 458; on service (933) 549 (here Mullā Ḥusain); in the left centre at Kanwa 566.

Shāh Ḥusain chuhra, a brave of Ḥusain Bāī-qarā—left in Balkh (902) 70.

Sulṭān Ḥusain Dūghlāt—joins Bābur (901) 58–9; conspires against Tambal (907) 154; sent by The Khan (Maḥmūd) to help Bābur (908) 161.

Ḥusain Ghainī—a punitive force sent against him (911) 253.

Ḥusain-i-hasan—out with Bābur (925) 403; killed and avenged 404, 405; [†925 AH.—1519 AD.].

Maulānā Shāh Ḥusain Kami, a poet—particulars 290.

Ḥusain Kashīfī—his omission from Bābur's list of Herāt celebrities 283 n. 1.

Ḥusain Khān Lashkar (? Wazīr—writes from Naṣrat Shāh, accepting Bābur's three articles (935) 676.

Sulṭān Ḥusain Mīrẓā Bāī-qarā Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Mansūr—defeats Maḥmūd Mīrān-shāhī (865) 46, 259 and (876) 260; his relations with Nawā'ī 33, 272; his campaign against Khusrau Shāh (901) 57, 58–61, 130; his dissensions with his sons 61, 69, (902) 68–70, 260, (903) 94–5; his capture of Herī (875) compared with Bābur's of Samarkand (906) 134–5; does not help Bābur against Shaibānī 138, 145; asks Bābur's help against him (910) 190–1, (911) 255; his death 256, and burial 293; particulars of his life and court 256–292;—(personal 256–amīrs 270–sadrs 280–wazirs, etc. 281—poets 286—artists 291)—his dealings with Zūn-nūn Arghūn and Khusrau Shāh 274; his kindness to Maṣʿūd Mīrān-shāhī (903) 93, 95; his disorderly Finance Office 281–2; delays a pilgrim 284, his copyist 291; his splendid rule 300; his buildings 305; his relation Nuyān Beg Tirmızī 273; Bābur writes to him in ignorance of his death (912) 294; Bābur's comments on him 60, 191, 225; a poem mistakenly attributed to him 281; [†911 AH.—1506 AD.].

Sulṭān Ḥusain Mīrẓā Mīrān-shāhī, son of Maḥmūd and a Tirmızī wife—his death (el. 13) in his father's lifetime, 47, 110.

Mīr Ḥusain mu'ammātī Nishāpūrī—particulars 288 and n. 7; [†904 AH.—1498–9 AD.].

Ḥusain Khān Nūḥānī Afghān—holding Rāpīr and not submissive to Bābur (932) 523; abandons it 530; takes it again (933) 557; drowned in flight 582; [†933 AH.—1527 AD.].
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Sultan Husain Qanjut, maternal grandfather of Husain Badi-garâ—his Timurid descent 256 n. 5.

Shah Mir Husain Qârlûq—waits on Bâbur (925) 403 (here var. Hasan) 409; sent to Bajaur (926) 422; meets Bâbur on his road 423; in charge of impedimenta (932) 458; allowed to raid from Milwat 464; fighting for Bâbur 468, 471; in the left wing at Panipat 472; posted in Jûnpûr (933) 544.

Husain-i Shaikh Timûr—particulars 273 (where in n. 2 read grand ("father ").

Sultan Husain Sharqi—rise and fall of his dynasty 481; [†905 AH.—1500 AD.].

Shah Husain Yâragi Mughul Ghanchi—in the left wing at Panipat (932) 472, and at Kânwa (933) 567; on service 530.

Husamu’d-din ‘Ali Barlas, son of Khalifa—on service (934) 601; waits on Bâbur (935) 687.

Ibn-i-husain Mirza Bâi-garâ Timurid, Barlas Turk, son of Husain and Pâpâ—parentage 265; joins his brothers against Shaibâni (912) 296; fails in etiquette when meeting Bâbur 297; his place at a reception 298; goes back to his districts Tûn and Qânin 301; mentioned 331; the poet Ahi his servant 289; [†919 AH.—1513 AD.].

Ibrahim âtâ (Father Abraham)—his tomb in Turkistân 159.

Ibrahim Beg Begchik, brother of Ayûb—in the right wing at Qandahar (913) 334.


Ibrahim Chaghatâi—joins Husain Bâi-garâ 279, 689 n. 4.

Ibrahim chuhrâ—conveys a quatrain of Bâbur’s (925) 401.

Ibrahim Dûldâi Barlas—particulars 274.

Sultan Ibrahim Ghaznavi—histomb 218; [†492 AH.—1098 AD.].

Ibrahim-i-husain Mirza Bâi-garâ Timurid, Barlas Turk, son of Husain—particulars 265; on his father’s service (901) 57; receives Balkh (902) 70; besieged (903) 93–4; [†910 AH.—1504–5 AD.].

Ibrahim Jânî—fights for Bâbur at Sar-i-pul (906) 139; one of three Ibrâhîms killed there 141, 624 n. 1; his son Chilma q.v.; [†906 AH.—1501 AD.].

1 On p. 279 l. 3 from foot read “There was also Ibrahim Chaghatâi” after “Muhammad-i-zamân Mirza”.
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Mir İbrahim qānūnī—waits on Bābur (935) 605; his kinsman Yūnas-i-‘alī q.v.

Sultān İbrahim Sahu-khail Lüdî Afgān, son of Sikandar—Bābur sends him a goshawk and asks for the ancient lands of the Turk (925) 385; co-operation against him proffered to Bābur by Sangā 426, 529; a principal actor in the years of the lacuna from 926 to 932 AH. 427; no indication of Bābur’s intending to attack him in 926 AH. 429; his misdoing leads to appeal for Bābur’s help (929) 439; defeats his uncle ‘Ālam Khān (932) 456–7; Bābur moves from the Dūn against him 463; his military strength 463, 470; imprisons humble men sent by Bābur 464; various news of him 465, 466–7; Bābur’s estimate of him 470; defeated and killed at Pānīpat 473–4, 630 n. 4; an Afgān account of Bābur’s care for his corpse ib.; references to his rule in Gūāliār 977, to the rebellion of his Eastern amīrs 523, 527, to his capture of Chandīrī and defeat at Dāulptūr by Sangā 593, to Bābur’s route when he was defeated (932) 206, and to his “prison-house” 459; his resources contrasted with Bābur’s 480; his treasure at an end (935) 617; his mother q.v. s.n. mother; his son sent to Kāmrān’s charge in Qandahār (933) 544; [†932 AH.–1526 AD.]

İbrahim Sāru Minglīgh Beg—Chāpūk—particulars [Author’s Note] 52; disloyal to Bābur (900) 52; besieged and submits 53; receives Shirāz (902) 66; remains with Bābur at a crisis (903) 91; on service (904) 101, 106; his man holds fast in Aūsh 107; plundered by ‘Alī-dost (905) 119; waits on Bābur 125; one of three İbrāhīms killed at Sar-i-pul (Khwāja Kārdzan) 139, 141; his brother Samad q.v. his good Bowman 66; [†906 AH.–1501 AD.]

İbrahim Sultān Mīrzā Shāh-rukhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Shāh-rukh—his rule in Shirāz, death and successor (838) 20; referred to 85; [†838 AH.–1414–5 AD.]

İbrahim Tağhāī Beg Begchīk, brother of Ayūb—wounded and nicknamed Chāpūk (902) 67; leaves Bābur (903) 86; in Aūshī with Bāyazīd Iūrāchī (908) 171; sent against Pāp ib.; arrests Bāyazīd 173–4; wounded but fights for Bābur 174; soon falls behind in the flight from Aūshī 176; in the right wing at Qandahār (913) 334; holds Balkh for Bābur (923) 463 n. 3; sent as Bābur’s envoy to Aūzbeg Khāns and Sultāns (935) 643.
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**Ibrāhīm Tarkhān** Arghūn—serving Ḥusain Bābī-qara (901) 58; holding Shirāz (906) 130; reinforces Bābur 131; one of three Ibrāhīms killed at Sar-i-pul 140–1; his brother Aḥmad q.v.; [†906 AH.–1501 AD.].

Qāẓī Ikhtiyār—particulars 285; waits on Bābur and examines the Bāburī script (912) 285; is instructed in the exposition of the Qurān by Shaibānī (913) 329; [†928 AH.–1521 AD.].

IIlās Khān, see Rustam.

Shāh ‘Imād Shīrāzī—brings Bābur friendly letters from two amirs of Hind (932) 463.

‘Imādu’d-dīn Mas‘ūd—an envoy of Jahāngīr Mirān-shāhī to Tramontane clans (911–912) 296.

‘Imādu’l-mulk, a slave—strangles Sikandar Gujṛānī (932) 535.

Imām-i-muḥammad—Bābur’s company drink at his house (925) 418; his master Khwāja Muḥammad-āmin q.v.

Īsān, see Aisān.

Ishāq Ātā (Father Isaac)—his tomb in Turkistān 159.

Iskandar, see Sikandar.

Islām Bārīs—particulars 276.

Ismā‘īl chilma, see Chilma.

Isma‘īl Khān Jilvānī (not Jalvānī)—with ‘Ālam Khān Lūdī (932) 456; deserts him 457; writes dutifully to Bābur 464; speaks of waiting on him (934?) 680; does it (935) 677, 679.

Isma‘īl Khān Yūsuf-khail Lūdī, son of ‘Alī—parleys with Bābur at Milwat (932) 459; deported 461.

Ismā‘īl Mītā—Naṣrat Shāh’s envoy to Bābur (935) 640–1, 664–5.

Ismā‘īl Ṣafawi ‘Arab, Shāh of Persia—reference to his capture of ‘Irāq (cir. 906) 280, 336; gives refuge to a fugitive Bābī-qara (913) 327 n.5;  �� a principal actor in the lacuna years from 926–930, 427;  �� his relations with Shāh Beg Arghūn 430; relations with Bābur (927) 433–4;  �� his death after defeat (930) 443;  �� Lord Bacon on his personal beauty 443 n. 1; his son Tāhmāsp q.v.; his (presumed) Bābī-qara disciple in Shi‘a heresy 262; [†930 AH.–1524 AD.].
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Ja‘far Khwāja, son of Mahdî Khwāja and step-son of Bābūr’s sister Khān-zāda—fills his father’s place in Etāwa (933) 579, 582; sent to collect boats (934) 598; pursues Bībān and Bāyazīd (935) 682.


Jahāngīr Mīrzā Barlās Turk, eldest son of Timūr—named in Abū-sa‘īd’s genealogy 14; is given Samarkand by Timūr 85; his tomb in Kesh 83; his son Muḥammad 78, 85; [†776 AH.–1374–5 AD.].

Jahāngīr Mīrzā Mirān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of ‘Umar Shaikh and Fātima Muḥīl—particulars 17; sent (a child) to reinforce an uncle (cir. 895) and then betrothed 48, 189; comes to Andijān after his father’s death (899) 32; Mughīl support for him against Bābūr (900) 43–4, (903) 87–8, (904) 101; joins Tambil 103; a “worry” 104; defeated at Khūbān (905) 113; waits on Bābūr 119; summoned for a Samarkand expedition 122; reinforces Bābūr (906) 138; a gift to him from the exiled Bābūr (907) 150; joins Bābūr (908) 173; acts against Bābūr’s wishes 173–4; flees in panic 174–5; rumoured a prisoner 176; his occupation of Khujand (909?) 182; Bābūr rejects advice to dismiss him (910) 191; deference to him from Khusrau Shāh 193; his part in occupying Kābul 198, 199; receives Ghaznī 227; out with Bābūr 233–4, 235–6, 239; rejects counsel to betray him 239; is Bābūr’s host in Ghaznī 240; his experiences in an earthquake (911) 247; insists on a move for Qalāt-i-ghilzāi 248; waits on Bābūr and does service 252–3; his misconduct 254; causes Bābūr to mobilize his troops 255; goes to Yaka-aūlāng (912) 294; the clans not supporting him, he goes to Herī with Bābūr 295–6; at social gatherings 298, 302; defeats his half-brother Naṣīr 321; his death 331 n. 3, 345; his widow brings their son Pīr-i-muḥammad to Bābūr (913) 331; [†912 or 913 AH.–1507–8 AD.].

Nūru’d-dīn Muḥammad Jahāngīr Pādshāh Mirān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Akbar—his work in Bābūr’s burial-ground 710; words of his made clear by Bābūr’s 501 n. 6; mentioned concerning the tamghā 553 n. 1; [†1037 AH.–1627 AD.].

Jahāngīr Turkmān—revolts in Badakhshān against the Aŭzbegs (910) 242; keeping his head up (913) 340.
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Jahān-shāh Barlās, son of Chaku—mentioned in his son Muḥammad Barandūq's genealogy 270.

Jahān-shāh Mirzā Barānī, Qarā-qūlūq Turkmān—ruling in Tabriz while Yūnas Chaghataī stayed there 20; his sons defeated by the Āq-qūlūq (872) 49; his son Muḥammad's wife Pasha 49;

Rāi Jāīpal Lāhorī—a legend of his siege of Ghaznī 219; [†cir. 392 AH.-1002 AD.].

Rāja Jāī-singh Jāīpūrī—his astronomical instruments 79 n. 4; [†1156 AH.-1743 AD.].

Jalāl Khān Jīg-hat—waits on ‘Ālam Khān Lūdī (932) 456 and n. 4; his house in Dīhli Bābur's quarters 476; his son ‘Ālam Khān Kālpī q.v.

Jalāl Khān Lūdī, son of ‘Ālam Khān—deserts his father (932) 457; in the left wing at Kānwa (933) 567 (where for “Jamāl” read Jalāl).

Jalāl Tāshkīndī—brings Bābur news of Bīban and Bāyazīd (935) 685.

Jalālu'd-dīn Maḥmūd nāī—a flautist, heard in Herāt (912) 303.

Sultān Jalālu'd-dīn Nūhānī—Jalāl Khān, son of Bihār Khān and Dūdū—one of three competitors for rule (935) 651 n. 5; writes dutifully to Bābur 659; news of his and his mother's coming 664; waits on Bābur 676; receives revenue from Bihār 676.

Maulānā Jalālu'd-dīn Pūrānī—origin of his cognomen 306; his descendant Jamālu'd-dīn Abū-saʿīd Pūrān q.v.; [†862 AH.-1458 AD.].

Sultān Jalālu'd-dīn Sharqī, son of Ḥusain Shāh—waits on Bābur (935) 651; particulars 651 n. 5; his man abandons Benares 652; entertains Bābur 652; his son styled Sultān iḥb.; his gift of a boat to Bābur 663; in the battle of the Ghogrā 669; on service 678.

Shaikh Jamāl Bārin Mughūl—his son (?) Shaikh ‘Ali q.v.

Shaikh Jamāl Farmūlī Afghān—deserts ‘Ālam Khān (932) 457; serving Bābur (933) 551.

Shaikh Jamālī—at a feast (935) 631; conveys encouragement to Dūdū Bībī 665-6.

‘Addendum:—p. 49 l. 4, read "wife" of Muḥammad "son" of Jahān-shāh.
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Shaikh Jamālu’d-dīn Abū-sa‘īd Pūrān—particulars 306 n. 2; ill-treated by Shaibānī (913) 306 n. 2, 328; [*921 AH.–1515 AD.].


Mīr Jamālu’d-dīn muḥaddas—particulars 284; [living 934–7 AH.–1527–31 AD.].

Shaikh Jāmī—ancestor of Akbar’s mother 623 n. 8.

Jāmī, see ‘Abdu’r-rahmān Jāmī.

Jamshīd, (an ancient ruler of Persia)—mentioned 85, 152.

Mīr Jān-‘aīrdī, retainer of Zū‘n-nūn Arghūn—sells provisions to Bābur (912) 308.

Jānak—recites in Turkhī (912) 304.

Jānaka Kūkūldāsh, (or Khānika)—escapes after Sār-i-pul (906) 141.

Jān-i-‘alī—murdered by Shaibānī (906) 127, 128; [*906 AH.–1500 AD.].

Jān Beg—in charge of impedimenta (932) 458; allowed leave for a raid 464; in a night-attack 471; in the left wing at Pānīpat 472 and at Kānwa (933) 567 (here Jān-i-muḥammad Beg Atāka); on service (935) 682 (here Jānī Beg).

Mīr Jān Divān—his house in Qandahār reserved as loot for Nāsir Mīrān-shāhī (913) 338.

Jānī Beg Dūldāi Barlās Turk—particulars 37 (where nn. 2 and 3 should be reversed).

Jānī Beg Sūltān Khān Aūzbeg - Shabān Chīngiz-khānīd—his two Mīrān-shāhī marriages of conquest 18, 35; fights for Shaibānī at Sār-i-pul (906) 139 (where read Jānī Beg Sūltān); he and his sons at Jām (935) 622; flees to Merv 636 n. 2.

Jān-i-hasan, Bārīn Mughūl—sent to reinforce Bābur (903) 92, (908) 161, 170.

Jān-i-nāṣir—answers a call-to-arms (925) 408.

Mīr Jān Samarkandī—his distasteful singing (912) 303.

Jān-wafā Mīrzā—serving Shaibānī in Samarkand (906) 131; escapes on Bābur’s success 133.

Barlās Jūkī—brings Bābur good news, a live Aūzbeg, and a head (925) 408.

Jūha Sūltān Taklū, Governor of Ispahān—with Ṭahmāsp Šāfawī on the battle-field of Jām (935) 635.
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Jüji Khān Chīngiz - khānid — a Qāzzāk descendant mentioned 23.


Sultān Junaid Barlās (or Junīd)—particulars 276; his sons Nīzāmu'd-dīn ‘Āli Khalīfa and Junaid q.v.

Sultān Junaid Barlās (or Junīd), son of the last-entered—incites an attempt on Samarkand (900) 52, 111; serving Bābūr (932) 460, 468, 471; in the left wing at Pānīpat 472; sent to help in occupying Dīhlī 475; given Dūlpūr 530-1; posted in Jūnpūr (933) 544; in Kharīd (935) 637 and n. 1; joins Bābūr late and is not received 667; gives local information 668; in the battle of the Ghogrā 669; on service 679, 682 and n. 2; his wife Shahr-bānū Mirān-shāhī q.v.

Kābulī Begīm Mirān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk—abandoned by her husband Bādī'u'z zamān Bāī-qarā and captured by Shaibānī (913) 328.

Kahil saḥīb-i-qadam—gives his horse to Bābūr (908) 174.
Pahlavān Kalāl—wrestles (935) 650.

Kalāntar of Dikh-kat (var. kālāntar and kīlāntar)—his house used by Bābūr (907) 150; his aged mother's story ib.

Kalīmu'l-lāh Shāh Bahmīnī Afghān—ruling the Dakhkhin (932) 482.

Kal-qāshūq—put to retaliatory death (903) 73.

Sayyid Kāmal—serving Khusrau Shāh (903) 96 (where for "Qasīm" read Kāmal).

Kamāl Khān Sāhū-khail Lūdī Afghān, son of ‘Ālam Khān—in the left wing at Kānwa (933) 567.

Kamāl Khwāja—his birth-place Khujand 8; [†803 AH.-1400-1 AD.].

Kamāl sharbatchī—in the right wing at Qandahār (913) 335.
Pahlavān Khwāja Kamālu'd-dīn Badakhshī—in the right wing at Kānwa (933) 566.

Khwāja Kamālu'd-dīn Husāin Gāsur-gāhī—particulars 280, 281; sent as envoy to Shaibānī (904) 145.

Khwāja Kamālu'd-dīn Māhmūd, retainer of Ismā'īl Safawi—with Bābūr after the defeat at Ghaj-davān (919) 362-3; [†cir. 919 AH.-1514 AD.].
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Kamālu’d-dīn Qīāq (var.)—lays before Bābur complaint of the begs of the Balkh frontier (935) 649.

Kāmrān Mirza Mirān-shāhī Tīmūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Bābur and Gul-rukh Begehīk— the date of his birth App. J, xxxv; taken on the Transoxus campaign (916–920) 358; carried in haste to meet his father (920) 395; joins his father 417; the Mubin written for his instruction (928) 438; left in charge of Kābul and Qandahār (932) App. J, xxxv; a letter from Bābur to him ḥb. and App. L, xliii; his copy of the Bābur-nāma App. J, xxxv–vi; gifts sent to him (932) 460, 522, 642; put in charge of Ibrāhim Lūdi’s son (933) 544; of his transfer to Multār (934-5) 604, 605 n. 3, 645; of his proceedings in Kābul 618; his marriage to a cousin 619; the Wālidīyyah-resāla, Hindustān Poems and specimens of the Bāburī script sent to him 642; heads of a letter to him 645, 646; meets Humāyūn in Kābul (935) 696; meets Bābur in Lāhūr (936) 699: of his governments 699; later action in Multān and Lāhūr (938) (which read for 935) 699; visits his father’s tomb near Ágra (946) 709; [†964 AH.–1556 AD.].

Kankū or Gangū—killed at Kānwa 573; [†933 AH.–1527 AD.].

Karīm-bīrdī—on Bābur’s service (935) 661.

Karīm-dād Turkmān—at a household party (906) 131; escapes from Sar-i-pul (Khwāja Kārdzan) 141; one of four fighting with Bābur (908) 166, 396; reprieved from a death sentence (914) 345.

Karm-chand—acting for Ḥasan Mewati (933) 545, 578; asks peace from Bābur for Ḥasan’s son Nāhar 578.

Kārm Singh—killed at Kānwa 573; [†933 AH.–1527 AD.].

Rāja Karna Guālīārī, (or, Kirti), Tūnwar Rājpūṭ—his buildings in Guāliār 608 n. 3.

Khadija Āgāḥ, and later, Begīm, mistress of Abū-sa’Īd Mirān-shāhī, wife of Ḥusain Bāī-qarā—particulars 262, 268; her dominance 268, 292; visited in Herī by Bābur (912) 301; at an entertainment to him 302; a suspicion against her 302 n. 1; captured by Shaibānī (913) 327; given for a traitor to loot 328; her daughter Āq Begīm and sons Shāh-i-gharīb and Muzaffar-i-ḥusain q.v.

Khadija-sultān Begīm Mirān-shāhī Tīmūrid, Barlās Turk, daughter of Abūs a’īd—(probably) seen by Bābur in Herī
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(912) 301; Bābur visits her near Āgra (934) 588 and in Āgra Fort (935) 606, 616.

**Khalīdār Yāragī Mughūl,** son of Ḥaidar Kūkūldāsh—fights for Bābur at Sar-i-pul (Khwāja Kārdzan) (906) 139.

**Khalīfa,** see Niẓamū’d-dīn ‘Alī Barlās.

**Khalīl chuhra**—a brave who fought well for Bābur (904) 101.

**Khalīl diwānā**—on Aizūn Ḥasan’s service (904) 102 (where for “Dīwān” read diwānā).

Sūltān **Khalīl Mīrzā, Mīrān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk,** son of Mīrān-shāh—mentioned 262 n. 2; [†814 AH.–1411–2 AD.].

Sūltān **Khalīl Mīrzā Mirān-shāhī (ut supra),** son of Abū-saʿīd—his daughter sole wife of Bābā Sūltān g.v.

**Khalīl Sūltān Chaghātāī Chingiz-khānīd,** son of Ahmad, (Alacha Khān), full brother of Saʿīd—his son Bābā Sūltān g.v.

**Khalīl Sūltān Itārājī Mughūl,** brother of Ahmad Tamlal—holding Māḍū for Tamlal (905) 109; captured ḏō, and released 119; surprises Aūsh 125; helps Bābur against Shaibānī (906) 138; killed at Sar-i-pul 141; [†906 AH.–1501 AD.].

**Khalwi pīāda** (or Khalwā)—his spear-head bitten off by a tiger (925) 393.

The **Khatib of Qarshī**—an envoy to Bābur (910) 188.

**Khān-i-jahān,** see Fath Khān Sarwānī.

**Khān-i-jahān,** a “pagan”—opposes Bābur (933) 539.

**Khān-qulī,** son of Biān-qulī—leaves Bābur in Samarkand (903) 86; at a household party (906) 131 (where read Khān-qulī for “Khān-i-qulī”); gives ground for suspicion (907) 156; one of eight in the flight from Akhsī (908) 176, 177; in the right-centre at Qandahār (913) 335.

**Khān-zāda Begīm (1), Mīrān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk,** daughter of Maḥmūd—particulars 48.

**Khān-zāda Begīm (2), ut supra,** daughter of Maṣʿūd and Saʿādat-bakht—particulars 267; visited by Bābur near Āgra (935) 616.

**Khān-zāda Begīm (3), ut supra,** daughter of ‘Umār Shaikh and Qūṭluq-nigār—particulars 17; her marriage with Shaibānī (907) 18, 147, 184; her divorce and remarriage with Sayyid Hādī Khwāja 352 [H.S. iii], 364; her reunion with Bābūr (916) 18, 352, 356; her marriage with Maḥdī Khwāja g.v.; her summons to Hindūstān (935) 647; his son Khurram Shāh g.v.; [†952 AH.–1545 AD.].
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Khān-zādā Begīm (4), Tirmīzī, wife of Mahmūd Mīrān-shāhī—particulars 48; her son Masʿūd q.v.; her niece 48.

Khān-zāda Begīm (5), Tirmīzī, niece of the above, wife of Mahmūd—particulars 48, 9; her son Ḥusain q.v.; her five daughters 47–8.

Khān-zāda Begīm (6), Tirmizī, niece of the above, wife of Mahmūd—particulars 48, 9; her son Ḥusain q.v.; her five daughters 47–8.

Khān-zāda Begīm (6), 7th fr., wife of Ahmad—particulars 37; Babur, a child, pulls off her wedding veil (893) 37.

Khān-zāda Khānim Hājī-tarkhānī, daughter of Ahmad and Badiʿuʿl-jamāl (Badka)—particulars 258 n. 2, 329; illegally married by Shaibānī (913) 329; her husband Muzaffar-ī-ḥusain Bāī-garā q.v.

Khawānd Shāh Amir, ("Mirkhond"), author of the Rauzatuʿ-ṣ-safā—omitted (or lost) from Bābur's list of Herāt celebrities 283 n. 1; [†903 AH.–1498 AD.].

Khizr Khwāja Khān Chaghatāī Chingiz-khānid—mentioned in Yūnas Khān's genealogy 19.

Khwāja Khizr Nūhānī, a merchant—killed by a Mughūl (910) 235 (where for "Lūhānī" read Nūhānī).

Khūb-nīgār Khānim Chaghatāī Chingiz-khānid, daughter of Yūnas and Aīsān-daulat—particulars 21, 22; her death announced to Bābur (907) 148, 149; her rebel husband forgiven for her sake (912) 319; her husband Muḥammad Ḥusain Dūglāt, their son Ḥāidar and daughter Ḥabība q.v.; [†907 AH.–1501–2 AD.].

Khudā-bakhsh Chaghatāī, retainer, (1) of Khusrau Shāh, (2) of Bābur—in the right wing at Qandahār (913) 334; rebels against Bābur (914) 345.

Khudāi-birdī Beg tughchī, Mughūl—stays with Bābur at a crisis (903) 91; made a beg and on service 110; killed at Sar-i-pul 141; [†906 AH.–1501 AD.].

Khudāi-birdī būqāq, Mughūl—killed at Asfara (900) 53 (here ʿalākām, my guardian); his favour from Bābur 105; his son Quli chūnāq q.v.; [†900 AH.–1495 AD.].

Khudāi-birdī tughchī Timūr-tāsh—made ʿUmar Shaikh's Lord-of-the-Gate (cir. 870) 14; particulars 24–5; [†a few years after 870 AH.–1466 AD.].

Khurram Shāh Aūzbeg-Shaibān, Chingiz-khānid, son of Shaibānī and Khān-zāda—particulars 18; [†a few years after 916 AH.–1510–11 AD.].
Khūsh-kildī¹ Mughūl—in the centre at Qandahār (913) 335.

Khusrau, an ancient ruler of Persia—mentioned in a couplet 85.

Khusrau Gāgānī—waits on Bābur (910) 230 (where insert his name in the last line); taken as a guide 231.

Khusrau Kūkūldāsh—at a household party (906) 131 (where insert his name after that of Shaikh Darwesh); captured by Tambal (908) 168; rejoins Bābur (913) 330–1; in the right centre at Qandahār 335; out with Bābur (925) 377, 403; an enquiry 405; posted in Siālkot (930) 442; seeming still to hold it (932) 453; on service 465, 471; in the van at Pānīpat 472; in the right wing at Kānva (933) 566, 568; given Alūr (Alwar) by mistake 578; sent against Balūchis (935) 638; at social gatherings 385–7–8.

Amīr Khwāja Khusrau Lāchīn Turk—a couplet of his quoted 503; [†725 AH.–1325 AD.].

Khusrau Shāh² Turkīstānī, Qibchág Turk,—particulars 49–50; takes Mahmūd Mīrān-shāhī (at. 17) to Ḥiṣār (cir. 873) 46–7; referred to as a rival 50; his tolerance of Ḥiṣārī ill-conduct (899) 41–2; expelled from Samarkand on Mahmūd’s death (900) 51–2; opposes Ḥusain Bāi-qarā (901) 57, 60–1; his rise helped by Bāi-qarā failures 61; supports Mas’ūd Mīrān-shāhī 64; falls out with him 71, 93; blinds him (903) 95; defeats Bādī'-zamān Bāi-qarā 60–1; re-equips him defeated by his father (902) 70; receives well the fugitive Bāi-sunghar Mīrān-shāhī (903) 74; makes him pādshāh in Ḥiṣār 93; strangles him (905) 110; a fugitive Tarkhān goes to him (906) 120, 141; his niggardliness to Bābur 129, 130; gives him no help against Shaibānī 138, 183; Qāsim Beg quchīn takes refuge with him (907) 27; his position less secure (910) 188; followers of his join Bābur 189, 192, 196, 227 n. 3; invited to co-operate with the Timūrid Mīrzās against Shaibānī 190; takes the Kābul road on Bābur’s approach 192, 244; offers him service 192; the interview of his submission 193–4; allowed to go towards Khurāsān 194, 195; breaks his pact and is put to flight 197, 243; gets sensible counsel in Herāt 243; makes trouble for Nāṣir Mīrān-shāhī in Badakhshān 244–5; beheaded at Qundūz by the Aūzbegs 244; good results from his death for Bābur 245; Bābur’s reflections on the indiscipline of his followers 199, 230 n. 5, 239, 244–5; his former following rebels (914) 335;

1 His name might mean Welcome, Bien-venu.
2 Khusrau-shāh may be the more correct form.
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his brothers Wālī and Bāqī, and nephew Aḥmad-i-qāsim q.v.; [†910 AH.–1505 AD.].

Khwājā Chishti var. Husaini—at a feast (935) 631.

Khwajakā Khwāja, Muḥammad-i-‘ubaidu’l-lāh, eldest son of Ahrārī—protects Bāī-sunghar Mirān-shāhī in the Tarkhān rebellion (901) 62 (where, erroneously, “Khwajaki”); becomes his spiritual guide 63; visited in Farkat by Bābur (907) 149; his brother Yahyā q.v. 632.

Khwaja Khwaja, Muhammad-i-*ubaidu'l-lah, eldest son of Ahrari—protects Bāī-sunghar Mirān-shāhī in the Tarkhān rebellion (901) 62 (where, erroneously, “Khwajaki”); becomes his spiritual guide 63; visited in Farkat by Bābur (907) 149; his brother Yahyā q.v. 632.

Khwāja Kalān, descendant of ‘Ubaidu’l-lāh Ahrārī—likely a likely recipient of the Mubān 438, 631 n. 3 (where for “son” read grandson of Yahyā); at a feast in Āgra (935) 631; gifts and leave given 632, 641–2; a copy of Bābur-nāma writings sent to him 653.

Mīr Khwāja Kalān, son of Maulānā Muḥammad  Sadru’d-din —receives Bajaur (925) 370; particulars 370 n. 2; prisoners pardoned at his request 371; out with Bābur 372; returns to Bajaur 376; is recalled on grounds given (926) 422–3; joins Bābur for Hindūstān (932) 447; on service 465–6; in the right wing at Pānīpat 472; helps to secure Āgra 475; of his leaving Hindūstān 520, 531; his offending couplet about leaving, and Bābur’s reply 525–6; has charge of Kābul and Ghaznī 524; conveys money to repair the Ghaznī dam 219, 524 n. 2, 647 n. 1; Bābur’s various writings sent to him, quatrains (925) 372, (932) 525–6, (935) the Wālidīyyah-risāla and Hindūstān poems 642—letters (925) 411, (935) 604, 618 n. 2, quoted 645–8; commended to Humāyūn as a friend 627; a letter of his mentioned 644; wine parties in his house (925) 371–2, 375; has Ghaznī wine at Milwat (932) 461; urged to renounce wine 648; tells Bābur of a fruitful orange-tree (935) 510, cf. 483 n. 2; quotation from his ode on Bābur’s death 709.

‘Abdu’l-lāh Khwāja Maulānā-i-qāzi—particulars 29, 89–90; supports Bābur (899) 30; chases off an invader 32; confers with other well-wishers of the boy (900) 43; mediates for Ibrāhīm Sārū 53, for Aūrgūtis (902) 68; envoy to Aūzūn Ḥasan (903) 87; open-handed to Bābur’s followers 88; entreats him to save Andījān 88–9; Mīr Mughūl aids him in its defence 122; hanged by Tambal and Aūzūn Ḥasan 89; ‘Ali-dost fears retaliation for his death (905) 119; his right guidance recalled by Bābur (912) 303; [†903 AH.–1498 AD.].
Khwājaki Mullā-i-ṣadr, son of Maulānā Muḥammad Ṣadru’d-dīn, and elder brother of Khwāja Kalān—particulars 67; killed near Yām 67; [†902 AH.–1497 AD.].

Khwāja Mīr-i-mīrān—speaks boldly at Akhṣī (908) 174; in charge of baggage camels (925) 376, 377, and of Bābur’s camp 389, 391; Bābur halts near his Lamghān village (926) 424; given charge of Daulat Khān Yūsuf-khail (932) 459–60; in the left-centre at Pānīpat 973; entrusted with gifts for Kābul 525.

Khwāja Mīr Sulṭān—he and his son receive gifts (935) 632.

Khwānd-amīr, grandson of Khwānd Shāh Amīr (“Mirkhond”)—associated with Muḥammad-i-zamān Bāī-qarā (923) 364–5, 463 n. 3; fleeced by Shaibānī’s order (913) 328 n. 2; his discomforts in Herāt 617 n. 2; waits on Bābur (935) 605; Bābur invites him in verse 693; completes the Ḥabībū’s-siyar while at Tīr-mūḥānī with Bābur 687 n. 3; his omission (or loss) from Bābur’s list of Herāt celebrities 283 n. 1; his and Bābur’s varied choice of details 328 n. 2; his patron Amīr Ghiyāṣu’d-dīn and nephew Ghiyāṣu’d-dīn 436; [†942 AH.–1535 AD.].

Khwāja Khwānd-sa’īd—Bābur visits his tomb (925) 407.

Mīr Khāwānḍ—Shāh Amīr (“Mirkhond”)—author of the Rauṣatū’s-safā, grandfather of Khwānd-amīr—his omission (or loss) from Bābur’s list of Herāt celebrities 283 n. 1; [†903 AH.–1498 AD.].

Kichik ‘Alī—his courage (908) 176; made prisoner (933) 557, 576; shiqdār of Koel 176.

Kichik Bāqī dīwāna—suspended (911) 248; killed at Qalāt-i-ghilzāi 248; [†911 AH.–1505 AD.].

Kichik Begīm Bāī-qarā Timūrid, Barlās Turk, daughter of Husain and Pāyanda-sulṭān—refused in marriage to Mas’ūd Mīrān-shāhī 265; “afterwards” marries Multā Khwāja 266.

Kichik Khwāja—on ‘Askari’s service (935) 681, 682.

Kichik Khwāja Beg, son of Maulānā Muḥammad Ṣadru’d-dīn and elder brother of Khwāja Kalān—in the left wing at Khūbān (905) 113; killed at Qalāt-i-ghilzāi 2482; [†911 AH.–1505 AD.].

1 The “afterwards” points to an omission which Khwānd-amīr’s account of Husain’s daughters fills (lith. ed. iii, 327).

2 No record survives of the Khwāja’s deeds of daring other than those entered above; perhaps the other instances Bābur refers to occurred during the gap 908–9 AH.
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Kichik Mirza Miran-shahi Timurid, Barlas Turk, son of Ahmad (Mirza Sayyidi) and Akh Badi-qarar—particulars 257.

Kichkina tungtar—sent with orders to Tramontane begs (925) 406.

Kipa and Kipik, see Kupuk.

Raja Kirti Guha, see Karna.

Kitin-qarar Sultan Auzbeg—in Bakh (932) 545–6; at Jam (935) 622 (where in n. 1 read 935 for “934”); makes complaint to Babur 649, 645 n. 1.

Kitta Beg Kohbur Chaghatai, son of Sayyidi Qara—convoys Yusuf-khail chiefs to Bhira (932) 461; on Babur’s service 465–6, 468, 528, (933) 545, (935) 638; wounded at Bieana (933) 548.

Kitta Mah and Kichik Mah, slaves of Muazzafar-i-husain Badi-qarar—offend Babur by their performance (912) 304.

Kuchum Khan Sultan—Kuchkunji—Auzbeg-Shaiban, Chingoiz-khanid—particulars 632 n. 3; his force gathered at Qarshi (917) 353; also a principal actor between 926 and 932 AH. 427; his position in relation to ‘Ubaidu’llah (935) 618 n. 6; in the battle of Jam 622; various accounts of his escape or death 623, 636; his envoy to Babur 631, 632; his sons Abu-sa’id and Pulad q.v.; [†937 AH.–1530–1 AD.].

Kuki-i Baba Qasha, see Haji Muhammad Khan Kuki.

Kuki,1 paternal-uncle of the last-entered (A.N.)—on Babur’s service (934) 589, (935) 674, 679; in the battle of the Ghogra 673; [†940 AH.–1553 AD.?].

Kupuk Beg, var. Kipik, Kipa (hunchbacked) —in Babur’s service (910) 237; promoted (911) 253; frost-bitten (912) 311; in the centre at Qandahar (913) 335; envoy to Mirza Khan (925) 405.

Kupuk Bi Auzbeg var. ut supra—blamed for three murders (906) 128; given Khwarizm by Shaiban (911) 256; his son Qambar-i-alii q.v.

Kupuk Mirza Badi-qarar, Muhammad Muhsin, son of Husain and Latif-sultan—parentage 262; defeated by his father (904) 260; does not join his brothers against Shaiban (912) 296–7; defeated and killed 329–30; [†913 AH.–1507 AD.].

1 This may be a tribal or a family name. Abul-ghazi mentions two individuals named “Kouk”. One was Chingoiz Khan’s grandson who is likely to have had descendants or followers distinguishable as Kuki. See Add. Note P. 673 on Kuki fate.
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Sayyid Lāchīn—bearer of an urgent message from Bābur (932) 453.


Langar Khān Janjāha—on Bābur’s service (925) 380, 381, 388–9, 412; one of a raft-party 385; waits on Bābur 391, 411.

Langar Khān Niazāī Afghān—one of a raft-party (925) 412; waits on Bābur (926) 421.

Laṭīf Begīm Dūldāī Barlās Turk—particulars 37 (where for “916” read 917 AH.).

Laṭīf-sūlţān Āghācha Chār-shamba’ī, a mistress of Ḥusain Bāī-qarā—particulars 269; her sons Abū’l-muḥṣin and Kūpuk q.v.; [†before 911 AH.–1506 AD.].

Lope de Vega—a popular use of his name resembling one of Nawā’ī’s 287 n. 3.

Lutfi Beg—measures the Ganges-bank on Bābur’s journey (933) 659.

Maghfurt, see Faghfurt.

Māh-afruz—married by Kāmrān (934) 619 n. 1.

Mah-chuchūq Arghūn, daughter of Muqīm and Zarīf—marries Qāsim Kūkūldāsh (913) 342, 199 n. 1, 365; their daughter Nahīd q.v.; [†cir. 975 AH.–1568 AD.].

Mahdi Sultan Aūzbeg, the constant associate (brother?) of Ḥamza—defeated by Ḥusain Bāī-qarā (901) 58; enters Bābur’s service 59; deserts 64; defeats ‘Alī Mīrān-shāhī and goes back to Shaibānī 65; his Mughuls are disloyal to Bābur (904) 105; serving Shaibānī (906) 131; at Sar-i-pul 139; at Ḥiṣār (910) 244; retires before Bābur (916) 352; defeated and killed by him at Pul-i-sangīn (917) 18, 37, 262, 353, 354; his Mīrān-shāhī wife 36; his sons at Jām (935) 622; [†917 AH.–1511–12 AD.].

Mahdi-Sultan Aūzbeg-Shaibān?—his identity discussed 264 n. 1; his son ‘Ādil and grandson ‘Āqil q.v.

Sayyid Mahdī Khwāja, son of Mūsā Khwāja and third husband of Bābur’s sister Khān-zāda—Bābur’s dīvān-begī (916–7) 704 n. 3; dissuades Muḥammad-i-zamān from accepting Bābur’s invitation to Kābul (after 920) 364; on Bābur’s service (932) 468, 471; in the left wing at Pānīpat 472, 473; commands troops sent to seize Dihlī 475; gifts made to him 527; given Etāwa 530; orders changed 531;
serves as an escort (933) 534, 537; given Biāna 539; sends news of Sangā’s approach 544; joins Bābur quickly 548; in the left wing at Kānwa 567; given leave for Kābul 579; host to Bābur near Etāwa (935) 644; waits on him returning to Āgra 686; displeases him 688 n. 2, 704 n. 2; summoned to Court 689; later particulars 644 n. 4, 688 n. 2, 692; discussion of a plan to make him Pādshāh 703-7; his name may be a gloss in the story 705; his son Ja’far q.v.; his inscribed slab at Amīr Khusrau’s tomb 704 n. 1; his surmised Tirmīzī descent 704; his relation or servant Mir Muhammad (925) 381.

Māhīm Begīm, wife of Bābur—particulars 344 n. 3, 711, 712, 714; with Bābur during the Transoxus campaign (916-920) 358; adopts Hind-āl (925) 374, 385, 715, App. L; visits Humāyūn in Badakhshān (928) 436; goes to Āgra (935) 640 n. 2, 650 n. 2, 665, 686-7, 689 n. 2, 690; her influence probably misused on Humāyūn 694, 707; meets him, sick, in Muttra (937) 701-2; her care of Bābur’s Āgra tomb (937) 709; [†940 AH.-1533-4 AD.].

Sayyid Mahmūd Aūghlāqchī, Mughūl—forced to go on foot (910) 239.

Mahmūd Beg Nūndākī, Barlās Turk—particulars 51; defends Hisār against Abā-bikr Mirān-shāhī (873) 51, and against Husain Bāī-qarā (901) 58; negotiates with Husain 61.

Sultān Mahmūd Dūldāī Barlās Turk—expelled from Andijān (900) 44; turns informer (905) 125.

Mulla Mahmūd Farābī, associated with Khalīfa—reads the Qorān to Bābur (925) 401; rebukes a jest at Khalīfa’s expense 416; reads the Khutba first for Bābur in Dihli (932) 476; reinforces the right wing [jūlghuma] at Kānwa (933) 569; leads the Morning Prayer at Rāprī (935) 643 (where for “Muhammad” read Mahmūd).

Sultān Mahmūd Ghāzī Ghaznawī Turk—his humble capital Ghaznī 217, 219; his and his descendants’ tombs 218; Dost-i-nāsir’s tomb near his 396; his dam and Bābur’s gift from Hindūstān for its repairs 219; Būt-khāk traditionally named from his idol-breaking 409 n. 3; mentioned as a conqueror of Hindūstān 479; contrast made between his position and Bābur’s 479; [†421 AH.-1030 AD.].

Sultān Mahmūd Khān Chaghalāī Chingīs-khānid, Khāqān of the Mughūls, elder son of Yūnas and Shāh Begīm—succeeds
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his father (892) 13; his disaster on the Chīr (895) 31, 34, 39; invades Farghāna (899) 13, 31; thought of as a refuge for Bābur 29, (908) 178;retires from Farghāna 32; attempts Samarkand and is defeated (900) 52, 111, (905) 122; takes Aūrā-tipā (900) 55–6; demands Andijān (903) 87; is visited by Bābul (900) 54, (903) 90, 92, (907 and 908) 153–159; sends help to Bābul (903) 90, 92, (904) 101, (906) 138, 139; his men abandon Bābul (903) 91, 92; he opposes Bābul (905) 115–6, 116; moves out against Tambal (907) 154, 156; numbers his army 154; acclaims his standards 155; ceremonies on his meeting his brother Aḥmad (908) 160; goes with him against Tambal 161, 168, 171; they number their armies 161;retires to Tāshkunt 172; defeated at Archiān by Shaibānī (909) 7, 23, [182–3; his præ-accession sobriquet Khāmkā Khān 23; his summer retreat in Farghānā 5; his Mīrān-shāhī marriage (cir. 892) 13, 35; retainers of his 25, 28; former followers, deported (908) by Shaibānī, return after his death (916) 351; Bābul's comment on him as a soldier 91, 157, and as a verse-maker 154; murdered with five young sons by Shaibānī 350; [†914 AH.–1509 AD.].

Māhmūd Khān Lūdī Afgān, son of Sikandar—fights for Sangā at Kānwa (933) 562; reported to have taken Bihar (935) 639, 675; one of three competitors for rule 651 n. 5; gathers an army to oppose Bābul 651–2; it breaks up 654; is near the Son 658; flees before Bābul's men 662; referred to 664 n. 7, 679 n. 7; on his title Sulğān 652 nn. 2, 6, 653–4 n. 1; [†945 AH.–1543 AD.].

Māhmūd Khān Nūhānī Afgān — holding a district from Bābul; taken by 'Alām Khān (932) 455, 456; deserts 'Alām Khān; waits on Bābul and given revenue from Ghāzīpūr 527; sent against Etāma 530; waits on Bābul (935) 659; searches for a passage through the Ghogrā 668; in the battle of the Ghogrā 669 (here Ghazīpūrī); receives a grant on Bihār 676; on service against Bīban and Bāyazīd 682.

Māhmūd Khān shīkdār of Sikandarpūr—collects boats for Bābul's passage of the Ghogrā (935) 668.

Māhmūd Khān Sulṭān Aūzbeg-Shaibān Chīngīsz-khānīd— in the battle of Sar-i-pul (Khwāja Kārdzan) (906) 139; receives Qūndūz (910) 244; his protection sought 196 n. 5; dies 244; [†910 AH.–1504 AD.].

Sulṭān Māhmūd Khīlīj Turk, ruler in Mālwa—particulars 482 ' (where in n. 2 for “Gujrāt” read Mālwa); his territory (916)
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593; his jewels (925 and 935) 612–3; thought of by Rahim dād as a refuge 688 n. 2 (where for “Muḥammad” read Maḥmūd); [†937 AH.–1531 AD.].

Maḥmūd kūndūr-sangak, pūḍā—killed fighting 68; [†902 AH.–1497 AD.].

Sultān Maḥmūd mīr-akhwur, see Mīrzā Beg firvīgī-bāz (58 and n. 4).

Sultān Maḥmūd Mīrzā Ghāzī, Mīrān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Abū-sa’īd—particulars 45–51; defeated by Ḥusain Bāī-garā (865 and 876), 46, 259–60, 268; succeeds his brother Ahmad (899) 40–1, 86; alienates allegiance 41–2; sends Bābur wedding-gifts (900) 43; his death 27, 45, 50, 52; his family joins Bābur (910) 189; referred to 12 n. 2, 13 n. 5, 190, 194; his Ḫīsār house 93; [†900 AH.–1495 AD.].


Maḥmūd Sarwānī, son of Fath Khan Khān-i-jahān—ordered to stay at Court (933) 537.

Maḥmūd Shāh Ilyās—his murder mentioned to illustrate a succession custom of Bengal 483.

Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī, son of Jalālūd-dīn—Bābur gives him the title of Sultān (935) 652.

Maḥmūd, son of Muhammad-i-makhdūmī — beheaded in Badakhshān 242; [†910 AH.–1504–5 AD. ?].

(? ) Maḥndī (415, 473), or Mindī or Hindī (235, 335)—kills an Afgān trader (910) 235; in the centre at Qandahār (913) 335; wine first given to him (925) 415; in the left wing [tūlghuma] at Pānipat (932) 473.

Khwāja Majdu’d-dīn Muḥammad Khawāfī — particulars 281, 282.

Makan Farmūlī (? ) Afgān—not submissive to Bābur (932) 529; sent out of the way before Kānwa (933) 547; his son Ḥasan q.v.

Makhdūm-i-‘ālam, Naṣrat Shāh’s Governor in Ḫājīpur—his defences on the Gandak (935) 663.

Ḥaṣrat Makhdūmī Nūrā—mentioned 641 n. 1.

Makhdūm-sultān Begīm Mīrān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, daughter of Maḥmūd and Zuhra—in Badakhshān (cir. 935) 48.
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Malik-dād Kararānī (Karānī)\(^1\)—replied (932) 477-8; on service (933) 540, 582, (935) 682; in the right wing at Kānwa (933) 557.

Malik-i-muḥammad Mīrzá Mīrān-shāhī, nephew of Abū-sa‘īd—aspires to rule (899) 41; murdered 41; his wife 47; his house 146; [†899 AH.-1494 AD.].

Maliks of Alangār—their garden a halting-place (926) 424.

Malik of Fān—stingy to Bābur (906) 130.

Malik-quli Kūnārī—Bābur halts at his son’s house (926) 423 (where read qulī for “‘Alī”).

Malik Sharq—returns from service (935) 683.

Mallū Khān of Mālwā—his tank at Chanderi 597 n. 8, 598.

Mamāq Sultān Aūsbeğ - Shaibān Chīngīz-khāned, son of Ḥamza—takes service with Bābur (901) 58, 59; his death 353; [†911 AH.-1511-2 AD.].

Māmūm Khalīfa, ‘Abbāsī, son of Hārūnu’r-rashīd—his Observatory and Tables, Author’s Note 79; [†218 AH.-833 AD.].

Mānik - chand Chauhān Rājpūt—killed at Kānwa 573; [†933 AH.-1527 AD.].

Rāja Man-sing Gūālīrī, Tānwar Rājpūt—his buildings 607, 608; his son Bikramājīt q.v.; [†924 AH.-1518 AD.].

Shāh Mansūr bakhshī—helps Shaibānī to take Herāt (913) 325; given Khadija Begīm to loot 326.

Shah Mansūr Barlās—on service (932) 465-6, 475, 530, (933) 545; in the right centre at Pānīpat (932) 472, 473, and at Kānwa (933) 565, 569; his untimely praise of the Rājpūt army 548, 550.

Sultān Mansūr Khān Chaghātāī Chīngīz-khāned, eldest son of Ahmad, Alacha Khān— defeats his half-brother Sa‘īd (914) 349; mentioned as Khāqān of the Mughūls, Sa‘īd as Khān in Kāshghar 427; [†950 AH.-1543 AD.].

Mansūr Mīrzā Bāt-garā, ‘Umar-shaikhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk—mentioned in his son Husain’s genealogy 256; his not-reigning 256; his wife Firūza and their children 256, 257; his beg Wali q.v.

Mansūr Turkmān—in the centre at Qandahār (913) 335.

Malik Shāh Mansūr Yūsuf-zāī Afghān, son of Sulaimān—envoy of his tribe to Bābur (924) 371; his daughter’s

\(^1\) Cf. E. and D. for “Karānī” (e.g. vol. iv, 530). The Hai. MS. sometimes doubles the ‘r; sometimes not.
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marriage with Bābur (925) 375, App. K; waits on him 399, 400; his brother Taus Khān and cousin Ahmad q.v.; a follower 377.

Maqsūd sūchī, shārbatčī, kārg—in the left centre at Qandahār (913) 335, 338; his tossing by a rhinoceros (kārg) 400.

Marghūb gul—in Mahāwīn (932) 523.

Miān Ma’rūf Farmūli Afghān 1—disaffected to Ibrāhīm and (later) to Bābur (932) 523; his opposition 530; flees 533–4; his son Muḥammad (?) leaves him (934) 598; his sons Muḥammad and Mūsa q.v.


Shaikh Maślahat Khujandī—his birthplace 8; dreamed of by Bābur (906) 132; his tomb visited by Timūr (790) 132 n. 2.

Mastī chuhrā—deals with a drunken man (925) 415; intoxicated by beer (926) 423.

Sulṭān Mas’ūd Ghaznavī—his tomb 218.

Sulṭān Mas’ūd Mīrzā Mirān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Mahmūd and Khān-zāda I—particulars 47, 48; holding Ḥisār (900) 52; opposes Ḥusain Bā’ī-garā and flees (901) 57–8, 130; one of three besieging Samarkand; retires with his desired Barlās bride 64; quarrels with Khusrau Shāh (902) 71, and with the Ḥisār begs (903) 93; takes refuge with Ḥusain Bā’ī-garā 93, 95, 261, 265; returns to Khusrau and is blinded by him 95, 50; goes back to Ḥusain 95, 266; mentioned as older than Bā’ī-sunghar 110; meets Bābur in Ḥerāt (912) 302; murdered by Aūzbegs (913) 267; his wives Ṣāliḥa-sulṭān Mīrān-shāhī, and Saʿādat-bakht Bā’ī-garā q.v.; his betrothed (?) Kichīk Begīm Bā’ī-garā q.v.; [†913 AH.–1507 AD.].

Sulṭān Mas’ūd Mīrzā Kābulī, Shāh-rukhī, ut supra—particulars 382; his cherished followers, sons of Mīr ‘Alī Beg q.v.; his son ‘Alī asghar q.v.; [deposed 843 AH.–1439–40 AD.].

Mulla Ma’sūm Bādshāhī, of Ḥusain Bā’ī-garā’s Court—no particulars 284.

Ma’sūma-sulṭān Begīm Mirān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, daughter of Ahmad and Ḥabība-sulṭān, and wife of Bābur—particulars 36, 711; her marriage arranged (912) 306, 714; brought from Ḥerāt (913) 330; married 339; dies in child-bed and her name at once given to her child 36; [†cir. 915 AH.–1509 AD.].

1 See Wāqi’āt-i-mushtāqī, E. and D. iv, 548.
Ma'sūma-sultān Begīm, ut supra, daughter of Bābur and Ma'sūma-sultān (supra)—her birth 36; with her father in the Transoxus campaign (916–920) 358; her marriage (or betrothal) to Muḥammad-i-zamān Bāī-qarā (923 or 924) 365; gifts made to her servants (935) 633; in the family-list 705, 706.

Maulānā Sayyidī, or Mashhādī—his chronogram on Humāyūn’s birth (913) 344.

Shaikh Mazīd Beg, Bābur’s first guardian—particulars 26, 27, [† before 899 AH.–1494 AD.].

Mīr Mazīd Ṭagḥāī Kūnī Mughūl, brother or uncle of Aīsān-daulat—takes part in a sally from Samarkand (906) 142; wounded at Akhsī (908) 168; rebels (921) 363, 397; his relations, ‘Alī-dost, Sherim, Qul-naẓr q.v.; [†cir. 923 AH.–1517 AD.].

Mazīd Beg Tarkhān Arghūn, son of Amīr Tarkhān Junaid (H.S. lith. ed. iii, 359)—his retainer Khusrau Shāh 49; his action in 873 AH. 51; his brother ‘Āshiq-i-muḥammad q.v.

Shaikh Mazīd Kūkūldāsh—envoy of Muḥammad-i-zamān to Bābur (925) 402.

Medīnī Rāo var. Mindī etc.—particulars 593 n. 5; his force at Kānwa (933) 562; holding Chanderī (934) 483, 593; Bābur negotiates with him 594; his house the scene of a supreme rite 595.

Mihr-angez Begīm Bāī-qarā Timūrid, Barlās Turk—married as a captive (913) 329 n. 1.

Mihr-bān Khānīm (see infra)—gifts to and from Bābur (935) 631, 632, 641; her husband Kūchūm Aūzbeg and their son Pūlād q.v.; a verse seeming to be addressed to her (925) 402.

Mihr-bānu Begīm Mīrān-shāhī, half-sister of Bābur (perhaps the Khānīm last entered)—particulars 18.

Mihr-nigar Khānīm Chaghatāī Chingiz-khānid, daughter of Yūnas—particulars 21, 149; joins Bābur in Kābul (911) 246; visited by him after her disloyalty (912) 315; goes to Badakhshān (913) 341; dies a prisoner 21.

Millī Sürdūk—reprieved from death (932) 477, 478.

Minglī Bi Āghācha, a mistress of Ḥusain Bāī-qarā—particulars 269; her sons and daughters 262–3, 266.

Minglik Kūkūldāsh—leaves Samarkand (907) 147.
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Minūchīhr Mīrzā Mirān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, brother of Abū-saʿīd—an attributed descendant 24; his son Malik-i-muḥammad q.v.

Minūchīhr Khaḥ Turk—delayed in waiting on Bābur by a forcible marriage (925) 386, 388; on Bābur's service in Bhīra 389; leading Daryā-khānīs (934) 589; his relation Naẓar-i-ʿālī Turk q.v.

Mīrak—entrusted with building work (935) 642.

Mīrak Kūr Dīwān (or Gūr)—in Ālā-ḫūrghān when Shaibānī took Herāt (913) 328.

Mirān-shāh Mīrzā Mirān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Aūlūgh Beg Kābulī—rebels against his father and goes to Khusrau Shāh 95; sent to Bāmlān 96.

Mirān-shāh Sultān Mīrzā Timūrid, Barlās Turk, 3rd son of Timūr—mentioned in a genealogy 14; his daughter's son Aḥmād Bāī-qarā q.v.; [†810 AH.–1407–8 AD.]

Mir Buzurg Tirmīzī—his daughter and granddaughter, wives of Mahmūd Mirān-shāhī 47–8, 49.

Mirīm—Mīr Muhāmmad?—adopted son of Aūzūn Ḥasan—killed fighting against Bābur 170; [†908 AH.–1502 AD.]

Mirīm Dīwān—ut supra—captured serving Bābur (904) 106; released (905) 119; discovers a rebel (912) 319.

Mirīm Laghari—ut supra—leaves Bābur for home (903) 91; captured serving Bābur (904) 106; killed 167; [†904 AH.–1499 AD.]

Mirīm-i-nāsir Beg—ut supra—enters Bābur's service (904) 103; one of a household-party (906) 131; in the lef centre at Qandahār (913) 335, 338; at social gatherings (925) 385, 388; on service 389, 391; receives his dead brother's district 397.

Mirīm Tarkhān—ut supra—drowned while serving Bāīsūnghar Mirān-shāhī 74; [†903 AH.–1497 AD.]

Mir Khurd Bakhāwal—one of a boat-party (925) 388; ordered to catch pheasants 404; made Hind-āl's guardian 408; on service (935) 640.

Mir Mughūl, son of ʿAbdu'l-wahhāb shaghāwal—helps to defend Andijān (903) 122; his son killed (904) 102 (here Mughūl Beg); sent by Tarkhāns to invite Bābur to Samarkand (905) 122, 123; on service (925) 389 (here Beg

1 Shaikhīm Suhailī however was named Aḥmād (277) not Muhāmmad.
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Muḥammad Mughūl; measures Bābūr’s marches (935) 658 (here Mughūl Beg); in the battle of the Ghográ 673–4 (here Mughūl-i ‘Abdu’l-wahhāb).

Mīr Sang-tarāsh—entrusted with building-work (935) 642.

Mīrzā Beg firīngī-bāz—in Ḥusain Bāti-qarā’s service (901) 58.

Mīrzā Beg Kāi-khusrawī—in Ālā-ḵūrghān when Shaibānī took Herī (913) 328.

Mīrzā Beg Ṭaghāī, see Sl. ‘Alī M. Ṭaghāī Begchīk.

Mīrzā Beg Tarkhān—in the left centre at Panipat (932) 472.

Wais Mīrzā Khān Mirān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk—Khān Mīrzā—son of Maḥmūd and Sulṭān-nigār Chaghatāʿi—particulars 47; sent by the Khān (Maḥmūd Chaghatāʿi) against Samarkand (905) 122; in Tāshḵīnt (908) 159; at Khusrav Shāh’s audience of submission (910) 193; demands vengeance on him 194; on service 234; disloyal (912) 313–20; captured and banished 320; rejoins Bābūr from Herāt (913) 331; in the right wing at Qandahār 334; his loot 338; goes to Badakhshān on Shāh Begim’s insistence 340–1, 342; his claim to rule in it 698 nn. 1–3; serves as a refuge for Saʿīd Chaghatāʿi (915) 349 and Hādīr Dūglāt 350; sends Bābūr news of Shaibānī’s defeat at Merv (916) 350; invites his help in recovering their ancestral lands ib.; messenger of Bābūr to Ismāʿīl Safawī 352; helps him to defend Ḥiṣār (918) 359; receives him plundered 362; sends him an envoy (925) 402; loses lands to Saʿīd Chaghatāʿi 695; mentioned 427; his death announced to Bābūr (927) 433, 621 n. 5; his titles 21 n. 5; his guardians 26, 122; [†927 AH.–1521 AD.].

Mīr-zādās of Khwāst—wait on Bābūr (925) 399.

Mīrzā-i-malū Qārlūq?—his son Shāh Ḥusain or Ḥasan q.v.


Mohan Mundāhir Rājpūṭ— a punitive expedition against him (936) 700–1; [†936 AH.–1529 AD. ?].

The Mother of the Head-man of Dikh-kat—particulars 150.

Ibrāhīm Lūṭ’s Mother —receives an allowance from Bābūr (932) 478; attempts to poison him (933) 541; started under guard for Kābul 543; her grandson sent to Kāmrān 544; [†933 AH.–1527 AD.].

Mīrzā-quli Kūkūldāsh (Mīrzā’s servant?)—with Jahāṅgīr (et. 9) in Akhsi (899) 32; one of three with Bābūr (908) 166,
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396; fights for him in Akhsī 174–5; one of eight in flight 177; his horse fails 178; at social gatherings (925) 385, 387, 388; out with Bābur 403; behaves in his own fashion 407.

Mūātūkān Chaghatāī Chingīz-khānid — mentioned in Yūnās Khān’s genealogy 19.

Bibi Mubāraka Yūsuf-zāī Afghān, a wife of Bābur—referred to 367 n. 3; her courtship App. K; asked and given in marriage 375, 376; a couplet suitting her 411; accompanies Mahīm to Āgra (935) 689 n. 5; her probable charge of conveying Bābur’s body to Kābul 709–10; her brother Jamāl App. K, xli; [† early under Akbar 963 AH.–1556 AD.]

Mubārak Khān Jilwānī—killed serving Bīban (935) 685.

Mubārak Shāh Muṣṭaffārī — rises in Badakhshān against Shaibānī (cir. 910) 242; invites Nāṣīr Mīrān-shāhī 242, 243; defeats Aūzbegs (912) 294–5; defeats Nāṣīr 321; in force (913) Author’s Note 340; invites Mīrzā Khān to Qīla’-i-zafar 21; [† cir. 913 AH.–1508 AD.]

Mughūl Beg, amir of Ḥusain Bāi-qarā—particulars 275.

A Mughūl servant—aims an arrow at Bābur (912) 316.

Mūḥammad, the Prophet—reference to 75; a saying on travel 184; his edicts do not include the imposition of the tamghā 555; on the duty of a wazīr 556; mentioned in the fardān and the fath-nāma (933) 553, 559–574.

Khwāja Mūḥammad, an old tailor of ʿUmar Shaikh’s—allays anxiety for Bābur (899) 30.

Mīr Mūḥammad-i-Mahdī Khwāja—on service (925) 381.

Pahlawān Ḥaji Mūḥammad—gifts made to him (935) 633.

Ustad Sulṭān Mūḥammad, a Kābul builder—orders for his work (935) 646–7.

Mūḥammad ‘Alī, son of Ḥaidar kikābdār—brings a gift (925) 418; summons Humāyūn (933) 537–8; sent out for news (935) 661, 662.

Mūḥammad ‘Alī bakhshī—on Abū-saʿīd’s service and defeated by Husain Bāi-qarā (868) 259.

Mūḥammad ‘Alī Jang-jang—in the centre at Bajaur (925) 370; at boat-parties 387, 388; his servant’s service 391, 392; his districts 392–3, 530; reinforced 412; waits on Bābur 403, 419, (932) 458; at Milwat (932) 460, 461; at Hisār-frūza 465–6; wounded 471; in the van at Pānīpat 472; on service
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530, (933) 549, 550, 576, 582; in the left wing at Kānwa 557; acts unsuccessfully against Biban and Bāyazīd (934) 589, 594, 598; pursues from near Qānūj 601; sent against Balūchis (935) 638; his brother Arghūn and sons Tardi-muḥammad and Nan-roz q.v.

Khwāja Muḥammad ‘Alī kitābdār — messenger to Khwāja Yaḥyā (905) 124; confuses a pass word (908) 164 (here sāirt-kīshi = sārt); captured by Tāmbal 168; fights against rebels (912) 315; in the left centre at Qandahār (913) 335; in charge of treasure 338; at entertainments (925) 410, 411, 413; at Kalanūr (930) 442 (here Tājik = Sārt).

Muḥammad ‘Alī Mubashīr-beg—stays with Bābur at a crisis (903) 91; at Khūbān (905) 113; in the flight from Akhsī (908) 163; captured by Tāmbal 168; killed on service 252; his servant Sulaimān 175; [†911 AH.–1506 AD.].

Muḥammad ‘Alī pīāda—deserts Nāṣir Mīrān-shāhī (913) 343.

Khwāja Muḥammad ‘Alī Ṭagḥāī — ‘Asas — brother of Mahim Begīm?—in the van at Qandahār (913) 335; meets Bābur at a crisis (914) 346; waits on Bābur (925) 399, 403; answers a military summons 408; the first to follow Bābur in renouncing wine (933) 552; at various entertainments (925) 387, 388, 400, 412, (926) 423, (935) 683; on his identity 522 n. 4; in charge of Bābur’s Agra tomb (937) 709.

Khwāja Muḥammad-amin—out with Bābur (910) 230; deserts from Qandahār (913) 343; at a garden-wine-party (925) 418; his servant Imām-i-muḥammad īb.

Muḥammad-āmin Khān Qāzānī, Jūgī Chīngīs-khānid—Shaibānī sends him a Herāt musician 292; [†925 AH.–1519 AD.].

Ustād Muḥammad-āmin jībāchī—attention for him desired from Khwāja Kalān (935) 647.

Muḥammad Andijānī—sent to Kābul (912) 313–4.

Muḥammad Arghūn—with Mughūls against Bābur (904) 106.

Sayyīd Muḥammad-i-aūrūs Arghūn, son of Aūrūs—particulars 279.

Shāh Sūltān Muḥammad Badakhshī — his claim to Greek descent and his six daughters 22. (Cf. T.R. trs. p. 107.)

Mīr Muḥammad Badakhshī of Ishkīmīsh—particulars 288–9; waits on Bābur (917) 289.

Muḥammad bakhshī—on service at Qandahār (913) 338.
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Muhammad Bāqir Beg Andijānī—with Jahāngīr (899) 32; disloyal to Bābur (900) 44; with Bāī-sunghar (902) 65; leaves Bābur for home (903) 91; in Akhsī and seen in the flight (908) 189, 181; 182; his son Dost q.v.

Muhammad Barandūq Beg Barlas Turk—particulars 270; on Hūsain Bāī-qarā’s service (901) 58; retorts on Khusrau Shāh (910) 243; retainer of Muʿzaffar-i-husain Bāī-qarā (911) 274, 293; acts against Shaibānī (912) 296, 297; at a feast 298; concerning Bābur’s reception at the Herī Court 299; presses him to winter in Herī 307; his plan of defence rejected (913) 326.

Muhammad Beg Begchīk, brother of Ayūb—in the right wing at Qandahār (913) 334.

Pahlawān Ṣaḥb Muhammad Bū-saʿīd—particulars 292.

Shāh Muhammad dīvānā, receives a fugitive Bāī-qarā 263; his son brings Bābur news of Bīban and Bāyazīd (935) 681.

Muhammad-dost Taghāī Kūnjī Mughūl, son of ‘Alī-dost—with Bābur (900) 53; remains at a crisis (903) 91; captured by Tambal (904) 106; released (905) 119; his self-aggrandizement 119; deserts to Tambal 125; negociates for him with Bābur (908) 173; blindered by the Aūzbegs 125.

Sayyid Muhammad Dūghlāt Hiṣārī—enters Bābur’s service (901) 58, 59; his Mughūls desert Bābur (904) 105; conspires against Tambal and goes to The Khan (Mahmūd) (907) 154; sent with Bābur against Tambal (908) 161.

Ṣultaṅ Muhammad Dūldāi, Barlas Turk—Bābur’s messenger to Hūsain Bāī-qarā (912) 294; returns with news of Hūsain’s death 295; in the right centre at Qandahār (913) 335; waits on Bābur from Bajaur (925) 401; overtakes him at Jūī-shāhī 410; at a wine-party 412; at Hiṣār-fīrūza (932) 465–6; in the right-wing at Pānīpat 472; given Qanūj 530; abandoning it (933) 557; unwilling to return there 582; sent against Balūchis (935) 638; ordered to Āgra 676.

Shāh Muhammad Farmūlī Afghān, son of Maʿrūf—particulars 675; Bābur gives him Sārūn (934) 603, 675; waits on Bābur (935) 675, 679.

Ṣultaṅ Muhammad Galpūk, Itārachī Mughūl—opposing Bābur (908) 165.

Shaikh Muhammad Ghaus—particulars 539; helps Bābur to gain Gūālār (933) 539–40; intercedes for Rahīm-dād (936) 688, 690.
Muḥammad Ḥaidar Mīrzā  
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Muḥammad Ḥusain Mīrzā Kūrkan  

Muḥammad-i-Husain Mīrzā Bāī-qarā Timūrid, Barlās Türk, son of Husain and Mingli—particulars 262, 268; hostile to his father (903) 94; his flight into ʻIrāq 262.

Muḥammad Jān, Najm Șānī’s Lord-of-the-Gate—envoy to Bābur and discontented with his reception (917) 355.

Muḥammad Khalīl akhta-begī—sent raiding (933) 538; at Kānwa (933) 569.

Muḥammad Khān Chaghatāī Chīngīz-khānīd—mentioned in Yūnas Khān’s genealogy 19.

Muḥammadī Kūkūldāsh, kinsman of Bābā Qashqa (?—q.v.)—seen with Bābur by Khān-zāda (before 907 and in 916) 18; on service at Milwat (932) 458, 460; in the right centre at Pānipat 472, 473, 475; sent against Dulpūr 530; receives Samāna 528; in the right wing at Kānwa (933) 566, 569, 576; sends news of a second ² Balūchī incursion (935) 605 n. 3, 638; reports action 675; ordered to Agra 676; at various entertainments (925) 385, 388, 412.

Muḥammad-i-makhdūmī—his son Maḥmūd q.v.

² The record of the first appears likely to be lost in the lacuna of 934 AH.
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Muḥammad Maʿṣum Mīrzā Bāi-qarā Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Ḥusain and Mingli—particulars 264, 269; his wife Bega Mīrān-shāhī q.v.; [†907 AH.–1501–2 AD. See ḤS. iii, 290].

Mullā Muḥammad Mazhab—profers support to Bābur (932) 463; Bābur’s envoy to Bengal (935) 637.

Muḥammad Mazīd Tarkhān Arghūn Chīngīz-khānid, son of Aūrdū-būghā—particulars 39; has charge of Nāṣir Mīrān-shāhī (899) 32; leaves Samarkand after the Tarkhān rebellion (901) 62; displeases ‘Alī Mīrān-shāhī (905) 121; plotted against ib.; invites Mīrzā Khān and Bābur 122,123; welcomes Bābur 40, 124; joins Khusrau Shāh (906) 129; fights for Bābur at Sar-i-pul (Khwāja ī Kardzan) 139; takes refuge with Khusrau Shāh 141; at Kūl-i-malik (918) 357; killed there 39; his house a post of Bābur’s 143; [†918 AH.–1512 AD.].

Sultān Muḥammad Mīrzā Bāi-qarā Timūrid, Barlās Turk—parentage 257.

Sayyid Muḥammad Mīrzā Dūghlāt, uncle of Ḥaidar—sent to help Bābur (906) 139; envoy of Saʿīd Chaghataī to him (917) 22; escorts his niece to Kāshghar ib.

Sultān Muḥammad Mīrzā Mīrān-shāhī, grandson of Timūr—his son Abū-saʿīd q.v.

Sultan Muḥammad Mīrzā Mīrān-shāhī Timūrid—his father Abū-saʿīd q.v.

Muḥammad mīṣkīn, Dūldāi Barlās, son of Ḥafiz—captured by Bābur’s men (903) 72.

Muḥammad Muḥsin Bāi-qarā, see Küpük.

Muḥammad Muqīm Beg Arghūn, son of Zūn-nūn—takes possession of Kābul (908) 195 n. 3; loses it to Bābur (910) 198, 199, 227, 246 n. 3; loses Qalāt-i-ghilzāī to him (911) 248–9; seeks his co-operation against Shaibānī (913) 330; withdraws and fails in etiquette 331–2; opposed to Bābur at Qandahār 333–7; flees in defeat 339.

Khwāja Muḥammad Muqīm Herāwī, father of Niẓāму’d-din Aḥmad the historian—mentioned 691 n. 1, 692; his story of a plan to supersede Humāyūn as Pādshāh in 937 AH. 703; discussion of it 704–7; its incredibility as told 704–5.

Muḥammad Mūmin Bāi-qarā Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Bādīʿuʿz-zamān—Astarābād claimed for him (902) 69; de-
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feated by an uncle 71 (where delete the ‘ain from his name); his murder attributed to Khadija Begim 268.

Shaikh Muhammad Musalmān, ancestor of the Farmūlī Shaikh-zādās—his tomb and descendants 220.

Sultan Muhammad Muzaffar Gujrātī, Tank Rājpūt—particulars 481–2; his death 481; his sons Sikandar Shāh and Bahādur Khān q.v.; [†932 AH.—1526 AD.].

Muhammad Nūhānī, see Bihār Khān.

Mullā Muhammad Pargharī—loquacious (932) 453.

Muhammad-i-qāsim Barlās—comes accidentally on Bābur (925) 417.

Muhammad-i-qāsim Mīrzā Arłat, son of Abūl-qāsim (H.S. iii, 327)—his Bāi-qarā wife and their child 265; his sons (?) Bābur and Murād q.v.

Muhammad-i-qāsim Mīrzā Bāi-qarā Timūrid, son of Ḥusain and Pāpā—parentage 265.

Muhammad-i-qāsim Nabīra, grandson of Muhammad Sīghal—made prisoner when opposing Bābur (903) 72.

Muhammad-i-qāsim Qībchāq Turk, son of Bāqī Chaghānīānī—leaves his family in Ajar (910) 191; father (?) of Ahmad-i-qāsim q.v.

Muhammad-quli qūchīn—Mīr Shāh qūchīn—helps Bāi-sunghar’s escape from Samarkand (901) 62; with Bābur at Samarkand and wounded (902) 68; stays with him at a crisis (903) 91; captured (904) and released by Tambal (905) 119; in the van at Sar-i-pul (Khwaja Kārdzan) (906) 139; besieged in Samarkand 142–144; with Bābur when surprised by Tambal (908) 163; in the left wing at Qandahār (913) 334; in a raid (925) 403.

Muhammad qūrčī, retainer of Khusrau Shāh—rises against the Aūzbeg occupation of Badakhshān (910) 242; expels Nāṣir Mirān-shāhī (912) 321; keeping up his head (913) 340.

Ustad Muhammad sabās-banā—his son Banā‘i q.v.

Maulānā Muhammad Sadrud-dīn Andijānī—his six sons’ service to Bābur 370 n. 2; his sons Khwāja Mullā-i-ṣadr, Kīchik Khwāja, Khwāja Kalān q.v.

Muhammad Sālih Mīrzā Khwārizmī, author of the Shaibānī-nāma—in Khwāja Yahyā’s service 1 and waits on Bābur (901)

1 See Shaibānī-nāma, Vambéry’s ed. Cap. xv, l. 12, for his changes of service, and Sām Mīrzā’s Tuhfa-i-sāmt for various particulars including his classification as a Chaghatāī.
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64; leaves Samarkand with the Tarkhāns (905) 121; enters Shaibānī’s service 65 n. 3; on Shaibānī’s service (910) 196 n. 5; couplets of his quoted by Bābur 120–1, 448; [*941 AH.–1534–5 AD.*].

Ustād Shāh MUḥammad sang-tarāsh—cuts an inscription (913) 343; receives orders for work (933) 585, 606, (935) 642.

MUḥammad Shāh Khīlji Turk, son of Nāṣiru’l-din of Mālwā—takes Chanderī and seeks Ibrāhīm Lūdī’s protection (916) 593; his young son Ahmad q.v.; [*931 AH.–1524 AD.*].

MUḥammad Shāh Pādshāh Mīrān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk—his change of name for an orange 511 n. 4; [*1161 AH.–1748 AD.*].

MUḥammad Shāh, see Shaibānī.

Shaikh MUḥammad-i Shaikh Bhakārī (?) — on service (933) 382.

Shāh MUḥammad Shaikh-zāda Farmūlī Afghān, son of Ma’rūf—leaves his Afghān associates (934) 598 (no name here); favoured by Bābur 603, 675; compelled to act with Bīban and Bāyazid (935) 675; writes dutifully to Bābur ib. ; waits on ‘Askarī and Bābur ib. and 679.

MUḥammad Sharīf munajjim (astrologer)—comes to Kābul (925) 399 and to Āgra (933) 551; augurs defeat at Kānwa 551, 576; offers congratulations on victory, blamed and banished with a gift 576.

Sultān MUḥammad Sīghal, Chaghatāi — his descendants MUḥammad-i-qāsim and Ḥasan q.v. (Cf. 66 n. 4 and Ḥ.S. lith. ed. iii, 275 for tribe and title resp.).

MUḥammad Sultān bakhshī—left behind to catch pheasants (925) 404; in a night-attack on Ibrāhīm’s camp (932) 471; in the left wing at Pānipat 472; has custody of the cook who poisoned Bābur (933) 542; staff-officers at Kānwa 568; host to Bābur (935) 629; introduces a Kābul messenger 644; brings news of Māhmūd Lūdī 653–4; writes that Bābur’s family is on its way from Kābul 657; waits on Bābur 606; his servant Shāh Qāsim q.v.

Sultān MUḥammad Sultān Chaghatāi Chīngīz-khānid — Sultānim and Khānika—eldest son of The Khan (Māhmūd) —sent to help Bābur (903) 92; his guardian and he oppose Bābur (905) 116; his part in acclaiming the standards (907) 155; goes out to meet his uncle Ahmad (Alacha Khan) (908) 159; * murdered 350; [*914 AH.–1508 AD.*].
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Muhammad Sultan-ı-jahāngīr Mīrzā Jahāngīrī Timūrid, Bārīs Turk—Samarkand given to him by his grandfather Timūr 85; his college 78.

Muhammad Sultan Mīrzā Bāi-qarā Timūrid, Bārīs Turk, son of Wais and Sultanīm—particulars 265; waits on Bābūr at Kalānūr (932) 458; on Bābūr's service 468, 471, 475, 530, 534, (933) 545, 548, 582, (934) 589, (935) 682; in the left wing at Pānipat (932) 472 and at Kānwa (933) 567, 570; gifts to him 527; given Qānūj 582; joins Bābūr (935) 651; in the battle of the Ghogra 671, 672, 674; mentioned 706 (where wrongly classed with half-Timūrīds); once owner of the Elphinstone Codex 706 n. 3.

Beg Muhammad ta'alluqchī—conveys gifts to Humāyūn (Muh. 934) and returns (Rabi' I, 935) 621; Bābūr complains of his detention.

Muhammad Tāhir—captured (903) 74.

Muhammad Timūr Sultan Aūsbeg-Shaibān, Chīngiz-khanīd, son of Shaibānī—at Samarkand (906) 128; at Sar-i-pul (Khwāja Kārdzan) 139; defeats and kills two Bāi-qarā Mīrzās (913) 263, 329-30; leaves Samarkand on Bābūr's approach (917) 354; at Ghaj-davan (918) 360; his marriages with captives 24, 36, 328 n. 1.

Mullā Muhammad tālib-mu'ammātī—an enigmatist of Husain Bāi-qarā's Court—particulars 201 n. 7; a couplet of his quoted 201-2; [†918 AH.—1512 AD.].

Pahlawan Ḥāji Muhammad tūfang-andāzī—receives gifts (935) 633.

Mullā Muhammad Turkistānī, retainer of Khusrau Shāh—makes Qūndūz safe for Shaibānī Khān (910) 192.

Muhammad-i-ʻubaidu'1-lāh, son of Ahrārī, see Khwāja Khwāja.

Sultān Muhammad Wais—waits on Bābūr (902) 66; runs away and is suspected (907) 156; serving Bābūr at Akhsī (908) 174; his retainer Kichik 'Alī q.v.

Muhammad Wali Beg—particulars 277; on Husain Bāi-qarā's service (901) 57, (902) 70, (903) 94.

Muhammad-i-ʻyūsuf Aūghlāqchī, elder son of Yūsuf—waits on Bābūr (905) 125.

* He died serving Bābūr, at Kūl-i-malik (H.S. iii, 344).—Further information negatives my suggestion (201 n. 7) that he and Mir Ḥusain (p. 288 and n. 7) were one.
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Mīr Muhammad-i-yūsuf—particulars 285; waits on Bābur in Herāt (912) 285; Shaibānī instructs him in exposition (913) 329.

Muhammad Zaitūn—opposing Bābur (932) 523; written to and makes false excuse 529, 530; waits on Bābur (933) 540; sent out of the way before Kānwa 547.

Khwāja Muhammad Zakariya,^2 son of Yahyā—murdered 128; [906 AH.-1500 AD.].

Muhammad-i-zamān Mīrzā Bāi-qarā Timūrid, Barlās Turk, grandson and last surviving heir of Husain—particulars 261, 269 n. 6, 279; spared by Shaibānī 263; his wanderings and association with Khwānd-amīr 364–5, 463 n. 3; sent to Bābur and married to his daughter Ma’sijma-sultan (923–4) 365; in Balkh 365, 522; dutiful letters and tribute sent by him to Bābur (925) 385, 402, 427, (926–932) 428; with Bābur (935) 606, 631, 639, 659; objects to the Bihar command 661–2; does homage for it and is given insignia of royalty 662, 706; starts for Bihār but is recalled 663, 664; in the battle of the Ghogrā 668, 669, 671; given Jünpur 682; pursues Bibān and Bāyazid 682; grounds for surmising in Bābur the intention to leave him as ruler in Hindūstān 705–7; of his later uprisings against Humāyūn 714 n. 1; [†drowned at Chausa 946 AH.-1539 AD.].

Muḥibb-i-‘ali Khān Barlās Turk, son of Khalīfa—marries Nāhid Begim (930) 443; in a night-attack (932) 471; in the left centre at Pānipat 472, 473 and at Kānwa (933) 565; unhorsed in ‘Abdu’l-‘azīz’ discomfiture 549–50; on service (934) 601.

Muḥibb-i-‘ali gūrčī—on Khusrau Shāh’s service (901) 60, (902) 71; joins Bābur (910) 188; Bābur’s praise of him (912) 307, 308; loyal 313, (914) 346; in the van at Qandahār (913) 335; collector of an impost (925) 384; at Ḩiṣār-fīrūza (932) 465–6; at an entertainment 410.

Muḥibb-sultan Mīrān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, daughter of Mahmūd—particulars 48, 49.

Sāqī MUḤSIN—wrestles (935) 660.

1 “Zaitun is the name of the Chinese city from which satin was brought (hoedie Thsiancheu or Chincheu) and my belief is that our word satin came from it” (Col. H. Yule, E. and D. iv, 514).

2 My text omits to translate yiqit(xūghūl) and thus loses the information that Yahyā’s sons Bāqī and Zakariya were above childhood, were grown to fighting age—braves—but not yet begs (see Index s.n. chuhra).
Muḥsin Dūlḏāī Barlās—at Chanderī (934) 590.
Mu'inu'd-dīn al Zamjī—omitted (or lost) from Bābur’s list of Herāt celebrities 283 n. 1.
Mujāhid Khān Multānī—on Bābur’s service (933) 540.
The Mulla, see ‘Abdu'r-rahmān Jāmī.
Mullā Bābā Farkatī—brings Bābur news of Shaibānī (913) 343.
Mullā Bihishtī—conveys gifts to Hind-al (935) 642.
Mullā Bābā Pashāghari, Chaghhatāī—comes into one of Bābur’s dreams (906) 132; at Sar-i-pul 141; envoy for Bābur to Khusrau Shah (910) 188; loyal (912) 313, (914) 346; disloyal in Ghaznī (921) 363; deserts Humāyūn (932) 545; joins the Aūzbegs; his proceedings 546; his brother Bābā Shaikh q.v.; his Kābul garden 315.
Mullā Hijrī, a poet—waits on Bābur (907) 153.
Mullā Kābir—his devious route to wait on Bābur (925) 399.
Mullā Khwājaka—prescribes for Bābur (925) 399 (where read Khwajaka).
Mullā Tabrizī—conveys gifts (935) 642.
Mullā Ṭagḥāī—envoy to Bābur of Abū-saʿīd Aūzbeg (935) 631, 632, 641.
Mūmin—suspected of the death of Nūyān Kūkūldāsh (907) 151-2.
Mūmin-i-ʿali tawāchī—conveys orders (932) 451; conveys the Kānwa Letter-of-victory to Kābul (933) 580.
Mūmin Ātākā—out with Bābur (925) 404; on service (932) 465, 534; in the left wing (tūlghuma) at Kānwa (933) 568, 569; his brethren (935) 679.
Khwāja Munir Aūshī—incites attack on Bukhāra (902) 65.
Sayyid Murād Aūghlāgchī—referred to as father of Yusūf 39 and Ḥasan 279; [†874 AH.—1469–70 AD.].
Mūrād Beg Bāyandarī Turkmān—his joining Ḥusain Bāi-qarā (908) 280, 336.
Murād Mīrzā Arīlāt, son of Muḥammad-i-qāsim and Rābi‘a-sultān Mīrān-shāhī—his Bāi-qarā (?) marriage 266.2
Murād Qajar Turkmān, qūrchī—‘Īraqī envoy to Bābur (935) 666, 688, 689, n. 4.

1 See Add. Notes under p. 39.
2 See Add. Notes under p. 266.
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Mullā Khwāja Murshid 'Irāqi—envoy of Bābur to Ibrāhīm Lūdi (925) 385, 427 n. 3; made Diwān of Bihār (935) 661, 662.

Mīr Mūrtāza—particulars 284.

Musā Khwāja—whispers of Mughūl rebellion (914) 346.

Malik Musā Dilah-sāk (Dilazāk) Afghān—receives gifts (925) 394; brings tribute 409.

Mūsā Sultan Farmūlī, son of Ma'rūf—waits on Bābur (935) 685; in the battle of the Ghogra 669.

Mustafa Shaikh-zāda Farmūlī Afghān—on service for Ibrāhīm Lūdi (932) 527; his brother Bāyazīd q.v.; [†932 AH.–1525–6 AD.].

Mustafa Rūmī, tawāchī—his culverin-discharge at Pānipat (932) 474; has carts made for defence at Kānwa (933) 550; at Kānwa 550, 568–9; at the Gangas bridge (934) 599; in the battle of the Ghogra (935) 668, 669, 670.

Mū'yaḍ—leading Daryā-khānīs for Bābur (933) 582.

Shāh Muzaffar—particulars 291; his artist-training owed to Nawā'ī 272.

Muzaffar Barlās—particulars 270–1.

Sultān Muzaffar Gujrātī—his death and successor 534 (where for [Jumāda II] “and” read 932; [†932 AH.–1526 AD.].

Muzaffar-i-ḥusāin Mirzā Bāī-qarā Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Husain and Khadija—particulars 262, 268; serving under his father (901) 58, (902) 71; given Astarābād (902) 61, 69; made joint-ruler in Herī (911) 292–3; combines in action against Shaibānī (912) 296–7 and withdraws 301; fails in etiquette 297; in social relation with Bābur 298, 299, 300, 302–3; plain speech to him from Qāsim Beg 304; a false report of him in Kābul 313; irresolute in opposing Shaibānī (913) 326; his army defeated 327; flees (to Astarābād) abandoning his family ib.; his wife Khān-zāda Khānim q.v.

Sultān Muzaffar Shāh Hābshī, mentioned in illustration of a Bengal custom 483.

Mirzā Yār-i-aḥmad Najm Sānī, wazīr of Ismā'īl Şafawi—his killing Sohrāb Bāī-qarā 262; his commission to correct Bābur (918) 355, 359; his massacre in Qarshī 360; slain at Ghaj-dawān 262 n. 4, 361; Bābur's alleged
failure to support him 361; his retainer Muḥammad Jān q.v.; [†918 AH.-1512 AD.].

Nādir Shāh Afšārid — his birthplace (mod.) Qalāt-i-nādirī 329 n. 4; [†1160 AH.-1747 AD.].

Nahār, son of Ḥasan Khān Mewātī—released by Bābur from capture (933) 545; returns to Court 578; escapes 581.

Nāhid Begīm — her marriage (930) 443.

Nāman Chuhra—captured by Tāmbal (908) 168; at a wine-party (925) 385.

Guru Nānak Shāh—his relations with Daulat Khān Yūsūf-khāil and traditionally with Bābur 461 n. 3; [†946 AH.-1539 AD.].

Napoleon — his problem of creed in Egypt less difficult than that of Bābur with Shi’ā support 356.

Nārpat Hāra Chauhān Rājpūt—his force at Kānwa (933) 562.

Nāsir Beg—makes over Andijān to Bābur (904) 103; counsels him (908) 165; captured by Tāmbal 168; his sons Dost-, Mirīm-, and Shāhīm-i-nāsir; his brother-in-law Aūzūn Hasan q.v.

Nāsir Khān Nūḥānī Afgān—particulars 659 n. 4; disaffected to Ibrāhīm Lūdī and unsubmissive to Bābur (932) 523; discussion of his movements 530; assembles a force but flees before Bābur’s 533-4, 544; his son Farīd q.v.

Nāsir Mīrzā Mīrān-shāhī Timūrid, Bahās Turk, son of ‘Umar Shaikh—particulars 17; in Kāsān (ct. 8) (899) 32; taken to his uncle Ahmad 32; meets Bābur (908) 172, 178; at the capture of Kābul (910) 198, 199; Zurmut hostility 220; given Ningnahār 227; misconduct 229, 241-2; accepts an invitation to Badakhshān 242-3; has an imbroglio with Khusrau Shāh 243; clans which had left him 255; defeats Āūzbegs (912) 295; defeated by Badakhshīs and goes to Bābur 321; Bābur’s reflections on the situation 322; out with Bābur (913) 324; in the van at Qandahār 335; his loot and command and beleaguerment in Qandahār 339-40; goes to Ghaznī 343, 344; given Kābul (917) 363; returns it to Bābur (920) 363; dies in Ghaznī (921) 363; his sister Mihr-bānū and wife Qarā-gūz Bāī-qarā q.v.; [†921 AH.-1515 AD.].

Khwāja Nāṣiru’d-dīn Tūsī — his Astronomical Tables 79; [†672 AH.-1274 AD.].
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Sultan Nasiru’d-din Khilji Turk, Sultan of Malwa—events following his death 593; his son Mahmud q.v.; [†916 AH.—1510 AD.].

Nasrat Shah Husain-shahi, Sultan in Bengal—particulars 482–3; reported friendly to Babur (935) 628, 637; sends him an envoy 637; negotiations with him 661, 664, 676; referred to as at peace with Babur 665; mentioned 667, 677, 679; his troops defeated on the Ghogra 671–4; peace made 676; [†939 AH.—1532 AD.].

Nasrat Shah Tughluk Turk—receives Dihli from Timur 481 n. 4.

Naurang Beg—punishes the Mundahirs (936) 700, 701.

Nau-ruz, brother of Muhammad-’ali Jang-jang—at Bajaur (925) 370.

Naukar Hindú, see Tuka.

Nazar-i-’ali Turk—on Babur’s service (925) 389; his relation Minuchihr q.v.

Nazar Bahadur—killed on Khusrau Shah’s service 93, 94, 279; [†903 AH.—1497–8 AD.].

Nazar Bahadur Ausbeg—one of five champions worsted by Babur in single combat (914) 349 n. 1.

Shah Nazar Turkmân—in the centre at Qandahar (913) 335; rebels (914) 345.

Ni’amat Arghun—his defeat 34.

Mulla Ni’amat—killed in a surprise by Sangā 549; [†933 AH.—1527 AD.].

Khwaja Ni’amatu’l-lāh—his son Āsafī 286 n. 2.

Nigārsi, see Dankūsi.

Nizām Khān Biāna’ī—not submissive to Babur (932) 523; receives letters and a quatrain from him 529; defeats Babur’s troops (933) 538–9; waits on Babur 539; in the left wing at Kānwa 567; on service (935) 678.

Khwaja Nizāmu’d-dīn Ahmad, the author of the Tabagāt-i-akbarī, son of Muhammad Muqim—discussion of his story of the intended supersession of Babur’s sons 702–8; [†1003 AH.—1594 AD.].

Sayyid Nizāmu’d-dīn ‘Ali Khalifa Marghilānī, Barās Turk son of Junaid—escapes from prison and death (900) 55; driven from Babur’s presence (903) 90, (905) 119; defends Kābul (912) 313; mediates (914) 345; hears rumours of
Mughul revolt 346; in the left centre at Bajaur (925) 369 and at Panipat (932) 473; given charge of Ibrahim's corpse 474 n. 1; at Khanwa (933) 556, 558, 564–5; on service 384, 395, 666; communicates bad news at Chanderi (934) 594 and (935) 639; mediates for Rahim-dad 689; discussion of his plan to set Humayun aside (in Hindustan?) 702–8; his seat at a feast 631; host to Babur 408; his sons Muhibb-i-'ali, Husamu’d-din-i-’ali, Hamza and daughter Gul-barg q.v.

Shaikh Nizamü’d-din Auliya—his tomb visited by Babur (932) 475; [†725 AH.–1325 AD.].

Nizamu’l-mulk Khawafi, Dihwan in Heri—arrested and put to death 282; [†903 AH.–1497–8 AD.].

Hazrat Nuh (Noah)—his father Lam q.v.

Nur Beg (perhaps Sayyid Nuru’d-din Chaghaniiani infra)—disobeys the Law, plays the lute (925) 395; joins Babur in an autumn garden 418; his brethren on service (932) 446; with Babur in the East (935) 653; in the battle of the Ghogra 673; sent to allay Rahim-dad’s fears 688–9; his brother Shaham q.v.

Sayyid Nuru’d-din Chaghaniiani—Sayyid Amir—a son-in-law of Babur and father of Salima-sultân 713; perhaps Nur Beg supra.

Shaikh Nuru’d-din Beg Turkistani, Qibchaq Turk—grandfather, through a daughter, of Yunas Chaghatai 19 (see T.R. trs. p. 64).

Nuru’l-lâh tamburchi—his experience in an earthquake (911) 247.

Sayyid Nuyan Beg Tirmizi—particulars 273; his son Hasan-i-ya’qub q.v.

Nuyan Kukuldash Tirmizi—makes a right guess (906) 131–2; on service against Shaiban 142; his sword sent as a gift to Tambal (907) 150; that sword wounds Babur’s head (908) 151, 167, 396; his suspicious death 151–152; Babur’s grief 152; Nuyan’s uncle Haq-nazar q.v.; [†907 AH.–1502 AD.].

Padmawati, wife of Rana Sangai—in Rantambhur (935) 612; mentioned 613 n. 1; her son Bikramajit and kinsman Asukmâl q.v.

Pahar Khan Ludi, see Bihar.
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Pahār Mirza, a father-in-law of Jahāngīr Mīrān-shāhī—his daughter brings her son Pir-i-muḥammad to Bābur (913) 331.

Pahlawān Aūdī (Oudhī)—wrestles (935) 683, 688.

Pahlawān Lābori, a boatman—wrestles (935) 656.

Pāpa Āghācha, a mistress of Ḥuṣain Bāi-garā—particulars 266, 268–9; her five sons and three daughters ib.¹

Pāpā-aūghūli, of Bābur’s household—out with Bābur (910) 234; at Qandahār (913) 335.

Pahlawan Aftdz—vest (935) 683, 688.

Pahlawan Ldhort, a boatman—wrestles (935) 656.

Papa Aghacha, a mistress of Husain Bdi-qard—particulars 266, 268–9; her five sons and three daughters ib.

Papa-aughuli, of Bābur’s household—out with Bābur (910) 234; at Qandahār (913) 335.

Parbat Karkar—conveys tribute to Bābur (925) 391, 392, 393.

Pasha Begim Bahārlū, Āq-ḡūlūq Turkmān, daughter of ‘Alīshukr Beg—particulars 49; her nephew Yār-‘alī Balāl q.v.²

Pāyanda-muḥammad Qīplān—out with Bābur (925) 404.

Pāyanda-sultan Begim Mīrān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, daughter of Abū-sa‘īd and wife of Ḥusain Bāi-garā—particulars 263, 265, 268; her son Ḥaidar and her daughters ib.; visited in Herāt by Bābur (912) 301; arranges a marriage for him 306; captured by Shaibanī (913) 327.

Pietro della Vallé—an illustration drawn from his recorded morning-draught (1623 AD.) 395.

Khwāja Pir Ahmad Khawāfī—his son 281.

Pir Budāgh Sulṭān, Khāqān in Desht Qibchāq (H.S. iii, 232)—his Bāi-qarā marriage 258 n. 2.

Mīr Pir Darwesh Hazār-aspī—in charge of Balkh (857) 50; fights there ib.

Pirī Beg Turkmān—joins Bābur (913) 336; particulars Author’s Note, 336.

Pir Kānū of Sakhi-sarwār—Bābur halts at his tomb (910) 238.

Pir Muḥammad Aīlichī-būghā, qūchīn—particulars 50 and nn.; drowned 48 n. 4, 50; [895 AH.–1490 AD.]

Pir Muḥammad Mīrān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Jahāngīr—brought by his widowed mother to Bābur (913) 331.

Pir-quli Sistānī—in the right wing at Pānipat (932) 472, and at Kānuwa (933) 566; on service (932) 530.

Pir Sulṭān Pashāi—one of Bābur’s guides (912) 308.

Prester John, Wang Khān [T.R.trs. 16], Ong Khān [Abu’l-ghāzī, Desmaisons’trs. p. 55]—his title 23 n. 3.

¹ For emendation of 266 n. 7, see Add. Notes under P. 266.

² On p. 49 l. 3 for “Black” read White; and in l. 3 read (“wife of”) Muḥammadī son of (“Jahān-shāh”).
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**Pulād Sultān Aūzbeg - Shaiban Chīngīs-khānid** — son of Kūchūm—Bābur sends him his earliest-mentioned Diwān (925) 402, 632 n. 3; at Jām (934) 622; an envoy goes from him to Bābur (935) 631, 632, 641.

**Pūrān** (Allāh-bīrdī or Allāh-quli)—out with Bābur (910) 234; wounded (913) 342; his father-in-law Qāsim qūchīn q.v.

Qābil (Cain)—Bābur goes alone to his tomb (925) 415.

Qādīr-bīrdī Ghainī—spoken to by Bābur when in hiding (908) 180-1.

Qāītmās Turkmān, retainer of Jahāngīr—drowned (910) 237.†

Qalandar pīāda—on Bābur’s service (932) 529.

Qambar-i-‘āli Arghūn—on Bābur’s service (935) 688.

Qambar-i-‘āli Beg—mobilizes the Hindūstān army by Abū-sa‘īd’s order (873?) 46; expelled from Khurāsān with Maḥmūd Mirān-shāhī 47.

Qambar-i-‘āli Beg qūchīn, son of Qāsim—races with Bābur (?) (907) 147; wounded, brings Bābar a message (908) 174; one of the eight in flight from Akhsī 177; gives Bābur his horse 177-8; beats down snow for a road (912) 308-9; fights rebels in Kābul 315; at Qandahār (913) 334; wounded 336; hurries from Qūndūz against rebels in Ghāznī (921) 364; brings Bābur a letter from Balkh (?) (925) 385.

Qambār-i-‘āli Beg Silākh, Mughūl—particulars 28; his inconvenient absence (904) 106; recalled (905) 108; goes away 110; returns 112; in the van at Khūbān 113; goes away 115; returns and is ill-tempered 117; his districts 115, 124; his ill-timed pacifism 118; his misconduct 123; goes to Tāmbal, made prisoner, escapes to Bābur 124; on Bābur’s service (906) 130, 131; at Sar-i-pul 138, 139; sends his family out of Samarkand 141; ? races with Bābur (907) 147; ? leaves Bābur in Dikh-kat 150 n. 3; conspires against Tāmbal and goes to The Khān (Maḥmūd) 154; serves Bābur against Tāmbal (908) 161, 162, 165, 166; counsels Bābur distastefully and flees 168, 170; talks to him of peace with Tāmbal 173; made prisoner in Akhsī against Bābur’s wish 174; leaves Khusrau Shah for Bābur (910) 189; dismissed by Bābur and why 192, 532 n. 1; his son ‘Abdu-shukūr q.v.

† Cf. H.S. Fertl’s trs. p. 70 for the same name Qāītmās.
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Qambar Bi Aūsbeg—blamed by Shaibānī for three murders (906) 128; on service for him (910) 242, 244; defeated by Ṭahmāsp Safawi's men (934) 622.

Qarā Ahmad yūrūnchī—Bābur's messenger to the Kābul begs (912) 314.

Qarā Barlās—leaves Samarkand with the Tarkhāns (905) 121; fights for Bābur at Sar-i-pul (906) 139; besieged and holds out to the end 143, 144.

Sayyid Qarā Beg Kohbur Chaghatāī—remains with Bābur at a crisis (903) 91; invited into Akhsī (for Bābur) (904) 101; escapes after defeat 106; at Khūbān (905) 113; released 119; his (?) hasty retreat to entrenchments (906) 138, 232 n. 4; his son ‘Abdu'l-qadūs g.v.


Qaracha Khān—punished for disobedience (925) 390-1; on service (934) 602, (935) 638; his messenger with news of Mahim's journey 650, 659.

Qārā-gūz Begīm Arlāt—her marriage with Nāṣir Mirānshāhī 265.

Qarā-gūz Begīm, see (1) Makhdūma, (2) Rābi'a-sultan.

Qarā-qūzī—on Bābur's service (932) 471; in the left-wing [tūlghuma] at Pānípat 473.

Qārlūghāch Bakhshi kills Mughul Beg's son (904) 102.

Qashqa Mahmūd (or Qāshqa), Beg of the Chirās tūmān of Mughūls—sent to help Bābur (906) 138; quarrels with a Begchik for the military post of honour (907) 155. (He may be “Bābā Qashqa” g.v.

Mullā Qāsim—building work given to him (935) 642.

Sayyid Qāsim (p. 96), see Sayyid Kāmal.

Qāsim-i-'ajab Beg—remains with Bābur at a crisis (903) 91; promoted to beg's rank (904) 104; captured by Tambal's men (905) 115-6; released 119.

Qāsim-i-'alī tariyākī—musician at entertainments (925) 385, 387, 388.

Qāsim Beg qūchīn—particulars 26; supports Bābur (899) 30, (900) 43; his appointments 43, 44 (where delete Sayyid as his title); punishes misconducted Mughūls (902) 66-7, 153 and has to leave Bābur (907) 27, 67; on missions (903) 90, (904) 100, 101; remains with Bābur at a crisis (903) 91;

1 His capture is not recorded.
defeated by Mughuls (904) 105–6; in the centre at Khūbān (905) 113; banished from Andijān by ‘Alī-dost 119; rejoin Bābur for Samarkand 123, (906) 130; suspects Banā‘ī 136; in the centre at Sar-i-pul 139; defending Samarkand 141, 142, 143, 144; races with Bābur (907) 147; advises a tactful gift 150; out with Bābur (910) 234; rewarded (911) 252; goes with a punitive force to Nigr-aū 253; a saying of his twisted for ill 254; defeats Āūzbegs (912) 295; insists in Herat on ceremony due to Bābur 298; angered by Bābur’s being pressed to drink wine 304; mistaken as to a route 308–9; mistakenly compassionate 313; allowed to keep his Fifth of spoil (913) 324; in the left wing at Qandahār 334, 335; wounded 336; retainers allotted to him 339; his counsel 339–40; mediates for suspects (914) 345; waits on Babur returned from Hindustān (925) 395; mediates for Tramontane clans to leave Kābul 402; Bābur breaks fast at his house 408; his sons Ḥamza, Tingri-birdi, Qambar-i-alī q.v.; his ill-conducted nephew 414; a servant 313; a father-in-law Banda-i-alī q.v.; [†928 AH.–1522 AD.]

Qāsim Duldāi, Barlās Turk — serving Bāī-sunghar Mīrān-shāhī (902) 65; joins Bābur 66.

Qāsim-i-ḥusain Āūzbeg-Šaibān, son of Qāsim and ‘Āyishasulṭān Bāī-qarā—particulars 267, 298; joins Bābur (933) 550; at Kānwa 556, 559; receives Badāūn 582; on service 582, (934) 589, (935) 682; in the battle of the Ghogrā (935) 669; mentioned 631 n. 4, 706.

Sayyid Qāsim Jalāir—wins the Champion’s Portion at Asfara (900) 53; takes it at Shāhrūkhiya 53; stays with Bābur at a crisis (903) 91; joins him for Šamarkand (905) 123–4; at Sar-i-pul (Khwāja Kārdzan) (906) 139; his strange doings in Pāp (908) 171; his unseasonable arrival in Akhsī 174; defeats an Āūzbek raider (910) 195; out with Bābur 234, (925) 403; drunk 415; Bābur pays him a consolation-visit 418; a party in his country-house (926) 420; assigned to reinforce Khwājā Kalān in Kābul (935) 647.

Qāsim Khān Qāzzāq, Ḫūji Chīngīz-khānid—his marriage with Sulṭān-nigar Chaghatāi 23; his good administration 23–4; [†924 AH.–1518 AD.]


Qāsim Khwāja—succeeds in his brother Yakka’s appointments (935) 674; on service 682.
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Qāsim Kūkūldāsh—at a household party (906) 131 (his name is omitted from the Hai. MS. f. 83 and from my text); helps Bābur at his mother's burial (911) 246; at Qandahār (913) 335; his Arghūn marriage 342, 199 n. 1, 443.

Qāsim Mīr-akhwūr—stays with Bābur at a crisis (903) 91; on service (933) 548.

Malik Qāsim Mughūl, brother (p. 568) of Bābā Qashqa—in the right-wing [tūlghuma] at Pānīpat (932) 473, and at Kānwa (933) 568; on service with his brethren (932) 528, (933) 558, 582, (934) 589; his good service near Qanūj and his death 599; his kinsmen, see s.n. Bābā Qashqa; [†934 AH.—1528 AD.].

Shāh Qāsim piāda—sent on a second mission to Bābur's kinsfolk in Khurāsān (935) 617.

Qāsim Sambhalī—not submissive to Bābur (932) 523; surrenders 528, 529; sent out of the way before Kānwa (933) 547 (where the Hai. MS. adds “Beg”, by clerical? error).

Qāsim Sulṭān Aūṣbeg-Shaibān Chīngīz-khānid—his Bāi-qarā marriage 267; at a reception (912) 298; his son Qāsim-i-husain q.v.

Qātāq Begīm, wife of Aḥmad Mīrān-shāhī—particulars 36; of Aḥmad's escape from her dominance 36 n. 1.

Qāyyām Beg—Aūrdū (Ūrdū) Shāh—out with Bābur (925) 403; waits on Bābur as Governor of Nīṅghnahār (926) 421; joins him in Hindūstān (933) 550 (here Qawwām Aūrdū-shāh); at Kānwa 556, 569.

Qāzī Bihzādī—Bābur forbids unlawful drinks in his house (925) 398.

Qāzī Ghulām—escapes death by pretending to be a slave (904) 102.

Qāzī Jiā—waits on Bābur (932) 527; on service 530, (933) 544, (935) 639; joins Bābur 667; on service 668, 682.

Qāzī of Kābul—waits on Bābur (925) 395.

Qāzī of Samāna—complains of Mundāhir attack (936) 693, 700.

Qismatāi Mīrzā—on Bābur's service in Hindūstān (932) 474, (933) 545, 546-7, 548; his untimely praise of the Rājpūt army 548, 550.

Qilka Kāshghari—escapes death (904) 102.

Qizil tawāchī—messenger of Shāh Beg Arghūn to Bābur (925) 395.
Qublai Khan, great-grandson of Chingiz Khan—his building at Qarshi 84 n. 2; [†693 AH.—1294 AD.]

Quch Beg (Qūj), son of Ahmad qarāwal—in the left wing at Khūbān (905) 113; his courage at Bishkharān 118; leaves Bābūr for Ḥišār (906) 129; reprieved at Qāsim qūchīn's request (914) 345; on Bābūr's service (925) 374, (925) 384; at Parhāla 390; comes on summons to Kābul 409; referred to as dead (933) 565; his brother Tardi Beg q.v.

Quch Arghūn—allotted in Qalāt to Qāsim qūchīn (913) 339.

Quch Beg Kohbur Chaghatalī, son of Haidar-i-qāsim—at Sar-i-pul (906) 139; in Samarkand besieged 142, 143, 144.

Qul-arūk—drowned in the Sind-water (910) 237.

Qul-bāyazīd bakāwal—particulars 237; swims the Sind-water (910) 237; at Qandahār (913) 335, 338; his son Tizak q.v.; his tomb near Kābul 198.

Qulī Beg Arghūn—known as attached to Bābūr (913) 337; returns from an embassy to Kāshghar (925) 415; his brother Ahmad-'āli Tarkhan q.v.

Qūlij Bahādūr Aūzbeg—mentioned in Ṭahmāsp's Ṣafavi's account of Jām (935) 636 n. 2.

Mīrzā Qūli Kūkūldāsh, see Mīrzā-qulli.

Qulī-muḥammad Būghdā qūchīn—particulars 40.

Ustād Qul-muḥammad 'Āūdī—particulars 291; his musical training owed to Nawā'ī 272.

Qul-nachāq—holding Balkh for the Bāī-qarās (912) 294, 296; surrenders it to Shaibānī 300.

Qul-nazar of Ṭagḥāī Beg—sallies out from Samarkand (906) 142; does well 144.

Qurbān Chīrkhi—sent into Bhīra (925) 381; a false rumour about him as invited into Balkh (935) 625; gifts to his servants 633; in the battle of the Ghogra 669; on service 678.

Qusam ibn 'Abbās, one of the Companions—his tomb at Samarkand 75.

Qusum-nāī (?)—on service (932) 534.

Qūṭb Khan Sarwānī—not submissive to Bābūr (932) 523; Mahdī Khwāja sent against him in Etāwa 530; takes Chandwār (933) 557; abandons both places 579, 582; defeated 587.

Khwāja Qūṭbu'ūd-dīn Aūshī (Ūshī)—his birthplace in Farghāna 475 n. 6; Bābūr visits his tomb in Dihli (932) 475; [†633 AH.—1235 AD.].
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Qūtlūq Khwāja Kūkuldāsh—with Bābur in Samarkand (906) 143, 144; host to Bābur (925) 398, 407; held up as an example 406.

Qūtlūq-muḥammad Kūkuldāsh, foster-brother of Daulat-sultan Khānīm—brings Bābur letters from Kāshghar (925) 409 (where for “Daulat” read Qūtlūq).

Qūtlūq-nigar Khānīm Chaghataī Chingiz-khānid, mother of Bābur—particulars 21; mentioned 17, 19; in Andijān (900) 43; entreats her son’s help (903) 88, 89; sent to join him in Khujand 92, and in Aūrā-tipā (905) 136; her Mughuls rebel (904) 105; with Bābur in Samarkand (906) 136; leaves the town with him (907) 147; hears of a sister’s death 148–9; goes to her own family in Tashkint 149; her dangerous illness ib.; her safety leaves Bābur free (908) 157, 158; with him in Sūkh 184; uses his tent in the exodus from Farghāna (910) 188; left in Kāhmard 189; crosses Hindū-kush and rejoins him in Kābul 197; her death (911) 21, 246; her treatment as a refugee in Tāshkint (908) contrasted with that of her refugee-relations in Kābul (912) 318; her concern for her son’s marriage affairs (905) 120, (910) 48; her old governess 148; [†911 AH.–1505 AD.].

Qūtlūq-qadam qarāwal—out with Bābur (910) 236–7; in the left-centre at Qandahār (913) 335; on service (925) 403, (932) 458, 460, 468, 471, 530; in the left wing at Pāṇīpat 472 and at Kānwa (933) 567, 570; on service 475; host to Bābur (926) 424; his tomb and bridge near Kābul 198, 204; [†934 AH.–1528 AD. ?].

Qūtlūq-sultan Begīm, daughter of Mīrān-shāh son of Tīmūr—wife of Ḥusain Qānjūt 256 n. 5.


Khwāja Raḥīm-dād, paternal-nephew of Mahdī Khwāja—receives and obtains possession of Gūāliar (933) 539, 540, 547; his quarters and constructions there (935) 607, 610, 613; Bābur sleeps in his flower-garden 612, 613; action against him as seditious 688–9, (936) 690; his son held as hostage and escapes (935) 688–9; Ibn Batuta’s account
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of him 692 n. 1; no sequel of his rebellion mentioned in the Akbar-nāma 692.

Rahmat pīāda—conveys letters to Kābul (932) 466.

Rāja of Kahlūr—waits on Bābur (936) 699.

Rajab-sultan Begīm Mirān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, daughter of Maḥmūd—particulars 48, 49.

Ramzān lūlī—a musician at parties (925) 387, 388.

Rāo Sarwānī, see Dāūd.


Mr. Thomas Rastel—an illustration drawn from his morning-draught recorded [1623 AD.] 395.

Rānā Ratan-ṣi—successor of his father Sangā in Chītor 613; mentioned in connection with the Khīlji jewels ib.; his younger brother Bikramājī q.v.

Rauh-dam—musician at entertainments (925) 385, 387, 388; in a raft-misadventure 407.

Rawūʿī Sarwānī (Rāo)—serving Bābur (933) 538 (here read as Dāūd), (935) 682; host to Bābur (934) 588.


Rūqaiya Aghā, wife of Badīʿuʿz-zamān Bāī-qarā—captured in Herāt and married by Timūr Aūṣbeg 328.

Rūqaiya-sultan Begīm Mirān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, daughter of ʿUmar Shāikh—particulars 18, 19; [†cir. 935 AH.—1528 AD.]

A Rūmī prescribes for Bābur (935) 657, 660.

Rāja Rūp-narāin—included in Bābur’s Revenue List 521.

Ruqaiya Aghā, wife of Badīʿuʿz-zamān Bāī-qarā—captured in Herāt and married by Timūr Aūṣbeg 328.

Ruqaiya-sultan Begīm Mirān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, daughter of ʿUmar Shāikh—particulars 18, 19; [†cir. 935 AH.—1528 AD.]

Rūstam-i-ʿalī Turkmān—in the centre at Qandahār (913) 335; on service (925) 377, (933) 538; in the tūlghuma of the left-wing at Kānwa 568, 569.

Rustam Khān—Iliās (p. 576)—captures Bābur’s commander at Kūl (Koel) (933) 557, 576; captured and flayed alive 576.


Nāṣīrūd-din Sabuktīgīn Ghasnavī Turk—the humble status of his capital 217; a legend concerning him 219; his son Maḥmūd q.v.; [†387 AH.—997 AD.].
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Sadharān Tānk Rājpūt—his acceptance of Islām 481 n. 5.

Pahlawān Sādiq—made to wrestle (935) 650; forbidden as an antagonist 653; wrestles 688.

Mullā Sa‘du’d-dīn Mas‘ūd Taftasānī—a descendant of 283; [†792 AH.—1390 AD.]

Sultān Sa‘īd Khān Ghāzī, Chaghatāī Chīnqız-khānīd, son of Ahmad—particulars 698 nn. 2, 3, 349; meets Bābūr (908) 159; stays with him in Kābul (914) 318, 349–50; receives Andijān from him (916) 318, 357; loyal to him 344 n. 2, 351–2; sends an envoy to him (917) 22; Hādār Dūghlāt goes from Bābūr to Sa‘īd (918) 362; two kinswomen take refuge with him (923 and 924) 27; reported to have designs on Badakhshān (925) 412; an envoy to him returns 415; named as a principal actor between 926 and 932 AH. 427; writes and sends gifts to Bābūr (932) 446; invades Badakhshān (936) 695–6; gist of a letter from Bābūr to him 697–8; Bābūr moves menacingly for the North-west 698; his full-brother Khalīl, his son Rashīd, his wife Ḥabība, and kūkūl-dāsh Yāngī Beg q.v.; [†939 AH.—1533 AD.]

Sa‘īdliq Sa‘d Turkmān—defeated by Ḥusain Bār-qarā (873?) 260.

Saif-i-‘alī Beg Bahārlū Qarā-qūlūq Turkmān, father of Bairām Khān-i-khānān—particulars 91 n. 3.

Maulānā Saifī Bukhrārī—‘Arūżi—particulars 288; [†909 AH.—1503-4 AD.]

Saif Khān Nūhānī, son of Daryā Khān—deserts ‘Ālām Khān Lūdī (932) 457.

Saifu’d-dīn Ahmad, Shaikhu’l-islām in Herāt—particulars 283; takes the keys of Herāt to Shaibānī (913) 328; his pupil Muḥammad-i-yūsuf q.v.; killed by Shāh Ismā‘īl 283; [†916 AH.—1510 A.D.]

Hājī Saifu’d-dīn Beg, uncle of Tīmūr—his descendant Walī Beg 272.

Sakma Mughūl—rebels against Bābūr (914) 345.

Ṣalāhu’d-dīn (Silhādī)—particulars 562 n. 3, 614 n. 2; his force at Kānwā (933) 562; attack on him planned and abandoned (934) 598; Bābūr visits village near his birthplace (935) 614; mentioned 628 n. 2.

1 He joined Bābūr with his father Yār-i-‘alī Balāl (q.v.) in 910 AH. (Blochmann’s Biographies, A.-i-A. trs. 315).
Sāliha-sultan Begim Mirān-shāhī, daughter of Mahmūd and Pasha, wife of Bābur—(name not now in the Turkī text) 47; the likelihood that she and "Dil-dār" were one 713 (where read Sāliha).

Sāliha-sultan Mirān-shāhī—Āq Begim—daughter of Ahmad and Qātāq—particulars 35; gifts from her wedding reach Bābur (900) 43.

Salima-sultan Begim—her parentage 713.

Sālima-sultan Begim—gifts from her reach Bābur (900) 43.

Salima-sultan Begim—his daughter Bega Sultan Begim’s Bal-qara marriage (cir. 860) 267.

Sultan Sanjar Barīs Turk, son of ‘Abdu’l-lāh—incites a Mughūl revolt in Kābul (912) 313-17; spared on family grounds 317.

Sultan Sanjar Mirza Mervī—his daughter Begā Sultan Begim’s Bār-qara marriage (cir. 860) 267.

Rānā Sangā Mewārī—particulars 483, 558 n. 2; his capture of Chanderī 593; proffers Bābur co-operation against Ibrāhīm Lūdī (931?) 426, 529; fails him (932) 529; takes Kandār 530, 539; Bābur’s attack on him deferred 530-1 and determined (933) 538; his strength and approach 544, 547; defeated at Kānwa 559-574; escapes 576; references to the battle 267, 533, 579, 582, 583, 599, 600, 630 n. 4, 637, 663; his lands not invaded, on climatic grounds 577, 578; Bābur’s planned attack on him in Chitōr frustrated (934) 598; his wife Padmāwati and sons Ratan-sī and Bikramājīt q.v.; his trusted man Medīnī Rāo q.v.; [†934 AH.–1528 AD.].

Sangur Khān Janjūha—waits on Bābur (925) 383; on service 389, 419; killed in a sally from Bīāna 548; [†933 AH.–1527 AD.].

Mīr Sar-i-barhana, see Shamsu’d-dīn Muḥammadd.

Sārīgh-bāsh Mirza Itārachī—sent by the Khān (Maḥmūd) to help Bābur (908) 161, 170.

Mullā Sarsān—Kāmrān’s messenger and custodian of Ibrāhīm Lūdī’s son (933) 544.

1 Concerning the date of his death, see Additional Notes under p. 603.
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Sar-ūpā Gujūr—Bābur’s guide to Parhāla (925) 389, 391.

Satrvi Kachi—his force at Kānwa (933) 562.

Sultān Sātūq-būghra Khān Ghāzi Pādshāh (b. 384 AH—994 AD.)—a surmised descendant 29 n. 8; his style Pādshāh 344 n. 2.

Sayyid Amīr, see Nūru’d-din Chaghāniānī.

Sayyid Dakkani—Shāh Ṭahir Khwāndī Dakkani—present at a feast (935) 631.

Sayyid Dākni Shirāsī, or Rukni, or Zaknī—receives honours and orders (935) 562; on his name and work ib. n. 2, 634 n. 1; (see supra).

Sayyidī Beg Ṭaghāi, see Sherīm Ṭaghāī.

Sayyidī ‘Alī darbān (? Muhammad-‘ali), son of Bābā ‘Alī Beg—particulars 307; serving Khusrau Shāh (901) 60–1; leads the Rustā-hazāra to join Bābur (910) 196; a follower punished 197; takes Bāī-qarā service (912) 307; drowned by Badi’u’z-zamān 307–8; [†cir. 913 AH—1507 AD.].

Sayyidī Mashhādi (var. Masnādī)—brings Bābur news of Khwāja Rahīmdād’s sedition (935) 688.

Sayyidī Mīrznā Andikhūdī, brother of Apaq Begim—his two Bāī-qarā marriages 267.

Sayyidī Rūmī—at a feast (935) 631.

Sayyidī Ṭabīb Khurāsānī—attends Bābur’s mother (911) 247.

Shād Begim Bāī-qarā Timūrid, Barlās Turk—particulars 263–4; her husband ‘Ādil Sultān Aūzbeg q.v.

Shādī, a reciter—his son Ghulām-i-shādī 292.

Shādī Khān Kiwī Afghān—fights and submits to Bābur (910) 233.

Shādmān chuhra—wrestles (935) 660.

Shāh Bābā bildār—entrusted with building work (935) 642.

Shah-bāz qalander—his tomb destroyed by Bābur (925) 377.

Shah-bāz Qārlūq—serving Tambal (908) 170.

Shāh Beg Arghūn—Shuja’ Beg—son of Zūn-nūn—his close association with his father 274; mentioned as with him in Qandahār (902) 71, (910) 198, 227; they give refuge to

1 Since my text was printed, my husband has lighted upon what shows that the guest at the feast was an ambassador sent by Burhān Nīgām Shāh of Ahmadnagar to congratulate Bābur on his conquest of Dihlī, namely, Shāh Ṭahir the apostle of Shiism in the Dakkan. He is thus distinguished from Sayyid Dākni, (Rukni, Zaknī) infra and my text needs suitable correction. (See Add. Notes under p. 631 for further particulars of the Sayyid and his embassy.)
Badl'u'z-zamān Bāi-garā (902) 71, (913) 307; act with the Mīrzā (903) 94, 95; favoured by Husain Bāi-garā 264; his dominance ib.; proffers and renounces co-operation with Bābur against Shaibānī (913) 330, 331–2; loses Qandahār to him 337–8; released from Ṣafawi imprisonment by his slave Sambhāl's devotion (917) 338 n. 2, 365; news of his taking Kāhān reaches Bābur (925) 395; his interpretation of Bābur's reiterated attack on Qandahār 365, 427; other suggestions for the attack of 926 AH. 430; his position and political relations 429; Bābur's campaign against Qandahār (926–928) 366, 430–436, App. J. xxxiv; final surrender to Bābur (928) ib.; his death 437, 443; his son Shāh Hasan, brother Muhammad Muqīm, slave Mehtar, commissary Qīzīl q.v.; [†930 AH.–1524 AD.?].

Shāh Begīm Badakhshī, wife of Yūnas Khān Chaghatāī—particulars 22–3; visited by Bābur (903) 92, (907) 149, (908) 157; delays to accept his plans 158; meets her younger son Ahmad 159; ordered by Shaibānī to stay in Tāshkīnt 184; comes to Bābur in Kābul (911) 246; disloyal (912) 317; his reflections on her conduct 318–9; goes to Badakhshan (913) 21, 35, 341; captured by Ābā-bikr Kāshghārī; her sons Maḥmūd and Aḥmad, her daughter Daulat-sultan, her nephews Sanjar Barlās; her grandsons Mīrzā Khān and Saʿīd (and his brothers) q.v.

Shāh-i-gharīb Mīrzā Bāi-garā Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Husain and Khadija—particulars 261, 268; his retainer Āḥī the poet 289 n. 3; [†902 AH.–1496–7 AD.—H.S. lith. ed. iii, 260].

Shāhī qalandar—plays the ribāb (925) 417.

Shāhī ṭamghāchī—appointed clerk (935) 629.

Shāhīm (Shāh Muḥammad ?)—sent for news (932) 454; climbs into Chanderi (934) 595 (here yūz-bāshi); his brother Nūr Beg q.v.

Shāhīm-i-nāṣir—one of eight fugitives from Akhsī (908) 177.

Shāh-jahān Pādshāh Mīrān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk—184; his imitation of Bābur (1030) 298 n. 3; his work in Bābur's burial-garden 710, App. V, lxxx, [†1076 AH.–1666 AD.].
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Shāh Muhammad muhrdār, son of Bābā Qashqa—on Bābur’s service (925) 388, (935) 688; his kinsmen see s.n. Bābā Qashqa; [†958 AH.—1551 AD.].

Shāh-quli ghichaki—a guitar-player—particulars 291.

Shāh-quli Kūl-ābī—goes into Ḥisāt (935) 640; his brother Wais q.v.

Shāh-quli, ? servant of Div Sūltān (p. 635)—sent to give Bābur a report of the battle of Jām (935) 649; conveys from Bābur an acceptance of excuse to Ṣahmāsp Ṣafawī 649.

Shahrak—conveys letters and a copy of Bābur-nāma writings (935) 652, 653.

Shahr-bānū Begim Mirān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, daughter of Abū-sa‘īd—particulars 268; married to Ḥusain Bāī-qarā (cir. 873) and divorced (876) 21 n. 1, 268.


Shāhrūkh Mīrza Barlās Turk, son of Timūr—mentioned in a genealogy 14; ruling in Herāt when Ḥusain Bāī-qarā was born there (842) 256; his wazir serves Ḥusain (after 873) 281; [†850 AH.—1447 AD.]

Shāhrūkh-Sulṭān Afshār Turk—commands a reinforcement for Bābur from Ismā‘īl Ṣafawī (917) 354.

Shāh Ṣufī—does well in Samarkand (906) 144.

Shāh Soltān Begim (? Arghun), wife of Abū-sa‘īd Mirān-shāhī and mother of ‘Umar Shaikh—her parentage not stated 13 n. 5, 45 n. 1; goes from Akhšī to Andijān when widowed (899) 32; a mediator (905) 113; her death announced (907) 149; [†906 AH.—1501 AD.]

Shāh-suwar Mughūl—fights in single combat (904) 106.

Shāh Ṣahār Khvāndī Dākkanī, see Sayyid Dākkanī.

Shāh-zāda, ? Shāh Ḥasan Arghūn—(926) 417, 418.

Shāh-zāda Mungirī, son of Naṣrat Shāh—negociates with Bābur (935) 676 (where the note reference “ 5 ” should follow Mungir).

Shaibak pīāda—brings news of Hind-āl’s birth (925) 385.

A Shaibān-Aūzbek Sulṭān’s marriage 23.

1 For further particulars see Add. Note under p. 688.
2 For “H.S. ii” read iii (as also in some other places).
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Muhammad Shaibání Khán — Shaibaq Khán 1 — Aūzbeg-Shaibán Chingiz-kháníd — his relations with Ḥamza and Mahdí Sultáns q.v.; invited to help Bāī-sunghar (903) 73; raids Shiráz 92; defeats Tārkháns in Dabúsi (905) 40, 124, (906) 137; takes Bukhárá 125; is given Samarkand by ‘Ali *Miráñ-sháhí 125; murders the Mirzá (906) 128; his men murder Khwája Yaḥyá and two sons 128; loses Samarkand by Bābur’s surprise attack 131, 132, 134; Bābur’s comparison of this capture with Ḥusain Bāī-qrá’s of Herát 135; Bābur’s estimate of Shaibání’s position 137–8; defeats Bābur at Sar-i-pul (Khwája Kárdañ) 138–141; besieges Samarkand and effects its surrender (906) 142–7; receives an envoy from Ḥusain Bāī-qrá 145; crosses the frozen Saihún and raids Sháhrukhíya 151; plunders Aūrā-típá 152–3; referred to (908) 158, 168; invited into Farghána 172; crosses the frozen Saihún and raids Shahrukhíya 151; plunders Aūrā-típá 152–3; referred to (908) 158, 168; invited into Farghána 172; defeats the Chághatáí Kháns and Bābur at Archáñ 18, 183; captures Andijáñ (909?) 192; beheads Wáli Qíscháq (910) 196; takes Khwárizm (911) 242, 255–6; co-operation against him invited by Ḥusain Bāī-qrá (910) 190, (911) 255; his men beaten in Badakhshán (911–2) 294–5; takes Balkh 300; his capture of Herát (913) 263, 275, 296–7, 325–330; besieges Náṣár *Miráñ-sháhí in Qandahr and retires 339–40, 343; a recognized menace to Kábúl 21 n. 4; 340, 342; orders Sa’íd Chághatáí’s death (914) 349; 125; murders Chághatáí and Dughláát chiefs 350; war begun with Sháh Ismá’il (915) 350; defeated and killed at Merv 350; his wives Mihr-nígar Chághatáí, Khán-záda *Miráñ-sháhí, Zuhra Aūzbeg q.v.; his sons Timúr and Khurram q.v.; Baná’í his retainer (906) 136; creates a Tārkháñ 133; [†915 AH.—Dec. 1510 AD.].

Shaikhí—receives gifts (935) 633.

Shaikhím Beg, amír and poet of Ḥusain Bāī-qrá—particulars 277, 286; [†918 AH.—512–3 AD.].

Shaikhím Mirzá Aūzbeg — holding Qaráshí for his nephew ‘Ubádu’l-láh (918) 360.

Shaikhím mîr-shíkár—loses one of Bābur’s good hawks (925) 394.

Shaikhí náyí, flautist in Ḥusain Bāī-qrá’s Court—particulars 291; owed his training to Náwá’í 272.

1 Down to p. 131 the Hái. MS. uses the name Shaibání or Shaibání Khán; from that page onwards it writes Shaibág Khán, in agreement with the Elphinstone MS. —Other names found are e.g. Gulbadán’s Sháhí Beg Khán and Shah-bakht. (My note 2 on p. 12 needs modification.)
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Shaikh Sharaf Qarā-bāghī—his arrest for sedition (935) 687-8.
Shaikh Sharafu’d-dīn Munīrī—his father Shaikh Yahyā Chishti 666; his writings read aloud to Akbar 666 n. 7; [†782 AH.–1380 AD.].

Shāmī (Syrian)—deserts from Qandahār (913) 343.
Sher-afgan, brother of Tardi and Qūj Begs—on Bābur's service (933) 538.

Sher-i-ahmad—belittled as good company (935) 648.
Sherak Beg (van Sher, Sherka)—serving Muqlī Arghun (910) 195; defeated and takes service with Bābur 196, 198; in the centre at Qandahār (913) 335.

Sher-im (Sher-i-muhammad ?) chuhra, a brave ?—defends Hisār (910) 244; killed at Qunduz ib.; [†910 AH.–1505 AD.].

Sherim Taghai Künji Mughul—Taghāi Beg—maternal uncle of Bābur's mother—supports Bābur (899) 29, (903) 91, 98; captured by Tāmbal (905) 110; released 119; in Samarkand (906) 141, 143, 188; Bābur's reflections on his conduct 141, 188; thinks of leaving Bābur (910) 188; on his service 194, 197, 234; loses an index-finger 235; his post against rebels (912) 314; an opinion on game (kiyik) (913) 325; in the right wing at Qandahār (913) 334, 337; counsels a retreat to Badakhshān from Kābul 340; disloyal (916) 351; heads Mughūl revolt in Ghaznī (921) 363; defeated 364, 397; takes refuge with Bābur 364; his son Tūqā q.v.; his (and other) abbreviated names 29 n. 2.

Sherim Zikr Beg—put to death in Kābul under 'Abdu’r-razzaq (909?) 195 n. 3.

Sher Khan Lūdī Afghān, son of 'Ālam Khān—on his father's service (932) 455.

Sher Khan Sūr Afghān—Farīd Khān—Sher Shāh—favoured by Bābar (934) 652; serving Maḥmūd Lūdī (935) 652; co-guardian of Jalāl Khān Nūhānī with Dūdū Bibī 652 n. 1, 664 n. 2; writes dutifully to Bābar 659; his training, cog-

1 The title “Aūghlān” (child, boy) indicates that the bearer died without ruling.
nomen and one of his marriages 664 n. 2, 659 n. 4; his victory over Humāyūn (1540) 652 n. 3.

Sher Khān Tarkalānī—host to Bābūr (926) 424.
Sher-quāl qarāwal Mughūl—loyal to Bābūr (912) 315; at Qandahār (913) 333, 335; rebels (914) 345.
Bābā Sher-zād, see Bābā Sher-zād.
Mullā Šams—very riotous (932) 453.

Sher-qulī qardwal Mughul—loyal to Bābūr (912) 315; at Qandahār (913) 333, 335, rebels (914) 345.
Baba Sher-zad, see Baba Sher-zad.

Mulla Šams—very riotous (932) 453.

Sultan Šamsu'd-dīn Āltāmish (Altamsh) of the Slave dynasty in Dihli—his buildings in Gūālīār 610, 611; [†633 AH.—1236 AD.].

Sayyid Šamsu'd-dīn Muḥammad—Mīr Sar-i-barahna—particulars 280.

Shaikh Šihābu'd-dīn 'Arab—at a feast (935) 631.
Mu'zzu'd-dīn Šihābu'd-dīn Muḥammad Ghūrī—his capital Ghaznī 217; mentioned as a conqueror of Hindūstān 479; his position contrasted with Bābūr’s 479–80, 481; [†602 AH.—1206 AD.].

Shāh Sikandar—on Bābūr’s service (932–3) 546; sent to Bihār (935) 664.

Sikandar-i-Filkūs—Alexander of Macedon—Badakhshī chiefs claim of descent from him 22; a surmise that he founded Samarkand 75; his supposition that the Indus was the Nile a probable root of a geographical crux 206 n. 3; [†327 B.C.].

Sultan Sikandar Mīrzā Bāī-qarā Timūrid, Barlās Turk, nephew of Husain—parentage 257; his wife Sultan-nīzhad q.v.; [†908 AH.—1502–3 AD.].

Sultan Sikandar Lūdī Afghān, son of Buhlūl—over-lord in Bhīra (910) 382, 383; his treasure 470, exhausted (935) 617; his siege of Gūālīār 477; his capture of Jünpūr and Dihli (881) 481, 571 n. 5; Bābūr visits his tomb (932) 476; his brother ‘Ālam Khān and sons Ibrāhīm and Mahmūd q.v.; his death and its date 427 and n. 3; [†923 AH.—1517 AD.].
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Sikandar Shāh Gujrātī — his accession and murder 534–5 (where for “2nd” read 932); [†932 AH.–1526 AD.]

Sīktū Hindū — father of Dīwa q.v.

Sīūndūk Turkmān — his hands frost-bitten (912) 311; in the centre at Qandahār (913) 335; rebels against Bābūr (914) 355.

Sīunjuk Sūltān Khān Aūzbeg-Shaibān, Chingiz-khānid, son of Abu'l-khair—besieges Tāshkīnt (918) 358, 396; his son Bārāq at Jām (935) 622.

Sohrāb Mīrzā Bāi-garā, son of Abū-tūrāb — particulars 262.

The Spanish Ambassadors — the place of their first interview with Tīmūr 78 n. 2.

Sulaimān — offers his horse to a wounded man (908) 175.

Sulaimān Āqā Turkmān — envoy of Ṭahmāsp Ṣafawī to Bābūr (933) 540, 583; in the right wing at Kānwa 566.

Sulaimān Mīrzā Mīrān-shāhī Tīmūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Mīrzā Khān (Wais) — brought to Kābul on his father’s death (927) 433 n. 1; in the right centre at Pānīpat (932) 472, and at Kānwa (933) 565; sent to govern Badakhshān (936) 697–8, 699; Bābūr’s protective warning to Sā’īd Chaghatāī 697–8 (here styled Shāh Mīrzā); on his descent 698 nn. 2, 3; meets his rebel grandson Shāhrūkh (cir. 983) 191 n. 2; [†997 AH.–1589 AD.].

Mīān Sulaimān Shaikh-zāda Farnūlī Afghān — reinforces ‘Ālam Khān Lūdī (932) 456; gives him 4 laks 457; Bābūr dismounts at his Dīhlī home 476.

Malik Shāh Sulaimān Yusuf-zāi Afghān — murdered by Aūlūgh Beg Kābulī App. K, xxxvi; his sons Maṇṣūr and Tāūs, his nephew Aḥmad q.v.

Sultān-bakht Begīm Mīrān-shāhī Tīmūrid, Barlās Turk, daughter of Abū-sa‘īd — her daughter visited by Bābūr (935) 616.

Sultānīm Begīm Mīrān-shāhī (ut supra), daughter of Aḥmad and Qātāq— particulars 36.

Sultānīm Begīm Bāi-qarā (ut supra), daughter of Ḥusain and Chūlī Begīm— particulars 265; arrives in Kābul (925) 397; dies on her way to Āgra (933) 265; her husbands Wais Bāi-qarā and ‘Abdu’l-bāqī Mīrān-shāhī, her son Muḥammad

1 Here delete “Sultān-nigar Khānīm”, who was his grandmother and not his mother.
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Sultān Mīrzā and grandson Aūlūgh Mīrzā (265 n. 5) q.v.; [†933 AH.–1527 AD.].

Sultān Malik Kāshgharī, Duldāī Barlās Turk—his sons Ḥāfīz Muḥammad and Āḥmad Ḥājī Beg, his brother Jānī Beg q.v.

Sultān-nīgār Khānīm Chaghatāī Chingīz-khānid, daughter of Yūnās Khān and Shāh Begīm—particulars 23; long parted from a half sister (907) 149; meets her brother Ahmad (908) 159; mentioned in Bābūr’s reflection on disloyal kinsfolk (912) 318; writes to him from Kāshghar (932) 446 n. 2; her son Wāis [Mīrzā Khān] and grandson Sulaimān q.v.; [†934 AH.–1527–8 AD.].

Sultān-nīzhād Begīm Bāi-qarā Timūrid, Barlās Turk, daughter of Husain and Pāpā—particulars 266; her husband Sikandar Bāi-qarā q.v.

Sultān-qulī and Sultān ‘Ālī, see Bābā-qulī and Bābā ‘Ālī.

Sultān-qulī chūnāq, Mughūl—his fidelity (904) and treachery (?) (914 and 921) 105, 109 n. 5; falls into a pit outside Kābul (910) 198; does a bold deed 236; out with Bābūr (911) 252–3; rejoins Bābūr from Herāt (913) 330–1; in the Mughūl rebellion at Ghaznī (921) 364 n. 1.

Sultān Suyūrghatmīsh Mīrzā Shāh-rukhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Shāh-rukh—mentioned in his son Mas‘ūd’s genealogy 382.

Ṭaghāī Beg, see Sherīm Ṭaghāī.

Ṭaghāī Shāh bakhshī—put in charge of Shāh Beg’s treasury (913) 338.

Ṭāḥam-tan Turkmān—particulars 279; his grandson Muḥammad-i-zamān q.v.

Ṭāhīr Beg Duldāī Barlās Turk, son of Ḥāfīz-i-muḥammad—joint governor of Mīrzā Khān (905) 122; feeds the famished Bābūr (907) 148.

Ṭāhīr tibrī—finds Ibrāhīm Lūdī’s body (932) 475; surprised by Rājпутs (933) 549.

Shāh-zāda ² Ṭahmāsp Ṣafawī ‘Arab, son of Ismā’il—mentioned as reigning from 930–932 AH. 427; Bābūr’s envoy to him (930) returns with gifts (933) 540, 560 n. 2, 538, 712; his campaigns against the Aūzbegs (934) 618, (935) the battle of Jam 617 n. 3, 622–4 (where on p. 622 n. 1 read 935

¹ On p. 433 n. 1 her name is mistakenly entered as that of Sulaimān’s mother.

² Concerning this title, see Add. Notes under p. 540.
for "934"), 625 n. 4, 635–6; his own account of the battle 635–6; desires peace 639 n. 3; his envoys in Agra 630, 632; his friendship enjoined on Kāmran 645; [1984 AH.–1576 AD.].

Tāj Khān Sārang-khānī Afgān — sends Bābur news that Mahmūd Lūdī's army has broken up (935) 654; waits on Bābur 657; brings news which prevents hunting 658; sent on service 682; superseded in Chūnār by Junaid Bārlās 683.

Tāju’d-dīn Mahmūd Arghūn — holding Qalāt for Muqīm (913) 339; waits on Bābur (925) 418.

Sultān Ahmad Tāmbal Itārachī Mughūl—with Bābur at Asfara (900) 53; wounded near Samarkand (902) 67; promoted (903) 86; deserts Bābur under privation 86, 87; joins Aūzūn Ḥasan in supporting Jahāngīr in Farghāna 87–8; induces the Khān (Mahmūd) to withdraw support from Bābur 91; his tyranny (904) 100–1; brings Jahāngīr against Bābur in Marghīnān 101; his men dubbed out of Akhsī and defeated at the ferry 101–2; loses Andijān 103; is joined by anxious Mughūls 105; takes Jahāngīr against Andijān and retires 106–7; Bābur’s campaign against him (905) 108–110, 112–5; defeated at Khūbān 113; helped feebly by the Khān 115–6; opposes Bābur at Archān 117 and at Bishkāран 118; terms made 118–9; waits on Bābur 119; his ill-influence 119, 125; makes Qambar-i-‘alī prisoner 124; deserters to him 118, 125, 156; moves against the Khān (906) 145, 154; an uncle’s rough comment on him 145; is sent Nūyān’s sword by Bābur (907) 150–1; conspiracy against him 154; the two Khāns join Bābur against him (908) 161–176; wounds Bābur with Nūyān’s sword 166–7, 396; terms with him repudiated by Bābur 169, 171; invites Shaibānī into Farghāna 172; occupies Akhsī citadel 173; left by Jahāngīr 173–174; mentioned to Bābur in the flight from Akhsī 178, 182; helped by Shaibānī 183; defeated by him and killed 244 and n. 3; a couplet of Muhammad Šāliḥ’s about him 289; his brothers Beg Tilba, Khalil, Muḥammad and Bāyazīd q.v.; [†909 AH.–1504 AD.].

Tāng-ātmish Sultān Aūzbeg-Shaibān?—at a feast (935) 631; his descent 631 n. 4; in the battle of the Ghogrā 669.

Tārdī Beg, brother of Qūj (Qūch) and Sher-afgān—in the left centre at Pānipat (932) 472, 473, and at Kānwa (933) 565; on service 538–9, 582, (934) 590, 602; [†946 AH.–1539 AD.].

Tārdī Beg khāksār—Bābur visits him (925) 417–8; makes verse dropping down the Kābul-river (932) 448; praises a
spring and receives a district 467, 581; returns to the darwesh-life (933) 583; conveys a gift to Kāmrān in Qandahār 583.

**Tardika**—Tardi yakka (568 n. 1)—on service (932) 462; in the right wing [tūlghuma] at Kānwa (933) 568, 579; joins Bābur at Dugdugi (935) 651; on service 678.

**Tardī-muḥammad** Jang-jang, son of Muḥammad Jang-jang—sent into Bhira (935) 661, 664.

**Tardī-muḥammad** Qīchāq—at entertainments (925) 386, 400.

**Tarkhān Begīm** Arghūn Chīngīs-khānīd, daughter of 'Abdūl-ālī—particulars 36.

**Tarsam Bahādur**—punishes the Mundāhirs (936) 700-1.

**Tarsūn-muḥammad** Sulṭān—serving Humāyūn (935) 640.

Malik Taūs Yūsuf-zāī Afghān—escorts his sister Mubāraka to her wedding with Bābur (925) 375.

**Tāṭār Khān** Kākār (or Gakar)—particulars 387; detains one travelling to Bābur (925) 386; killed by his cousin Hāṭī 387, 389; Bābur dismounts at his house in Pauhāla 390; [†925 AH.-1519 AD.].

**Tāṭār Khān** Sārang-khānī Afghān—Khān-i-jahān—in Gūālīār and not submissive to Bābur (932) 523; surrenders (933) 539-40; on Bābur’s service (935) 582 (here Khān-i-jahān).

**Tāṭār Khān** Yūsuf-khālī Lūādī Afghān—particulars 382, 383; his son Daulat Khān q.v.; [†a few years before 910 AH.-1504-5 AD.].

Amīr Timūr Beg Barlās Turk—Ṣāḥib-i-qirān—mentioned in genealogies 14, 256; his birthplace Kesh 83; Samarkand his capital 75, 77, 78; his description of Soghd 84; his removal of the body of Sayyid Barka to Samarkand 266 n. 4; circumambulates Shaikh Māṣlahat’s tomb (790) 132 n. 2; and Aḥmad Yassawī’s (799) 356; captures of Qarshī 134 n. 1; his example followed in the bestowal of Farghāna 14; his gifts of the governments of Dihī 487 and Samarkand 85; his descendants styled Mirzā down to 913 AH. 344; Husain Bāī-qarā the best swordsman of his line 259 and greatest in his lands 191; a descendant 567; favoured begs 19, 39; one of his old soldiers 150; a descendant effects the migration of fowlers to Multān 225; Bābur’s victory where his had been at Pul-i-sangīn 352; his and his descendants rule in Hindūstān 382; their loss of lands to the Aʿūzbegs 340; his builders and Bābur’s numerically compared 520; [†807 AH.-1405 AD.].
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Timūr ‘Uṣmān Mirān-shāhi Timūrid, Barlās Turk—mentioned 280.

Tingri-birdi Bashaghi (?) Mughul—in the left wing [tūlghumā] at Pānīpat (932) 473.

Tingri-birdi Beg, son of Qāsim quchīn—helps to beat down snow for a road (912) 308–9; in the left wing at Qandahār (913) 334, 336; his servant at Bajaur (925) 361; entertains Bābur 401; returns to his districts Khwāst and Andar-āb 403; overtakes Bābur at Jūi-shāhī 410; acts swiftly for him (932–3) 546.

Tingri-quli, a musician—plays at Bābur’s entertainments (925) 385, 386, 388; upset into the Parwān-water 407; first given wine 415.

Tirahi Sultān—takes a letter to Khwāja Kalān (925) 411.

Mulla Tirik-i-‘ali (= Pers. Jān-i-‘ālī?)—fights for Bābur at Bajaur (925) 368 and (on his name) n. 5; on service (933) 551 (where read Tirik).

Tizak, son of Qūl-i-bāyazīd bakāzval—captured as a child and kept 4 years (910) 197.

Tūfān Arghūn—joins Bābur and so creates a good omen (913) 333.

Sayyid Tufān—on Bābur’s service (932) 453.

Tūghlūq-tīmūr Khān Chaghatāī Chīngiz-khānid—mentioned in Yūnas Khān’s genealogy 19.

Tūkta Hindū (var. Nau-kār)—given charge of gifts for Kābul (932) 525.

Tūkhtā-būghā Sultān Chaghatāī Chīngiz-khānid, son of Ahmad (Alacha Khān)—waits on Bābur (934) 601; at a feast (935) 631; referred to as serving Bābur 318; works magic 654; in the battle of the Ghogrā 672, 673; receives praise, thanks, and guerdon 674, 677; on service 682; [†cir. 940 AH.—1533–4 AD.].

Tūlik Kūkuldāsh 1—Tambal strikes him with Bābur’s sword (912) 316; defeats Aūzbegs in Badakhshān (925) 408; on Humāyūn’s service (935) 640; his servant Barlās Jūkī q.v.

Tūlmish Aūzbeg—in the battle of the Ghogrā (935) 669; on service 678.

Tūlūn Khwāja Beg, Bārin Mughul — particulars 87; on Bābur’s service (902) 66, (903) 88; killed 88; [†903 AH.—1498 AD.].

1 He may be the Tūlik Khān quchīn of the Ma‘asiru’l-umrā i, 475.
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Tūqa Beg, son of Sherim Ṭaghāī — captured by Tambal when serving Bābur (904) 106; killed as a prisoner 107; [†904 AH.–1499 AD.].

Khwāja ‘Ubāidu’l-lāh Ahrārī Naqshbandī — his righteous influence in Samarkand 42; his intervention for peace between ‘Umar Shaikh and kinsmen 62 and n.1; Pashāghar once his village 97; disciples named by Bābur, Aḥmad and ‘Umar Shaikh Mīrān-shāhī, Darwesh Beg Tarkhan, and Maulānā-i-qāżī q.v.; held in slight esteem by Mahmūd Mīrān-shāhī 46; his family ill-treated by Mahmūd (899) 41; dreamed of by Bābur (906) 132; his Wālidīyyah-risāla versified by Bābur 619–20, 468 n.4, 604; his sons [Muhammad ‘Ubaidu’l-lāh] Khwājakā Khwāja and Yahya q.v.; [†895 AH.–1491 AD.].

‘Ubaidu’l-lāh Sultan Khān Aūżbeg, Shaibānī Chingiz-khānid, son of Mahmūd and nephew of Shaibānī—defeats two pairs of Bāi-qara Mīrzās (913) 263, 329–30; defeated at Merv (917) 354; defeated north of Bukhārā i.b.; his vow and return to obedience 348, 356; victorious over Bābur at Kūl-i-malik (918) 201 n.7, 357–8; routs Najm Şānī at Ghaj-davān 360–1; avenges Mughūl tyranny in Hisār 362; attacks Herāt (927) 434; takes Merv (932) 534, 617 n.2; takes Mashhad (933) 534, 623 n.3; attacked by Ṭahmāsp Šafawī (934) 618, 622; defeated at Jām (935) 622 (where in n.1 for “934” read 935), 635–6; Ṭahmāsp’s description of him 636 n.211; his wives by capture Ḥabība Dūghlāt and Mihr-angez Bāi-qara q.v.; [†946 AH.–1539 AD.].

Rāwāl Udai-singh Bāgarī—his force at Kānwa (933) 562; his death 573; [†933 AH.–1527 AD.].

Ulugh, İülü, see Aülūgh, Aülüs.

Mīr ‘Umar Beg Turkmān—particulars 279; his sons Abīl-fath and ‘Ali Khān q.v.

‘Umar Mīrzā Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Mīrān-shāh—mentioned 262 n.3.

‘Umar Shaikh Mīrzā I, son of Timūr—mentioned 14 (where in l.3 for “and” read who); receives Farghāna 14; [†797 AH.–1395 AD.].

1 Ilaidar Mīrzā gives an interesting account of his character and attainments (T.R. trs. p. 283).
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‘Umar Shaikh Mîrzâ II Mîrân-shâhî, father of Bâbur—particulars 16–19, 24–28; his lands 17, 24, 50, 55, 95 n. 2, 103; Akhsî his capital 10; his ambition 12; his family relations 12; betroths Bâbur 35, 120; Farghâna invaded (899) 13; his death 13, 29, 32, App. A, i, iii; his house used by Bâbur (908) 172 and his tomb visited (900) 54, (908) 173; his mother Shâh Sultan Begîm q.v.; his retainers Tulûn Khwaja, ‘Abdu’l-wahhâb, Khwaja Khwaja q.v.; his old tailor 30; mentioned 6; [†899 AH.–1494 AD.].

Umid Aghâcha Andijânî, ghûnchachî of ‘Umar Shaikh—her son Nâsîr q.v.; [†before 899 AH.–1494 AD.].

‘Usmân, the Third Khalîf—Bâbur surmised that Samarkand became Musalmân in his reign 75; [†murdered 35 AH.–665 AD.].

Mullâ-zâda Mullâ ‘Usmân—particulars 284; his birthplace Chîrkh 217.

Amîr Wâhid—his tomb in Herât visited by Bâbur (912) 306; [†35 AH.–655–6 AD.?].

Beg Wais—brings news from Kâbul to Āgra (933) 536.

Pîr (or Mîr) Wais—stays with Bâbur at a crisis (903) 91; released (905) 119; leaves Samarkand during the siege (906–7) 146.

Shâikh Wais—stays with Bâbur at a crisis (903) 91; leaves Samarkand during the siege (906–7) 146.

Wais Atâka—his canal at Kâbul 200.

Wais Khân Chaghataî Chîngîz-khânîd, father of Yûnas Khân—mentioned 19; his sons Yûnas and Aîsân-bûghâ q.v.; [†832 AH.–1428–9 AD.].

Sultân Wais Kûlîbî—his friendship recommended to Humâyûn (935) 627; reinforces Qila’-i-żafar (935 or 936) 696; his daughter Haram Begîm q.v.

Wais Lâghari Beg tîghchî—particulars 28; joins The Khân (Mahmûd)(899) 32; safe-guards his ward Nâsîr Mîrân-shâhî ib.; on service for Bâi-sunghar (902) 65; waits on Bâbur 66; stays with him at a crisis (903) 91; on his service (904) 98, 100, 101, 106; at Khûbân (905) 113; advises 117; plundered by ‘Ali-dost 119; leaves Samarkand during the siege (906–7) 146; his son (?) Beggînâ q.v.

Wais Mîrân-shâhî, see Mîrzâ Khân.
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Sultān  **Wais Mirzá**  Bāi-qarā Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Bāi-qarā II—parentage 257; his cousin and wife Sultānim q.v.

Sultān  **Wais Sawādī**—mentioned 372; sent to collect a tax he had fixed (925) 374; receives gifts and leave 376.

Sultān  **Wālāma Tāklā**—mentioned in Shāh Ṭahmāsp's account of the battle of Jām (935) 626 n. 2.

Pīr  **Wāli Bārlas Turk**—loses Siwāstān to Shāh Beg (cir. 917) 429 n. 1.

Wāli  **Beg Barlās**—particulars 272–3; his son Muḥammad-i-Wāli q.v.; [†973 AH.].

Wāli  **Beg Qīchāq Turk**—brother of Khusrau Shāh—particulars 51; on his brother's service (901) 60, 64, (902) 71, (903) 93–4; mentioned (906) 129, (910) 191 by Ḥusain Bāi-qarā; inquired for from Khusrau by Bābur 193; defeated by Aīmas 196; his death 51, 196; his former followers gathered together 242; [†910 AH.–1504 AD.].

Wāli  **khazānchī, Qarā-qūzī**—captured by Tāmbāl in Akhsī (908) 181; in the left centre at Qandāhār (913) 335; his matchlock shooting at Bajaur (925) 369; on service 391, (932) 458, 465–6, 471; in the right wing at Pāñipat 472, 475, and at Kanwā (933) 566; his ill-behaviour in the heats 524.

Wāli  **pārschī** (cheeta-keeper)—receives a gift (935) 633.

Wāli  **Qīzīl Mughūl**—rebuked (932) 453; in the right-wing [tūlghuma] at Pāñipat 473; made shīq-dār of Dīhli 476; on service (934) 601, (935) 638.

Yādgār-i-muḥammad 3 **Mīrāz**  Shāh-rukhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Muḥammad—his capture of Herāt referred to 278; his defeat by Ḥusain Bāi-qarā at Chanārān (874) 260; his loss of Herāt to Ḥusain (875) 260, 279, compared with Shaibānī's of Samarkand to Bābur (906) 134–5; the date of his death referred to 259 n. 1; his Master-of-horse Mīr (Qambar-i)'alī q.v.; [†875 AH.–1470–1 AD.].

Yādgār-i-nāsir **Mīrāz**  Mīrān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, son of Nāsir—gifts made to him (935) 632; [†953 AH.–1546 AD.].

Yādgār-i-sultān  **Begim** Mīrān-shāhī (ut supra), daughter of 'Umar Shaikh—particulars 18; her Aūzbeg marriage (908) 18, 356; her return to Bābur (917) 356.

1 See Additional Note under P. 372.
2 See Additional Notes under P. 51.
3 Here the Hai. MS. and Ilmīnsky's Imprint add "Nāṣir". 
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Yādgār Ṭagḥāī—his daughter Bega Begīm q.v.
Khwāja Yahyā, younger son of ʿUbaiduʾ-lāh Ahrārī—his part in the Tarkhān revolt (901) 63; treats with Bābur (904) 98; welcomes him to Samarkand (905) 124; waits on Shaibānī (906) 127; banished by him and murdered with two sons 128, 147 n. 4; his house mentioned 133; his sons Muhammad Zakariya and Bāqī, his grandsons ‘Abduʾsh-shahīd and Khwāja Kalān q.v.; [†906 AH.—1500 AD.].

Shaikh Yahyā Chīshti—his tomb visited by Bābur (935) 666; his son Sharafuʾd-dīn q.v.

Yahyā Nūhānī, at the head of Hindūstān traders—allowed to leave Kābul (925) 416.

Yahyā Nūhānī (perhaps the man last entered)—waits on Bābur (935) 676; a grant and leave given 683; his younger brother (no name) 683.

Yakka Khwāja—on Bābur’s service (934) 598; in the battle of the Ghogrā (935) 671; drowned 674; his brother Qāsim q.v.; [†935 AH.—1529 AD.].

Yāngī Beg Kūkūldāsh—brings Bābur letters and gifts from Kāshghar (932) 445–6.

Yaʾqūb-i-ayūb Begchīk, son of Ayūb—on Ḥusain Bāi-qara’s service (901) 58; proffers Khusrau Shāh’s service to Bābur (910) 192–3.

Sultān Yaʾqūb Beg Āq-qūšīlūq Turkmān—a desertion to him 275; affords refuge to Bānāʾī 287; his beg Timūr ʿUsman Mīrān-shāhī q.v.; [†896 AH.—1491 AD.].

Maulānā Yaʾqūb Naqsḥbandī—his birthplace Chīrkh 217; [†851 AH.—1447 AD.].

Yaʾqūb tez-jang— one of five champions defeated in single combat by Bābur (914) 349 n. 1.

Yaʾqūb Sultān—mentioned as at Jām 636 n. 2.

Mullā Yārak—plays one of his compositions and incites Bābur to compose (926) 422.

Yārak Ṭagḥāī (var. Yārīk)—stays with Bābur at a crisis (903) 91; locum tenens in Akhsī (905) 116; retaliates on Turkmān Hazāras (911) 253; takes charge of sheep raided by Bābur (912) 343; in the right wing at Qandahār (913) 334.

Yār-i-ʿalī Balāl, Bahārīlū Qarā-qūšīlūq Turkmān, grandfather of Bairām Khān-i-khānān—stays with Bābur at a crisis (903) 91; wounded (905) 109 (where in n. 5 for “father” read
grandfather); rejoins Bābur (910) 189; on his Tramontane service (932-3) 546.

Yār-i-husain, grandson of Mīr (Shaikh) `Ali Beg—waits on Bābur (910) 228; asks permission to raise a force in Bābur’s name 231; kills Bāqī Chaghāniānī (911) 250-1.

Yārīm Beg—Yār-i-muhammad?—on Bābur’s service (913) 337.

Yīlī-pars Sulṭān Aūzbeg-shaibān—his brother Aīsān-quli (q.v.) 265.

Yīsūn-tawā Khān Chaghatāī Chīngiz-khānid—mentioned in Yūnas Khān’s genealogy 19.

Yūl-chūq—conveys a message to Bābur (904) 99.

Yūnas-i-`alī, son of Bābā `Alī Lord-of-the-Gate—surprised at a Tuesday’s fast (925) 398; on Bābur’s service 278, 468 (where read his name in l. 3) 475, 521; in the right centre at Panīpat (932) 472, 473 and at Kānwa (933) 565, 569; has charge of Ibrāhīm’s mother 543, 545; makes a garden (932) 532; in social charge of Tahmāsp Šafawī’s envoys (935) 631; inquires into Muhammad-i-zamān Bāī-qara’s objections to Bihār 661, 662; in the battle of the Ghogrā 671; at entertainments (925) 400, (935) 683; his kinsman Ibrāhīm qanūnī q.v.

Yūnas Khān Chaghatāī Chīngiz-khānid, Bābur’s maternal grandfather—particulars 19-24; made Khān of the Mughūls by Bābur’s grandfather 20, 344 n. 2, 352; his friendly relations with Bābur’s father 12; receives Tāshkīnt from him 13; defeats him 16; his sons Mahmūd and Ahmad q.v. and daughters 21-4; his servant Qambar-i-`alī q.v. mentioned 92 n. 1, 149, 565 n. 1; [†892 AH.—1487 AD.].

Khwāja Yūnas Sajāwandī—his birthplace in Luhūgur (Logar) 217.

Yūsuf-i-`alī—musician at entertainments (925) 385, 387, 388; 418.

Yūsuf-i-`alī bakāwal—on Bābur’s service in Bajaur (925) 375.

Yūsuf-i-`alī Kūkūldāsh—made joint-dārogha in Herāt (911) 293; Bābur’s cicerone in Herāt (912) 304; his good dancing 303.

Yūsuf-i-`alī rikābdār—conveys a letter concerning Hind-āl’s pre-natal adoption (925) 374; receives a gift for swimming

1 The natural place for this Section of record is at the first mention of Yūnas Khān (p. 12) and not, as now found, interrupting another Section. See p. 678 and n. 4 as to “Sections”.
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401; meets Bābur 418; (?) in Sambhāl (934) 587; (?) dies there 675, 687 (here ‘Ali-i-yūṣuf’); [†935 AH.–1529 AD.].

Khwāja Yūsuf Andijānī, a musician—particulars 4.

Yūsuf-i-ayūb Begchik, son of Ayūb—Bābur warned against him (910) 190; takes service with Bābur 196; winters with Nāṣir 241; leaves Bābur for Jahāngīr (911) 190, 254.

Yūsuf bādī—particulars 289; [†897 AH.–1492].

Sayyid Yūsuf Beg Amīndī, son of Murād—particulars 39; waits on Bābur from Samarkand (903) 72; holding Yār-yīlāq for ‘Ali Mīrān-shāhī (904) 98; dismissed from Khurāsān on suspicion 98; joins Bābur (910) 196; advises him 197; his death 241; his brother Ḥasan and sons Muḥammad-i-yūṣuf and Ahmad-i-yūṣuf q.v.; [†910 AH.–1505 AD.].

Yūsuf dārogha of Akhsī (?)—interviews Bābur during the flight (908) 181–2.

Sayyid Yūsuf Machamī—particulars 118; opposes Bābur (905) 118, 117 n. 2.

Zāhid Khwāja—abandons Sambhāl (933) 557; on service (935) 682; [†953 AH.–1546 AD.].

Shaikh Zain Khawāfī—verse-making on the Kābul-river (932) 448; his account of Bābur’s regretted couplet 448 n. 5; goes into Dihlī for the Congregational Prayer 476; makes a garden at Āgra 532; recalls a vow to Bābur (933) 553; his inshā on Bābur’s renunciation of wine and of the iṅmaḥā 553–6; his Fath-nāma of Kānwā 559–574, and chronograms of victory 575; in the left centre of the battle 565; prefers requests for Muḥammad-i-zamān Bāī-qarā (935) 662; invited in verse by Bābur 683; his maternal uncle Abūl-wajd q.v.; [†940 AH.–1533–4 AD.].

Zainab-sultan Begim—her granddaughter met by Bābur near Āgra (935) 616.

Zainab-sultan Begim Mīrān-shāhī Timūrid, Barlās Turk, daughter of Maḥmūd—particulars 48; married to Bābur (910) 48, 711; [†cir. 912 AH.–1506–7 AD.].

Zard-rūī—on Bābur’s service (935) 668, 669.

Zar-dusht (“Zoroaster ”)—mentioned in a verse 85.

Bibi Zarīf Khātūn—her daughter Māh-chūchūq 199 n. 1, 342 n. 3.

1 The entries of 934 and 935 may concern a second man ‘Ali-i-yūṣuf.
2 Perhaps skilled in the art of metaphors and tropes (‘ilmul-bādī’).
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Zubaida Aghācha Jalāʾir—particulars 267, 273 n. 2; [† before 911 AH.–1506 AD.].

Zubaida Khatūn, wife of Khalīfa Hārūnu’r-rashīd—a surmise concerning her 306 n. 1; [† 216 AH.–831 AD.].

Zubair Rāgḥi—revolts against Aūzbeg rule in Badakhshān (910) 242, (912) 295; defeats Nāsir Mīrān-shāḥī 321; standing firm (913) 340; [† 914 AH.–1508 AD.].

Zuhra Begī ʿĀghā Aūzbeg, concubine of Maḥmūd Mīrān-shāḥī—particulars 47, 49; intrigues disastrously with Shaibānī (905) 125–6, (906) 127–8.

Mīr Shaikh Zūʾn-nūn Beg Arghūn—particulars 274–5; captures Shāl (Quetta) (884) 429 n. 1; his ward-ship of ‘Alī Mīrān-shāḥī (900) 55; imprisons Khalīfa 55; surrenders Aūrā-tīpā 56; serving Ḥusain Bāī-garā (901) 57, 60 n. 3; becomes an ally of the rebel Badiʿu-z-zamān (902) 71, (903) 94–5, 260; invited by Ḥusain to co-operate against Shaibānī (910) 190, 191; goes for refuge to Ḥusain 243; dealings with his son Muqīm 198, 227, 248; his title Lion-of-God 281; part of the coalition government in Herāt (911) 293; defeats Aūzbegs (912) 296; social matters 298, 299, 307; hears plain speaking from Qāsim Beg qūchīn 304; his futile opposition to Shaibānī (913) 326; defeated and killed 275, 327; his retainer Jān-aīrdī; [† 913 AH.–1507 AD.].
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Ābāpur (S.E. of Āgra), Bābur at 642-3.
Abā-qrūq (Kābul), Bābur at 197.
Ab-burdan (Upper Zar-afshān), description of 152; spring and pass of 152; a route through 40 n. 4.
Ab-dara (Hisār-shādmand), Bādur takes up good ground at 353.
Ab-dara (Hindū-kush), a winter-route through 205, 242, 321, 351.
Āb-i-khan (Farghāna), Tambal in 110, 112.
Ab-i-rahmat = Qarā-sū g.v. (Samarkand), mentioned to locate Kān-i-gil 78, 81.
Ab-istāda (S.E. of Ghazni) described 239; Bābur at 218, 239.
Aibadr (Khurasān), Anwārī’s birthplace 260 n. 1.
Ab-i-yr-qrūq (Samarkand), Bābur in 66.
Abuha or Anuha (N.W.F.P. India), limits Sawād 400.
Ābūn- or Atūn-village (Kābul), Bābur at 407.
Adampūr or Ārampūr-pargana (U.P. India), Bābur at 650, 684; 682 n. 1; location of 650 n. 3; 684 n. 3.
Aīnānpūr (Kābul), on the Surkh-rūd 209; of the name 207, App. E, xxi; a dārōgha’s head-quarters 208; the Bāgh-i-wafā near 421, 443; Bābur at 229.
Adūsā-and-Mūrī (U.P. India), Bābur at 645.
Afgānīstān, Bābur’s limitation of the name 200; demerits of its mountains 223.
Āgā, revenue of 521; ‘Ālam Khān plans to attack 455-6, 474; estimate of Pānipat casualties made in 474; submits to Bābur 523; exhaustion of treasure in 617; a military rendezvous 676; supplies from 685; hot season in 524; measurement of Kābul-Āgra road 629; water-raising in 487; Bābur takes oleanders to 610; his workmen in 520, 630, 642; keeps Rāmān in 584; receives letters from 639; comes and goes to and from 478, 548, 581, 606, 686; others ditto 475, 526, 540, 576-8, 606, 621-4, 650; mentioned to locate places 529, 531 (2), 588, 597, 641, 650-8, 680.
Āhangārān (on the Herī-rūd, Khurāsān), 308 n.
Āhangārān-jūlgā 1 (S.E. of Tashkint), Bābur at 90, 152, 161.
Aḥār-passage (Ganges), Bābur’s troops at 528.
Aibak, mod. Hāibak, Fr. map Boukbara, Hai-bagh (Kābul-Balkh route), Bābur at 189; a rebel near 546, and for location 546 n. 2.

Aikart-yār (Kābul), Bābur’s scouts fight near 196.
Aikt-sū-ārā = Miyān-dū-āb = Between-the-two-waters (Farghāna) an alternative name Rabātik-aūrchnī 88; located 88, n. 2; Mughuls in 88, 105; Bābur in 114; Tambal in 116.
Allāsh- or Allāmīsh-dāryā, Qarā-dāryā (Farghāna), Bābur’s men defeated on, 105; game near 114.
Allāk-yūlq (Hisār-shādmand), Bābur at 187-8, 194.
Aīchī (E. Turkistan), of the name 50, n. 2.
Aīndīkī var. (Kābul), Bābur gathers tooth-picks near 407.
‘Aish-pushla (Farghāna), Tambal near 106; Bābur near 165.
Almālık-dābān (Samarkand) described 83; a boundary 84; 64 n. 1; 80 n. 2.
Āt-tūghdī (Kābul) position of 253 n. 3; Bābur at 253.
Ajar Fort (in Kāhmard, or Kāhmard g.v. Fr. map Māmelēn), Bābur’s and his followers’ families left in 189; various occurrences in 197, 243, 293; a plan to defend 191; gifts to its peasantry 633 n. 5.
Akhṣī, Akhṣīkīt (Farghāna), described 9; book-name of 9 and n. 4; position of 13; — ‘Umar Shaikh’s capital 10; exploit at 16; death at 13; — a rebel at 26; a death in 40; appointments to 32, 115; a notable of 110; a village of 171; a melon of 82; besieged 31–2, 54; threatened 44; army of, called up against Bābur 110; comings and goings from and to 87, 90, 101–3, 124, 161, 176, 180, 182, 183; river-fight below 102; Bābur at 54, 116, 170–1–2; apportioned to Jahāngīr 118–9; an army hostile to Bābur near 162; promised to Bābur 168; his attempt to defend 173–6; his flight from 176, 396; Shaibānī defeats the Chaghatāī Khāns near 18, 182, 351–6.
Akrīdā-pargana (Panj-āb), a holder of 453.
Alātī-gūh (Farghāna), on a Hisār-E. Turkistān route 129; sub-districts of 162.
Alāngār-tūmān (Kābul), described 210; a constituent of the true Lamghānat 210; a holder of 241; Bābur in 424.
Alā-qrīghān = Ikhtiyārūd-īn (Herāt), Bābur reported captive in 315; the Bāt-qarā households in 327; captured by Shaibānī 328.
Alā-sāi-bulāk (Kābul), described 220–1; wines of 221.

1 My text has jūlgāš, but I am advised to omit the genitive š; so, too, in āikt-sū-ārā-šī, Rabātik-aūrchnī g.v.
2 Cf. s.n. Āhangaran-jūlgā n. as to form of the name.
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Ala-tagh (s. of Qalat-i-ghilzai, Afghaniestan), over-run 249.
Alexander's Iron-wall (Darband z.w. Caspian Sea), mentioned in metaphor 564; purpose of 564 n. 3.
Alexandria ad Caucasum (Kabul), site of 214 n. 7.
Alghu-tagh var. Aulagh-tagh (mid-Oxus valley), a Bait-gara arrival near 60.
'Ali-abad (Samarkand), Shaibani in 135.
'Ali-masjid (Khai-bar-route), Babur passes 394, 411-2, 450; description of its spring 412 n. 1.
'Ali-shang-tamun (Kabul), described 210; a constituent of the tune Lamghanat 210; a holder of 241; Babur in 342, 424.
Allahabad (India), see Prag.
Almaligh (E. Turkistan), depopulation of 1; located 2 n. 1; referred to 162 n. 2.
Almar (s. of Mai'men, Fr. map), Babur passes through, 296.
Almatu (E. Turkistan), depopulation of 1; located 2 n. 1; referred to 162 n. 2; a battle near 349.
Alti-shahr (E. Turkistan), an occasional name of Yiti-kint 11 n. 6.
Alwär, Alur (Rajputana), a rebel leaves 545; an arrival from 687; mentioned to fix limits 577-8-9; gift made of its treasure 519; an appointment to 378.
Ambahar (N.W. F.P. India ?), on a suggested route 376; pass of 376.
Ambala (Panj-ab), Babur at 465.
Ambar-koh (Qunduz), a fight on 61.
Amla (Kabul), Babur at 422.
Amroha (U.P. India), revenue assigned of 685.
Amu-darya, Oxus, Babur on 48, 189, 249, others on 57, 74, 193, 244, *359*; of Trans-Amu tribes 242; limits territory 49; Babur's fortunes lost beyond 426;—ferries of, Aubah, 93, 95 (where for Aubah read Char-jat), 110, 189, Charrjul (which read for Aubah), Kilif 57, 191, Kirki 191, Turmiz 191.
Andar-ep (n. of Hindust-kush), a n. boundary of Kabul 200; mountains of 221; roads from 205; a holder of 403; comings through 51, 193 (Babur's), 196.
Andarab (Panj-ab), Babur at 391-2.
Andijan (Farghana), description of 3-4; the capital, sport in, pure Turki in, climate of 4—its water 5, mountains of 15, 55, 102, 118, 125; tribes of 162; a grass of 221; its Char-bagh 29; celebrities of 4, 280; mentioned to locate places, etc., 4, 8, 10, 16, 113, 396; its railway 30 n. 5; given to 'Umar Shaikhi I and II, 14; people of led into captivity 20, 22; Babur its governor 29 n. 1; succeeds in it 29 attacks on 27, 30, 54, 87-8, 106-8, 161-8, 171, 192; captures of 18, 20, 89, 90, 122, 192, 244; demanded from Babur 87, 168, 318, 351-2; Auzbeg chiefs wait on Babur in 58; lost by Babur 89-90, 122; his attempts to regain 92-7-8, 162-5; succeeds, 103-4, 115; proposed disposition of 118; the cause of his second exile from 105; he compares it with Samarkand 123; a raid near 164; its army on service, 48, 87, 101, 171-2; occupied by Sa'id Khan 351-7, 362; commandants of 25, 32, 44; gifts sent to 633; comings and goings to and from 32, 58, 64, 102-3-6-8-9, 113, 145, 150, 165-8, 170, *183, 399; Babur's comings and goings to and from 55, 66, 71, 114-9, 174; hint of another visit 358 and n. 2; (see Farghana).
Andikhan (Farghana), 161 see Andijan.
Andikhud (w. of Balkh, Khurasan), fighting near 46, 260; plan to defend 191; Sayyids of 266-7-8; a commandant of 279; a traitor in 325.
Anwar, ? Unwara (near Agrar), Babur at 589, 641.
Aqdar-tuzi (Samarkand), a battle near 34.
Aq-bura-rud (Farghana), rapid descent of 5 n. 3.
Aq-kutal (between Soghd and Taشكint), a force passes 111.
Aq-qahghah (Aurä-tipa, Samarkand), a rapid message through 25.
Aq-su (Aurä-tipa, Samarkand), Ahmad Miranshah dies on 33.
Aq-su (Eastern Turkistan), 20 n. 5, 29 n. 5. 'Arabia, a bird of 497.
Arat (Kabul), App. G. xxv.
Arch-kin (Farghana), a road through 116.
Archian-qurghan (Farghana), Tangbal enters 117; scene of the Chaghatai Khan's defeat 117 n. 2, *182, *351 (where read Archian for "Akhs"), 356 (here read near Akhs). Argund-eb (Qandahar) irrigation off-takes of 332 n. 4, 333 n. 4.
Art-pargana, Arrah (Bihar, India), Babur in 664-6.
Arind-water, Rind (U.P. India), Babur on 684.
Arupar (U.P. India), see Rupar.
Arus-, Urus-, Arys-su (W. Turkistan), a battle near 16.
Asafa (Farghana), described 7; Persian-speaking Sarts of 7 and n. 3; a holder of 115; Babur takes refuge in 7 and sends gifts to Highlanders of 633 and n. 4; Babur captures 53; Babur in a village of 123.
Asfanduk (Samarkand), Babur in 131-2.
Aspara or Ashpara (Mughulistan), Abu-sa'id Miran-shah leads an army to 20.
Astara-eb (e. of Pul-i-chiragh, Fr. map Mai'men), tribes in 255.
Astarabad (Khurasan), partridge-cry in 496; oranges of 510; a poet of 290 n. 3; Husain Bait-qaara and 46, 95, 259, 260, 261, 272; assignments of 61-9, 70, 94; commandants

1 Asterisks indicate Translator's matter.
in 272 (Nawā'ī), 275; two Bāi-qarās put to death in 262, 266.

Atak, "Attock" (on the Indus), locates Nilsāb 206 n. 3, and Bāba Wali Qandahārī's shrine 332 n. 4.

Atar (Kābul), located 211; Bābur at 343, 422-3.

Aūba, Ubeb, "Obeb" (on the Heri-rūd), a holder of 274.

Aūd (U.P. India), see Oude, Oudh.

Aūlībā-tū (Ghaznī?), Bābur at 323.

Aūliā-ātā (E. Turkistān), 2 n. 1.

Aūlīgūn-nūr (Kābul), located 209; a route past 209; on the "nur" of the name App. F, xxiii; Bābur at 421-5.

Aūnjū- or Unjū-tūpa (Farghāna), Bābur at 110.

Aurangābād (Haidarābād, Dakhin, India), a grape of 77 n. 2.

Aūrūp-tāp (between Khuajand and the Zardāsh, Samarkand), its names Aūrūsh and Aūrūshāna 77; an ap of 25; Dikhkhat a village of 149, 154; locates Khwās 17; escapes to 124, 141, 156; transfers of, to Umar 'Shaikh 17, to Ahmād 27, 30, 35, to Muh. Hussain Daghālīt 97; Ahmād dies in 33; The Khān in 92; Bābur's family in 136; Bābur in 98-9, 124, 149 (2); enemies of Bābur in 152, 154.

Aūrūq or Urgenj (Khwarizm), a claim to rule in 266.

Aūrūq (Samarkand), surrenders to Bābur, 68.

Aūsh, Ush (Farghāna), described 4; a trick of the ragamuffins of 6; course of its water 10; appointments to 32, 65; a raid near 25; an arrival from 112; fugitive to 168; dependencies of 109, 110; Tambal and 103-7, 123; Bābur's men in 114; oppression of 172; good behaviour at 176; Bābur at 108, 161-2-4-7-9 (advice to go to).

Aūtār, Utrār, "Otrār" (W. Turkistān), see Yangī.

Aūtrūlī, Atrauli (U.P. India), Bābur at 587.

Aūz-kint (Farghāna), refuge in planned, for the child Bābur, 29; Mughuls take refuge in 105; Jahāngīr, with Tambal, and 103, 114-6-8, 123; Bābur and 29, 108-9, 118, 161-2-9; Bābur's note on 162.

Aūxghīr (Farghāna), a holder of 118, 125 n. 2.

Aūsārājīn (on the Caspian), taken by White Sheep 49; cold of 219; a comer from 280; Timūr's workmen in 520.

Bābā Iṣān Abūālī, i.e., Bābā Wali Qandahārī (Qandahār), irrigation-channels towards 332-6; shrine of the saint near Atack (Attock) 332 n. 4.

Bābā Iṣāh (Herāt), Husain Bāi-qarā dies at 256; (see Fr. map Herat, Baboulei).

Bābā Khākī (Herāt), a rapid message from Farghāna to 25; an army at 326; located 25 n. 2, 326 n. 1.

Bābā Lūlī (Kābul), Bābur advances towards 315.

Bābā Qarā (Bajaur q.v.), spring of 371; identical with Khwāja Khizr 371 n. 1; valley of 367 n. 3.

Bābā Tawalkkal's Langar (Farghāna), the younger Khān halts at 168.

Bābā Wali (Atak, Attock), see Bābā Iṣān.

Bābur-khāna (Panj-āb), 450 n. 5.

Bāburpurī (U.P. India), Bābur at 644 n. 6.

Bachrātā var. (Farghāna), a ferry crossed near 116, 170 (by Bābur).

Badakhshān, Farghāna's s. boundary 1; Hindū-kush divides Kābul from 204; trees of 221; locates Kāfrīstān 46; Kābul trade of 202; Bābur sends sugar-cane to 208; a poet of 288; Rusta Ḥāzāra of 196; unprofitable to Bābur 480; reference to his conquest of 220; Greek descent of its Shāhs 22, 242; a series of rulers in 47-9, 208 n. 8, 243, 340, 426, 433, 497; a plan for defence of 191; Aūzbegs and 242, 294; considered as a refuge for Bābur 430; various begins go to 21-2-4, 48; Naṣīr's affairs in 424-3-312-2; a letter of victory sent to 371; Bābur plans going to 412; Bābur and Māhmūd visit Ḥumayūn in 426, 436; Sa'id Chaghatāi's affairs with 412, 495-6; *Ḥumayūn's descent of 690, 707; *offered to Khallīf 697 and n. 1; *contingent disposition of 706.

Badām-chashma (Kābul), climatic change at pass of 203; Bābur at 229, 409, 445.

Bādāyūn (U.P. India), appointments to 267, 582.

Bādghīs (Khurāsān, n. of Herāt), Aūzbegs defeat Bāi-qarās in 275; Bābur in 256, 307.

Bād-i-pīch-pass, Bād-pakht (Kābul), a route through 209; Bābur goes through 434, 421; places an inscription in 434.

Bād-rū-lūlūk, Tag-ūlū (Kābul), described 221; water of 227 n. 1; a route through 209; Bābur in 421.

Bādrū-ferry (Ghogra, Sarū); 667 n. 5.

Bādshāh-nagar (U.P. India), Bābur's visit gives the name to 678 n. 1.

Bāgar (Rājputānā), a holder of 573; identified 573 n. 2.

"Bāghdād," a variant for Bāghdād 40 and n. 2.

Bāghlān (Qūndūz), nomads leave Kābul for 402.

Bahār or Bihār (Kābul), seat of a tribe 413; Bābur at 414.

Bahat, Bihat, Jhelum-river (Panj-āb), course of 485; Bābur on 382, 441, 453; crossed in fear of him 382.

Bahraich (U.P. India), revenue of 521; locates Ghzarā crossings 669.

Bajaur (N.W.F.P. India), concerning its name 367 n. 4, 571 n. 3; once a Kābul dependency 207; wines and fruit of 372, 510-1; monkeys and birds of 492-3-4; beer made in 423; a test of women's
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virtue in 211; Bābūr and 367 to 370, 371–3, 377, *429; repopulation of 375; tribute of 400; Dost Bég’s valour at 370, 397; Khwāja Kālān and 370, 411, 422–3; Bibi Mubārika left in 376; arrivals from 401.

Bakkak-pass (between Yaka-aūlān and the Heri-rud valley), Bābūr’s perilous crossing of 309; an alternative pass (Zirrīn) 310 n. 2.

Baksar sarkār (U. P. India), revenue of 521. Baksara (U. P. India), Bābūr at *603, 660.

Balūdar, Bilādar (U. P. India), Bābūr at 686.

Balā-ḫiṣār (Kābul), present site of 198 n. 4; (see Citadel).

Bālā-jūr (Kābul), maker and name of 200 and n. 5.

Ballia (U. P. India), sub-divisions of 637 n. 1, 664 n. 8, 667 n. 2.

Balkh (Oxus valley), border-countries of 76, 261, 204; heat in 520; a melon-grower of 686; its trade with Kābul 202; holders of 18, 61–9, 257, 263, 275; exploits at 50, 93, 270; Husain Bāi-garā and 70, 191; Khusrau Shāh and 93–4, 110, 270; Shabānī and 294–6, 300, *363; Kītīn-qarā and 545 6; ‘Ubaid and 622; *Ismā‘īl Šajawī and 359, 363; Muhammad-ī-amān and *364, 385, *428; Bābūr and 220, *359, *426–7, *442–4–5–6, 463 and n. 3, 546 n. 1, 625.

Balkh-āb, headwaters of 216; Bābūr crosses 295.

Balnāth Jogī’s bill (Panj-āb), Bābūr near 452.

Bāmān (Khurāsān; w. of Ghūr-bund, Kābul), mountains of 215; how reached from Kābul 205; Khusrau Shāh and 96 (where for “Qāsim” read Kāmal; Bābūr and 189, 311, *351, 409.

Bām-valley (Herāt), a langar in 308 n. 1; Bābūr in 296, 297 n. 1.

Banakāt, Fanakāt = Shāhrukhiyya (Tāshkint) 2 n. 5, 76.

Banaras, Benares (U. P. India), crocodiles near 502; threatened 652–4; Bābūr near 657.

Banas-river (India), course of 485.

Bāndīr, Bhandīr (C. India), a fruit of 507; Bābūr at 590–8.

Band-i-sālār Road (Farghānā), Bābūr on 55, 116.

Bangarmāwū, Bangarmau (U. P. India), Bābūr near 601.

Bangash tūmān (Kābul), described 220, 209, 233, 405; a holder of 27, 252; plan of attack on 229, 231–3, 382.

Bannū plain (N. W. F. P. India), a limit of Kābul territory 200; a waterless plain near 234; date of the modern town 232 n. 5; Bābūr and 218, 231–2, 382, 394.

Bānswārā (Rājpūtāna), an old name of 573 n. 1.

Banūr (Patiāla, Panj-āb), Bābūr on (Ghaggar) torrent of 464.

(The) Bar (Panj-āb), 380 n. 4.

Bārāch (U. P. India), see Bahraich.

Barak or Birk (? N. W. F. P. India), mentioned as between Dasht and Farmūl 235.

Barakistān, Birkistān (Zurmūt, Kābul), a tomb in 220; ? tongue of 207.

Barā-koh (Farghānā) described 5; position of 5 n. 2.

Bārámūlā (Kāshmir), a limit of Savād terri- tori 372 n. 3.

Bārān-sū, Panjhīr-sū (Kābul), affluent to 210–1; the bird-migrants’ road 224; migration of fish in 225; bird-catching on 228; routes crossing 209, 342; locates various places 207 n. 5, 215, App. E, xvii;—passers along 195, 242; Bābūr and 254, 420, see Koh-dāman.

Bārān vilāyāt (Kohistān, Kābul), Bābūr in 253, 320, 405.

Bāra (N. W. F. P. India), road of 411; Bābūr fords the water of 230.

Bārī (Rajpūtāna), hills of 486; hunting- grounds in 509 n. 2; Bābūr at 509, 585.

Bārīk-āb (affluent of the “Kābul-river”), Bābūr on 409, 414, 446.

Bast, Bost (on the Helmand, Afghanistān), Husain Bāi-garā’s affairs at 94, 260.

Bātšam (‘Irāq), a w. limit of Khurāsān 261 (where read Bastām); captured 622.

Bateswār (U. P. India), ferry of 643 n. 3.

Bāzār and Tāq (India), see Dasht.

Bāzārark (Hindū-kush), described 205.

Beg-tūt (Kābul), earthquake action near 247.

Benares (India), see Banāras.

Bengal, Bangala (India), particulars of the rules and customs in 482; envos to and from 637, 640, 665; army of 663; Bābūr at ease about 677, 679 n. 7; traversed by the Ganges 485; a bird of 493; fruits of 504.

Between-two-waters (Farghānā), see Aikl-sūrā.

Betwī-river, Betwa (C. India) described 597.

Bhānder (C. India), see Bānīdr.

Bhilsān (C. India), Sangā’s 483, Bābūr’s plan against 598.

Bhirā (Panj-āb), history of 382; revenue of 521; tribes of 387; Balūchis in 383; locates places 379, 380, 381; limit of Lādī Afghan lands 481, and of Bābūr’s in Hindūstān 520; servants from 616, 678; arrivals from 228, 391, 419; local sildery 389, 359, rhinoceros in 490, Bābūr and 377–8, 382–3–7, *429, 478; he stays in the fort of 384; safeguards people of 383, 478; sends prisoners into 461; summons by Māhīm of an escort from 650; a governor 386–8, 392–9.

Bhījpūr (Bīhār, India), Bābūr at 662.

Bīhār-sū, Beas (Panj-āb), course of 485; Bābūr crosses 458.

1 Bābūr uses this name for, Anglicé, the Kābul-river as low as nearly to Dakka.
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Bhāna, Bayāna (Rāj-pūtāna), mountains in 486; red-stone of 532, 611; water-raising in 487; a dependency of 563; locates places 539, 613; disaffection to Bābur of 523–9; taken 530–8, 540–5; a gun made to use against it 537; praise of its soldiers 548, 550; an appointment to 579; asked for 613; Bābur at 577, 581; his workmen in 520; revenue from assigned to support his tomb *709.

Bīān-wān pargana (U.P., India), assignment on 540.

Bībī Māh-rūī (Kābul), Bābur at 314.

Bībrām, Bīrbrām (Panj-āb), four ancient sites so-named 230 n. 2; Bābur at 230, 394, 450–1.

Bīhār (India), a limit of Aghan lands in Hind 480–1; and of Bābur’s 520; revenue of 521; Bābur and 639, 656, 677–9; an assignment on 676; mentioned as if Bābur’s 561; Muḥammad-i-zamān and 661–3–4; an earlier Lūdī capture of 675; a diwān of 661.

Bīhiya (Bīhār, India), Bābur at 662–7 n. 2.

Bih-zādī (Kābul), Bābur at 398, 416–8; wine fetched from 417; 19th century vinegar of 417 n. 2.

Bījānagar, Vijāynagar (Dakāhin, Deccan, India), a ruler of 483.

Bilādar (U.P., India), see Balādar.

Bilah (Panj-āb), Bābur at 237.

Bilkīr? (Kābul), Bābur at 420.

Bilwah ferry (Ganges), Bābur at 658.

Bimrūki pargana (Panj-āb), a holder of 453.

Bīrk and Bīrkistān, see Bārak.

Bīshhārān (Farīghāna), good fighting at 28; Bābur at or near 117–8, 170.

Bīsh-kint (on the Khujiand-Tāshkint road), Tambal at 145, 154; Bābur at 151.

Bī-sūt (Kābul), Bī-sūts migrated to Bajaur 375.

Bolān-pass (Balūchistān), *Shah Beg’s entrance to Sind 429.

“Bottam” (? débouchement of the Zar-afshān), a word used by Ibn HankaI 76 n. 6.

Būdāna-gūrīg (Samarkand), described 82; Bābur at 131 (here Quail-reserve).

Būhālpūr (Panj-āb), Bābur at 454.

Bukhārā (Transoxiana), described 82; w. limit of Samarkand 76 and of Sogd 84; deficient water-supply of 77; trade with Kābul 202; wines of 83; melons of 10, 82; bullies in 7; Bābur sends sugar-cane to 208; various rulers of 35, 38, 112; governors in 40, 52, 121; taken by Shaibānī 125; various attacks on 63–5, 124, *356–7–9, *354, *359, *360; Bābur’s capture of 21, 704 n. 3; Mahdī Khwāja and 704 n. 3; various coming and goings from and to 62–3–4, 135, 534.

Būlān (Kābul), a route through 209.

Būlid (Rājpūtāna), revenues of 521.

Burhānpūr (C. India), Bābur on water of 592–8.

Burh-ganga (Old Ganges), its part in the battle of the Ghogrā 667 n. 2; 674 n. 6, 667 n. 2.

Būrka-yilāq (Aūrā-tipa q.v.), Bābur at the fort of 92, 124.

Busāwar (Rājpūtāna), Bābur at 548 (where read Busāwar) 581.

Bā-stān-sarāī (Kābul), Bābur at 251–4.

Bā-stān-sarāī (Samarkand), 62; Bābur at 74, 134.

Būt-khāk (Kābul), damming of its water 647; Bābur at 409, 446 n. 4.

Buz-gala-Khāna (Samarkand), see Aitmak-dābūn.

Chāch, see Tāshkint.

Chachāvali (U.P., India), Bābur at 649.

Chach-charān (on the Heri-rād), a holder of 274; Bābur at 308.

Chaghānān (Ḥiṣār-shādān), located 48 n. 5; an earlier extension of the name 188 n. 4; Nūndāk dependent on 471; a meadow (a’ilān) of 129; a ruler in 47; Khusrāu Shāh at 93; Bābur in 188.

Chāghān-sarāī bulūk, Choghān-sarāī (Kābul), described 212; water of 211–2; name of 212 n. 2; a governor of 227; Bābur’s capture of 211 (where for *920” read 924), *366–7 n. 3.

Chahār see Chār.

*Chak-chaq pass (Ḥiṣār-shādān), Bābur traverses 359.

Chālādīrān (Persia), cart-defence in the battle of 469 n. 1.

Chāmbal-river (C. India), course of 485; Bābur on 509, 585–9, 607, 614; Shāh-i-jahan pours wine into 298 n. 3.

Champa-rān (Bīhār, India), revenue of 521.

Chānrān (n.w. of Mashhad), Ḩusain Bā-qarā’s victory at 260; located 260 n. 1 and Ferté q.v. p. 39 n. 2.

Chandāwal (Bajaur, N.W.F.P.), of its name 367 n. 3; torrent of 372; Bābur hunts near 372.

Chandawār, Chandwār (U.P., India), correct name of 642 n. 8, water-raising in 487; comings and goings from and to 531, 552, 582; Bābur at 589, 642–3; he loses it 557, 581.

Chandīrī (C. India), described 582–3–5; hills of 486; death of a holder of 573; mentioned to fix dates 269, 483, 605; Bābur’s capture of 589, 590–2–4–8.

Chapar-kuda (U.P., India), identity of with Chaparghatta 650 n. 1; a start from 659 n. 5; Bābur at 650.

Chār-dār col (Hindū-kush), 204 n. 4.

Chār-dih plain (w. of Kābul-town), the Kābul-river traverses 200 n. 4; *overlooked from Bābur’s tomb 710.

Chārīkār, Chār-yak-kār (Kābul), altitude of 204 n. 4; name of ib. 295 n. 1; Judas-trees of 216 n. 3.
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Chār-jūl ferry (Oxus), 95 (where "Aūbāj" is wrong).
Char-shambā = Wednesday (Oxus valley see Fr. map Maimēnē), 71 n. 2.
Chār-sū (Samarkand), an execution in 196.
Chār-yak (Fr. map Maimēnē), over-run 295, 94 (where for "San-chhirk" read San and Chār-yak).
Chashma-i-tūra pass (Kābul), Bābur at 403–4.
Chāsh-tūpa (Kābul), Bābur at 320.
Chatsū (Rājpūtāna), revenue of 521.
Chā-tū var. Jāl-tū (Kābul), Bābur at 228.
Chatur-māk (U.P. India), a Ghogra-crossing at 669, 677.
Chaupāra (N.W.F.P. India), an Indus ferry at 206; a limit of Bānnū 233; Bābur near 234.
Chaupāra (U.P. India), ferry of 677–9.
Chauza (Bihār, India), a death at 273 n. 3; Bābur at *603, 659, 660.
Chauza or Jūsa (C. India), Bābur at 581.
Chīchikh-tū (Balkh-Herāt road), located 300; Bābur at 296.
Chihil-dukhṭarān (Farghana), 107, 162; (Herī) 296, 301; (Kābul), 107 n. 1.
Chihil-ṣulba (Kābul), Bābur hunts near 420.
Chīkmān-sārāī (Andikhūd, Oxus valley), a defeat at 46, 260, 268.
Chīn, China, Kābul trade with 203; a Chīn cup 407; [for "China" see Khiṭṭāī].
Chīn-āb, Chān-āb, tract and river (Chen-āb, Panj-āb), course of 483; the Bar in 380 n. 4; a Turk possession 380–2; Bābur resolves to regain 380; he on the river *441, 453; envoys to him from 386; his family reach 659; an appointment to 386.
China-qūrgān (Kābul), Bābur at 407.
Chīnīfūt or Chīnīwat (Panj-āb), a Turk possession 380–2; Bābur resolves to regain 380.
Chīrāgh-dān (Upper Herī-rūd), Bābur at 309; see Add. Note p. 309 for omitted passage.
Chīrk (Kābul), described 217; a pullā of 284; a soldier of 669, 678.
Chīr-sū, Chīr-chīk (Tāshkent lands), Ahmad Mīrān-shāhī’s disaster at 17, 25, 31–4–5.
Chītr (Panj-āb), Bābur at 645.
Chīṭtūr, Chītor (Rājpūtāna), hills of 486, Bābur’s plan against 598; Rānā Sangā’s 483, 617.
Chūnār (U.P. India), advance on 652–4; arrival from 657; appointments 682–3; Bābur at 658; road measured from 659; question of identity 682 n. n.
Chūpān-ātā (Samarkand), 72 n. 3, 76 (Kohik), 76 n. 4; Bābur crosses 124; [see Kohik].
Chūṭṭāṭil (Dāskā, Qandahār), Bābur at 238–9.
Cintra (Portugal), oranges of 511 n. 4.
Citadel (arg) of Kābul, 201; Bāla-biṣār 198 n. 4; —of Samarkand, 77; position of 78 n. 6; Bābur in 134, 141.

Dabūsī (Samarkand), Aūzbeg victories at 40, 124, 137.
Dahnāh (see Fr. map Maimēnē), corn from 295; traversed 194–7, 243, 295.
Dakkā (Kābul), App. E. xx; [see note to Bārān-sū].
Dakkān, Dakhin, Deccan (India), rulers in 482; *Daknī = Dakkanī 619, 631, Add. Note pp. 619, 631.
Dāman (N.W.F.P. India), see Dasht.
Dāmghān (Persia), a w. limit of Khurāsān 261; Bāī-gāras captured in 263; Aūzbegs defeated at 618, 622.
Dandān-shīkan pass (Khurāsān), Bābur crosses 294.
Dār-i-bām (Badghīs, Khurāsān), Bābur in 296.
Dāra-i-gaz (s. of Balkh), a recall from 14.
Dāra-i-Ghāzī Khān (Panj-āb), 233 n. 3.
Dāra-i-khwūsh (Kābul), Bābur in 27, 251–3.
Dāra-i-nūr (Kābul) described 210; unique character of 210, 241, App. F; wines of 210, 410, App. G, xxv; monkeys of 211, 492; name of App. F, xxiii, xxiv; a holder of 227, 344; attacked 241; Bābur in 422.
Dāra-i-pūr-āmlīn (Kābul), Bābur at 342 (where for "anim" read āmlīn).
Dāra-i-sūf (Khurāsān), character of 222.1
Dāra-i-ṣang (Khurāsān), defense for planned 191.
Dāra-i-zindān (Kābul-Balkh road), mountains of 222; located 189 n. 6; Bābur in 189.
Darband (Caspian Sea), 564 n. 5.
Darband-i-ahānīn (Īlīshār-shāmdān), a limit of territory 47; a name of Quługha, Quhqa, 194; *Bābur at 353; Najm Šāmī near 359.
Dar-i-gḥām canal (Samarkand) described 76, 84; Bābur on 124–5; (see Kohik-water).
Darūtā (Kābul), Bābur at 421–2.
Darwāzā (Bājaur ? N.W.F.P. India), a road through 376.
Dasht (Plain), Dāman, Bāzār and Tāq (N.W.F. P. India), names of 229 n. 1, 233 and n. 1; (Mehtar Sulaimān) mountains of 223; limits Bānnū 233; a route through 206; Bābur and 229, 235–7, 394.
Dasht-i-shāikh, Kurrat-tāziyan (Kohistān, Kābul) described 215.
Dāwar (Kohistān, Kābul), Bābur at 421; perhaps Dūr-nāma 421 n. 5.
Dhār (C. India), observatory in 79.
Dībālpūr (Panj-āb), revenue or 521; water-wheels in 486, 532; commandants in 442–3, 463; Bābur captures 208, *441, 575–8.
Dīb-i-agfān (Kābul), a rebel in 345; a goer to 402.
Dīb-i-ghulāmān (Kābul), Bābur at 413.
Dīb-i-yaqūb (Kābul), narrow of 200; water of 241; Bābur at 409, 445.

1 "The Dāra-i-ṣūf, often mentioned by the Arabian writers, seems to lie west of Bāmīān" (Erskine, Memoirs, p. 152 n. 1).
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Dihli, mountains of 485; the capital of Hindústán 463; a Lúdi possession 481; revenue of 521; Miwát and 577; ‘Alam Khán and 455–6; Ibrahím marches from 465; Sangá gives Bábúr rendezvous near 529; Bábúr takes possession of 475; appointments to 476; submissive 523; mentioned as Bábúr’s 561; Khwāja Kaláni’s inscription in 525; an arrival from to Bábúr 526; treasure of 583, *695 n. 1, 617.

Dikh-kat (Aúrätípa, Samarkand), described 149, 152; an arrival in 151; Bábúr in 149, 150, 633 n. 4.

Dilmáu var. (U.P. India), comings and goings from and to 534–7, 681–4; variants of name of 681 n. 3.

Din-kot, Dhánkot (N.W.F. P. India), location and name of 206 n. 6; limit of Koh-i-jüd 380 and of Dánni 233; routes through 206, 399.

Dirápur (U.P. India), Bábúr in 649.

Dirí pass (Kábul), a route through 209.

Diyúl (Samarkand), allies of Bábúr in 138.

Dízak (Samarkand), Bábúr a fugitive in 148; a governor of 26.

“Doáb,” see Miján-dú-āb.

Dú-āba (U.P. India), Gangetic changes in 667 n. 2.

Dugdúgi (U.P. India), Bábúr at 651–2.

Dúghába river (Khorášán), head-waters of 216.

Dúkí (Qandárhâr), mountains of 223, 236; Bábúr in 218, 238, 382.

Dúlpur, “Dhólpur” (Rájpútâna), mountains of 486; Ibáhím Lúdi’s begs in 593; Bábúr and 520, 552, 385, *603–6, 614, 634–5–9, 689; accounts of work in 606, 634, 642; a view from 610.

Dún (Jaswán, Panj-āb); ‘Alam Khán in 457; Bábúr in 461–2.

Dungarpúr (Rájpútâna), old name of 573 n. 1.

Dúr-námá or *namá’í (Kohistán, Kábul), described 215; Bábúr at 420; (see Dáwar).

Dúrrín- or Dúrrin-tangi (Kábul), a limit of Sháh-i-Kábul 200, 417.

Dú-shamba (Badakhshán), Humáyun at 621.

Dúshí (n. of Hindu-kush), Khusráu Sháh submits to Bábúr at 51, 191–5.

Egypt, see Miśr.

Etáwa, Itáwa (U.P. India), hostile to Bábúr 523–9, 530; appointments to 530–3, 579, 582; comings and goings from and to 541, 645, 689; Bábúr at 644, 686.

Faizábád (Badakhshán), *7 Bábúr and Máhín at 436.

Fakhrú’l-dín-a álum (Balkh-Herátroad), Bábúr at 296; (see Fr. map Maiméné).

Fanákát, Bánákát = Sháhrukhíya (Táshkint), passed by the Str-darya 2; identity of 2 n.5, 7 n.5.

Fán-tágh (Hisár-shádáman), Lake Iskandar in 129; Bábúr in 130.

Fáráb (W. Turkistán?), a mullá of 643.

Farághána (Faraghána), Bábúr at 168.

Faraghána mod. Kokand, description of 1 to 12; extent of 2 n. 3; included in Transoxiána 76; Alps of 223; nick-name of 289; winter-route into 2, *183; capitals of 3, 10, 162; an e. limit of Samarkand 76; Kábul trade of 202; celebrities of 4, 7, 76, 90, 289; ‘Úmar Sháhkhí’s (I and II) 14–7, 24; Bábúr succeeds in 1, 29; invasions of 13, 20–9, 54, *183; proposal to dispossess Bábúr 168; an arrival in 28; an exit from 190; Bábúr’s loss of 19 n. 1, *183; Bábúr’s leaving 187; (see Andíján).

Far-kat (n. of Kindir-tau g.v.), a refugee in 149; a mullá of 343; reached from Ghawá (Faraghána, Fr. map, Gava), 179.

Farmúl támán (Kábul), described 220; a s. limit of Kábul 200; Uðghún in 206 n. 2; roads through 206, 231–3–5; Shákhzádas of 220, 679 n. 7.

Fathpur (U.P. India), Bábúr at 643, 686.

Fathpúr or Nahthpur (U.P. India), a dependency of 680; lake of 681.

Fathpúr-Aswa (U.P. India), Bábúr at 651.

Frútázábád (U.P. India), 643 n. 3.

Frúz-koh (Ghár-Kábul road), Bábúr on 365.

Frúzup (jhirka; Gurgaon, Panj-āb), described 560 n. 1; Bábúr at 590.

Fulúl (Badakhshán), Khusráu Sháh and 60; Mughúls from, join Bábúr 192 (where read Fulúl).

Gagar, Ghaggar, Kakar river (Patiála, Panj-āb), Bábúr visits and describes 464–5; called rúd (torrent) of Banúr and Sanúr 464.

Gagar, Kakar (U.P. India), a constituent of the Gográ, Ghográ g.v.; the word Gagar or Kakar used 602.

Gamb(h)ir-water (India), Bábúr crosses 606.

Gandak river (India), course of 485; defence of 663.

Gandamak (Kábul), Bábúr at 394, 414, 446.

Gang-river, Ganges (India), course of 485; changed course of 667 n. 2, 674 n. 6–7 n. 2, 682 n. 1; bridged by Bábúr 495, 599, 633; lands and chiefs east of 523, 628, 638, 651; various crossings made of 530, 544, 583–7, 593, 669, 681–4; Bábúr on 598 to 663, 666–7; a battle-station east of 371; Bábúr swims 603–5, 655, 660.

Garm-chashma (Kábul), Bábúr at 229, 411, 448.

Garm-shr (S. Afghánistán), *432; a bird of 496.

Garizzán (Khurássán, Fr. map Maiméné, Ghouristán), mountains of 222; locates a place 69; a plan for defence of 191; Bábúr at 296 (where mis-spelled “Gurzán”).
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Gau- or Kau-water (Kabul), Kafristan the source of 210.
Gawar or Kawar (Kabul), position of 210.
Ghain (Kabul), a punitive force against 253.
Ghaj-darvan (Bukhara), *besieged 360; *battle of 361, 279: a fugitive from 363.
Gharjistan, Gharjistan (Khurasan), mountains of 222; Babur near 308; Muhammad-i-zaman in 365.1

Ghawra (Farghana, Fr. map, Gava), Babur seeks the road to 179, 160-1-2.

Ghasipur (U.P. India), crocodiles of 502; an assignment on 527; a holder of 669; threatened 544, 680; Babur at 659; his boats sent to 679.

Ghazni = Kabul and Zabulistan, Ghazani (Kabul); describes 217, 321; a N.W. limit to Hindustan 481; cold of 219, 526; game in 224; no honey from 203; firewood of 223; highwaymen on road to 228; wines of, taken to Hindustan 461, 551; repairs of a dam at 219, 646; a route to 206; locates Zurmut 220; a Shahrulkhi's 382 (here Kabul); Aulugh Beg and 95 n. 2; Dost Beg buried at 396; various governors of 227, 253-4, 307, 343-4, 363, 397, 525; not subjected to Babur (912 AH.) 300; rebellion in (912 AH.) 363; Khwaja Kalan and 447, 526; Babur and 199, 228, 239, 240, 330, 526.

Ghir (Khurasan), mountains of 222; w. limit to Kabul 200; road from Kabul to 214: a holder of 274.

Guram (Panj-âb), an assignment of 525.

Ghir-bund tamân (Kabul), described 214; Nil-âb (Naulibis) in 206 n. 3; roads from 205; a tulip of 215; Babur in 193, 294, 314.

Ghür (Khurasan), position of 409; a route through 94; corn from 295; a failure in 546.

Gharjistun, see Gharjistan.

Ghâwâr (Farghana, Fr. map, Gava), a surmised route through 235 n. 2.

Gibrik or Kibrik (Kafristan), people of 207.

Ginguta (Panj-âb), described 462; an occupation of 457.

Girdiz (Kabul), head-quarters in Zurmut 220; tribesmen on road to 228, 403; a road for 403; locates a place 403; Khwaja Kalâns 525; Tang-i-waghchân a name for its pass 403 n. 1.

Gogra, Ghogra, Gagar, Kakar river (U.P. India), see Saru.

Gosfand-lyâr (n. of Bannû-plain), a sheep-road travelled by Babur 233.

Goshta (Kabul), 206 n. 4.

Gâlârlâr, Gwâlor (C. India), described 607 to 612, 613-4; Babur's building in 520; hills of 486; revenue of 521; forms of the name 486; ruler of killed at Panjaq 477; hostile to Bâbur 523-9 (where add "Gâlâlr" after Dûlpûr, l. 4 fr. foot), 539; assigned 539; gained 540; reinforced 547, 557; Bâbur's visit to 605, 552, 607 to 614; on envoy from 612; sedition in 688-9, 690, *692 n. 1.

Gâî-water, Gumtâ (U.P. India), course of 485 (where for "Gumti" read (Bâbur's) Gui); Babur on 601, 658, 683-4.

Gujrat (Panj-âb), a tree of; a ruler in 481; affairs of 534-5.

Gûk-sârâi (Samarkand), described 41 n. 2, 63, 77; ascension-stone in 77 n. 5; a Mirza sent to 41.

Gul-i-bâhâr (Kohistân, Kâbul), described (without name) 214-5; fish-catching in 226, Bâbur at 320-1, 406-7.

Gûmî valley and river (N.W.F.P. India), Bâbur and 235-6.

Gûmbazak pass (Khurasân; see Fr. map Maimêne), Bâbur at 294.

Gûmâz-i-chaman (Farghana), Bâbur at 176.

Gûrâ-khattari (Panj-âb), Bâbur and 230, 294.

Gurghun-su (s.e. of the Caspian), Hûsain Bâgar swims 259, 260 n. 6.

Guzar var. (Qandahar?), Bâbur at 332.

Hâ-darwesh waste (Farghana), described 9, 9, 151; *birthplace of Bâbur's legendary son 358 n. 2.

Haft-bacha pass (Hindû-kush), described 203.

Hâjî-ghât pass (Hindû-kush), turns Hindû-kush 205 n. 2.

Hâjipûr (Bihar, India), Babur and 674; a governor of 663 n. 6.

Hâjî-tarkhan = Astrakhân (on the Caspian), a chief of 258.

Haldî-gur (U.P. India), location of 668 n. 2, 669 n. 1, 671 n. 1; Babur's men cross 668-9, 675.

Hâlwâ-chashma (Khurasân), a victory at 260.

Hammadân (Persia), a saint of 211; *a soldier of 700.

Hamatû pass (Panj-âb), Bâbur crosses 381.

Hangu (N.W.F.P. India), Bâbur at 231-2.

Harmand-, Halmand-river (Afghânistan), source of 216; a drowning in 307.

Harû, Kacha-kot water (Panj-âb), Bâbur crosses 379, 452; an Indus-ford near 206 n. 5.

Hash(t)-nagar (N.W.F.P. India), a limit of Kâbul 200; desolate 207; rhinoceros in 490; birds of 497, 500; places a place 376; Bâbur advised to raid 410-1.

Hasht-yak (W. Turkistân), Bâbur near 151.

Hâtya (Panj-âb), limit of a clan 452 n. 5.

Hazarasp (Khwarizm), a holder of 50.

Heri, Herât (Khurasân), description of 304 to 306; Hûsain Bâgar's birthplace 256, conquest of 134, splendid rule in 273, ease in 261, feast in 264, delay of a

1 Babur's itinerary gives Gharjistan a greater eastward extent than the Fr. map Maimêne allows, thus agreeing with Erskine's surmise (Memoirs p. 152 n. 1).—The first syllable of the name may be "Ghur".
for a sign of victory *440; his fifth expedition fixes dates 269, 545; indications that only the fifth aimed at Dihl *429, *444, 480; his decisive victories, at Pānīpat 475, at Kanvâ 574; references to his conquest 220, 561; some of his Begs wish to leave 524–5, 579, 584; his Hindustān poems 642, App. Q; his ease in and hints at leaving 617, 645, 686; his family brought to 646, 686;—the *Abbar-nāma chronicles no public events of 936–937 AH. in 682; *Bābur’s journey to Lāhor (936 AH.) may point to his leaving Hindustān 707; *Humāyūn’s arrival in 696, 707; *on Bābur’s intended disposal of Hindustān 702 to 708; *burial of his body in 709 and later removal from 709–710;—Bābur’s description of Hindustān 478 to 531, viz. —Introduction, on earlier Tramontane expeditions into 478 to 480, boundaries and capital of 480, rulers in 932 AH. 481, varied climate, character of and northern mountains 484; rivers and Arāvalli range 485; irrigation 486, other particulars 487,—mammals 488, birds 493, aquatic animals 501, fruits 503, flowers 513;—seasons of the year 515, days of the week 516, division of time 516, weights and measures 517, modes of reckoning 518;—Hindūs in 518,—defects and advantages of 518–9, 531, 532, revenues 520–1.

Hindū-kush mountains, n. boundary of Kābul 200–4; connected ranges 210, 380; called Hindū-kush in Kābul 485; account of their prolongation in Hind (i.e. Hīmulayas), 485; roads and passes of 204–5; the clouds a hindrance to bird-migration 224; limits of territory fixed by 47–9, 194; an episode on 270 *Bābur’s crossing 930 AH. 442.

Hīsār-frūza (Pañj-āb), revenue of 521; given to Humāyūn 465, 466, 528; occupation near 540.

Hīsār (-shādman; Transoxiana), mountains of 222; clans from 228; Kābul trade with 202—Abā-bikr and 51; Mahmūd and 47–9; Mas’ūd and 52, 64, 71, 93–5, 261; Bāi-sung-har and 52, 61, 96, 110–2; Husain and 48, 57–8–9, 61, 130, 191, 260–3, 275; Bābur traverses 128, 130, 187–8, moves for *352, takes 37, 262, *352–3, defends *358, 471, attacked in 345, *361–2, leaves 362–3;—Mughūls leave 58 and rebel 105; goes to 104, 141; Shāibānī and 192, 244, *362; abandoned by the Aūzbēgs 622–4; Khusrav Shāh and see s.n.; *threefold catastrophe in 362; Humāyūn ordered to attack 625; Qāsim qūchān and 66; a governor in 46–7; occupied for Bābur 640.

Hormuz (Persia), Farghāna almonds imported to 9.

Hūnī (Kābul), Bābur at 405.
Ilyak-súa, Khánámíghán (Hísár-shárdmán), locates a place 48 n. 5.

Indri (U.P. India), an arrival at 456.

Indus, see Sind-daryá.

Iráq (Persia), Kábul trade with 202; various captures of 49, 51, 280, 336; envos to and from 540, 583, 666; other comings and goings from and to 20, 46, 260–2–8; 275, 282–7, 291–4 n. 3, 622; Babur’s gifts to kinsfolk in 522.

Iráqin, i.e. ‘Irág-i-‘ajam and ‘Irág-i-‘arábí, places noted for cold in 219.

Irj or Irich (C. India), Babur by 590.

Ishkimish (Qúndúz), not in Badakhshán 288; on a named route 321; military activity at 60, 192, 243.

Ispahan (Persia), a governor of 635 n. 6.

Istlif (Kábul), described 216; a garden at 246; fishing at 226; Babur at 246, 406, 416–8.

Jagdálík pass (Kábul), Babur crosses 229, 341, 414.

Jahán-námá fort (Bíhára, Panj-áb), Babur in 384 (where for “núma” read namá).

Jahán-námá hill (Díbbál district), 485.

Jahán-námá’l (Kábul), Babur at 421; see Jáí-šáhí.

Jajmáh or Jajmáwa (U.P. India), rebels in 533; a submission near 534.

Jakín pargana (U.P. India), Babur in 644.

Jálandhar (Panj-áb), an appointment to 442.

Jalísar, Jalesar (on the Jumna, U.P. India), Humáýún at 531; Babur at 589, 640 (in both places read Jalísar).

Jalísar, Jalesar (on the Ghográ, U.P. India), Babur at 681; perhaps Chakras 681 n. 4.

Jálífh (w. frontier, Kábul), 205 n. 2.

Jál-tú var. Chá-tú (Kábul), Babur at 228.

Jám, mod. Jám-rúd (N.W.F.P. India), Babur at 229, 230, 412.

Jám (Khurásán), Háifíl’s birthplace 288; how marked in maps 623 n. 8; *714; Jámi the cognomen of Mauláná ‘Abdur-rahíman q.v.; Aüzíbég defeat near 622 n. 1, 625 n. 4, 635, 636 n. 2, details as to location of the battle 623 n. 8, 635 n. 4.

Janára or Chánára (U.P. India), rebels take refuge in 682; not identified 682 n. 1.

Janglík (Kábul), Babur at 251–3, 311–4 n. 1.

Jáswán-dún (Panj-áb), described 462; Babur in 461–3.

Jaunpúr (U.P. India), see Júnpúr.
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403–4; 5–7–8; 415–18–19; 441–2–3; other
comings and goings 51, 196, 228, 321,
349, 364–5, 385, 399, 531, 539, 544,*696,
687, 699; men sent to 343, 413, 446,
476; various Begins arrive in or leave
269–606, 616; family journey from 646–7,
650–5–7–8, 686–7–9 n. 5; followers
delay to go to 307; *landless men in 706;
excess levy of grain on 228; its sir* (weight)
632; officers in 250, 270, 273, 382, 646
n. 3; newly-made begs of 458, 524;—
anxiety for 300, 307; disloyalty in 313–
320, 331, 345; *tqnal 349; *Mughils
of 357; of its troops 375, 550, 579, 625;
—Babur in the it the last ruling Timurid 340,
*427; envos to him in *439–440, *441,
529; his poverty in 525; learns the word
sangur in 232; family affairs in *603–4;
—letters of victory sent to 371, 466, 580;
other letters to and from 374, 541, 618,
639, 645–59; gifts 463, 523, 642; Babur's
seemingly intention of return to 698 n. 5,
*705–6–7; his chosen centre *705; the
taking of his body to *709–10; his burial-
garden and grave *710–11.

Kabul-water, Nil-āb a name of 206 n. 3;
forls of 206, 345, 411; App. E xvii, xix,
xx; Babur on 451.

Kabūd (Soghd, Samarkand), 73; 98.
Kachako-kot (Panj-āb), a holder of 250; Babur
crosses water of (Ilfarū) 379, 403, 452.
Kachhwa (C. India), described 590; Babur at
590–2.

Kānhrīstān, mountains connecting with its own
480; former extent of 212 n. 3; border-
lands of 210–1–2; wines of 211–2, 372;
highwaymen of 205, 214; a ghāzī raid
into 46.

Kahastān (Herī), Babur at 305; Shāhābīnī
at 329.

Kāhān (Sind, India), Shāh Beg's capture of

Kahlūr (Simal Hill-state, India), taken for
Babur 464; *its Rāja visits him, 692–9.

Kāhmard or Kālmard (Kābul-Balkh route,
Fr. map Māimēnē), a plan for defence of
191; a governor in 409, 546 n. 2;
exposed to Aīzāb attack 409; various
occurrences in it 239, 250, 295; Babur in
48, 189; households left in 189, 194–7;
Babur loyal to Jahāngīr in 190, 239; he
sends gifts to peasants of 633; (see Ajar).

Kahrāj (N.W.F.P. India), Babur at 373–4.

Kakar river (N. India), see Gagar, Ghaggar.
Kālabāgh (Panj-āb), located Dīnkot 206, n. 5.
Kālānjīr (Panj-āb), perverted allegiance of 387
(whole n. 3 delete the second sentence).

Kālānjīr (U.P. India), revenue of 521;
Mahuba a dependency of 685 n. 3.

Kālanūr (Panj-āb), a governor of 442; Babur
and 451–8.

Kālda-khār (Panj-āb), described 381; Babur
at 381–9, 391.

Kalpi (U.P. India), revenue of 521; elephants
in 438; dependencies of 649, 686; locates
places 544, 590, 659; hostile to Babur
523; Babur in 590; boats from 598, 684.

Kālpūsh (Khorāsān), 622 n. 3.

Kāma bulūk (Kābul), described 213; water
of 211.

Kamari (Kābul), meadow of 204; Babur at
244; (on the Indus), Babur at 230.

Kām-rūd valley (Hīsār-shādān), a flight
through 58; Babur in 129–30.

Kānār ferry (Jumna U.P. India), Babur at
589, 590–8.

Kān-bā (Samarkand), locates places 52, 64;
Mahmūd (Khān) at 53, 111.

Kandār, Kuhandār (Rājpūṭāna), besieged by
Sāngā, surrenders 530–9.

Kandī-bādām (Farghāna), described 8, locates
a place 20; a governor of 115; passers
through 44, 172; Babur at 92, *358 n. 2
(a legendary visit).

Kandla or Kándla (U.P. India), revenue of
521; an assignment on 679.

Kāngra (Panj-āb), a "Bajaur" north of 511
n. 3.

Kānhpūr, "Cawnpore" (U.P. India), 649
n. 7.

Kanigūram (Dasht-Kābul route), 235 n. 2.

Kanwā, Kanwāha (Rājpūṭāna), Babur's
victory of 549, 557 to 574, 523 n. 3.

Kanwāhīn (Panj-āb), Babur at 458.

Karat (Panj-āb), Babur at 464.

Kārā-sū, Qarā-sū? (Kābul), a tribe on 413.

Karg-khānā, see Sawād.

Kark? (Kābul), Babur at 395.

Karrnā (Irāq), surrenders 51; an intruder
in 260.

Kārmā-nāsā river (Bihār, India), ill-repute of
659; Babur on 659–60.

Kar-māsh mountain (Kābul), located 403;
Babur near 403–5.

Kārmīnā (Samarkand), mentioned as a
wilāyat 84.

Karnāl (U.P. India), *Bābur at 701.

Karnān (Farghāna), a village of 161; locates
place 162, 168 (where in section heading
for "Kāsān" roaKārnān); a darogha of
179–80; Babur and 179, *182.

Karrā (U.P.I.), a dependency of 651; Babur
at 652.

Karrāh-Mānīkpūr (U.P. India), revenue of
521; elephants in 488; 3humāyūn near
544.

Kāsān (Farghāna), described 10; fixes a date
28; a raid near 26; a departure to 32;
a holder of hostile to Babur 170; Babur
at 104, 116.

Kāsīnghar (E. Turkīstān), an e. limit of
Farghāna 1, of Samarkand 76; a border
tribe of 55; *Kāshghar–Farghāna road
183; trade with Kābul 202, Andijānī
captives in 20 n. 3; rulers in 21, 29 n. 5,
32–7, 318, 415, 427, 695–6; Mughuls in
*184, 351, 364; arrivals from 399, 415–6;
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Bābur’s kinsfolk in 21–4, 318, 409, 522; a devious journey through 399; a return from 408, and to 590.

Kashmir, mountains of 380-7, 481; a bird of 494; lost dependencies of 484; Bābur on name of 484, *sends an expedition to 692–3–8 n. 5, 701. Additional Note p. 693.

Kātālān (N.W. F. P. India), Bābur at 377.

Kattawāz-plain (Ghaznī?), torrent of 240; Bābur in 323–5.

Kawārī-water (C. India), Bābur crosses 607, 614.

Kechef-dara (Khurāsān), leads down to Mashhad 622 n. 3.

Kesh = Shahr-i-sabz (Samarkand), described 3, 83; a blinded refugee in 95; Banā‘ī dismissed to 136; an arrival from 137; Bābur and 125–8, 138.

Keshkūd (Īsār-shāhmān tract), Bābur at 130.

Khāibār-mountains (Kābul), route through 206; crossings of 250, 260, 492; Bābur’s crossings of 229, 382, 411–3.

Khairābād (U.P. India), revenue of 521; Bābur’s army at 583.

Khākān-arīq (Farghāna), Bābur on 165–7.

Khallīa (Soghd, Samarkand), Bābur at 148.

Khalishak (Qandahār), a water-head 332; Bābur at 333.

Khamalangan (Badakhshān), a holder of 242.

Khamchān (Badakhshān), military move to 321.

Khān-yūrti (Samarkand), described 82; Bābur at 67–8, 82, 124, 131.

Khārābīk (Farghāna), Bābur near 163–8.

Khārbīn (s.e. of Ghaznī), 323 n. 3.

Khāri (U.P. India), Bābur at 580.

Khārid pargana (on the Sarū = Ghogrā), formerly on both banks of the river 561 n. 2, 664 n. 8, 674 n. 6; present limits 637, n. 1; position of town of 679 and n. 1; a (now) Bihār pargana of 674; Humāyūn plunders 544; capture of mentioned 561; Bābur’s man in 637; position of its army opposing Bābur 664, 676 n. 5.

Khārtān (Samarkand), a celebrity of 76.

Khāsān plain (Farghāna), Bābur crosses 124.

Khāsīr (W. Turkistān), Bābur at 151.

Kawāk road (Hindū-kush), 205; height of its pass 204, n. 4.

Khwāl-i-qūtī (see Zirrin pass), Bābur in 309.

Khinjan (n. of Hindū-kush), roads to 205.

Khirgird or Khirjard (Khurāsān), Jāmī’s birthplace 623, n. 8; battle of Jām fought near 623, 635.

Khīs-khāna (Kābul), Bābur passes 417.

Khitāi = N. China, a caravan from 15; porcelain, etc. from 80, 157–9, 160; trade profits in 202. [N.B.—For all instances Bābur’s word is Khítāi and not “China”.]

Khōzār or Khūzār (Samarkand), mentioned as a wīlāyāt 84; lost by Aūzbegs, 135, 359.

Khūbān or Khūnān (Farghāna), approx. site of Bābur’s first ranged battle 113.

Khujand var. (Farghāna), described 7; not counted by all as in Farghāna 17; locates a place 55; holders of 35, 115; Ahmad Mirān-shāhī takes 30; surrender to Bābur of 53; Bābur’s first marriage made in it 35, 120; he in it 89, 90–1–2; a “poor place” 97–8; he halts in a village of 100; his legendary transit of 358 n. 2; a follower’s compulsory journey to 124.

Khujand-water, Sāhīn, Sir-daryā, see Sāhīn. Khūlm (Kābul-Balkh road, Fr. map Bokhara), vine-culture in 210 n. 6; places on its river 546 n. 2.

Khūqān (Farghāna), an arrival at 44; Bābur at 161.

Khurāsān, Khurāsānī (219), Hindustānī use of the name 202; Kābul roads from 205, 300; Kābul trade with 202, 225; melons and oranges of 203, 510, compared with Kābul Koh-dāman 216; *hammāms in 79; medical practice in 246; refined manners of Khurāsānīs 303; nomads of 221; *enforced migration of Mughūls to 351; — Maḥmūd Ghausnawī and 479; Abū sa’īd’s Cadet Corps of 28, 50, App. H, xxvi, xxvii; Yūnas Khān in 20; Abābikr defeated in 260; Maḥmūd expelled from 46; Mas‘ūd “did not stay in” 95 (where add the quoted words, l. 12, after “service”); Badī‘uz’-zamān returns to 70; Ḥusain Bālīg, and 57, 94, 259–60–80–3; Bābur and 185–7–8, 255, 285–6, 295, 300, 330–2; Ma’sūma in 36, 339; — troops of 61, 296; dismissals to 98, 128, 194–7, 319, 320; comings and goings from and to 15, 194, 197, *243, 264, 270, 331, 363; distinguished men of 280–2–4, 291; Bābur’s kinsfolk in 246, 253, 522, 617; a verse well known in 328.

Khūrd (Khwurd)-Kābul (Kābul), wild asses in 224; river-dam of 647; Bābur in 341.

Khurrām (Kābul-Balkh route), traitors to Bābur near 546 (Fr. map Maimêné, Khouram).

Khūsh-āb (Panj-āb), Abā-bikr in 260; Bābur regards it as his own 380–2; Dalūchis in 383; an enemy to 383–4, 388; a governor of 388; a fugitive through 399.

Khutan, Khotin (E. Turkistān), Allīchī the capital of 50 n. 2; Gūrkhan a title of rulers in 84 n. 2; a ruler in 32.

Khutlūn (Īsār-shāhmān territory), river and alps of 60, 222; a saint’s burial in 211; a ruler and holders of 47, 58, 93, 191–6; Bābur’s victory in 18.

Khwāja ‘Abdu’s-samad (Kābul), 201.

Khwāja Basta (Kābul), a water-course near 647.

Khwāja Bikargān (Farghāna), water of 99 n. 4.

Khwāja Changal (Tāḥqān), 61; located 60 n. 4.

Khwāja Chār-tāq (Qūndūz) 244.

Khwāja Didār (Samarkand), Bābur’s winters in 73–4; Shāh-bānī near 130–1–5; Bābur passes 147.

Khwāja Ḥasan (Kābul), Bābur passes 398, 418.
Khwāja 'Imād (Hīsār-shādmand), Bābur at 188.
Khwāja Ismā'īl Sīrīf (s.e. of the Kābul territory), mountains of 223; Bābur at 323-4.
Khwāja Kafshīr (Samarkand), escapes by 62, 144.
Khwāja Kārdzan var. Kardzin (Samarkand), 65, 128; Shaibānī at 138.
Khwāja Khāwand Sa'id (Kābul), wines of 203, 215.
Khwāja Kītā (Farghāna), Babur at 165.
Khwāja Khizr (N.W.F.P. India), Babur at 372-6.
Khwāja Khizr's Qadam-gāh (Kābul), 201, 407.
Khwāja Khizr's Mosque (Samarkand), 142.
Khwāja-rabāt (Samarkand), 73, 97, 127-8, 130-1.
Khwāja Raushānāt's Chashma (Kābul), 201.
Khwāja Reg-i rawān (Kohstān, Kābul), described 215; Bābur at 420.
Khwāja Riwāj (Kābul), rebels go to 245, 345.
Khwāja Rustam (Kābul), Babur near 447.
Khwāja Shahāb (Kābul), Babur at 418.
Khwāja Shamū's tomb (Kābul), 201.
Khwāja Sīh-yārān (Kābul), described 216; names of the "Three friends" 216, n. 4; Bābur at 398, 405-6-20.
Khwāja Zaid (n. of Hindū-kūsh), Bābur at 195.
Khwās (Samarkand border?), 'Umar Shaikh defeated at 17, 34; located 17 and n. 1.
Khwārizm = Khiva, w. limit of Samarkand 76; and northern of Khurāsān 261; cold in 219; Mahmūd Ghansawī's over-rule in 479; Chin Siyāf defends 242, 255-6; Khusru Shāh's head sent to 244; a Bāqīrā refugee in 397; governors of 256, 274; Muhammad Šāhī of it 289 n. 4.
Khwāst, "Khost" (n. of Hindū-kush), mountains of 221; name and character of 221 n. 4; a mullā of 368; Mīr-zādās of 412; comers and goers from and to 399, 403, 196 n. 5; piety of Khwāstīs 523 n. 1; *Māhim Begim's connection with 714; Babur at *363, 408.
Kīlā-gāh (n. of Hindū-kush), a fugitive through 321.
Kilirah? (U.P. India), Bābur at 680.
Kīlf ferry (Oxus), Husain Bāi-garā and 57, 191.
Kīndīr-taq (below Bāghdād), height of 83.
Kītib or Kīb (Panj-āb), an appointment to 393.
Koel, Kūl, Kūl (U.P. India), see Kūl.
Kohāt (Panj-āb), Bābur in 218-31-33-50, 382-94.
Koh-bacha (var. ?a common noun; Kābul), tooth-picks gathered on 407.
Koh-dāman (Herāt), an appointment to 274.
Koh-dāman (Kābul), described 215 to 217; Bābur on 320, 405, 416, 420.
Koh-i-jūd, Salt-range (Panj-āb), described 379; places connecting with 381, 452; a note of Erskine's on 380 n. 2.
Koh-khīrāj (U.P. India), Bābur at 653.
Kohik, Chāpān-ātā g.v. (Samarkand), described 76 n. 4; gardens on 78, 80; bounds a meadow 82; Bābur near 72.
Kohik-sū = Zar-asfān (Samarkand), course and name 76, 76 n. 4; bounds a meadow 82, and a tāmūn 84; suggested drowning in 128 n. 2; Bābur and 64, 130-1; swims it in flood 140.
Koh-i-nūr, Rocky - mountain (Kābul), see Kūnār.
Koh-i-safed, Spīn-ghur (Kābul), described 209; Pushtū name of 209 n. 2; App. E, xvii, xix, xx.
Kohistan (Badakhshān), begins of 296; — (Kābul), villages of described 214 and n. 7; a tāmūn of 213; rava avis of 213 n. 7.
Kohit mountains (s. of Samarkand), limits possessions of territory 47.
Kūftin (Samarkand), 65.
Kūkcha-sī (Badakhshān), 321.
Kūl, Kūl, Koel (U.P. India), a governor of 176; Bābur's building-work in 520 (here Kūl), his envoy to 526, loss of 557, 576, visit to 586-7.
Kūl-āb (Badakhshān), a chief of 627 n. 2, *696.
Kula-grām (Kūnār, Kābul), Bābur at 423.
Kuldjā (E. Turkistān), Alamīgh the former capital of 2 n. 1; *The Khāns escape after defeat by its road 183 (where read Kuldja).
Kul-kīnā or Gul-kīnā (Kābul), a place of revel 200-1, 395.
Kūl-i-malik (Bukhārā), Bābur defeated at 40, *357.
Kūnār with Nūr-gal (Kābul), described 211; is Koh-i-nūr (Rocky-mountain), the true name of, App. F, xxiii, xxiv; torrent of 212; beer made in 423; peacocks in 493; a test of woman's virtue in 212, governors in 227, 344; Bābur in 343, 376, 423.
Kundi (Lamghānāt, Kābul), see Multa-kundī.
Kündih or Kündbah (Bihār, India), Bābur at 674-7, 687 n. 3 (where read the name as above).
Kūra pass (Kābul), divides the hot and cold climates 220; Bābur at 421.
Kūrārah (U.P. India), Bābur at 651.
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Kūrdūm-dabān (Farghāna), 5 n. 3.
Karī (U.P. India), Bābur at 651.
Kurrat-tāziyān (Kābul), see Dasht-i-shaikh.
Kusār (U.P. India), Bābur at 652.
Kushān (Persia), locates Rādāgan 622 n. 4.
Kūtīla (Panj-āb), Bābur gains 462; strength of 463.
Kūtīla-lake, mod. Kotila-jhil (Gurgaon, Panj-āb), Bābur at 580 and n. 1.
Kūy-pāyān, Low-lane (Samarkand), 146.

Lāhūr, Lahor (Panj-āb), revenues of 446, 521; snows seen from 485; water-wheels of 486, 532; locates Sīālkoṭ 429; Daulat Khān and 382–3, *428, *441–2–3, 451; Bābur’s envoy detained in 385; ‘Ālam Khān and 444, 455–8; Bābur’s begs in 443, 453–4; sedition in 688; *Bābur’s visit to (936 A.H.) 604 n. 1, *692–3–7–8–9, 707; Māhmūd and 650–9; *taken by Kāmrān (where for “935” read 938).
Lak-lakān (s. of Tashkint), a hostile meeting at 145.
Lakhna, Lakhnau, Luknau, “Lucknow” (U.P. India), a bird of 495; abandoned by Bābur’s men 594; Bābur at 601; *Bibān and Bāyāzīd approach it 677; *news of capture of 679 and n. 2, 681; variants in name of 677 n. 3, 678 n. 1, 582 n. 6, App. T; see Luknūr.
Lamghānāt tūmāns (Kābul), described 207–13; true use of the name 210; classification of 200; a tūmān of 318; mountains of 222; tribes in 229, 242; fruits of 203, 424, 510–1; birds of 494–5, 500; fishing in 226; routes into 206–9; *locates, 211; Bābur in 414–19–21–*29; (see Lamghān).
Lamghān tūmān (Kābul), the name of 200 n. 1, 210; a fruit and tree of 508; limits a tribe 341; Bābur’s retreat to 21, 340; Bābur in 407–14–19–21–*29.
Lār (Persia) a native of 284.
Lasweree, Battle of (1803 A.D.) 578 n. 1.
Lāt-kint (Farghāna), Bābur at 108.
Lawānīn (U.P. India), Bābur at 656.
Lombardy (Italy), wine culture in 210 n. 5.
Luḥfigur, mod. Logār (Kābul), described 217; Chirkh its one village 217; a celebrity of 184; 217; wine-culture in 210 n. 6.
Luknūr (Rāmpūr, U.P. India), revenue of 521; besieged by Bibān 582; *approached by Bibān and Bāyāzīd 677; *news of its capture 679 and n. 2, 681.

Macha (Upper Zar-afshān), located 149, 152; ‘All Mirān-shāhī takes refuge in 55; Bābur in 27, 67, 152–3.
Macham (Farghāna), a foot-hill 118, 125 n. 2.
Madan-Banārās, Zāmania (U.P. India), Bābur at 658.

Madīnā (Arābīa), Bābur sends gifts to 523.
Mādū, Māzū (Farghāna), Bābur takes 109.
Madhākūr (U.P. India), Bābur at 548, 616 (where read as here).
Maghāk-pul (Samarkan), Bābur at 68, 132.
Mahān (Farghāna), Bābur at 123.
Mahāwīn (Muttra; U.P. India), not submissive to Bābur 523.
Mahūba (U.P. India), rebels take flight to 685, 682 n. 1.
Mahūrā-sangur (N.W.F.P. India), locates a tribe 376.
Mahyar (N.W.F.P. India), 373 n. 6.
Maidān (Kābul), the road to 228; earthquake action near 247; white marble of 710.
Maidān-i-Rustam (Kābul), Bābur at 405.
Māing (U.P. India), Bābur near 683.
Makka (Arabia), Bābur sends money gifts to 522, and a Qorān in his script 228 n. 3; pilgrims to 26, 267 n. 2, etc.
Malabar, a succession-custom in 482 n. 5.
Malarā (Rājpūtāna), revenue of 521.
Malot, see Milwat.
Mālā (C. India), an observatory at 79; known in Bābur’s day as Mandāū g.v. 79.
Māmā Khāṭān (Kābul), 405.
Mānas-nī (nai; Rājpūtāna), other names of 578 n. 1; reputed outfall of 580; Bābur on 578–9.
Mandāghān (Khurāsān), Bābur at 295.
Mandāū, Mandū (C. India), capital of Mālā 482 n. 2; Mālā known as 79, 482; hills of 486; a ruler of 482; a holder of 593, 688 n. 2, downfall of sulţāns of 483; [Elphinstone Codex passim and Haidara- bad Codex, except on p. 79 where “Mandū” occurs, write Mandāū].
Mandish, Mandesh (N.W.F.P. India), Bābur at 375.
Mandrāvar tūmān (Kābul), described 210; one of the three constituents of the true Lamghānāt 210; a village of 424; holders of 229, 344; Bābur in 321, 421.
Mānikpūr (U.P. India), revenue of 521; elephants in 489.
Māqām (N.W.F.P. India), perhaps mod. Mandāū 377 n. 2; Bābur near 377–8.
Marāgha (Āzar-bāyiğān, Caspian Sea), astronomical Tables constructed at 79.
Marghīnān (Farghāna), described 6; bullies of 71; a celebrity of 7, 76; locates a place 7; comings and goings from and to 30, 97 n. 2, 173; lost to Bābur 30; recovered by him 99–100; rebel attack on 101–2; Bābur in 103, 123, 162–9, 172.
Marūchāq (on the Murgh-āb, Khurāsān), Aūzbeg raiders defeated at 296.
Marvār (Rājpūtāna), Sangā’s approach from 544 n. 5.
Mashhad (Khurāsān), a celebrity of 285; a Bā-qi-qaq holder of 263, 296, 329–30; held by Aūzbegs 534, 623; Tāhmāsp’s route to 622 n. 3.

1 On p. 7, l. 1, after “turbulent”, add, “They are notorious in Māwarā’u’n-nahr for their bullying.”
Masht (Ghazni ?), a tribe in 323.
Masjid-i-jauza (Farghāna), described 5.
Masjid-i-laqlqa (Samarkand), described 80.
Masjid-i-maqua' (Samarkand), described 79.
Māstūng, Quetta (Balūchistān), Shāh Beg and 337, *427 (where read Māstūng).
Mātarid (Samarkand), a celebrity of 75.
Māwarā'ūn-nahr, Transoxiana, name of the country of Samarkand 74; name includes Farghāna 76; melons and wines of 82-3; bullies in 7 (see s.n. Marghīnān for an omission); Leaders of Islam born in 7, 75-6; three strong forts in 3; an appoint- ment in its interests 61, 85; in Aūzbeg hands 427, 480, 618; *Bābur's desire to regain 697 n. 1 (and s.n. Bābur).
Mehtār-Šulaimān range (Afgān border), a shrine on 238; Bābur and 236-8.
Merv, Marv (Khurāsān), comings and goings from and to 135-7, 296, 301, *357, 623; chiefs of 261, 244; *Ali-sher winters in 287; Bābur's sister in 18, *352; Shaibānī defeated and killed near 318, *350; *Ubayd and 534, 618, 622.
Mewāt, Miwāt (Rājpūtāna), revenue of 521; hills of 486; account of 577-8-9; holders of 523, 551; Bābur orders a raid on 551; Kānwa casualties on the road to 577; Bābur at 578.
Mīān-dū-āb, "Doab" (between Ganges and Jumna), revenue of 521; archers of 526-8, 551-7; a fargana bestowed in 539; *Ālam Khān goes to 457; Tibrāhim advances into 467; Bābur puts down a rebel in 576.
Mīān-kālī, Miyan-kāl (Samarkand), returns to Bābur 135; Aūzbegs in 622.
Mīān-kalāī (N.W.F.P. India), Bābur in 373; ? a dū-āb 373 n. 6.
Mīān-wilāyat, Miyan-wilāyat (U. P. India), revenue of 521.
Mīch-grām (Kābul), a tribe in 413; Bābur at 414.
Mīl (Kāfīrīstān), position of 210.
Mīlwaṭ, Malot (Panj-āb), prisoners sent to 461.
Mīlwaṭ, Malot (U. P. India), Bābur's capture of 457-8, 461.
Mīnār-hill (Kābul), Bābur crosses 314.
Mīr Ghiyāṣ-langar (Khurāsān), Bābur at 307-8.
Mīrzā-rābāt (Farghāna), w. wind over 9 n. 2, *183.
Mīṣr, Egypt, compared with a Samarkand tāmān 84; *Napoleon's task in 356.
Mītt-kachha (Kohistān, Kābul), described 214.
Mūghūlīstān, mountains of 222; game in 325; Aspara in 20; Yūnās Khān in 12; a Mughūl tāmān enters 20; *Mughūls forced to go far from 351; a dweller in 114; Bābur thinks of going to 158, *184.
Muhammad Aghā's village (Kābul), Bābur at 405.
Muhammad Chap's Bridge (Samarkand), 72.
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Muḥammad-fajj (N.W.F.P. India), meaning of the name 229 n. 5; Bābur at 231.
Multa-kūndi (Kābul), defined 211.
Mūltān (Panj-āb), the Five-rivers meet near 485; a dependency of 237; fowlers migrated from 225; Abā-bīr at 260; Daulat Khān and 441-2; 'Askari recalled from *603, 605; Kāmān and 645, 699.
Mungīr (Bengal), Bābur's envoy to 676.
Munīr (Bībār, India), Bābur at 666-7, 670.
Mūntūghul-ṭāgh (Farghāna), variants in name of 8 n. 5; mines and malarial influence of 8; surmised action on wind of (here Mogol-tau) 9 n. 2; (see Abūl-gāhā, Dēsmaisons p. 12).
Muqur (Afghanistān), Bābur at 345.
Mūra-pass (Iṣfār-shād mān), 58 n. 1; Bābur crosses 129 (not named).
Murgh-āb river and fort (Khurāsān), Ḥusain Bāt-garā and 191, 260; Bābur on 285, 297-9, 300; Shaibānī at 327.
Murghān-koh (Qandahār), position of 332 n. 4; Bābur at 336.
Mūrū and Adūsa, Bāburpūr (U. P. India), Bābur at 644.
Muttra (U. P. India), see Mahāwīn.

Naghr or Naglīz (Kābul), a s. limit of Kābul 200; position of 206, 231-3.
Nagūr, Nagor (Rājpūtāna), revenue of 521.
Nakhshab (Samarkand), see Qarshī.
Namāngān (Farghāna), new canal of App. A, ii, n. 1; Bābur near 117.
Nānāpur (U. P. India), Bābur at 657.
Nānī (Ghazni), Bābur at 240; old Nānī plundered 254.
Napoleon's* task in Egypt compared 356.
Nārdak* (U. P. India), a hunting-ground 701.
Nārīn (n. of Hindu-kush), a fugitive through 321.
Nārmūl (U. P. India), an assignment on 677.
Naṣīkh (Farghāna), Bābur at 92.
Nathūpūr or Fathpūr (U. P. India), Bābur near 680-1.
Naugrām (U. P. India), Bābur meets his sister at 689 n. 3.
Nījr-āl tāmān (Kābul), described 213; moun- tains of 222; products of 203, 213; boiled wine in 213; a dependency of 220; locates Ālā-sāt 220; Bābur in 253, 420-1, his frontier-post of 213 n. 2.
Nil-āb (Indus), various instances of the name 206 n. 3; a tribal limit 378, 387; routes to Kābul from 206; old Nil-āb located 392; comings and goings from and to 250, 265, 399, 419, 422, 647, 659; given to Humayūn 391; Bābur at 392, counts his army at 451.
Nīlī (The),* used as an illustration 9 n. 2; Alexander takes the Indus for 206 n. 3.
Ning-nahār tāmān (Kābul) described 207-9;
its book-name Nagarahār 207; meaning of the name 208, App. E; not included in the Lamghānāt 210; a dependency of 213; waters of 209, App. E; wintering tribes 242; a bird of 493; division of hot and cold climates n 229; Bāgh-i-wafā laid out in 208; holders of 227, 317, 344, 421; an arrival from 345; Bābur at 342.

Sirah-tū or Sirah-tū, Kālūn (Heri), Shābdān’s family in 343.

Nīrūn (Bihār, Indiā), Bābur at 674.

Nīrkh-pass, Takht-pass (Kābul), Bābur crosses 228.

Nishāpūr (Khurāsān), mentioned as on a route 622 n. 3.

Nishīn-meadow (Heri), Ḵūsain Bār-garā and 95, 261.

Nū-kīnt (Farghānā), locates an enemy 116; threatened 170.

Nulbā (U.P. Indiā), Bābur at 657.

Nūndāk, Ḵ. S. Nawāndāk (Chaghānān q.v.), located 471; Barlās family of 51 (where “Badakhshān” is wrong); Bābur near 129; Aḥzābs retires to 471.

Nūr-gal (Kābul), described 211; meaning of its name, App. F, xxiii; holders of 227, 334; Bābur at 343, 423.

Nūr-lām (Kābul), see App. F, xxiii.

Nūr-valley (Kābul), see Dāra-i-nūr.

Nūsh-āb (Farghānā), Bābur near 114.

Otrār (W. Turkistān), see Aūtrār.

Oude, Oudh, Aūd, Adiṣhadhā (U.P. Indiā), revenue of 521; river-crossings to 669; locates places 601–2, 679 n. 2; army of 684–5; a bird of 495; appointment to 544; ? Bābur at 680 and n. 2; his Mosque in App. U.

Pakhī, Pakhī (Panj-āb), formerly part of Kashmir 484.

Paighar (Samarkand), limit of Samarkand on upper Zar-afshān 152.

Pamghān range and village, Paghmān (Kābul), described 215–6; village destroyed by earthquake 247; Shāh Begmīn’s 318; *snows seen from Bābur’s burial-garden 710.

Pāmīr routes, *spring re-opening of 695.

Pānī-mālī or -mānī (N.W.F.P. Indiā), the road to 376.

Pānīpāt (Panj-āb), battles at 472 n. 1; Bābur’s victory at 457, 469, 470–1–2, 534.

Panj-āb (Indiā), of the name App. E, xx; *Bābur’s power in 426, 430; *Daulat Khān’s strength in 412, 443; Bābur’s journey to (937 AH.), 604 n. 1, *698.

Panj-dīh, Pand-dīh (Khurāsān), Aḥzāb raiders beaten at 296.

Panjhir, Panj-sher tūmān (Kābul), described 214; pass-roads of 195–6, 203; highways of 214; river of 407; a dārogha in 250.

Panj-kūrā (N.W. F. P. Indiā), Bābur at 373–4. Pāp (Farghānā), holds fast for Bābur 91, 101; affairs in 171–4–6 n. 3.

Pārāndi-pass (Hindū-kush), described 205; height of 204 n. 4.

Parashāwar, Peschāwar (N.W.F.P. Indiā), a limit of Kābul 200; beauty of flowers near 393; rhinoceros of 490; partridges in 496; Bīgrām near 230 n. 2; Bābur and 382, 393, 410–2.

Parhāla (Panj-āb), a Kakar stronghold 387–9; described and taken by Bābur 396–7.

Parsurā-river (U.P. Indiā), Bābur on 682–3.

Parsurā, Parsurār (Panj-āb), an assignment on 684; Bābur at 458; G. of Indiā form of name Pasrūr 684 n. 1.

Pār-wān (Kohistān, Kābul), described 214–5; wind of 201, 224; road and pass of 205; fishing in 226, 406; wines and flowers of 215.

Pashāghār (Samarkand), described 97; a native of 188; Bābur at 97–8, 148.

Pātakh-i-āb-i-shakna (Kābul), meaning of the name 403 n. 2; Bābur at 403.

Pawat-pass (Mehtar Sulaimān range), Bābur crosses 238.

Pehlūr, Phīllaur (Panj-āb), Bābur at 458.

Pesh-grām (N.W.F.P. Indiā), Bābur at 373.

Pīāq, Allahābād (U.P. Indiā), Bābur at 654–5; incident of his march from 657.

Pichghān (Kābul), bird-catching in 220; punitive attack on 253.

Pich-i-Kāfiristān (n. of Kābul country), wines of 212; hostile to Bābur 212.

Pīr Kānū, see Sakhī-sarwār.

Pul-i-chirāgh, Bil-i-chirāgh (Balkh-Herāt road), located 69; a victory at 69, 260.

Pul-i-sāllār (Herāt), 329–30.

Pul-i-sangīn (Ḥiṣār-shādmand), *Timūr’s and Bābur’s victories at 353–4.

Puṣhta-i-āsh (Farghānā), forces near 106, 165.

Qābā (Farghānā), swamp of 31; invaded 30; Bābur at 123, 162.

Qabādān (Ḥiṣār-shādmand), Bābur at 188; taken for him 640.

Qabil’s tomb, i.e. Cain’s (Kābul), Bābur at 415.

Qānīn (Khurāsān), held by a Bāi-qārā 296, 301.

Qaisār (s.w. of Maiमनेन, see Fr. map), Bābur at 296.

Qalāt-i-gilzāl (Qandahār), Bābur takes 248–9, 339; road south from 333; a governor of 340; fugitives join Bābur near 331; Hindūstān traders at 331.

Qalāt-i-nādir (n. of Mashhad, Khurāsān), birthplace of Nādir Shāh 263 n. 4, 329 n. 4; Bāi-qārā holders of 263, 329.

Qanān (U.P. Indiā), revenue of 521; appointments in 265, 582; hostile both to Ibrāhīm and to Bābur 523–9; military occurrences at 530, 557, 582–9, 594–8.
Qandahār (Afghanistān), sometimes reckoned as part of Ghazni 217; a s. limit of Khurāsān 261; irrigation-waters of 332–6; heat of compared 520; Kābul trade with 202; routes to 206, 308; — governors in 264, 274; Arghūns in 71, 227, 326, 336, 429; Husain Bāı-qara’s failure at 94; — Bābur’s campaigns against 220, 246–8, 330–9, *365, *426–28–36–39; unremunera- tive to him 480; his rock-residence (Chihil- zāna) near 333–5, App. J; Shaibānī’s siege of 21, 331–9, 340–4; Nāšir in 338; Kāmhrān in 583, *694–9, *706; — Khwānd- amīr leaves 605; a rapid journey to 621; *705; Lord Roberts on his first view of 333 n. 1; ruins of in 1879 AD. 430.

Qārā-bāgh (Kābul), Bābur at 196; a rebel of 687.

Qārā-bāgh-meadow (Qandahār), flood-waters of 240; spoils shared out at 339; a rebel of 687.

Qārā-būgh (Samarkand), Bābur at 147.

Qārā-būlāq (Samarkand), Bābur at 66–7; a punishment at 66, 153.

Qārā-daryā (s. arm of Saḥīhūn), now supplies Andijān 3 n. 6; 88 n. 2; App. A, ii.

Qārā-kūl (Samarkand), mentioned 84; irriga- tion of 76–7; a governor of 40; lost and regained by Aūzbekgs 135–7.

Qārā-kūl-pass, ? Malakand (N.W.F.P. India), Bābur on 376.

Qārā-nakarīq (? Kābul), a route through 209.

Qārlūq wīlāyāt (Panj-āb), a governor of 403.

Qarshī, Nashaf, Nakhshāb (Samarkand), described 84; Tarkhāns in 62, 88, 135 (here ? Kesh, p. 138); Aūzbekgs and 135, *353–4; Bābur’s wish to spare and Nājm Šānī’s massacre 359–60, 361.

Qārā-rabāt (n. of Herāt), Bāı-qara defeat at 327.

Qārā-sū, Siyāh-āb (Kābul), Bābur fords 396; (N.W.F.P. India), he crosses 450; (s. arm of Zar-afshān, Samarkand) 78; course of 82; a meadow on 81; known as Ab-i-raḥ- mat 78.

Qārā-tīgn (n. of Ḥiẓār-shādāmān), passers through 58, 112, *349; Bābur plans to go through to Kāshghar 129; *his Mughāl assailants retire to 362.

Qārā-tū (Kābul), located 208–9; Bābur at 198, 409, 405.

Qarghā-yīlāq (Kābul), low hills of 320.

Qīātū (Khāzīn I), Bābur at 323.

Qībchāq road and pass (Hindū-kush), de- scribed 205; Bābur on 197.

Qīlāghū (Kābul), Bābur at 413.

Qīrṭ-ārlīq (Kābul), Bābur on 410, 448.

Qīla ‘i-Tikhītyār’d-din, Ālā-ṣūrghān (Herāt), Bābur rumoured captive in 313; Bārı-qarā families abandoned in 327.

Qīla ‘i-garaf, Shāf-tiwār (Badakhshān), former name Shāf-tiwār 242; sends an envoy to Bābur 618; a rapid journey from 621; offered to Mīrzā Khān 21, *349; a Chaghathā’ī fugitive through 349; opposes the Aūzbekgs 242; — Humāyūn’s de- partures from (932 AH.) 545, *935 AH.) 694–5; *Hind-āl in charge 696–7; *be- lenguered by Sa’īd 697; *made over to Sulaimān 699.

Qīlī-sū, Surkh-āb, g.v. (n. of Hindū-kush), locates a road 205 a fugitive on 321; Bābur near 192–3.

Quhlughha, Quḥqa (Ḥiẓār-shādāmān), see Dar- band-i-ahanīn.

Quība meadow (Samarkand), described 82; 80; a murder in 128; Bābur in 72, 141.

Qūndūz (Badakhshān), n. limit of Kābul 200; pass-roads 204–5; head-waters of 216; tribes of 228, 402; Mughāls of 345, 361; a ruler in 47; Husain Bāı-qara and 48, 50–7, 61, 94, 191, 260, 275; Khursāru Shāh and 57, 60, 70–4, 93, 110, 141, 196, 244; Shaibānī and 192, 242–4; going to 270, 546; Bābur and 51, 318, *352–3, *362–3, *427–80; letters of victory sent to 371; his sister sent to 18, *352.

Qurghā-tū (Kābul), a route through 376.

Qūrūq-sāl (Kābul), located by context 208–9, 341, 395; Bābur at 341, 395, 414.

Qūsh-khāna (Ḥiẓār-shādāmān), an encounter at 71.

Qūsh-khāna meadow (Qandahār), Bābur in 338.

Qūsh-gumīb (Kābul), Bābur at 229, 241, 447.

Qūsh-nādir or nāwar (Kābul), Bābur at 247, 417.

Qūfīq-qadām’s tomb and bridge (Kābul), position of 208; Bābur at 198, 395.

Rabāıt-i-duzd or -dūdur (n. of Herāt), a Bāı-qara defeat at 263.

Rabāıt-i-khwājā (Samarkand), head-quarters of Shavdār 97; Bābur’s men in 73; Bābur in 97, 130–1; 127–8.

Rabāıt-i-sarhang (Farghāna), Tambal in 108, 110.

Rabāıt-i-Soghīd (Samarkand), a battle near 111.

Rabāıt-i-surīk (Kābul), Bābur at 341.

Rabāıt-i-zauraq or -rūzaq (Farghāna), Bābur at 165, 396.

Rabāıtjik-ārūchīn (Farghāna), see Aīkī-sū-ārā.

Rādāgān (n.w. of Mashhad), Ṭahmāsp at 622; name and location of 622 nn. 4, 5, 623 nn. 4, 7.

Rāgh (Badakhshān), uprisings in 242, 321.

Rahap river, ? Rāpti (India), course of 485.

Rāsīng (C. India), Bābur’s intention against 598.

Rānt(h)ambūr (Rāptūtāna), revenue of 521; hills of 486; Sāngā’s 483.

Rāprī (U.P. India), a pargana of 644; a dependency of 686; military vicissitudes at 523–30–57–81–82–98; Bābur at 643.

Rasdhān (Farghāna), birthplace of the author of the Hidāyat 7, 76.
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Râvi river (Panj-âb) 458; source of 485.
Rechna dû-ab (Panj-âb), *Bâbur in 429.
Rivers of Hindûstân 485.
Rohtâs (Panj-âb), a tribal limit 452 n. 5.
Rûm (Turkey-in-Asia), Kâbul trade with 202; a medical remedy of 657; Rûmî defence of connected carts 469, 550, 564, 635.
Rûpar (Panj-âb), Bâbur at 464.
Rûstâ-hazâra, ? a tribe name (Badakhshân), men of join Bâbur 196; (Elph. and Hai. MSS. Rûstâ, Ilîmsînî, p. 153, Rûstâkh; is it Rûstâkh *infra*?).
Rustam -maidân (Kâbul), described 405;
Bâbur at 405.
Rûstâq (Badakhshân), revolts against Aûzbegs 242; see Rustâ-hazâra *supra*.

Sabzawâr (Khurâsân), a return from 261; on a route 622 n. 3.
Sâf-koh (Kâbul-Herât route), Bâbur on 295–6.
Safed-koh (Kâbul), see Koh-i-safed.
Saighân (Khurâsân; see Fr. map Mâimêné), on the summer-road by Shibr-tû 205;
Bâbur in 294.
Sâlûn - daryâ, Sîr-daryâ, Khujand - water (Transoxiana), course of 2, 84 n. 5, App. A, ii; the Khâns and 13, 31, 156, 172; various crossings of 101–16; a proposed limit of lands 118–62; Bâbur's crossings of 151 (on ice), 161, 170–9, *183; his men's success on 102; his father's defeat on 16; see Nârin and Qarâ-daryâ for constituents of.
Sâlî-kal (Kâbul), Bâbur at 342.
Sairâm (n. of Tâshkhint), locates Yâgha 159; holders of 17, 35; name of used as a password 164; *withstands the Aûzbegs 358.
Sajâwând (Kâbul), celebrities of 217; Bâbur at 241.
Sâkân (Fârghânâ), a ferry near 161.
Sâkhan (Ghazni), ruined dam of 219.
Sakh-e-sawâr (Dara-i-Ghâzî Khân, India), Pir Kânûn's tomb at 238; Bâbur at 238.
Salt-range (Panj-âb), see Koh-i-jûd.
Sâmâna (Panj-âb), river of 465; fixes a limit 638; an appointment to 528; *a surmised source of historic information 693; *a complaint from to Bâbur and punitive results 700.
Samarkand (mod. Asiatic Russia), description of 74–86; names of 74, 75 and 4 n. 4; subdivisions, see Bukhârâ, Karminâ, Kesh, Khozar, Qarâ-kûl, Qarshî= Nashaf and Nakhshab, Shâvdâr or Shâdâr, Soghîd; meadows of 67–8, 70–77, 81–2, 128, 131; buildings and constructions in:—(1) Timûr's 77–8 and s.u. Gardens, (2) Âllâgh Beg's 78–9, 80, 133, 142–4, (3) others 75–7 nn. 6–8; — Alps of 222; cold in 202–4; a comparison of 216; fruits 8, 510; bullies 7; Aimâqs 221; trade with Kâbul 202; name locates places or fixes dates 1, 2, 25, 44–9, 136, 150–1–2, 244, 284, 289; Corps of Braves 28, App. H, xxvii; tâgkhîs 28; rulers of 13, 35, 41–6, 52, 65, 74, 90, 111, 121–7, 147, 152, 479, 622; governors of 37, 131; comings and goings to and from 15, 20–2–4, 64, 88, 136–7, 148–9, 256, 300, 402–3; refugees to 46, 51, 58, 95 (plan for), 271; an execution in 51, 196; a raid near 16; 'Umar Shahîkh and 12, 15; Târkhân revolt in 61–3; besieged for a bride 64; Abû-sa'id takes 20–8; Mahmûd Chaghhatî and 23, 88, 122; — Bâbur at, 5, taken to 35–7; his desire for 97–8, *706; desired by others 64, 111–2; his attempts on 64–6–8, 72–4, 92–3–7, 112–5–9, 131–2, *354; invited to 122–3–4; captures of 18, 35–9, 40, 74, 88, 132–4, 266, 277–9; *355, 471; his surprise capture compared 134–5; * rule in 86–7, 135, 147; leaves it to help Andîjân 88–9, 190; defeated at 133–141; besieged in and surrenders 141–7, 168, 24; leaves it 147, 358, 471; — Shâhînî receives it in gift 125; loss and gain of 74, 147, 168; occupation of 125–8; *183, 256, 300, 325–8, 360; — *Haidar Daughlât in 357; Merv Mughûlis near 357; Humâyûn attempts to recover 625, 639; — envos from to Bâbur 438, 630–1, 642; gifts to 522; Bâbur's 1st Dwân and the Mûbin sent to 402, App. Q, viii, *438.
Sammân (Persia), a fruit of 6.
Samâbhal (U.P. India), revenue of 521; snows seen from 485; hostile to Bâbur 523; Bâbur's 528, 547; abandoned by his men 557; Bâbur at 586–7; deaths of officers in 675, 683 n. 4, 687; Humâyûn's fief 697, *700–2.
Sâm-sûrâk (s. of Tâshkhint), The Khân's army counted near 154; hunting near 156;
Bâbur at 152.
Sân (Balkh territory ?), plundered 94, 295 (p. 94 for "Sân-chirik", read Sân and Châr-yak).
Sanâm (C. India), river of 465.
Sang (Fârghânâ), Bâbur at 176; *183.
Sang-i-aîna (Fârghânâ), described 7.
Sang-i-barîda (Kâbul), Bâbur passes 407.
Sang-i-lakhshak (Qandahâr), Bâbur at 333.
Sang-i-sûrâkh (Kâbul), Bâbur passes 228; and (Dasht-Farmûl road) do. 235.
Sangdakî pass (Panj-âb), Bâbur crosses 379, 392.
Sangzâr (Samarkand), Bâbur and 92, 124, 131; (p. 92, 1, 9, read " to Sangzâr by way of Yâr-ylâq ").
Sanjî-tâq (Kâbul), a pleasure resort 200 n. 6.
Sanjid-dara (Kâbul), Bâbur at 196, 406.
Sanûr (C. India), torrent of 464.
Sapân (Fârghânâ), a hostile force at 101.
Saqâ (Fârghânâ), Bâbur's victory near 113.
Sarâî Munda (U.P. India), Bâbur at 651.

*1 On p. 134 for "(I was) 19" read in my 19th (lunar) year.
Shāhbulhāk = Fanākāt q.v. (Tashkint), a limit of Samarkand 76; names of 2 n. 5, 7 n. 5, 13, 76; holders of 13, 17; various military occurrences at 21–4, 16, 54, 7, 23, 151; Champion’s-portion taken at 53. Shakdān (Badakhshān), a force at 295. Shāl = Quetta (Balūchīstān), Shāh Beg goes to 337; *427. Shām, Syria, a Samarkand ūmān compared with 84. Shamshābād (U.P. India), exchanges of 477, 594–8, 613; an assignment on 677. Sham-tū (n. of Hindū-kush), on a route 192. Shāsh (W. Turkistān), see Tāshkint. Shatlut river, ? Sutlej (Panj-āb), Bābur crosses 457. Shāvdār or Shādwār ūmān (Samarkand), described 84; a fort of 68; head-quarters in 97; a Tarkhān in 122; joins Bābur 125. Sherkot (Bhīra, Panj-āb), a holder of 382. Sherrikān? (Ghazni?), a fight near 397. Sherwān (n.e. of Mashhad, Persia), a native of 284; (see Fr. map Maʿīmānē). Shibarghān (Khurāsān), besieged 94; defence planned 191; battle near 260. Shibr-tū pass (Hindū-kush), described 205; height of 204 n. 4; meaning of name 205 n. 2; crossed 242, 321; Bābur crosses 294, 311; (for an omission on p. 205, see Add. Note p. 205). Shirāz (Persia), Yūnas Khān in 20; (Samarkand), a Commandant of 130; Bābur near 64–6, 73; raided by Shaibānī 92; 98. Shibw (Kābul-river), Bābur at 343. Sniz (Kābul-Ghazni road), Bābur near 248. Sherkoch (Ghazni?), locates a place 323 n. 3. Shulut (Kābul), App. F, xxiv. Shungār-khān mountains (n.w. rampart of Zār-āshān valley), Bābur crosses 130. Shutur-gardan (Samarkand), described 142 n. 1, 143. Sīlākot (Panj-āb), revenue of 521; officers of 98, *442–3; *attacked 443; Bābur and *429–52–54–58. Siddhūr (Panj-āb), see Sāyīdūrū. Sīhkāna (Afgānīstān), a tribe in 323. Sihānd, Sihānd, Sirhind (Panj-āb), revenue of 521; names of 383 n. 1; rivers rising n. of 485; fixes a limit 638; fixes a date 457; snows seen from 485; a holder of 383; an assignment on 582; Bābur and *441–64, *693–9, *700–1. Sikandar’s dam (C.P. India), described 606; Bābur at 585. Sikandara (U.P. India), Bābur at 587. Sikandarābād (U.P. India), Bābur passes 588. Sikandarpūr (U.P. India), a ferry station of 677; an official of 668; Bābur at 679. Sikrī (U.P. India), hills of 485; *Bābur keeps Rāmzān at 351, changes name of 484 n. 2; selects it for his camp (933 A.H.) 548; Bābur at 549, 581–5–8, 600, 615–6; revenues of support his tomb *709.
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Sind (India), *Shâh Beg and 427–9.
Sind-daryâ, Indus, of "Nil-âb" as a name of 206 n. 3 ; fords and ferries of 206 ; tributaries of 216, 485 ; rhinoceros of 490 ; limits lands 206 n. 6, 231–3, 380, 392, 484, 525 ; *Shâh Beg and 431 ; *Babur’s compulsion to seek territory across 706 ; Babur on 230–7, 582, 378–92, *452–3 ; mentions it in verse 525–6.
Singar-water, Sengar (U. P. India), Babur bathes in 649.
Sinjâd-dara (Kâbul), Babur in 196, 406.
Sir-âb or Sâr-i-âb (n. of Hindû-kush), a pass-route to 205 ; a defeat near 51, 196.
SirâUILiya (U. P. India), Babur at 634.
Sird, Sirda, Sarda (U. P. India), a constituent of the Gagar, Gogrâ, Ghoôrâ 602.
Sirhind (Panj-âb), see Sihînd.
Sirkâi, *Sirakhs (Khurâsân), Sbainâni near 327.
Sîstân (Khurâsân), a s. limit of Khurâsân 261 ; plan of defence for 326.
Sîwâlik-hills, or Sawâlak (N. India), Babur on the name 483.
Sîwi, Sibî (Balûchistân), an official in 238 ; an incursion into 260 ; Sîwistân, *427.
Syâh-âb, see Qarâ-sû.
Syâh-koh (Kâbul), located (unnamed) 209 ; various names of 209 n. 3.
Syâh-sang (Kâbul), meadow of 201 ; a scene of an Afghân massacre, App. K, xxvi.
Soghd îmân (Samarkand), described 84, 147 ; Babur and 64, 135, 147.
Son-water (Bihâr, India), an enemy near 658 ; crossed for Babur 662 ; Babur on 666.
Spîn-ghur (Afghanîstân), see Safed-koh.
Sûf-valley (Khurâsân), see Dara-i-sûf.
Sûgandpûr (U. P. India), Babur at 686.
Sûhân-nûrî, or Sûhâr-nûrî (Kâbul), App. G, xxv.
Sûhân-sû (Panj-âb), a tribe on 380 ; Babur on 379, 391.
Sûkh (Farghânâ), Babur’s refuge in 7, 130 n. 1, 176 n. 1, *184–5 ; gifts to envoys from 633.
Sukhjâna (C. P. India), Babur near 614.
Sulaimân-range (Afghan border), see Mehtar Sulaimân.
Suljânâ (Persia), cold of 219.
Sûlânpur (Kâbul), Babur at 409–13–47.
Sûlânpur (Panj-âb), founder of 442–61 ; a return to 457 ; *taken from Babur 443.
Sûnkâr (Râjpûtânâ), Babur at 581.
Sûrhk-âb (n. of Hindû-kush), see Qizil-sû.
Surkh-âb, Qizil-sû (Hijâr-shâhdmân), Babur’s victory on 352–3.
Surkh-âb and rûd, Qizil-sû (Kâbul), 207 n. 5 ; Bhâg-i-wafâ on 208, Adinâpûr fort-on 209 ; wild-ass near 224 ; Babur crosses 395 ; ruins near App. E, xvii.
Surkh-râbât (Kâbul), see Rabât-i-surkh.
Sûsân-village (Kâbul), Babur at 422.
Sutluj and Shultût (sic Hai, M.S.), Sutlej-river (Panj-âb), limits lands 383 ; course of 485 ; crossed 457 ; Trans-Sultur revenues 521.
Syria, see Shâm.
Tabrîz (Persia), cold of 204–19 ; Yûnas Khân in 20.
Tag-aû (Kâbul), see Badr-aû.
Tahangar (Râjpûtânâ), hostile to Babur 538.
Tâkânâ (? Khurâsân), a fight at 260.
"Tâkhtâ Qarâchî" (Samarkand), 83 n. 2 ; see Aitmâk-dâbân.
Takhî-islamîn (Farghânâ) 5 n. 2.
Tâlîqân, Tâlkhân (Oxus), a Bûl-qarâ at 60 ; Mughûls from 192.
Tal Ratoi (Nathpûr, U. P. India), 681 n. 1.
Tang-âb (Farghânâ), Babur at 100 ; located 99 n. 4.
Tang-i-wâghchân pass (Kâbul), see Girdlz.
Tank, Tâq (N.W.F. Province), see Dasht.
Târâz or Tarar (E. Turkistân), see Yângi.
Tarnak river (Qandahâr), see Turnûk.
Tarsht (Khurâsân), Husain Bûr-galr’s victory at 259 and n. 5 (where read p. 524).
Tâshkint, Tâshkend (Russia-in-Asia), of its names 2 n. 5, 7 and n. 5, *184 ; its book names Shâsh and Châch 13, 76, ravines of App. A, ii ; holders of 32–5, 115, 154, 161 ; a rebel at 36 ; Khalifa sent to 90 ; name of used as a pass-word 164 ; Shâban’s capture of 908 A.H.) 23–4, *184 ; holds out for Babur (918 A.H.) 356–8, 396 ; its Aûzbeg Suljâns at Jâm 622.
Tâsh-râbât (n. of Herî), Babur at 301.
Tatta (Sind, India), course of the Indus through 485 ; playing cards sent to 584.
Tâzî var. Ìâr (Ghaznî-Qalât road), Babur at 248.
Tibet, Babur locates 485.
Tijâra (Râjpûtânâ), a chief town in Mîwât 578 ; given to Chîn-timûr 578–9, 688.
Tika-sikirtû, Goat-leap (Farghânâ), ‘Umar Shaikh defeated at 16.
Til, Thal (Kohât, N.W.F. P. India), Babur at 232.
Timûr Beg’s Langar (Kâbul), Babur at 313.
Tîpa (Kâbul), assigned for a camp 199 ; earthquake damage in 247 ; an exit from 254.
Tîrâk-pass (Farghânâ), 15 n. 5.
Tirhut (Bihâr, India), revenue of 521.
Tirmitû (Hijâr-shâhdmân territory), a s. limit of Samarkand 76, Begins of 37, 47–8 ; Husain Bûr-garâ and 5, 191 ; a governor of 74 ; Bâqi Chaghânînî’s 188, 249 ; a sayyid of *704–5 ; Nâm ânî at 359 ; entered for Babur 640.
Tir-mûhâni (Bihâr, India), mentioned 679, 675 n. 1, 687 and n. 2 ; the Hâbirîn’s-sîyâr finished at 687 n. 2.
Trîz-dara (Kâbul), 208 n. 4.
Tochî-valley (N.W.F. P. India), ? to be traversed by Babur 231.
Toda-bhîm (Râjpûtâna), Bâbûr at 581; Sangâ at 545 (where “Agra district” is wrong).
Tons-river, Tûs-sû (U.P. India), Bâbûr on 656, 683.
Tramontana (between the Oxus and Hindû-kush), army of 447; *706.
Tûghlîqâbâd (Dihî), Bâbûr at 476.
Tûl-pass and road (Hindû-kush), account of 205; height of 204 n. 4.
Tân (Khurâsân), a Bâl-qârâ holder of 296, 301.
Tûp (Kâbul-Herât road), Bâbûr at 295.
Tûqîz-âlûm (Oxus), a defence question 191.
Turfân (Chinese Turkistân), Bâbûr plans going to 158.
Turkistân, course of the Saihûn in 2–3; trade with Kâbul 202; gold-cloth of 641 n. 5; Shaibânî and 65 n. 3, 73–4, 135; his vow in Hazrat Turkistân 356; *Ubadî in 354.
Tûrnûk, Tarnak (Qandahâr), 332 n. 3; a holder of 340.
Tûs-sû (U.P. India), see Tons.
Tûs (Irâq), an astronomer of 79; Shaibânî attacks 534.
Tûta (U.P. India), Begins from Kâbul pass 616.
Tûtlûq-yûl, Mulberry-road (Farghâna), Bâbûr on 165.
Tûtûn-dara (Kâbul), water taken from 647.
Udyânapûrâ (Kâbul), App. E, xxi; see Adînapûr.
Ujjain (Mâlwa, C. India), an observatory in 79.
*U'mân-sea, receives the Indus 485.
*Umarâbâd (Khurâsân), an ascribed site of the battle of Jâm 635 n. 5.
*Ünjû-tûpâ (Farghâna), see Âunjû-tûpâ.
*Uqâbain (Kâbul), site of the Bâlâ-hiâr 201.
*Urğenj (Khûwârîzîm), see Aûrgânj.
Urghûn (Kâbul), see Aûrghûn.
Urûs-sû (W. Turkistân), see Arûs.
*Ush (Farghâna), see Aûsh.
Ushtur-shahr (Kâbul), Bâbûr in 195, 294, 314.
*Utrrâr, Otrar, Aûtrâr (W. Turkistân), see Yângî.

Varsak (Badakhshân), position of 523 n. 1, Bâbûr’s gifts to 523.
Vierney, Vernoe (E. Turkistân), position on site of old Almâtî 2 n. 1.
Wakhsh (Hiûrâr-shâdman), Aûzbegs at 352, 362.
Walût pass (Hindû-kush), account of 205; height of 204 n. 4.
Warikh (Farghâna), account of 7.
Wasmand fort (Samarkand), Bâbûr at 132.
Wazr-âb (Hiûrâr-shâdman), 58 n. 1.

Yada-bîr (Kâbul), Bâbûr at 394, 411, 448.
Yaftal (Badakhshân), a force at 321.
Yagha or Yaghma (n. of Tâshkît), tombs at 139; Bâbûr at 139.
Yâlî (Khurâsân), tribes in 255.
Yaka-aulang (w. of Bâmlân, see Fr. map Maimêné), Jahângîr goes to 294; passes from Herî-rûd valley to 310 n. 2; Bâbûr in 311.
Yak-langa (Kâbul), Bâbûr crosses 445.
Yâm (Samarkand), Bâbûr at 67; 84 n. 3.
Yân-bulâgh (Kâbul), Bâbûr on road of 425.
Yângî-hiâr (Kâshghar), *a death-bed repentance at 362.
Yângî = Tarâz (E. Turkistân), depopulated 2; book-name of 2 and n. 1; an army at 20.
Yângî = Õtrar, Otrar (W. Turkistân), a mistaken entry of in some MSS. 2 n. 1.
Yangi-yûl pass (Hindû-kush), described 205.
Yârî (Ghaznî-Qâtât road), see Tazi.
Yârî (Zar-afshân), Bâbûr crosses the bridge to 130.
Yârkand (E. Turkistân), *696.
Yâr-yûlîq (Samarkand), Timûr’s “head” of Soghd 84; fights near 33, 122; villages of 97–8; submits to Bâbûr 98; Bâbûr in 64, 92, 125, 130–1.
Yâsân (Farghâna), see Kasbân.
Yâsî-kijît (Farghâna), Bâbûr’s men defeated at 27, 105.
Yîlân-âât or Yîlân-aût (Samarkand), Bâbûr at 147.
Yîlân-chaq (n. of Hindû-kush), a tribe of 196.
Yîlû-kînt (Farghâna), mandrake in 11; of its position 11 n. 6; Yûnas Khân’s headquarters 20 n. 5.

Zâbul, Zâbulistân, a name of Ghaznî q.v.
Zâhâq fort, “Zohak” (s. of Bâmlân), Bâbûr at 294; (see Fr. map Maimêné).
Zamânia (U.P. India), see Madan-Banaras.
Zâmîn (Samarkand), locates places 34, 64; Bâbûr at 97.
Zâmîn-dâwar (Qandahâr), Arghûn chiefs in 71, 337–9; Zûn-nûn’s 274; taken by Bâbûr 27; plan to defend 326.
Zar-afshân river, Kohîk-sû q.v. (Samarkand), described 76 and nn. 4, 5; Macha village on 149 n. 4; Bâbûr crosses 67, 130; *Najm Şâmî crosses 360.
Zardak-chûl (w. of Bâlkh), over-run 94.
Zarqân or Zabârqân (Farghâna), Bâbûr at 161.
Zindân valley (Kabul-Balkh road), see Dara-i-zindân.
Zirrîn - pass (between Heri-rûd valley and Yaka-aullang), Bâbûr misses it 309–10.
Zurmut tâmân (Kâbul), described 220; floods in 240; Gîrdiz head-quarters in 220.

Index II. Geographical
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of Bükhará, (trs. Blochmann and Ranking) — a note by Kieu 288; Sálí’s pupil Báisunghar 111; his high number of rubá’í measures App. Q, lxvi.

Asia Portuguesa, Manuel de Faria y Sóusa— Habsi succession custom 482.

Astronomy and Astrology—Tables and Observatories 74, 79, Pr. xxx; Canopus (Suhail) 195; forecasts 139, 551; houses of Scorpio 633; Pole-star a guide 323, its altitude at Chandírí 597; Capricorn 597.

Ayi-r-akbárí, Abú-fażl (trs. Blochmann, jarrett)—(see nn. on pp. named): Climates 1; gilíj (cognomen) 29; observatories 79; guns 473; clepsydra 516; kitchen rules 541; fruits 3, 501–3–4–5, 512; chalma 624; hunting deer 630; baḥrí (falcon) 632; mīlāk (gold, cloth) 641; yak-tai (unlined) 652; — (weights and measures) khar-war 228, īnāb 630, sang=tāsh 632; — a title 209; a child traveller 265; Bārīs legs 270; — (places) Kábūl 207, 221; Kachá-kot 250; Sidhúr 429; Nagaráhára App. E, xxiii; Bālúlrúp 454; Kanwán 458; Milwát (Malot) 461; Jāhán-námá 485; Chausath 581; Lakhnúr 582; Sikandra Rá 587, Godí, Gúti 601; — (persons) 285, 653, 666, App. P, Ivi;— Bàbúr’s expedition to Kashmir 693.

Agār-i-sanáddí, Sayyid Ahmad Khámind—places Bàbúr visited 475; Mahdí Khwája and Amir Khusru’s tomb 704.

Noticeable words:—P. āb-dund 109 = P. dā-pāsh 62, 595–6; aš-i-sū-arā = P. miyān-dā-qā = Mesopotamia i.a 88; aṁabg (élán) 51, 196, 207–15–55, Add. Note P. 49; M. ašāidi when Alácha 23; argham-chi 614; asbálá (stew) 4; aŭdīliq (oda-lisce) = P. ghúnchachi q.u.; aŭghlán (child, boy, non-regnant chief) 19; aŭgh-labchí 39; ārēchín 41, 88; āng, āng (Preser John’s title) 23; ārēchín 176, 282; Aūz-beg, -kān, -kint, i.a. 162, (see A.N., trs. i, 160, 170); āyíd-aît = P. mihr-šiyāh (mandrake) 11.

The Bàbûr-námá, Zahrír’ud-din Muḥ. Bàbúr (Lion) Mirzá and (later) Fádísbá Gháší.

I. Sections of the Book:— (The record of pre-accession years is lost Pr. xxxvi); (1) Farghāná 1–182, (Trs. N. bridging a gap 182–183); (2) Kábúl 187–346, (Trs. N. 347–366), 367–425, (Trs. N. 426–444; (3) Hindútán 445–602, (Trs. N. 603–4), 605–690, (Trs. N. 691–716);


II. Lacune:— (other than mentioned above); minor in 935 AH. see dating and nn. on pp. 617, 621, 630, 636, 687, and for surmised patching from fragments of 934 AH. 654, 655, 680; (1) References to events of the gaps see nn. on pp. 105, 364–208, 441, 575–381–408, 422—(of 934 AH.) 603, 617, 618, 621—an Akhthnáma indication 639; (2) Varia concerning the gaps:—Causes of, Pr. xxxiv; misinterpreted xxxv; results in present displacement xxxvi;

III. Varia Concerning the Book:—

(1) Date of composition, [see nn. on pp. named]: 48, 50, 79, 98–102 135–139, 154, 176, 190 (l. 5 fr. ft.) 198–203 4–6–8—214–18–19–20 (para. 3), 269–76–78–85—313 (”now” para. 2), 314 (“now” l. 4), 315 (l. 2), 318 (para. 2), 337 (l. 16), 373 (l. 8 fr. ft.), 374; (2) Literary style and idiom:—plain diction 2, precise wording e.g. 5, 79, 475, 485, appreciation of words 67, 265, 283, 627, comments on style e.g. 22, 67, and pronunciation 210, 484, early diary differs in wording from the narrative 367; lapses into courtly Persian 445, 537, 539; (3) Grammatical details:—relatives not used Add. Note, P. 167; uses of “we” and “I” 104, 118; distinctions of meaning expressed by Ar. and T. plurals e.g. 5, 80; uses of the presumptive tense 37, 75, 162, 167, 577 (cf. Shaw’s Grammar); examples of idiom 29, 44, 66, 75, Add. Note, P. 167 (ghariča); (4) Varied information see Preface passim; (5) Bàbúr’s notes:—Khwája Mubáláná-i-qāzí 29—Ibráhím Sárí 52—Champion’s portion 53—Gák-sarái 63—Fázíl Tarkhán 133 — Aūz-kint 163— Pass-words 169—Mulá-kundi 211—Military terms 334—Pírí Beg 336—Badakhshán 340—Sl. Ma’súd M. 382—Campaign of 910 AH. 382—Dauált Kháñ 383—dajija 516—pall 517—Mullá Apáq 526—uroh (from the Mubún) 630—fāsh weight 632;
(Shaibāq), 143–8, 154 (dīm), 159, 161–4–9; Preface xii, xlii, xliii (No. v), xlvii; cf. JRAS Notes infra; (c) Haidarābād Codex, published in Facsimile by the Gibb Trust, ed. A. S. Beveridge—basis of the B.N. in English: 1, 187, 445, Preface xxvii; appears a direct copy of Bābur's autobiography Codex 47, 103, 515; contains (Jahangir's?) Rescue-passage App. D; divergency of Kāsān Imprint from it ib. xiv; referred to in nn. on pp. 2, 8, 9, 10, 12, 133 (Shaibāq), 14, 18, 23 (careful pointing clears away a doubt), 28, 31, 36, 40 (Bāgdād corrected to Būghdā), 60–4, 75, 88, 132, 140–6–8, 153 (a mistake?), 154 (dīm), 159, 164 (sārīr kīshī), 165, 168, 177 (Pers. dictum), App. A, i (Akhsī); Preface xxvii, xxxii (title), xxxv, xli (Table), xlv (No. x), xlvii;—

(2) Persian work:—(a) Tabāqāt-i-bāburī, described 445; made known to Erskine 520; its deference to Bābur App. P, lvii; shews a date 496; shews nature of an illness (B.'s) 446; specifies drinking-days 447, 450; gives a useful pen-name 448; Buhlūpūr 454; of a gun 489; Varsak and Khwāstīs 523; Naukar or Tuka 525; Bābur points "Sīkri" to read shukri 548; styles him "Nawāb" 560 etc.; describes a porpoise as bārī App. M, xlvi; helps as to "Luknūr" App. T, lxxiv; (b) Wāqī-āt-i-bāburī ( Acts of Bābur), (the first Pers. Trs. 1583), Pāyanda-ḥasan Muḥākhlī of Ghanī and Muḥ-quīl Muḥākhlī of Ḩiṣār—explicit 187, 198; useful variants 267, 624, 645; a puzzling phrase 549, and passage 617; title Pr. xiii; described liii (No. vi); (c) Wāqī-āt-i-bāburī (Acts of Bābur), (the second Pers. Trs. 1589), 'Abdūr-rahim M. Turkmān—misleading glasses 2 n. 1, 3 m. 1; tāsh misread 312 etc.; verses doubtfully Bābur's 312; a gloss unsupported 337; a difficult passage 617; a fine illustrated copy (B.M. 3714) 155, 298, 325; Erskine's account of its diction (quoted) Pr. xlv (No. vii); on its title xxxiii;

(3) Persian - English work:—The Memoirs of Baber, Leyden and Erskine (1826)—[see nn. on pp. named]; Varia:—Leyden's slight collaboration 287, 367, 380, Add. Note, P. 287, Pr. xlviii, Cap. iv, [L. and E. Memoirs]; two notes by Leyden 10, 219; not fully representative of Bābur's autobiography 2, Cap. iv; advance in help (MSS. and other) since Erskine worked 347, 620–22, App. T, lxiii; his own MSS. 680; Indian guidance 632, 661; dating agrees with Bābur's 629; misled by his Persian source [g.v. 3 etc.] and by a scribe's slip 544; his help to Ilminski 1, 187, 326,


(4) Turki-English work:—The Bābur-nāma in English (Memoirs of Babür), Annette S. Beveridge—see Preface and other contents of these volumes.

Bābar, Stanley Lane Poole—the Eight Stars 139; a misled note 468.

Bābur und Abūl-faţl, Teufel [ZDMG, 1862]—an opinion negativated 119; useful critique on "Fragments" (g.v.) Preface Cap. III, Part III and App. D; Mubin MS. used by Berénézine 438; Babur-nāma title 653, Pr. xxxiii.

Bāhar-i-'ajam (Pers. Dict.) see Dictionaries. Bāz-nāma (Book of Sport), Muḥibb-i-āli Barlīs—its author's descent 276; i exchanged with n (cf. Luḥāni and Nuḥāni) ib.


Bengali Household Stories, Macculloch—a sign of obedience 275.

Beveridge Annette S.—JRAS. Notes in referred to in loco:—MSS. of the B.N. Turki text 1900; Further Notes 1902, Haidarābād Codex and all others 1905, 1906; Elphinstone Codex 1907; Material for a definitive text and account of Kehr's Codex and its Persian alloy 1908; Kehr's Latin Version of part of his source i.e. the Wāqī'-nāma-i-pādshāhī (Bukhara Compilation g.v.) 1908, Klaproth's Archiv 1909, and (expected) on the confused identity of the Bukhārā Compilation with the Bābur-nāma 1922;—(2) Grounds for making a new translation Preface Cap. IV; the mistaken identity of Kehr's source (supra) Cap. III 2; of the Bābur-nāma, Preface passim.

Beveridge Henry—(1) Notes in loco:—tabālghā'ī 11; Bābā-i-kābul 14; Quintets 15, 288; a mistake by Firishta 15; Lotuseaters 42; Daulat-shāh 46; Hāfez parodied 201; Byron's tambourgi 247; Jāmī plagiarized 258; Khasinatul'-asfīyā quoted 211; Timūr's burial-position 266; syphilis 279; an illegal marriage 329; Bābur's satirical verse and Shaikh Zain 448; Zafar-nāma (?) quoted 485; "kaka" 502; Khw. Khusrāu's couplet 503; the name "Cintra" for an orange 512; Timūr on Hindustān 526; fate of Ibrāhīm Lūdī's mother 543; tāmghā 553; a pun 571; verses traced 571, 628–6;
Bibliothèque Orientale, B. d’Herbélot — (see nn. on pp. named), ‘Umar Skaikh 13; Sāṭīq-būghrā Khān 29; Ṭaḥmūd Mīrān-shāhī 46; Māṭaridariya and Ash’ariya Sects 75–6; Ismāʿīl Khartank 76; Naṣīrūd-din Tūsī 79; Nil-āb 206; ‘Qızil-bāsh’ explained 630.

Biographie Universelle, Langësart, Babourxlv. Biographies of Ladies (Sprenger’s Cat.) — two women-poets 286.


Blochmann H. (JASB. 1873)— Bābur’s Mosque in Šamḥāl 687; see Ayīn-i-akbarī.

Blood-ransom 461; retaliation 64, 102, 119, 194, 251–5, 424.


Book-names — Akhsikīt = Akhsī 9; Banākāt = Shahrūkhīya 76; Chāch and Shāsh = Tāshkin 13, 76; Gālūr or Gālīwar = Gālūlār 605; Nashaf and Nakhshāb = Qarṣī 84; Nagaraḥāra = Nīng-nahār 207; Tarāz = Yāngī 2.

Book-room — Ghaīr Khān Lūdūrī 460.


Botany of the Afghan Delimitation Commission, Aitchison — regional grasses 222; garqand = sax-aol (2) 223.

Brahminical thread 561.

Bridge of boats see Boats.


Browne, Professor Edward Granville — the Haidarabād Codex Facsimile, Preface xlv (No. x).

Building-stone — Samarkand 83, Kābul 710, Chandīrī 597, Dūlpūr 606, Gālūlār 608, Bānā 611.

Bukhārī Compilation, known as ‘Bābur-nāma’ see Waqī‘nāma-i-pādshāhī.

Bullies of Marghīnān (Marghilān) 7 (where in line 1, adā, ‘They are notorious in Māwarā‘u-nahār for their bullyings’).

Burhān-i-qāṭī (Pers. Dict.) see Dictionaries.


Bū-ṣūn, Sa’dī—couples quoted 139,152,326.

Noticeable words:—(P.-Ar.-T.) bāghāt, bāghār, bāghchā and begāt, begār 5, 80, 478; bāghkīsh 59, 69; bakhkī (in M. surgeon) 169; bāhṣilguār (commanders) 119; bāmtān (a weight) 261; bātīq (slough of despond) 31; būrī (rich man) 127; bārī (old servant) 30; bī = beg 128–7; bildurgā 225; bī = dāhindī = P. sīk-bāndī (Byde Horse) 470; bīlāk 446; bāgh-mārār 8,10; bāghdā (cutlass) 40; būlāk and balīq 196, 17 and 221; būsh (bosh) 507.

Cabool (Kabul), Sir Alex. Burns — (see nn. on pp. named); wind and running sands 201, 215; climate 204; kalīg-dari 213; Kohistān 214; millet 215; Bābur’s Burial-garden 710.

Cadell, Jessie E. — quoted Preface xxvii.
Catalogues:—(see nn. on pp. named) ;

" Coins of the Shahs of Persia (B.M.),
R. S. Poole—Bābūr’s surmised vassal coin 355, App. H, xxx, Preface xxxv ;

Feronia Nursery Calculata, Seth—Jackfruit 506 ; sang-tarā orange 511 ;

Library of the King of Oudh, A. Sprenger—Biographies of Ladies 286 ; Shāh u Darvesh 290 ; Ahtī 290 ;

" Library of Tippto Sultān, C. Stewart—Tābaqāt-i-naṣīrī 479 ;

Manuscripts Tures de l’Institut des langues orientales, W. D. Smirnov—Mafṣūḥāt-i-tirmīrī 653 ; Bābūr’s writings 656 ;

Persian MSS. (B. M.), C. Rieu—Shāsh and Fanākāt 2, 7 ; Khw. Kamāl 8 ;

Akhshkītī 9 ; ’Abdul-lāh Barīlās 51 ;

Saftī 111, 288 ; Halwa-spring 260 ;

Niẓāmī 271 ; Daūlāt-shah 274 ; Bāṣnāma 276 ; Suhāltī 277 ; Marwārdī 278 ; Amīr Ḥamzā 200 ; ’Ātā’ullāh 282 ; Tafṣāzānī 283 ; Khamsātīn 288 ;

Husain Nishāpūrī 288 ; Yūfas of Farghāna 289 ; Hilālī 290 ; a scribe-poet 291 ; Sūlākīt-l-malik 348 ; Nawāt’s Doiwāns arranged 419 ; Histories of Tāhmasp 622 ; Ḩābiw’s-siyar finished 687 ; Tārīkh-i-salātin-i-afghānā 693, 701 ;—Kasan Imprint misleads 259 ; a questioned reading 266 ;

Persian MSS. in the I. O. Library, H. Ethe—Khw. Ḥijrī 153 ; Husain Nishāpūrī 238 ; Shāh u Darvesh 270 ; a scribe-poet 293 ;


Catamites 26, 42—5—9, 278, 396 (cf. 174 n.) .

Cathay and the way thither, ed. Sir H. Yule (Hakluyt Society vol. i, p. 20)—running-sands 215 .


“ Chaghatāi Castles ” 208 .

Chaghatāi families—Ali-sher Nawā’t a member of one, Preface xxxi .

Chaghatāi–Osmanisches Wörterbuch see Dictionaries .

1 This Cat. contains the Turkī MS. of the Bukhara Compilation, now owned by Leyden.
Dobistän, Mir Zül-fiqār 'Alī'u'll-husainī (pennname Mūbad)—Nānak founder of the Sikh religion 461; Rādiyān sect 622; [concerning the authorship of the book see JRAS. H.B.'s art. q.v.s.n.].

Darwesh-life—soldiering abandoned for 262; return to 583.

Dating by events:—Battle of the Goat-leap 16; Dispersion of Ārzūn 20, Battle of Kānbāī 111–2 [T.R. trs. 119]; the dating of 935 AH. 605, App. S.

Defrémery C.—[J. des Savans 1873], art. Les Mémoires de Baber (P. de C.) 562.

De Paris à Samarcande, Madame Ujfalvy—(see nn. on pp. named) Barā-koh 5, 6; Samarkand 74–5; qarā 'yīghāch (hard-wood elm) 81; paper-pulping mortars 81.

De Sačy, A. L. Silvestre (Nat. et Ex. 265, 285)—Ḥusain Shaikh Timūr 273 (cf. Daulatschah (Browne) 538–9); date of Ḩilālī's death 290.


Dictionaries, Lexicons, Vocabularies:—[see nn. on pp. named];

- of Antiquities, W. W. Smith—clepsydra 516;
- Arabic-English Lexicon, E. W. Lane—akhmail 336;
- Arabes; Supplément aux Dictionnaires, R. Dozy—bahri (a falcon) App. M, xlvi;
- Bahār-i-ājam (Pers. Dict.), Rāi Tikhana Bahār—a sign of fear 232; the Taftāzānt Šaikhīs of Īslām 283;
- Burhān-i-qātī (Pers. Dict.), Muh. Ḥusain b. Khalfā‘u’t tabrīzī—izāra (dado) 80;
- English—Persian, A. N. Wollaston—a rare meaning 648;
- Hindustani-English, D. Forbes—changed name of an orange 511; “needle-melting” citron 513; great millet (maize?) 514; names of days 516; gongman ib.;

Dictionaries, Lexicons, Vocabularies (continued):

- of Islām, J. P. Hughes—turbans 15; eating of food 44; mazḥāb 463; the Eight Paradises 646; legal endowment 701;
- of Oriental Quotations, C. Field—a common couplet 22;
- Persian-English, F. Steingass—176,202, 286, (metres) 514, 527, 630, qisīl-bāsh 643;
- Persico-Latinum Lexicon, I. A. Vulzers—shash-par 160; kaka 502; gharau 514; rād (whence Rādāgan) 622;
- Pushṭū—English, H. J. Raverty—Multakund 211;
- Sang-lāḥī (Turki-Persian), Muḥ. Mahdi Khān—described App. B, v; kharpa (the “Qaršī birdie”) ib.; contains verses entered as by Bābūr 439;
- Sanscrit-Bengali-English, Haughton—a stork 499; gula-prawn 502;
- of Towns (Dama'ma‘l-buldān), Yāqūt—“Akhshīkī” 9, 10;
- Turc Oriental, A. Pavet de Courteille—Bābūr's verses quoted 439, 526; a wag-tail 501; a meaning 626; Bābūr's script App. Q, lxii;
- Turki Vocabulary, R. B. Shaw—kāk-būrā (a game) 39; gūrīgh, reserved land 81; aṭīq, a darte−kutch, 4 horse-shoes and their nails 176; ḥārūq, brogues, and a ḥāpun, long coat 187; gūlpat, felt wide-awake 258; gūsh-bēghi, a Court official 278; shāhghalīw ilb. 463; fīrān, a deer 491; gīn, scabbard 503; akhtabegi, master-gelder 538; bālfār, a rendezvous etc. 592.—Part II J. Scully—gōdan, water-hen 224; kālkītk (caccia, kīkūr), 496; laqqa, magpie 501; gīrīk, swift 501; būta, a plant 505; amān-gārā (perhaps maize) 504; arikāk-gūmūsh, male-reed 514.

Diseases and accidents:—(a) Babur's saddle turns 147; sciatica 253–4; boils 254, 657–60; dislocated wrist 409–13–20; tooth breaks 424; ear-ache 310, 601–8–15; fall of river bank 655; fall of tent 678; wounds of head 150–167,—leg 167–9,—arm-pit 176; his illnesses:—unspecified (923) 365; catarrhal discharge (resandalik) 446–49–51; fever (903 AH.) 88–9, (911) 247, (925) 399 to 401; (934) 585–6–8, 603–4, (935) 619–20, (937) 702–3–5; (b) Of others:—childbirth 36; small-pox 48; “violent illness” 45; frost-bite 116, 311; cold 151; ulcerated hand 125; siphylis 279; pestilence 524; paralysis 620; malarial fever 4, 8; fever 33, 246.

Diversity of place-names through trs. see {e.g.} Qızıl = Surkh, Safed = Spīn.

Dividing line of the Afghānāns and Khurāsān 200.
Divorces 267–8, 329.

Dlwân-i Bâbur Pâdshâh, [ed. Sir E. D. Ross]—not Bâbur’s earliest collection 438–9, 447; appears referred to 642; verses suiting his moods and deeds 604, 626–44, 705; verses of the Dlwân in the B.N. 526–75–84–89; the Wâlidiyâvi-rÂisaÂla and B.’s new ruler 643; Elizabethan conceits 645; concerning the Râmpûr MS. App. Q, (illustration); 585; 635.


Dlwân writers mentioned by Bâbur—Ahlî 289; Ahli 290; ‘Ali-sher Nawâ’dî (Pers.) 272; Hûsain Bât-qârî (Turkî) 259; Kâmî 290; Saïfi 288; Suhaili 277; Mahmûd Barîlîs 51; Mahmûd Mirvân-shâhi 46.

Domestic animals—ass 144; buffalo 231, 393, 454, 490; camel:—khchâri 74, 249, tîwâ 232–5, 240, 376–91; camels counted 391; flesh eaten 251; cost of keep 489; gift of 382;—cattle 150, 231–4–5–8–3, 333–96, 454; symbol of submission 232;—dog 144, 224; elephant s.n. Nat. Hist.; horse see s.n.; mule 194, 338; sheep 50–5, 71, 228, 234–5–8–9, 249–50, 394; swine 211; yâk 55, 490 (here bahrî-qâtât) App. M.—fowls 82, 213; goose 82; pigeon 13, 259, 401.

Domestic appliances—china 80, 195, 407; festal ornament 304, App. I; drinking cups 489, 298 and 552; fuel 223, 311; goat-skins 371, 421; gong 515; knife 44; lamp 518; litter 254 and 401, 331 n. 3, 268; rope 509; spoon 44, 73 n. 1, 407, 509; table-cloth 44, 132; tooth-pick 407; torch 213–4, 387–8, 518.


Dress, articles of—bâsh-ayâq=sar-u-pâ (head to foot) t.a. 159, 393; bathing-cloth (fîtâ) 275, 527; brogues (chârâq) 187; caps;—black lambskin (garà-gûzû bûrûk) 258, ermine (îs bûrûk) 150, Mughûl bûrûk 15, 179; muslîf or musfûntâmil Mughûl bûrûk 159; helm-cap (dûwulgha bûrûk) 167;—chàr-gûb 304, 527; clasp (gûlûb) 156; girdle (tak-bûnd) 156, (bîl-bûhûk lit. waist-band) 298, (kam-rûnd) 642; cyzar (khîmûr) 561; coats and tunics:—jâma 652, surtout (jîlîa) 303, 632, long coat (chòpân) 187, sheep-skin coat (postûn) 181; short tunic (nimûcha) 652; tunic and coat (tûn) 14, 51, 159, 166, 371, 400; clothes in - wear (artmûq, artmûq) 339; torch (tawâq) 561; head-wear (bâshîqûy) 632; lung (dhoti) 519; rain-clown (kêfûq) 389; feather tippet 496; turban 14, 33, 101, 258; turban - aigrette 225, 325; wide - awake (gâlpûq); vest (kûngûlêh) 171.

Drums—nagaret 144, 155, 250, 337, 369, 628; of departure 235, morning 392, saddle 163–4; drumming sound [at the Running Sands] 315; dismissal of 595; tambour-player 247.

Durch Asien’s Wüsten, Sven Hedin—Fârgâhîa wind 9.

Dynasties—Bâhmanî 482; Qîtîch 29; Tughlîq 451; Shaîbânî’s destruction of 39; “Mughul Dynasty” a misnomer in Hind 158 (see s.n. Turk and Mughûl).

Noticeable words—dâbân, a difficult defile; dâdâ 157 (see taghâhî); Ar. daur, warp of a bow, App. C; dîm [‘T root de, telling]=P. san, numbering 154, 161, 468, Add. Note, P. 54.

Ear-rings 510 (where add (in l. 5) an omitted passage entered in App. O, lit.)

Economic Products of India, Watts—date-plum 210; fish-drugs 226; oranges var. 512.

Editors mentioned in loco—A. S. Beveridge, G. B.’s Humâyûn-nâma, and Fac-simile of the Haidarâbâd Codex; H. Brockhaus, Die Lieder des Hafiz; E. G. Browne, Tajärîrû ‘ü šu’ârâd (Memoirs of Poets), Turîkh-i-gu’ûsîda (Select History); C. M. Frehnn, Shâfarat-i-Turk (Genealogical Tree of the Turk); N. I. Ilminski, Bâbûr-nâma (Kasan Imprint); I. Kûnos, Shâkh Sultâmîn Eftendî’s Vocabûlury; D. C. Phillott, Tajärîrî-ti Tahmûsî; E. D. Ross, Bâbur’s Dwân (Râmpûr MS.), and Three Turkî MSS. from Kashghar; C. Schafer, Siyastân-nâma; R. C. Temple, Peter Mundy’s Travels; F. Velîminof-Zernov, Abûshqâ; H. Yule, Wood’s Journey.


Elphinston, Hon. M. — his Codex see s.n. Bâbur-nâma.

Embassy from Bâbur to Moscow App. Q, lxxxii. Embassy to Timur, Ruy Gonsalves di Clavigo (trs. Sir C. Markham)—Hindustan the Less 46; kneeling in greeting 54; Samar-kand 74–5–8; Kesh 83.

Encyclopaedia Britannica—range of temperature 204; Paridu’d-dîn ‘Jâfârî 271; rhino-horns 408; maize when first in Asia 509.

Encyclopaedia of Islâm—Rêné Basset’s art. Al-bûşîrî 620.


Essays, Lord Bacon—Ismâ’îl Safâvî’s personal beauty 441.

Etiquette and decorum—well-mannered 45, 271–3–6, 303; knees not crossed 33; feet hidden 34; deference to elders 303; epistolary 332; farewell 330;—Interviews:—kneeling 61–9, 301, 408; looking one another in the eyes (r.a.) 54, 64; embrace 160;—Meetings:—The Khâns with Bâbur 54, 159, 169; the two Khâns 160; Timûrîya

1 where, in n. 3, for f. 183b and f. 264b read f. 103b and f. 264.
Fair at Sakkî-sarwar, Michael Macauliffe—238.

Famous Monuments of Central India, Sir Lepel H. Griffin—Gûlbalâr 605.

Fân-valley, W. R. Rickmers—[J.R.G.S. 1907], Sara-tâq-dabân 129; Ab-burdan 152.


Fauna of British India, Oates and Blanford—flying-squirrel and snow-cock 213 nn. 5, 6, 7; various birds 495, 497, 301.

Festivals—Bâbur’s Kâmzân rule 584; Îd-i-îfrî 66, 235, 311, 351, 410, 584, 683, 689; Îd-i-qurbân 154; Nû-roz 236; approximation of Nû-roz and Îd-i-îfrî 236.

Fifth-share (Khams) 324.

Five-days’ World 50, 128, 328.

Flora Indica, W. Roxburgh—spikenard 392; mahâwâ 505; gîlâr 508; chirûnji îb.; kûrâ 514.

“Florio Berg Beneveni”, Secretary to a Russian Mission, Preface xlv.

Folk-lore—test of a dead woman’s virtue 212; blizzard-raising spring 219; “commerce with the Spheres” 275; eye-bewitchment 644; omens as to sex of an unborn babe App. L; succession customs 482.

Food (ex. birds and fruits)—bread 148 (cf. A.N. trs. i, 421 for spiced bread, also Memoirs p. 144 n.); brochettes (kabûb) 148, 415; betel 440; camel-flesh 493; carrots 542; cheese 394; meat cold 411; date-palm cheese 508; dried meat 542; fritters 541; haggis 506; hare 542; honey 203, 409, 440; lotus seed 660; mango preserve 440; millet porridge 181; pistachio nuts 508 (cf. s.n. Nat. Hist.).


Games and amusements—acrobats 635; cards 584; chess 38, 275–84–87; dancing 276–99, 303; dancing-girls 522, 634; dice 16, 275–8; draughts 16, 278; feats of archery q.v.; fights of cocks 259, rams 259, elephants 631, camels 631; improvisation and recitation of verse 16, 26, Preface xxx; kûk-kûrâ 39; leap-frog 26; pigeon-flying 13, 259; polo (chaughân) 26; wrestling 292, 660–83, Index I. s. nn. Dost-i-jâsîn, Sâdîq; hawking and fowling see s.n.


Gardening see “Indian” and “Manual”.

The Gate—Lordship in 24; Bâbur’s 26, 32; the place of judgment 24, 197, 259; Gatehouse 43; between-the-doors 24, 100, 133; waiting in 277; gate-ward post 166.

Gates of India, Sir T. H. Holdich—a Central Asian claim to Greek descent 22; headwaters in Koh-i-baba 216; a route 310.

Gazetteers:—[see nn. on pp. named];

“of India [ed.1908—1909]—Observatories 79; Nil-âb 206; Gîr-khattri 250; Pir Kânî 239; Sawâtî 378; Parhâla 387; Nagarakârâ App. E, xvii, xx (Bellev): the Gagar (Kakar, Gaghgar) 465; Bâgar 573; Chandwâr, Chandwâr 581–9, 643; Lukhnûr 582; Sarwân 576; Sikanda Râo îb.; Gûlîlâr 605, 610, 611; Parsârû 684; —Gujîr 250; Kakar 386; Lûhânt (var.) 455; Mundâhir 700; —brackish streams 384; a ruined range 486; a hunting-ground (Bârî) 509; Jûna (h)pûr = Junpûr 676; —tree squirrel 492; frogs 503; yâk App. M, xlvi.

“District Gs. of India:—Allahabad, (H.G. Neville), 653; ‘Azamgarh, (,,), 680; Ballia, (,,), 664, 667; Etawa, (Drake- Brockmann), 644 nn. 2, 6; Fattpur, (H. G. Neville), 651; Fyzabad, (,,), 656, App. U; Ghazipur, (Drake- Brockmann), 658; Gualiar, C. E. Luard, 590–4–7, 605–9, 610–12–13–14; Gurgaon, (F. Cunningham), 578–80; Jilham, (,,), 452, 461; Mainpuri,
Gazetteers of the Province of Oude, App. T., lxxv, lxxvi. of the Turkistan Region, Col. L. F. Kostenko — Farghāna: — passes 2; fruits 3; cooking recipe 4; fever 4; running-waters 5; Aq-būrā-riūd 5; Khujand 7, 8; Mogol-tau 8; Sangferry176; — Samarkand: — 74; extent of town 75, 145; Kohiš-sū 76; paper-making 81; Āb-burdan 15; three passes 83, 90, 129; Lake Iskandar 129; — distances 4, 6, 75, 84; ravines App. A, ii; various ib. v; rapid riding 25; kūk-būrā 37; Sārts and their tongues 6, 7; Central Asian claim to Greek descent 22.


Hābbūn’s-siyar, Khwānd-amīr — [see nn. on pp. named]; relations with the Bābūr-nāma 57, 127, 252, 528; value as a source 70, 348, 426; not used for The Memoirs 347; used by Bābūr 11, 256—91; completion of 687; — Kinsmen of Bābūr 13, 18, 5, 4—5, 4—8, 50, 61, 90, 111, 127; — Bābūr 29, 147, 184, 297, 354—7, 432—7, 704; — various persons 25, 38, 47, 50—4—8, 72, 98, 111, 128, 249, 396; [Bih-bād] 227 and App. H, xxvi, 579, 621; varia 133, 244—96, 327—8—9, 463 (n. where read Tamarisk); 469, 617—22; — Herāt 305; Chār-shanba 71; kīshāb 66; Nīghām 85 (where in n. read l. 2), H. S., iii, 44, 167.

Haft Iqīlm, Amin Ahmad Rāzī — celebrities of Chirck 217.

Hand-book to Dihili, H. J. Keene — places visited by Bābūr 475.

, to Bengal, Murray’s — observatories 79; Dihili 475, 704.


Hawking and fowling — experts in 31—8, 40—5, 67, 270—3—6; birds with dogs 224; a story 254; lost hawk 394; Bābūr's gift of a goshawk (qāīchīqā) 385; Ahmad Mirānshāhī and goshawks 34, Add. Note, P. 34. Herat's high standard of proficiency 283, Preface xxx; see Index II.


, B. de Meynard (J. A. xvi) — 257, 305—6—7, 326.

Hidāyāt, Burhān'ūd-dīn 'Alī Qīfīch (trs. C. Hamilton) — its author's birth-place 7, 76; held in honour 76; his descendant 29; Khamas, the Fifth 324.


Hindū-shahī rulers in Kābul 200.

Hindustani uses of "Khurāsān" 202 and other words 455—88—91—92—99 (where for bākāng read bāk-dāng); pronunciation 380, 484.

Hinks, Mr. A. E. (R. G. S.), estimate of distance from Kishm to Qandahār 621.

Histoire de Chingiz Khan, F. Petit de la Croix, the elder — Gūk-sarāī 63, Ascension Stone 77.

1 For "H.S. ii" read H.S. iii — also on p. 244.
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du Khanat de Khokand, Gen. V. R. Nalivkine—Sarts 6; Akhsh App. A, i, iv, v; tradition of Bâbur's abandoned child 358.

de Timur Beg, F. Péris de la Croix, the younger—Samarkand Gates and walls 77 (see Zaraf-nama).

Historical Sketches, Col. Mark Wilks—wulsa (flight en masse) 486 7 (where for "ultwash read ultwan"); Add. Notes, P. 487.

Histories—(see nn. on pp. named).

of Bukhara, A. Vambéry—descent of chiefs 244.

of Gujrat, E. C. Bayley trs. see Mirât.

of India, Elliott and Dowson—Tarkhâns 31 (where add n. 4 references vol. i, 300, 320-1, 498); Farmûlis 456, 675; Bugtâls 452; varia 274, 440-77, 652, 693; places 191, 219, 457, 582, 699; earthquake 247; Miân = Shâikh 457; a B. N. source 438, 482-39, 621; The Malêsâtî-i-timîrî 653; supersession of B.'s sons proposed 703.


Hobson-Jobson, Sir H. Yule (ed. Crooke)—(see nn. on pp. named), Byde (var.) Horse 470; the Koh-i-nûr 477; black-buck 491; gynoe-cow 492; pârtridge cries 496; rock-pigeon (bâghri-qâra?) 498; coucal 500; koel 501; mango 503; plantain 504; "mohwa" 505; kishmîsh 505; jambû 506; jack-fruit 506; toddy 509; an orange 511; shoe-flower 513; ghurry (clepsydra) 516; ser (measure) 517; "bowly" (baol) 533; "talookdâr" 621; "cuscuss"-grass 631; "moonau!" (monal) App. N, xlix; "chok!" App. V, lxxi.

Holy War—against Kâfiristan 46; Bâbur's against Sangâ 547 et seq. and Chandiri 589; references to 579-83, 637.

Horse-accoutrement—Mughil 160; mail 140-67, 380; saddle-bags 338.

Horses—tîpîchâsg—a breeder of 38; mentioned 235, 303 and 336 (grey), 383 (almond-coloured), 401, captured at Qandahâr 338.—Kâbûl horse-trade 202; horses bred for sale 235; how fed in a siege 145; eaten on a journey 148; swim the Zar-afshân in mail 140; in snow 253, 308-11; single-file in snow 314; women's use of during a battle 268; murrians 31; abandoned 239, 379; invaded to Kâbûl 376-8; trodden down by elephants 457; restorative treatment 666;—tribute in 228, etc.; raided by Bâbur 313; galloping-ground for 222; steps counted to estimate a distance 666—guhshât, a change-horse led by a rider 453; corn and grass for 186, 221-2-3, 238; 311, 394; unfit grass 222; anatomical similarity with the rhinoceros 490.

Hot-bath, hamman—Samarkand 78, Akhsh 173, Kâbûl 346, Bâbur finds none in Hindûstân 518, constructs in Agra, 532, 634, in Dülâpûr 614, 639.

Households and families—various 32, 123, 125-9, 141; Bâbur's sent to him 71-2, 151-3; (B.'s) 184, 306; marching for Kâbûl 189, 191-7; Mughûls' come to B.'s army 192-4; B. safeguards 199, 460-1; driven like sheep 242 (2); Bâi-qâras desert 837; Shaîbânî anxious about 135, 343; B.'s come to Hind 645-6, 650-7-8, 665-75-89; his wives and children 711-4.

Houses—high 221, windowed 201; in Chandirî 597; in Gûgilâr 608.

Huna, a fabulous bird 26.

Hunting:—circle (jirga) 114, 325, 424-50, 657; Bâbur's hunting 296, 602, 707.

Humâyûn-nâma, Bâyázîd Bîyât—a commanded book 691.

Humâyûn-nâma, Gul-badan Begîm—(trs. ed. A.S. Beveridge)—[see nn. on pp. named]; Adik Sl. 23; a betrothal 48; Khân-zâda 147; Mâh-chîchûk 199, 342; Apâq B. 301; Mahdî Khw. 381, 688, 703-4, 579; 'Asas (1) 387, (2) 552; Mâmâ Atîn 148, 407; various men 408 and 640, 526; a begîm's manly pursuits 263; Mâmî B. 344, 466; Mirzâ Khân 433 ([where, i. 2 fr. ft. read grand or mother]); Bâbur's sons 436; App. J, xxxv, 619, App. L, xliii, 545; B.'s daughters 441, 522, 708, 713; Bâbur's wounds 167, 524, 616, 630; his self-devotion 701, (illustration 702, Preface xxxii; his death 708-9; removal of body to Kâbul 709;—references to the H. N. 347, 689, 691-4, Pref. xxviii; its Biographical App. 13, 705, 711.

Ibn Batuta see Travels.

Hauqâl see Geography.

Illustrated London News—fortress gun and stone ammunition 595; rafts 673.

Indian Eras, Sir Alex. Cunningham—intercalary months 515; discrepant dates App. S, lxxi.

Indian Forest Trees, D. Brandis—[see nn. on pp. named], date-plum 210; cypress 222; weeping-willow App. I, xxxii; "mohwa" 505; bullace-plum 507; orange-like fruits 510; ebony-tree 585.

Indian Hand-book of Gardening, G. T. F. Speede—sinjïd (jujube) 203; amîükâ (date-plum) 210; sambil (spikenard) 392; "keeras" (cherry) 501; kamrak (averrhoa carambola) 506; sang-târa (orange) 511; under-ground jack-fruit App. O, lii.
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Inscriptions—Bābur’s at Āb-burdan 152, Bād-i-pich pass 343, Qandahār App. T;—on Ajodhya Mosque App. U; on B.’s tomb 710.


“Islam”’s foes killed 370; its army 564. Ivory 489.

Jogis—at Gür-khattīr 230.


Journey from Bengal to England, G. Forster—division of climates 229 (where for “Travels” read Journey).

Journey to the Sources of the Oxus, J. Wood (ed. Yule)—Kābul 199; Running-sands 201, 215; Hindu-kush passes (Yule’s Introduction) 204; dun sheep 224; Nagarahāra regions App. E, xxiii.

Journeys in Biluchistan, Afghanistan and the Panj-āb, E. Masson—(see nn. on pp. named), Kābul 199, 200, 201, (fruits) 203–4; Shib 215; Panjhir 205; Nilāb (in Ghūr-bund) 216; Adināpur 207; Chaghatāi castles 208; a meaning of “Lām” 210; Running-sands 215; Judas-tree 216; places 405, 412–17 457, routes 231, 417; sign of submission 232; Nagarahāra App. E, xvii; “Bābur Padshah’s stone-heap” (cairn) 416; Preface p. xxxviii.

Journey to India overland, A. Conolly—Kābul 199; rawyūf (rubarb) 203.

Kabul see “Cabool” and “Caubul”.

“Kafir”—uses of the word 481–3; 518, 577.

Kafirs of the Hindu-kush, Robertson—their wines 212.


Kehr, Dr. G. J. [scribe of the Pet. F. O. School Codex of the “Bukhārā Bābur-nāma”] see Wāqt-nāma-i-pādshāhī.

The Khamsatian (Two Quintets)—a reader of 15; imitated 288.

Khaṣmatī’l-asfīyā [Treasury of Saints], Ghu-lām-i-sarwār—Khwajaft Khw. 67; Mir Sayyid ʿAli Hamadānī’s grave 211; Pir Kānū 238; Jālalū’d-dīn Purānī 306; Sharaftū’d-dīn Mūmīrī 666.

Khuda—read disloyally 52, 328; Bābur’s compact 354–6; read in Dihli for him 476. The (Koh-i-nūr) diamond 477, 702.

Klaproth Jules—Preface xxxix, xlvi; [see Archiv und Mémoires relatifs etc.].


Noticeable words:—khachar 74, 249; khāk-bīla (leap-frog) 26; Khān-dāda; kīsāk (old person) 66; kim (yeast) 423; kīyīk 6, 8, 10, 224, 491; khīnār = cymar (scarf) 561; kūłāk syn. kūngelāk (pull-over vest, jersey) 171–5; kūhābrā see aǔghlaqīt; kūr-khāna; Qarshi = Ar. qaṣr 84; kūrūsh, looking in the eyes, interviewing i.a. 54, 64, 640 (cf. gūchūsh, embracing); kusārū [?] 369; kūshīlūq 250.


Laidlaw (J.A.S.B 1849) —nasal utterance App. E.

Lane’s Lexicon see Dictionaries.

Langlès art. Babour Preface xlv.

Law (Muhammad’s)—on blood - vengeance 194, 251–8; Shaibānī’s disregard of 329; Hussain Bāi-qarā’ī’s regard for 258; Bābur’s orthodoxy observance shown e.g. 25, 44, 111, 262, 370–7, 483, 547–51 74–99–6, and in the Mubin and Wālidiyah-riṣāla q.v.; his orthodox reputation (ehiphāf) 711; his observance as to intoxicants 302, beyond his 23rd year 299, 302–3–4; his return to obedience (933) in 44th year 551–5; referred to 203 (verse) 645–7–8; his breaches of Law—against types of verse 447, repeated 448; against wine, see s.n. Wine.


Les six voyages en Turquie, en Perse, et aux Indes, Jean Baptiste le Tavernier—the coin casbeke, khipī 296.

Letters of Lady Mary W. Montagne—lovers’ marks 16.

Letters—Nawā’i’s imitation of Jámī’s collection 271; Bābur keeps a letter of 910 to 935 AH. 190; his royal-letters (farman) 463–4, 526, 617 (with autograph marginal couplets), others (khaṭā) 331–2; to Khw. Kālān 411 (with autograph couplet), 603 n. 3, 627, and (reproduced) 645; to Humayūn (reproduced) 624; to Kāmirān 645–6, Preface xxxv, xliii; to Māhim 374, 541; Letters-of-victory—Kābul 319, Bajaur 371, Ḥiṣār-firūza 466, Kānwa 559–74, 580.

Levirate marriage 23, 267.

Levy on stipendiaries 617.

Lexicon Persico-Latinum, I. A. Vuellers see Dictionaries.


L’Inde des Rajas, L. Rousselet—Gūālīr 605.


Looting of assigned individuals 328.

Lord [J.A.S.B 1838]—Ghūrbund 205; Running-sands 215.
Meal-hours — big breakfast 389; noon 614—861.

Measures — Linear : — a'ilk (finger - breadth) 489, 630; arghamchi (rope) 614; arrow's-flight (i.e. bow-shot), i.e. 8, 640; from gate-ward to Gate 316; gas 611 n. 3; kuroh i.a. 76; qadam (step, pace) 75, 630, (of a horse) 666; qārt 7, 208—9, 489, 550, 611—29—30—31; qārtish (inch) 489; qīlāch 406—93; sharī 76, 200; spear's length 196, 377, 474; tanāb (rope) 630; tutām (hand-breadth) 630; yīghāch (Prs. trs. far-sang) 4, 7, 9, 10, 25, 55, 76, 82—3—4, 99, 138, 208—17—18, 323, App. A, v n. 1;—
Time — Hindūstān divisions of the year 515 to 517; boiling of milk 175, 237;—
Weight — bātmān 263, 276; mān 699; mīsāl 421—77, 632; rāt 477 n. 6, 517; tāsh (stone, silver & gold) 632; Kābul sīr (ser) 632, 546; Table of weights of Hind 517—8; tūla 517—41;— ass-load (kharwar) 228, 338—9, 374;—Numeration (Indian) 518;—Capacity — r mills water-power i.a. 208, 216, 462—5, 581; (coins by the) quiverful 632.

Medical and surgical remedies — dried plums (prunes) 82; water dropped from cotton 89; trepanning 106—9; seton, bandage (yīldīs) 169; powder for bone-growing 169; water-melon and narcissus 246, 399, 401; rose-water (jīl-āb) 400; antidotes to poison 511, 543; tonic powders 606; opium 608, 661; quicksilver 618; pepper-steaming 657, 669.

Medieval geography and history of Central and Western Asia — E. Bretschneider—Almālīgh and other old towns 2; Simiz-kint [Fat-village], a name of Samarkand 75; Nūyān explained 131.

Memories relatifs à l’Asie (ii, 134), J. Klaproth—its valuable extracts from the Bukhara Compilation, Preface, Cap. III, Part III; Bābur’s letter to Kāmrān, App. J, xxxv, (see Archives).

Memory, retentive, 290.

Mero Oasis, O’Donovan—Rādāgan 622.

Metamorphoses, Ovid—Scorpio and Libra 623. Migration enforced—of Mughuls of the Horde 20, 350—1; of Tramontane tribes 202 70, 322; of villagers to Bajaur 375, and planned to Stālkot.

Military :— Armies, size of :—Maḥmūd (Ghazni) 479; Shihābudd-din Ghurī 480; Aʿzāz-beg 480; Daulat Khān Lūṭī 451; Bābur, Qandahār 334, Bhīra 480, Pānipat 452—80; Ibrahim Lūṭī 463—80; Sangā 547; Tāhmāsp at Jām 635;—Bābur’s force in

1 On this peg may be hung the following note:—The Pādshāh-nāma (g.v.) calls the author and presenter of the above translation “Abū’l-ḥāfīz” Husaini (Bih. Ind. ed. vol. i, part 2, p. 585), but its index contains many references seemingly to the same man as Khwāja Abū’l-ḥusain Turbati. The P. N. says the book which it entitles Wāgi’ti-i-sahib-gīrīn (The Acts of Timūr), was in Turki, was brought forth from the Library of the (Turk) Governor of Yemen and translated by Mir Abū’l-ḥāfīz Husaini; that what Timūr had done with this book of counsel (dastān-i-naṣīḥa) when he sent it to his son Pir-i-muhammad, then succeeding (his brother) Jahāngīr (in Kābul, the Ghaznis, Qandahār, etc.) Shāhjāhān also did by sending it, out of love, to his son Aurangzīb who had been ordered to the Deccan.
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various encounters (200 to 300) 91; (240) 100; (1000) 87; (240) 334-7; (10 to 15) 140; (100) 147; (10 to 15) 166, (3) ib., (1) 167; (100) 173; (20 to 25) 177, (1) 178;

Commands: — Minglish (1000) 52; Nüyán (Mughūll) 151; Tāmān-begi (10,000) 17; Yüz-atlik (Centurion of horse) 143; Qūchín 32;—Army array: —108-13-55-98; 234-381; 468-71, 557-8; Bābūr’s organization and terms 334; flanking-movement (tālkhuma) 139, described on 140, 473, 568; rallying-point 547; rendezvous (būljār) 122-3, 592, 638; at the Sindferry 461-2; postings 113-39, 372, 595, 662-68;—Various: — A.S. Corps 674; army-list 451-2; camp-bāzār 67-8; Corps of Braves 28, App. H., xxvi; discipline 66-7; necessities for holding a fort 145; numbering (dāin) 154-61, 468, (san) 451-2; pass-words 164; pillars of heads 232, 324-71, 404; war-cries 138-44-55-63-66; ways and means 228, 617;—Rājpūt fighting customs 955; massacres of “Pagans” 370, 484, 596;—Appliances and constructions: —axe (tool) 108, 379; catapult 59; camp defence: —ditch and branch 60-1, 110-17, 138, 908 AH.) 162, Rūmī defence of linked carts infra (932 AH.) 469-70, 550-58; draw-bridge (pul-i-ravām) 171-76; flaming-fire 595; guns see fire-arms; ladders (štātt) 130-31-43-71, 368-70, 593; man-telet (ṭārā) 108-13-55, 368, 469, 593; mines 53-9, 343-70; mot 10; pit 98; head-drive (sar-kob) 53-9; spade or shovel (kātāmān) 108; smoke 59; wheeled-tripod 550-7;—Armour: — helm 166-7, 396; cuirass (mail or wadded) i.a. 195, 315-96; the word ḧība 195; Qāmāq ḧība 175; coat of mail (jashan) 195; horse-mail (ṯaṭyim) see horse; arm-protractor, the 4 plates of mail, attachment (gharīcha) 167, 315, 396;—Arms: — battle-axe (ḥāltā) 160, 370; broad dagger (jumdar) 528; hanger (khanjar) 528; Hindū knife (kārd) 528; lance (nēsa) 370; six-flanged mace (shash-par) 160; rugged mace (piyāstī, Sangālkāh Dīct. f. 312b, kiṣā thí) 160; casse-tâte mace (ṭittin) 160; scabbard (gīn) 167; sword (gīlīch) 160-61-67, 315-70-96, 453; broad sword (yāstī gīlīch) 150; (see Archery);—Carts (arābā) for Rūmī defence: —(Panipat) ordered collected 468; 700 brought and used as described 468-9;— misleading omission from (E.’s) Memoirs 468 n. 3;—progress of the defences 469-70; mantelets used 469; (position of guns 473-74);—(Kānwa) carts supplemented by wheeled tripods 550; place of carts in the march out 550-57-58; carts the frontal protection 550-58; well-made in Rūmī fashion 550; [posts of matchlockmen and cannoneers along the line of carts 569]; carts in the battle 564-697, 471; centre troops move from behind them 570-71; carts advanced in front of Bābur 571;—(Jām) Tāhmasp’s Rūmī defence 623, 635-36;—Fire-arms: —firing (swivel-gun, pierrier) 472, 667; mortars (gūzān) 59—the Ghāzī cast 536, tested 547—used 570-99—ineffective at Chandīri 592-5—its elephant-attraction 489; mortars and (add) carts landed 651—used in the Gogra battle (where “tope”) 669-70-71; a larger mortar made, bursts 588;—gurb-zan (culverin) 473—used at Panīpat 474, Kānwa 564-9, 71, the Ganges-bridge 599, Eastern campaign 651-6;—tāxfān, tāxfāk (matchlock) used 368-9, 466-9, 558-64-70-71-73, 599, 628-67-8-9; Tāhmasp’s 622-35;—gunners and matchlockmen 368, their pay 617 and wellbeing 647;—“fire-working” Bengalis 672;—mulūjār (gun emplacement) 593, 628 (for būljār?); 668;—Stone-missiles:— hurled by hand 109, 370, 595; legendary dropping of by birds 563; discharged from catapults 59, from catapults and matchlocks 109, 369, 431-73, 571-88-93-95-99, 617-67-70-79;—Transport: —pack animals 239; camels 232-5, 378, (counted) 391, 601-56 (see Domestic animals); elephants 489; carts (baggage) 237, 376-77, 468, 636, 700, (gun) 592-99, (unspecified) 601-51-56;

Minerals:—ribbon-jaspér 6; turquoise 8, 12; iron 12; jade 27, 67; ruby 194; silver and lapis-lazuli 214; lead and copper 485; Mirāt-i-jahān-nūmā, Shaikh Muh. Baqā—Khwānd-amīr’s journey to Hind 505; Mirāt-i-sīkandār, ‘Alī Muh. Khan (trs. E. Clive Rayle) —Gujrāt affairs 535; persons 562 and 614, 612; Guāllār jewels 613; Mirror-stone, (Farīghāna) 7.

Miscellaneous Works, Greaves—Observatories 79.

Mohl, Jules—date of revision of Tārīkh-i-fīrīshtā 694 (E. and D.’s Hist. of India iv, 209).


Moon-stroke 608.

Mountain-bases leading into the valley of Bāmin, Lt.-Gen. E. Kaye, C.B. (PRGS. 1879)—birds 213.

Mubīn (Exposition), Bābur—date of composition (928 AH.) 426, 437; described 437-8; Bābur’s choice of its title 630, 653; thought during its composition 449; quoted 630; sent to Samarkand 653.

Mughūls and Bābur:—a faithful Mughūl 87-8; Mughūls enter his service 58-9, 189, 190-2-4; 245; support Jahāngr against him see i.a. sunn. Tāmāl, ‘Ali-dost; offer to supplant him by Sa’id Chaghatāi 351; sent to help him 101-4, oppose him 115; desert him 86-7, 104-5; Five Rebellions against him 105, 208, 313-4, 345-9, 361-2-3, 397; his following purged of them 427; his comments on them 66, 104-5,
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115–40, 172; a Mughul chief’s dying comment on them 363; “Mughul dynasty” a misnomer 158.

Muhammadan Dynasties, Stanley Lane-Poole — Table of Timurids 262; various 479–82; certain Aūzbeg deaths 636.

Mu’ina’d-din al Zamji (J.A. xvi, 476, de Meynara’s art.) — Kichik Mirza’s Egyptian information 257.

Muntakhabul-lubab, Muh. Ḥāshim Kha’(aw)āfi Khān — [see nn. on pp. named], a source for filling Bābur-nāma gaps 208; Sīhrind, Sar-i-hind 383; siege of Chandīrt 596; varies Bābur’s chronogram of the victory 596.

Muntakhabul-tawārikh, ‘Abdul-qādir Badāyūnī (trs. W. Dows, Payne) Hasan Ḥiyrī 153; Bābur’s Script 228, App. Q, lxii, arrowed couplet 361; Muslim 437–9; Chronogram of Sikandar Lūdī’s death 427; the haunted field of Pānīpat 472; Ḥasan Mīwātī 523; Shaikh Gūran 526; Fārīghī 621; Muh. Ghass 690; quotes Bābur’s Funeral Ode 709.

“Musālmani” as used by Bābur 99, 104, 268, 481, and by Shaikh Zain 553–5.

Musalmān Numismatics, O. Codrington — various coins 632 [see JRAS. 1913–4].

Music — instruments: — ‘āḏā (lute) 292, 395; chang (jews’-harp) 303; drum set s.n.; ghachak (guitar) 291; nārī (flute) 291, 303; gānim (dulcimer) 278; gūzīs (guitar) 39; — modes: — 76 n. 5, 136, 287, 422; — performers: — 39, 278, 286–7, 291, 292, 422 (Bābur); at entertainments passim; — Banā’ī’s rapid progress as a musician 287.

Noticeable words: — āīmāg 51 etc. Add. Note P. 51; mīng = P. hasāra 52; mīng-begī see gūchīn; mīhman-beg 227.

Nadir Shāh Pref. xviii.


Narrative of the Journey to the Embassy to Kūshghar (Yarkand), H. W. Biddle — Satūq-būghrā Khān 29.


Natural History — Beasts — those common to Kābul and Hind 222; wild ass 224, 325; wild buffalo 490, 657; būghū-maral 8, 10, 114, 373, 491, 500; — elephant described 488, encounters with rhino and camel 451, 631, 657, in battle 463–70, 457–66, 68, 529, 668, in hunting 657, killed by a fleeing foe 662, killed in Makka 563, statues of, at Gūllār 609, various 590, 628–58; — ermine-wasel 492; yellow fox 114; flying-fox (bat) 500 (and n. 6 where read f. 135); gainīe cattle 492; goat 16, 83; hare 10, 114; — ‘īṭīk: — black buck, hog-deer and a smaller deer 222, 491, ṣīrīk (white) 6, 8, 10, 491, gūzīl ‘īṭīk, arqārg’ilhalcha (dun sheep) 224, 491; — tree-mouse 492; monkey, ape 211, 222, 492; musk-rat 214; nil-gau 222, 490; pig 114; qīchqār (ram) 492; karg (rhinoceros) 378, 450–1–89, 557; squirrel 492; flying squirrel 211; tiger 393, 664; yāk (gūtās) 55, 155, bāhṛi gūtās 485, 490, App. M. — Birds: — migration 220–4; catching 220–4–5; common to Hind and Kābul 220; decoy-birds 225; impeded flight 214, 496; special notes on App. B and N; combined sex-name 500; ‘āḏā (adjunct) 398, 498; ‘āḏā (adjunct) 499; ‘āḏā (adjunct) 499; bāhṛi-gūrā see sand-grouse and App. N.; Indian bustard and Great bustard 498; Large buzzak (black ibis) 499; white buzzak 499, 500 l. 2; buzzard (T. sār) 499, 500 p.3; chameleon-bird see lākha; cranes var. 224, 499; crow var. 500; ducks var. 224, 500; egret (garqara) 224; golden eagle (bāqāūr) 373, 500; florican 498; — goshawk (T. qārghīqāh and qārghīqāh) 34, Add. Note, P. 34, 385; greyheron (aqāq) 224, 499; jungle-fowl var. 497; ‘āḏā-īqār 214, 496–7, App. N., xlix (see lākha); — kulī, koel 501; Indian loriqut 494 n. 5; lākha var. 213, 222, 496, Add. Note, P. 496 (see ‘āḏā-īqār); magpie 500; green magpie 501; mānek (beef-steak bird) 499; monal 496, 497, App. N., phīl-pāikār 497; bulbul (nightingale) 420, 501; northern-swallow 495; parrot var. 493–4; partridge par. 421–93–96–97; peacock 493; pelican (gūţān) 224, App. N. 1; pheasant (qīrghīs-wal) 3, 8, 10, 34, 114, 493–97 (chīr); qīl-qûrūỹqāh (Qarshi-birdie) 84, App. B; quail var. 34, 497–8; sand-grouse (bāhṛi-gūrā) 84, 498; App. B; sīrīk-īqār 373; — sharāk; — Hīmālayan starling? 495 n. 3; — pintana wāt 495; house-mīna 495 (add n. ref. 5); pied-mīna ib.; — sparrow (chāchūg) 8; — snow-cock 213, 421, Add. App. N. 1, (see lākha and chīrītīka ib.) — white stork 499; kakaraka (swift) 501; wag-tail 498, 501; wild fowl 497; little green wood-pecker 501; summaq 500 (“eagle,” add Its colour is black); — Fish and amphibia: — migration 225; catching 225–7, 406, 682; of Hindustan

1 In n. 5 for “pārvān” read pārvān, and read Blanford.

2 which read (l. 17) for yak rāng. The name bāqāūr appears due to the clapping of the bird’s mandibles and its pomatous strout; (cf. Ross’ Polyglot List, No. 330).

4 Following the samīmaj insert “ Another is the buzzard (T. sār); its back and tail are red.” (Cf. Omission List under p. 500.)

4 See Omission List under p. 493.

5 After “Tramontane”, add Its breast is less deeply black.

6 The bird being black, its name cannot be translated “yellow-bird”; as noted on p. 373 sārīq = thief; sārīq = sārīq means a bird’s song.”
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fish 503; cray fish 502; unnamed 663; frog 503; porpoise 502; crocodile var. 501–2, 663; — Various:—lizard 501–2; locust (chittirika) 421, App. N, 1; mosquito 204; snakes, 8, 147, 406; Flowers: — Farghāna 5, 10; Kabul 215–7; Peshāwar 393; Hind 513–5; — arghāwān (red, the Judas-tree) 216–7, 305, (yellow) 217; habicus 513; jasmine 515; oleander 141, 580, 610; roses 5, 321 (couplet), 513; screw-pine 516; tulips 5, 215, 321; violets 5; — Fruits: — Farghāna 2, 3, 6, 8, 10; Samarkand 77, 82–4; Kabul 202–3, 8–10—12–16–18–20–21; Hind 503 to 513, App. O; — aian-lā 506; almond 6, 7, 9, 223, 507–8; ālā-bālā 203; apple 2, 8, 77, 202–20, 507; apricot 6, 202; badrang 203; plantain (lānāna) 208, 504; cherry 203; chūrūnji 508; citron var. 203–8, 10, 501–11; clustered—fig 508; coco-nut 509; colocoly-apple (wild gourd) 410–11 (whore for khuntāl read kungul); coriander 211; corinda 507; date-palm 410–24, 506–8; date-plum (T. ārd-yimīt) 203–10, fig 508; grape 3, 77, 202–3, 10–12–18–21—507–8, 646–86–87; jack-fruit 506; jāman 506, 606; jīlghūsa (palm-seeds) 203–13; jujube (sinjīd) 196, 203, chīkā 506; kamrak 506 (where add, I has no stone); lemon 512, 614; lime var. 512; lote-fruit 507; lotus-seed (duidāh) 666; mango 503; melon var. 10, 82–4, 92, 411, 645–6; 686–7; minusops 505; myrobolan 508; nāshpālī 3; orange var. 203–10–11, 414, 510, 512, App. N, 512, 614, App. O, lii; pear 203; peach 203; pistachio 508; plum 82; monkey-jack 506–7; pomgranate 6, 8, 77, 202–8, 507; quince 202, 507–12; tamarind 505 (n. ref. to babā) walnut 203, 508; — Trees and plants: — amān-garā, maize (? 504, small almond 223, būtā 505, būtā-kāh 221, clover, trefoil, sīh-barga, yārīnchā 6, 209, 346, conifers, arche, 221–2, cypress 81, 222, dhak 472; — ebony-tree 558, 614, hardwood-cam 81, grass (cuscus) 631 n. 2, holm-oak 213–16–23, madder 218, mahwōd 505–8, male-reed 514, mandrake and its similars 11, mastic 213–23, millet 81, 215, mulberry (tāt) 248, 494, olive 222, palmry-cam 509, App. O, liv, Pinus Gerardiana, jīlghūsa 203–13, plane 216, 398, poplar var. 13, 15, (tārīk) 145 and 156, 414 (where for “pur-simil” read poplar), garmand 223, reed 514, rice 210, 342, rhabarb 203, 345, 507, spikenard 392, sugar-cane 208, 388, tābāghī 11, tamarisk 14, 463 (where, wrongly, "tamarind") — willow 217, 306, (weeping) 304, App. I, (amāb-bīd) 512; — Physical various—Climate: — change on the Kānšālik-pass (? 2; — meeting places of hot and cold in Kabul 208 and 229, 220; both near the town 202; good climate Aūh 4–6 Kāsān 10, Soghd 84, Kabul 263; —

Climes: — Farghāna and Samarkand in the 5th 1, 74; Kabul in the 4th 199; — cold, Akhā 116, Hasht-yak 151, Ghazni 219, 526, Khwārizm 219, upper Heri-rūd valley 311, Kabul 314; —

Various: — dust-storm 520, 32–6; earthquake 247, 367; solar eclipse 659; ice; — Sir-daryā crossed on 151; Kabul ice-houses 215; near Farhāla 452; none had in Hind 518; — malaria: — Andijān 4, Khujand 8; — rain: — 384, 425; rain-making see magic; rain-talisman 423; rainy season (various) 405, 507, 514–19, 677–8; — snow: — 208, 215, 252, 314, 373; Himalayan snows 485; perilous journey in snow 309–11; snowfall of Samarkand and Kabul compared 77; — wind: — Farghāna 9 and n. 2, 151; Kabul 201; upper Heri-rūd valley 310; Hind 520, pestilential 524, 532, 654–7, does damage to Bābur’s writings 658.

Nestorian Church 2.

New account of the East Indies (Edin. 1727), Alex. Hamilton—Malabar succession customs 482.

Nīgār-nāma-i-hind, Sayyid Gulāl-i-āli—a British monument at Panipat 472.

Nine a mystic number—9 Turīkhān privileges 250; 9 allowed offences 250; gifts by nines; [ Cf. Shaṭjaratul-ātrak, Miles trs. p. 530, for the root of reverence for the number nine].

Notes on Afghanistan and Baluchistan, H. G. Raverty—[see nn. on pp. named], Kabul rulers and river 200; river called Nil-ab 206; Aqabain 201; Adinaprīr-region 207; Ghazni magic spring 219; migration of fowlers 225; Timūr’s pillars of heads 232; place of Zūn-nūn’s death 327; “Kakar” 386; “Pātakh” (= bāt-gaq = quagmire) 403; But - khāk a vahāra - site 409; — Various places 206, 220, (Güm-rahān) 236, 238–47–48 (2), “Chārīkār” (Chār-yak-ar) 295, 345–73, 403, (Zābul) 405; — Routes 206–9, 212, 223–35–54; book needs revision 330–67; a collaborator 213.

Notes on the Chugani and neighbouring tribes of Kafiristan, Col. H. S. Tanner (JRGs. 1887)—map mentioned 209; Dān-i-nür 210, App. F; Ning-nahār App. E, xix. [ Cf. Index II s.n. chīgān.]


Nouvelle Geographie; L’Asie Antérieure, Réclus—[see nn. on pp. named], Farghāna 4, 5, 9; distances (Akhā) App. A, v, (Tirmīz-Ihsār) 57; Samarkand 74, 83, 88; Mil-i-rādagān 622; Kadgar (i.e. Qájar) 666; sīspāq = fort App. Q, lxiv; dābān and other pass-names 54.

Noticeable words: — P. nabārā 66, 72; nikhalam (game-driving) 45; M. nūyān 131, 224–73;
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Observatories see Astronomy.

Omens—of the sex of an unborn child App. L; of success 466, 558.

Onan, Sir Charles Elliot — Badshâh-nagar named from Bâbur’s halt 675.

“Oolak” (baggage-boat), perhaps from T. aâlûgh, great 663.

Open-table, maintainers of 39, 45–9, 119, 227.

Opium-eater 385.


Oriental Proverbs, T. Roebuck—the “five-days’ world” 50.

Noticeable words:—M. Oghlât = T. Dûghlât = Qûnûr-ût of Aûzbegs 22.

Pâdshâh—uses of the word 1; title assumed by Bâbur 344.


Pâdshâh-nâmâ, Muhammad Amin Kazzwînî—Bâbur’s gardens in and near Kâbul App. V; [cf. Mafjûdat-i-tîmûrî].

Pagan see Kâfr.

Painting and painters—22, 78, 111, 272–91.

Painting and Painters of Persia, Martin—Bih-zâd 291.

Pargiter, Mr. F. E.—on “wulsa” 487–8, Add. Note, P. 487.

Pass-names 54.

Pass-words see Military.

Penmanship and scripts—good writers 28, 111, 278, 291; the Bâbûr-script 228, 642, App. Q, lxii.


Persia and the Persian Question, Lord Curzon—its “Radkan” explained 622.


Persian Poets, Sir W. Ouseley—Khwâja Kamâl 8.

“Pharaoh” used as an epithet 39.

Poems of Nizâmî (Meon and Lahor eds.)—


Poems of Nûrî-d-dîn ‘Abîdîr-rahmâm fâmî—a description of the Nafahât 284; the metre of the Subhâtî-âbrár adopted in the Shaibânî-nâmâ 289, and in the Wâli-dîyyah-ristâla 620 (where read rahmân for “ražîm”).

Poems of Kipling—“My Lord the Elephant 208; “The Border-thief” 308; “If—” 320.

Poison—suspected 302, 576; given to Bâbur 541; revealed by rhino-horn 489; antidotes, lime-juice 511, Lennian Earth 543.


Polyglot List of Birds, E. Denison Ross, Ph.D. —373, 495–6–7–8, 500; App. M, xlvii.

Popular Religion of Northern India, W. Crooks—Sarsawa 467.

Prayers, The Five—‘Umar Shaikh’s observance of 15; voluntary Sunnat-prayer 100; Bâbur (et. 12) less neglects the after-midnight prayer 44; Ahmad Mirân-shâhî observes on drinking-days 33; a reverse case 111; Erskine on their “performance” 258; time expressed by their names passim.

Prisoners—rebels killed 69, 113; war-captives killed 233, 466–8; set free 37, 237, 313, 371, 413; traitors pardoned 317–9, 320, 345.


Promotions—to beg’s rank from the household-circle 104; household-beg to Great Beg 86, 104; yasâwal to beg 273; to begship 87, 114, 278; gûrchi to gîr-begî 252; brave to beg 396;—a beg self-made 118; (’Askari) to preside in Dîwan 628; (a Mirzâ) to royal insignia 662, 706; to use of the tûgh (standard), frequent.


Punishments—beard shaved off 404; blinding 50, 63, 95, 194, 266; bow-stringing 110, 194; quartering 238, 454, 543; hanging 345; impalement 341; nose-slitting 234, 383; parade mutilated 404, 234; shooting 543; skinning alive 542; for disloyalty 70, 113.


Noticeable words:—P. pahr and pâs distinguished 634; passim 10.

Qandahar in 1879 A.D., Le Mesurier—the old town 431; stone-armament ib.

Qandahar see La grande inscription de Q. Qâdisatîl-burâlâ, Al-bûshri—Bâbur works from its motive 620; [cf. Réné Basset].

gibba—discrepancy 79.

giszal-bash (red-head) 266, 618–22–30–35.

The Quran (trs. G. Sale)—quoted by Bâbur 194, 316, 449; read by or to him, remedi- ally, 401, Add. Note, P. 401, 585; copied by him in his Script 228; obeyed as to the Khams (5th) of booty 324; re-

1 For references to Nizâmî’s text, I am indebted to Mr. Beveridge’s knowledge of the poems.
Reports:

of Mission to Kāshghar, Col. J. Bid-dulph's art.—marāl 8;

Persian Boundary Commission, W. T. Blanford's art.—Pteroclas arena-
rius App. B, vii.—A. Gérard's art.—irrigation-channels of Aūsh (Ush) 4;

Settlement Operations etc., Reid—old alluvium on the Gogrā 667; nar-
rowing of the river 669.

Reports (J. O. Library) I, VI, VII, J. Wood—vine-culture 210; Gūhr-bund 214; bōotr
(a plant) 222; climate-shed 229;—VI, VII, D. Leach—204–5–6–13–38;—IX, X, Alex. Burns—Kābul 199; unchanging trade-habits of Luhāns 235.

"Rescue-passage" 182, App. D; Preface xv (No. viii).

Revenue Accounts (Bengal), F. Gladwin—
dating of 935 AH. 629, App. S; tanā-measure 630.

Revenue resources of the Mughal Empire, E. Thomas—coin-values 446; ūmangā 553; Sikandari tanka 577.

Revenue various—Farghāna 12, Tātār Khān Lūdī's 383, Kābul-town 250, Hindustān 520, App. P.

Rhetorique, Garçon de Tassy—combinaisons énigmatiques 202.

Ride from Sāmikand to Herat, N. Grodekoff (trs. Marvin)—Pul-i-chirāgh 69; Chārshamba 71.

Riyāzī's-salāṭīn, Ghulām-i-husain — a Lūdī alliance 482.

Roads measured—Agra-Kabul 629; Munīr to camp by horse-paces 666; Chunār east-
wards 659.

ruler, mistrār—a new one for copying the Wālidiyyah-visāla 643.

Russian Policy in Central Asia, Grigoriev (Schuyler's Turkistan App. IV)—Bābur's
embassy to Moscow App. Q, lxxi; Peter the Great's embassy to Bukhara Preface
p. liii.

Sachan, C.—on the Malūsāt-i-i'lmūri 653.
Sāhīk-i-bukhārī, Ismā'īl Khartank—his native land 76.

Sainthood—courage a witness to 90.

Siyyar'ul-muta'akkirīn, Ghulām-i-ḥusain Khān —trepanning 105.

Salt, fidelity to 125, 440.


Samarkandis—displeased with a Mirzā 42; overjoyed at his death 52; no scarcity in a
siege 64; move against Bāḥkārā 65; oppose Bābur 72; their orthodoxy 75; joy at
Bābur's return 131–3.

Sanctuary 63.

Sang-lākh see Dictionaries.

Sārt, Sārt—Bābur's serviceable use of the name 6, 7, 149; a "Sārt"'s blunder 169.
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ferred to by him 517;—'Umar Shaikh a reader of 15, Preface xxx; transcribers of
38, 481; recited 246, 301; frequent quotations by Shaikh Zāin 553 to 6, 559 to—74;
quoted on a Samarkand arch 77; sworn on 179, 557; Shaibānī makes exposition of
329; a collection of homonymous verses 285; Sale's Intro. referred to 562–3.

Quatremère, E.—(N. et Ex.) 446–59, (J. des Savans, 1643) 605.

Qirānī's-sa'dain, Amir Khusrau—a coupled quoted 503 (H.B.).

Noticeable words:—gābāq 34; gāchār
(punned on) 44; gāri (a measure) 7; garā-
tiyāq 101, 103; gāzāqlar (guerilla times)
35; gāptāl (part of a saddle) 253; gībā-
ıyūliq (fat-faced) 14; qurghī (armourer,
life-guardsman) i.a. 188, 288; qūchīn =
ming-begī 26, 40; gūrghān (walled-town)
i.a. 3, 5, 8, 10; gūrīq (reserved land) 81,
168, 197; gūšhīq (improvised dance and
song) 24; gūmīz (fermented mare-milk)
155; gūchāsh (embrace) 160; gūlāch
(a measure) 406.

Races of Afghanistan, H. W. Bellew—Khiblīch
29 (where read title as above).

Raft—(Farghāna) 161, 180; (Kābul) 410–11–

Rāmacīnta, H. Sastri (Memoirs, AS Bengal)
Nagarāhāra App. E, xxiii.

Rāmpūr MS. of Bābūr's Dīwān, Preface l,
App. Q.

Rapid travel—Āurā-tipa to Bābā Khākt 25;
Kishm to Qandahār 621; Kābul to Agra
621.

Rashahdt-i- 'ainul-hayat [Tricklings from the
Fount of Life] 'Alī Kāshīfi—Khwājā Khwāja 62; Ahhrār 620; (not known to
Erskine).

Rausati's-safā, Mir Khwānd—referred to (?)
11; Bābā-i-kābuli 14; Hazārāspi 50; a
chronogram 85; the Chaghatāi Khāns
(908 A.H.) 161.

Récueils d'ITíndreis, Th. Radloff—fruit as
food in C. Asia 3, 114; position of Yūtī-
kint 11; elevation to Khānship 21; Pul-i-
mongāk 68 (Khorochkine's art.); battle-
cries 163.

Reports:

on the Ghilzai country, J. S. Broadfoot
[ed. W. Broadfoot]—birds at Ab-
īstāda 240;

of the Indian Archeological Survey,
Cunningham & Ferguson—[see nn.
on pp. named], places Bābur visited
475–6; a Gūlār dynasty s term cf
rule 477; Chandrī 592–7, App. R,
(plan); Gūlār 605–7 to 13; App.
R, (plan); Saṃbhāl 687;—Annual
Report 1914—kos-mīnār 629;

on Kornal, D. Ibbetson—Mundāhirs
700;
Scottish service for the Bābur-nāma, Preface xlvii, xlviii.


Sects, Muḥammadan—Māṭāridiyah, Ash'ari-yah, Abū Ḥanīfa's 75–6, Shafī'ī 283; Rādiyān 625.

Shāhī Kings of Kābul, Sir Aurel Stein—200.

Shāhī-nāma, Pirdausī (trs. Warner) Chāchī bow, Ḥadad arrows 13; much read 15; Dāqī Tārkhan sketched 40; a couplet 557; a quatrain 571.

Shaibanī-nāma, Muḥ. Šāliḥ Mīrzā (ed. Vambery)—see nn. on pp. named, writes "Shaibanī" not Shaibaq 12; Sh.'s marriages, with Bābur's sister 17–8, 147, and with Zuhra Aīsībāgh 268–6; his dealings with Zuhra's son 'Ali 126–8, with Bābur 144–6–7, with the Chaghatāi Khāns 182–3–4; later action 191–2;—Tambal 145, 244; others 40, 62, 101, 196; Chīn Şāfī 242–56; Khusraw Shāhī's jewels 144; Oghlāt (Dīghūt) 22; Chirkas sword 65; Khwāst a hell 221, bāghrī gārā App. B, v, vi; the book and its author 64, 120–1–7 [cf. Tuhfa-i-Sāmi I. O. 655, f. 342].

Shajarat-i-Tūrī, Abū'l-gāzī Mīrzā (ed. Frasini, trs. Désmaisons)—see nn. on pp. named], "Nūrūn" Sherīm etc. 29; an archer's mark 34; san=dim 154; tūghār, tūghā (end of a river 643; a Shāhī sultān 265; of Bābur's descent see its Introduction.

Shajaratul-atrāk, Aūlugh Beg Shahrūkhī (trs. Miles)—Bābur's descent see its Introduction.

Sharaf-nāma, Sharaf Khān (trs. F. E. Charmoy)—Battle of Jām 635.

Sharaful-dīn 'Ali Yazda—his book on enigmas 201; his Zafar-nāma (see s.n.) Preface xxcx.

Shaving—Bābur's first 187; Humayūn notes his in the B.N. 466; beard shaved as punishment 404; untrimmed by vow 552; head shaved 408, 649.


Sikh religion—Nānak's exposition to Bābur 461; Nānak and Daulat Khān ib.


Slaves—slave-women retaliate on their owner's murderers 63, are captured at the Samarkand ditch 73, taken by crocodiles 502; slave-agents in poisoning Bābur 541;—Shāh Beg's faithful slave see Sambhāl; the chief-slave 346; slave-trade between Hind and Kābul 202.—Mingli Bibī, a slave-woman 269.

Song by Wordsworth recalled—the 'undying fish' 305.

Spanish Literature, Ticknor—Montalvan on Lope de Vega 287.

Sport and politics under an Eastern sky, Lord Ronaldshay—marāl 8.

and Travel, F. C. Selous—marāl 8.

Square seal—Abū-ṣa'id's 28.

Standards (tūgh, qūdās-tūgh)—acclaimed 155; bestowed 372 etc.; Bābur's 140–66 etc.

Sūlāh-ūl-mulūk, Faṣl b. Ruzbāhān Isfahānī—value as a source 348; supports the form "Bābur" 356.

Supplement etc., R. Dozy see Dictionaries.

Swimming—man and horse in mail 140, 237; man and horse bare 237; competition 401; on bundles of reeds 673; Bābur's (in mail) 140, 603–55–660–61.

Noticeable words:—P. sar-i-sabz, green-head 66,703; P. sar-kob 53–9; sangur 232; sīhngāq, a script App. Q, liii.

Tabaqāt-i-akbarī, Nizāmūdīn Ahmad—see nn. on pp. named], Bāburī Script 228, App. Q, liii; Jang-Jang 370; date of Shāh Beg's death 437; Ḥāzāras serve Bābur 457; Gujrāt affairs 535; Multan affairs 699; Bābur's Kashmir force 692–8; the author's father 691; proposed supersession in Hind of Bābur's sons 64–89–93, discussed 702 ff.; the book plagiarized 693;—i-bāburī, Shāikh Zainu'd-dīn Khwāfī see B.N. and Zain.

—i-nāṣīrī, Minhāj [trs. Raverty] Sāṭūq-būghrā Khān 29 (where read Tabaqāt); Chandwāl 537; quoted by Bābur 479; described by Erskine 279; used in Appendix E, xxiii.

Tanghā (lit. stamp), a transit or customs duty 250; forms the revenue of Kābul town ib.; Husain Bai-gārā marks his stamps Bih bud (valid) 271; remission of 553–95; a tanghācli clerk 629.

Tārikh-i-ālam-arāî, Mir Sīkandar—see nn. on pp. named, its Safawī outlook 349; Ṭahmasp's Aīzābāgh campaign 622; Battle of Jām 623; insignificant appearance of 'Ubaīdullāh 636;—i-bādāyūnt see Muntahāhba't-tawārīkh.

—i-dāūdī, "Abdul-lāh—"Shāikh" and "Miān" interchangeable titles 457.

—i-fīrishta, Muḥ. Qāsim Fīrishtā [trs. Major-Gen. J. Briggs]—"Umar Shāikh 13; a mistake 15; Bābur's reluctance to rank himself with Timūr 134; his single combats 329; his sobriquet

1 Cf. Mr. G. Murray's trs. (Euripides i, 86) suggesting that the Wooden Horse was a sar-kob.
Qalandar 523; his Embassy to Persia 540; his siege of Chandīrī 596;—Yar-i-`alī Balāṭū 91; Ghazı Khan’s literary culture 460; the cognomen jān-dār 566; Badrū-ferry over Gogrā 667;—value of the book as a source 208, 349, 694; date of its revision 694.


—, i-Hājī Muḥ. ʿArīf Qandahārī—account of Qandahār 348.


—, i-rashīdī, [Muḥ.] Haidar Mirzā Dughlāt [ed. Ney Eliās, trs. E. D. Ross]—Places:—Almāghī 2; Ťūt-kint 11; Qīlāt-i-nādārī 263; Qīlā-i-ziyār 21; Herāt 306; Qandahār [Insc.] App. J, xxxv; Tribes etc.—tūmān-begs 17; gūčin 26; chuhrā-jɪşga App. H, xxvii; Chaghātāis and Mughūls distinguished 320; Chaghātāi or Timūrid supremacy 344, Begchiks 50, 712 or Chīrās 155; Tarkhāns 31; Greek descent 317; Jigrāks 55; Turkmān Hazārās 311; Persons:—12—App. A, iii; 21; 23; 32; 48; 62; Jahāngrī 183, 254–94–302; 195–242–56; 249–272; 273; 330–41 96–7; 409; 641; 694–6; Varia—fruit as food 3; yāk, gūčīs App. M, xviii; on joint-rule 293; epoch-making events 20, 35, 158, 182, 350; Bābur:—name 17; character 194, 320; Script App. Q, lxii; disastrous expedition (910 A.H.) 241; relationships 246; single combats 349; Trāmuntane campaign 349 to 366; hospitality to exiles 350; a frontier affair 412; onset of last illness 706; Haidar:—his life saved 21; descent and other particulars 22; excuses his father 317; his list of tribes and chiefs valuable 415; his book of great and, perhaps, unique value for Bābur’s lacnūna 347–8; referred to Preface xxxix, xxxviii; his Codex xlii, xlii (No. iv);

—, i-salāṭīn-i-aż̄ghāna, Ahmad Yādgār [part-trs. E. & D. vol. I]—Hindustān in 929 AH. 439–40; Pāṇīpat 474; Bābur’s visit to Lāhor (936 A.H.) 604–98 to 700, 703–6; Mundāhrs 700; anachronism 707; Bābur’s “selection” of a successor 707; importance of its contribution for filling a lacnūna 693, 702–6.

—, i-shahrūkhī, Niyyāz Muḥ. Khubānī—tradition of a babe abandoned 358.

—, i-sher-chāhī, “Abbās Khān Sarwhānī”—“Shaikh” and “Mīān” 457; ‘Āzam Humāyūn 477; Sher Khān Sūr 659, 684.

—, i-Sīnd, Muḥ. Maʾṣūm Bhakkarī—chief authority 336, 428; Shāh Beg 338, 427, (death) 437; sieges of Qandahār 431 to 436; the Inscription App. J, xxxiii.

Tarkhān—suitable meaning 31 [where add ref. E. & D.’s. II. of I. i, 300, 20, 21, 498] privileges nine 250; not given to all Arghūn chiefs 249 n. 2; a merchant Tarkhān 133; marriages 49, Preface xxviii; revolt 61 to 64, 86, 112; see s.n. Nine & H. Beveridge’s note on Etruscan names. Tarkhān-nāma or Arghūn-nāma, Sayyid Jamāl—a useful source 428.

Tawārikh-i-gusūda—(Select Histories)—fashions of sitting and kneeling 33, 54–9; Tūlūn Khwāja Mūghūl 66; supplements the B.N. 127.


Tāzikvardī’s sh-shī’ārār (Memoirs of Poets) Doulat-shāh (ed. Browne)—[see nn. on pp. named], Akhsikītī 9; dates of Maḥmūd Mirān-shāhī’s boyhood 46; Almāghī Mūsātīg 47; Ḥazarāsī 50; a couplet 85; Ḥusain Bāy-garā 259–60–73; Gāzūr-gābī’s good birth 281; Rabāt-i-sangbast 301–30; Bīb-bīd Beg App. H, xxvi–vii; Rādāgān–town 626; Jamī’s birthplace 623;—the author in the battle of Chīkāmān-sarāfī 46; one of his collaborators 274.

—, i-Sultān Sātīg-būghrā Khān—a seeming descendant 29.

—, i-Tāmahṣ, Shāh Tahmāsp Sāfawī (ed. D. C. Phillott)—Div Sultān 635; battle of Jām 636.

—, i-Wūqī’āt (var.) Jāhār (trs. C. Stewart)—outside literary criticism 619; a date at which Bābur’s body lay near Kābul 709.

Tents—al-aḍḥūq 188; aṭuṭqh 339; ag-aṭuṭqh chādar 169–88, 239, (flooded) 339, 678; chār-tāg 264; khar-gāb (=kibīrka, and al-aḍḥūq?) 239, 678;—şamūdar (awning) 358; tūngūf (roof-flap) 78; pesh-khāna 678.


Thornd-Defences 487.

Timūr-pūlād, buys a Codex of the Wāqīʾnāma-i-pādsḵaī q.v.

Three (Turkī) MSS. from Kāshkhar [ed. Sir E. Denison Ross]—the title Jān-wang 567.


The Times—on diverse names of a single place 209.

Tongues and utterance—Andijān Turki 4; Farsi (Persian)—speaking Sārts of Astara 7; Kābul’s polyglot tongues 207; Mughūlī—
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speaking Hazaras; Bābur on clipped Hindu-stani utterance 380, and on the words Kās and Sawālak 485.


Traditions—4, 5; one versed in 283–4.


Transliteration 2.

Transmigration 518.

Travels in Bukhara, Sir Alex. Barnes—[see nn. on pp. named], mulsā, a Panj-āb disease 446; water-fall fishing 227; in Europe and Asia, Peter Mundy (ed. Sir R. Temple)—boali (a well) 533; Gūglār 605.

in India, Pietro della Vallē—the morning-draught 395.

of Ibn Batūta (trs. Sanguinetti & Lee)
—Samarkand the Protected City 75, Add. N.P. 75; Kajwarra 590; Rahim-dād 693; 704.


in Panj-āb (etc.), Mohan Lall—Herāt 305–6; Qandahār Insc: App. J; Bābur's burial-place 710.

of the Russian Mission, G. Timkovsky [i.e. H. E. Lloyd] fruit as food 33.


Tribes and Castes of the N.W.P. and Oude, W. Crooke—Jats 454; Nuhānī (or Luhānī) 455; Jaghat (serpent) 456; Tānk 481.

Tribes and other groups:

Afghan:—1 Abdūr-rahmān 403; Afridi 411–2; Aūghān 217–20; Aūrijiz 526; Bilāt 248; Bārki 207; Dīlah-zāk 231, 367–94, 412–3; Dilah-zāk Yaqūbkhāil 394; Gagānī 251; Gīłhīt 323–31; 'Isa- khāil 233; Jasawāl [var. Jaswān 462]

Jalwānī see Index I; Khattak 439; Khirīchī 208–20–49–413; Khīzr khālī 413; Khū- ghānī 220; Kīwi 233; Kūrānī, Kārānī, Karānī 233, 477; Landar 220; Lūdī 481; Index I; Lūdī khaṣa-khāil i.e. Sahū-khāil 465; Lūdī Sarang-khānī 540, 654; Lūhānī see Nuḥānī; Mahmand 221, 232–31–45; Muḥammad-zāīf 376 (where read as here); Nāz-zāl 233; Nuḥānī 235 (cf. 455 n. 3), Index I; Pānī 540; Pashā(?!) 207; Samū-khāil (Khīrīchī?) 412; Sūr 233; Tarkalānī 242, 424; Türī 220; Wazīr 413; Yusuf-zāīf 231, 371–3–56, 400–10–19;—Afgānhs of Bhira 399, Ghazni 218, Sind riverain 218–36, Kābul 207–21;—Afgān thieves 208, 341; Afgān warings in Hind 426, and power 480–1; serving Bābur 522; bad-mannered 451;—

Aūz-beg ("Uz beg"):—2, 37, 135, 622, Index I; Aūz-beg Qāzaq ("Cossack") 23; Aūz-beg Mankīt 195;—

Chaghatāi i.e. Chaghatāī Khān's tribal appanage:—extinct but for their Khāns in 1547 (953 AH.) Tār. Rashī. trs. 149; near Heri 320, 689; its Kohkuran clan 55; high families in, Sīghal 60, 72, Nawā'ī's (Index I) distinguished from Mughūls 320, 351, Turkes 340;—

Mughūls of the Horde:—105–92; tūmans (groups of 10,000) :—Bārin 19, 473; Bechgīk 155; Chīrās 158; Sāghārīchī 20; sub-divisions (?):—Bishāghī [var.] 473; Darbān 60; Itārajī 161, 415; Jalār 91; Kūnchī 20; Qālmāq 23; Manghīt 101;—Mughūl devastation 2, 98, 172, 362; faithlessness 105, 140 etc.; conduct on the Chīr 17, 31–4; the Horde divided 19; its dislike for cultivated lands 12; its tūmans in open land 221–54–55; return from enforced migration 20, 350–1;—

Turk:—Afshār 354; Aūghār (Awīghr, Uīghr) 40, 118; its Ishīt clan 40, 65; Barlās 51, 429, Index I; Barlās Dūlādī 25, 37; Daryā-khānī 231, 589; Istīlāj 353; Khīlīj 482; Qipchāq 19, 49;—Turks of Andījān 4, Kabul-lowlands 207–15–21; early Turk rulers of Kābul 200; contrasted with Sārts 149;—Uses of the name, "Mughūl and Turk" 158, 402; "Chaghatāī and Turk" 340; "Turk and Tīmrūd" one 380–2–4–8–9; probable statement of B.'s descent 320; his claim to rule in Hind, based on Turk descent 380–2–4; 476–9; Turk warning to Bhāna 529;—

Turkmān:—White-sheep Horde 49 (where read White for "Black");—its Bāhārīl clan 49; its Balāl 91 and Bayandar 279;—Black-sheep Horde 10;—Qajar 666; Turkmāns serve Bābur 47, 279, 361;—features 111;—Hazāras (infra); Türkūshār 101;—

1 Abūl-ghāzā as classes Manghīt with Mughūl tribes, Radiolf with Turk tribes (Réveuls p. 325), Erskine says, "modern Nogais."
Various:—'Arab 207, 522, 631; Arlāt (Turk?) 265; Ashpāri 101; Asiqānchī [var. Saqanchī] 197; Balūchī 383, 459, 522; Bengali (race) 482; Būgālī 452; Kāfr 212-3, 342-72, 424; Kakar (var.) 387-9; Kas 484; Kīb (or Kīthī) 393; Meos 577; Farsi (Persian, race) 7, 207, 507-55; Ghiyās-wāl (or-dāl) 393; Gujār 250, 379-87, 454; Habshi 483; Janjuha-khail and Jūd-khail 379-80-87; Jats 250, 387, 454; Jīgrāk (var.) 55, 101; Nūndīrī (var.) 196-7, 200-1-7, 275, 326, 430 (cf. E. & D. iv, 304, Turkāri) Nīl-ābī 379 (see Index II); Parājī 207;—Rājpūt.—Chhānūn 573, Tānk sept 481;—Tājīk 6, 207, 420, 535;—

Hazāra (1000):—Gādāi or Kiłdū 250, Qārdīq 391-3, 403; Rustāq [or Rusta] 196; Sl. Mas'-ūdī 221-8, 525; Turkman 27, 214-51, 311 to 313;— Hazāras w.—of Kābul 200-7-22, 430; e. of the Sind 457, 522; in the open country of Ghazni 218, Kābul 221, Heri-rūd valley 308; refuge taken among 49; traversed 254.

Tribute—Jīgrāk 55, Ghazni 240, Yūsuf-zāï 375, Bhīra 384, Kakar 391, Bajaur and Sawād 400, Balkh 402; Nijr-aī 421; Koh-i-jūd 379.

Tuhfa-i-samī (a Turki anthology), Sām M. Sofawī—Marwārīd 278; syphiilis 279; a jeer 468.

The twelve Imāms, 258, 354.

Turkī tongue, Preface xxvii, Cap. iv.

Turkistan, Alex. Petzhold—Sārts 6.

E. Schuyler—[see nn. on pp. named],

Farghānā:—extent of 2, various 5, 10, 6, 8; (wind) 9; (out-of-doors life) 29; kūk-būrā (a game) 39; Old Akhšī App. A; Sārts 6;—Samarkand:—67, 74-5-7, 83, (Aūrgūlt) 68; Kesh 83.


Franz v. Schwarz—autumn fever 4; running-waters 4, recipe for ma'jūn 16; sīghāh (measure) 4; a Kīrghīs measure 196; loess constructions 30; charkh (a hunting bird) 224; Mogol-tau 8; duties of the Lord of the Gate 24; kūk būrā, baiga 39; Greek descent 22; various App. A, v.

Tāsūk-i-jahāngīrī, Jahangīr Pādshāh (trs. Rogers and Beveridge)—Bugials452; Daulat Khān Lūdī 461; measures 189; birds 497; kūshmīsh 515; couplet 6; metrical amusements App. Q, lixvi—viii; its titles for Bābur varied ib. Ixxi; Jahangīr’s additions to the B.N. App. D, xiii, Preface xlv (No. vii), lii; his pilgrimage to B.’s burial-garden App. V, lxx; his stay in B.’s Garden ib.

Noticeable words:—tabalghā, a tree 11; tāsh-chantū, outside bag (?) 160; tāsh, stone confused with tāsh, outer 3, 43, 78, 80, 160; tātrī, complete, enclosed 109, 280, 501 (where this better describes the koel’s song); tipūchāy a horse and its points 38; tīr-giz, arrow 34; tīrīk 36, 362; īrū, turn of a hill 205-8 etc.; tālīk vegetable food, other than grain 114; tūn-yārīm, half-dark 100; tūrā (ordinances) 38, turi (army mantelets) 108-13-55, 368, 469, 593; tūmān, 10,000, a district command 17; tūq-bār, one using a standard 313; tūlghuma s.n. Military; tūsqāwal 224, 314; tūlgār and tūqāt 643.

‘Umar Khayyām’s Quatrains (trs. E. H. Whinfield) — a couplet Babur’s words recall 203.

Upper Basin of the Kābul-river, Sir C. Markham (PKGS 1879) — Hindu-kush passes 204, maps of Koh-i-baba 216.

Velaminof-Zernof, editor of the Sharaf-nāma 635 and Abūshīga App. Q, lxiii.

Vergleichungs-Tabellen des Muh. und Christlichen Zeitrechnung, F. Wustenfeld—dates of 935 AH. 629, App. S.

Verses:—of untraced authorship 332, 316 and 670; verse-making 15, 22, 38-9, 46, 54, 111, 136-7, 154; Bābur’s opinion of Nawāt’s Turki verse 271; Shabahnī’s verses made public 329; composition on a model 448;—Metrical amusements 585-6, App. Q, lxv-vi.

Vikramāditya Era 79 (where road began).

Virgil—citron-juice as an antidote 511; Scorpio and Libra 623.

Visit to Ghuzni (etc.), G. T. Vigne—[see nn. on pp. named], boundary between Afghans and Khurāsān 200; Kābul-river ib.; 'Uqābān 201; rhubarb 203; sāhihabit-sheep 203; Dūr-nāma 215; Running-sands 215; Pāmgān villages 216; arghwān 217;—various:—218-9, 224, 227; ‘Tānk’ for Tāq 233; routes 208, 235; Bilah on the Indus 237; see App. E, xxiii.


Voyage dans le Turkistan, Fedtschenko (trs. G. du Laurens) — Sange-aina, Mirror-stone, 7.

Voyage en Perse et autres lieux d’Orient, Jean Chardin—lovers’-marks 16; square seal 28; Sikla-yulduz, Eight-stars 139; kīpī (casbeké) (a coin) 296; epistolary etiquette 332.

Wāqī-nāma-i-pādshāhī (Record of Royal Acts), ‘Abdu’l-wahhāb akhund of Ghaj-
dāvān (1709)—(found mentioned as the Bābūr-nāma, the "Bukhrā Bābūr-nāma" and the "Bukhrā Compilation")—for its seeming author's colophon JRAS. 1900, p. 474 and Preface lvii; its divergence from the true text Preface xxxix, its element of true text (Kāmrān's tattered Codex) li; its dual purpose xxxix, lxii; its character xl; its stop-gaps xlv; its use by Leyden xlvi; Described (as it is in Kehr's transcript):—Preface, Cap. III, Parts I and III; its history lii, author and colophon lvii, (cf. JRAS. 1900, p. 474); its identity confused with Bābūr's true text Preface, Cap. III, Part III;

Its descendants and offtakes Table lvii;—(a) Petrograd F. O. Codex (an indirect copy (?)), described by purchaser as Bābūr-nāma, Preface xliti—iv;
(b) Petr. F. O. School of Oriental Languages Codex, entitled Bābūr-nāma, scribe G. J. Kehr—referred to in loco:—diction of the Farghāna Section 1, of the Kābul Sect. 187, of the Hindūstān Sect. 445; its Persified character exemplified 147, 150, 167, and Add. Note, 177, (cf. JRAS. 1900, pp. 76, 88); its Latin version App. J, xxxv, Preface liv;—Other references 9, 18, 19, 44–8, 88, 164, 169;

Full contents:—Preface lii; their reconstruction by Ilminski lii—iv, (cf. his own Preface JRAS. 1900 and a separate form in B.M., I.O., R.A.S. Libraries, etc.); the "Fragments" Preface xlv (No. viii), lii, (in loco) 438, 549, (a discussion) 574, 630, 640 (cf. JRAS. 1900–6–8).
(c) The "Bāhūr-nāma" Imprint (constructed and edited by) N. I. Ilminski—referred to in loco, App. D, 227–59, 336, 420, App. I, xxxii; modelled on the L. and E. Memoirs of Baber 326, 337, App. T, lxxiv, Preface lii (cf. Ilminski's Preface ref. supra), 574; Preface:—its Kasan publication li; its deviation from its sole basis (Kehr's Codex) li; Ilminski's work and some results lii, with n.1 mid-page, liv; his doubts and achievement of a Turki reading book see his own Preface ref. supra;

Water—water-thief 109, -road 595; dug for 234; under-ground courses of 417.
Wedding-gifts—43, 400.
Wednesday (Chār-shambha)—coincidences of the day 71.
Wells—chambered (wāīn, bālī) 532–3; dug 548, 552; purified when new 634.
Wīlayat—Kābul 414.

With the Kurram Field-Force, J. A. S. Colquhoun—a route 231.

Wine (i.e. any fermented liquor) — 'ārāg (spirit) 385–6–7–8, 453–61–76; mahuwa-flower 505; beer 423; cider (kaşgīr) 83, Add. Note, P. 83; wines of Bukhrā 83, Herī 265, Kābul:—Alā-sālī 221, Darā-i-nūr 210, 410, App. G, Ghazni 461, Kābul-tūmān 203, Nījr-aū 213;—Kāfiristan 211–12, 372;—rules in use:—drinking days 33–4, 111, 447; one liquor only 386; no-pressure on a non-drinker 406–10; wine parties:—Bābūr protests against excess 398; excludes drunkards 419, is disgusted by drunken uproar 386 and by beer-intoxication 423; gives his followers freedom to do as Herātīs did 304; givers of "wines", Khw. Kālān 371–5–6, 461, Shāh Beg 400, the Bāīt-qārā Mirzâs 299, 302, Khw. Muḥ. 'Ali 411 (a business-party), 413;—Bābūr's breaches of Law not committed till cirt. his 28th year 83–355; resisted temptation in Herāt 299, etc.—his parties associated with beauty of scene e.g. autumnal 414–16–18; in his gardens 412, 406 and 420; under a plane-tree 405, at Istālīf 406, near an illuminated camp 450; after and before long marches (frequent); mention made of (925 AH.) 375–85–88, 408–10–14–15–16–17–19; (926 AH.) 420–1–2–3–4; (932 AH.) 447, 450–53–61; (933 AH.) 537;—drinks a few cups to console 418, out of courtesy in a charmless place 424; "morning" 395–8, 415–20–22; gallops when not sober 388–98;—

Other Law-breakers Preface xxix, 16, 33–4, 45, 70, 134, 259–68–73, (woman) 36, 417; Herātīs 259, 113ārīs 42, Pich-Kāfirs 22;—

Parties accompanied by improvisation 26, dancing 299, music (usually); (for return to obedience see Law and Index I s.n. Bābūr).
Wordsworth's "undying fish" recalled 305.
Workmen—Timūr's 77, 520; Bābūr's 520, 634.
Wray, Mr. Cecil and Mr. Leonard—their help 495, 502.

Yajūj and Majūj (Gog and Magog) 560.
Yāqūt see Dictionary of Towns.
Noticeable words: — Yada-tâsh, jade-stone see Magic; yâghrunchi, divination from sheep’s-blades 233; yîghâck, tree, wood 11, 81; yîghâch see Measures; yîgit, a brave 16, 53, 70, App. H, xxvii; yîlûq, alp see i.a. Yâr- and Bûrka-; yînka-chicha, maternal-uncle’s mother-in-law (?); yînkalik, levirate 23, 267, 306, 616; yûkûnmûk, to bend the knee 301; yûsûnlûq, hereditary 23.

Zafar-nâmâ (Book of Victory i.e. Timûr’s) Maulana Sharafu’d-dîn’Ali Yazdi — [see nn. on pp. named], places 10, 74–8, 83–4; persons 39, 272; meaning of Sawâlak 485; Timûr’s capture of Qarshî 134; his burial at a saint’s feet 266; his workmen 77, 520; partly translated in Histoire de Timûr Beg q.v.; the book and its main basis, the Malfûzât-i-timûrî Preface xxix, xxx, its author xxxii.

Zainu’d-din Khawâfî (Shaikh Zain)’s writings — (1) Tabaqât-i-babdûrî q.v.; (2) Múbìn, a Commentary on Bâbur’s Múbîn 438; (3) Fârmân announcing Bâbur’s renunciation of wine and remission of țamghât-tax 553; (4) Fath-nâmâ of the victory at Kânwa 559 to 574; Bâbur’s reason for inserting it (4) in his book 559; the sole Letter of victory so preserved 561; grounds against supposing Bâbur wrote a plain Turkî account of the battle 574.
OMISSIONS FROM TRANSLATION AND FOOT-NOTES.

p. 7 l. 1 “turbulent” add They are notorious in Mawara’u’n-nahr for their bullying.

p. 27 l. 1.5 “(1504)” add when, after taking Khusrau Shah, we besieged Muqim in Kabul.

p. 31 l. 1 “paid” add no (attention).

p. 43 l. 19 enter f. 24b.

ib. 1.8 fr. ft. “Taghai” add and Azun Hasan.

p. 43 Sec. c, l. 2 “good” add he never neglected the Prayers.

p. 48 l. 1.6 “grandmother” add Khan-zada Begim.

p. 52 l. 4 fr. ft. “childhood” add and had attained the rank of Beg.

p. 88 l. 9 Hasan add and Sl. Ahmad Tambah.

p. 92 l. 8 “on” add to Sang-zar.

p. 95 l. 12 “service” add did not stay in Khurasan but.

p. 128 l. 18 “two” add young (sons).

p. 131 l. 12 “Jan-wafa” add Mirza.

p. 134 l. 7 fr. ft. “that” add night that.

ib. 1.3 fr. ft. “was” add in my 19th (lunar) year.

p. 136 l. 5 “was” add in my 19th (lunar) year.

p. 139 l. 11 fr. ft. read Jani Beg Sultan.

p. 141 l. 10 “Khusrau Shah” add my highly-favoured beg Qambar-i-ali the Skinner Mughul, not acting at such a time as this according to the favour he had received, came and took his wife from Samarkand; he too went to Khusrau Shah.

p. 143 l. 16 “that” add near Shutur-gardan.

p. 152 l. 12 fr. ft. “dead” add A few days later we went back to Dikh-kat.

p. 164 Sec. d, l. 6 fr. ft. “for” add Sairam.

p. 201 l. 12 read Kabul-fort.

p. 205 l. 10 fr. ft. read “are closed for” 4 or 5 months in winter. After crossing Shibr-tu people go on through Ab-dara. In the heats, when the waters come down in flood, these roads have the same rule as in winter (“because” etc.).

p. 217 l. 11 “Sih-yaran” add It became a very good-halting-place. I had a vineyard on the hill above the seat.

p. 221 Sec.h, at the beginning insert The mountains to the eastward of the cultivated land of Kabul are of two kinds as also are those to its westward (“Where the mountains” etc.).

p. 230 last line “men” add Khusrau Gagiani.

p. 247 l. 1 “Qush-nadir” add meadow.

p. 308 l. 14 “ground” add Moreover it snowed incessantly and after leaving Chiragh-dan, not only was there very deep snow but the road was unknown.

p. 391 March 18th “darogha-ships” add Sangur Khan Qarluq and Mirza-i-malui Qarluq came leading 30 or 40 men of the Qarluq elders, made offering of a horse in mail, and waited on me. Came also the army of the Dilah-zak Afghans.

p. 393 March 25th l. 2 “out” add from the river’s bank.

p. 454 l. 5 “boat” add There was a party; some drinking ‘urāq, some beer. After leaving the boat at the Bed-time Prayer, there was more drinking in the khirgah (tent). For the good of the horses, we gave them a day’s breathing on the bank of this water.

p. 468 l. 3 “sent” add Yunas-i-ali and Ahmadi and (“‘Abdu’ l-lah”).

p. 484 l. 1 “Rao” add with four or five thousand Pagans.

p. 498 (r. n. florican), “colour” add The flesh of the florican is very delicate. As the kharchal (Indian buzzard) resembles the tughdagh (great buzzard) so the charz (florican) resembles the tughdiri.
ib. (s.n. sand-grouse) "Tramontana" add the blackness of its breast is less deep, its cry also is sharper.

p.500 after l.11 "eagle" add (new para.) Another is the buzzard (T. sar); its tail and back are red.

p.506 (s.n. kamrak) "long" add It has no stone.

p.507 n.3 "name" add also; "plantain" add (banana).

p.510 l.5 see App. O, p. liv for addendum.

p.529 l.4 fr.ft. "Dulpur" add Guiliar.

p.595 l.19 "other" read 2 or 3 (places); the Pagans in the du-tahi began to run away; "the du-tahi was taken."

p.603 l.7 fr.ft. "(366b)" add and between Ghazipur and Banaras (p. 502).

p.674 l.2 "river" add in his mail.

p.678 l.2 "amirs" add Sultan.

p.679 l.8 fr.ft. "given" add It was settled that a son of each of them should be always in waiting in Agra; l. 7 fr.ft. "Araish" add and two others; l. 2 fr.ft. "Saru" add towards Oude.

p.689 l.2 fr.ft. "laks" add and a head-to-foot (dress).

App. Q l.1 "interpret" add those of.
CORRIGENDA.

To ensure notice many of these are entered in the Indices.

Pages
6 l. 4 “meadow” read plain (maidan).
11 n. 4, “siyar” unaccented; (H.S.)
   ii read iii n.n. pp. 18, 38, 48, 244.
12 n. 4 l. 3 “attack in” read attacking.
14 l. 3 “and” read who.
16 l. 10 n. ref. “3” tr. to “amorous”.
24 n. 1 “932” read 923.
27 para. 2 read “Baba ‘Ali Beg’s
   Baba-ulti”.
28 l. 8 “leaders” read Mughul mir-
   zadas.
29 n. 6 l. 5 “then” read his.
37 l. 8 “916” read 917; and tr. nn.
   2 and 3.
38 l. 9 “favour” run on to Ahmad.
44 l. 9 55 l. 12 delete “Sayyid”.
46 l. 12 read Chikman.
49 l. 3 “Black” read White.
51 l. 12 fr. ft. “Badakshan” read
   Hisar.
55 “f. 34” read f. 32b.
57 l. 1, enter f. 33 and move “f. 33b”
   to 58 l. 2.
61 l. 4 “Beg” read Baba-ulti Beg.
68 l. 10 fr. ft. tr. n. ref. 4 to “Aurgut”.
69 n. 2, read ammantung; and tr.
   nakbunid and bakunid.
79 l. 5 tr. n. ref. 3 to gible; in author’s
   n. read Batamius; and in n. 4 read
   Ayin.
85 l. 9 read 851 A.H.-1447 A.D.; 1.3
   fr. ft. move “Jumada I, 22, 855 A.H.”
   to p. 86 l. 1, after “years”.
94 l. 6 “Chirik” read Char-yak.
95 l. 2 fr. ft. Aubaj read Char-jui.
96 last line “Qasim” read Kamal (or
   Kahal).
109 l. 16 “qasim” read qadus.
ib. n. 5 l. 3 read grand’ father”.
117 l. 2 “909” read 908.
122 n. 4 “bulghar” read buljar.
129 l. 14 “daban” read kustal.
131 ll. 3-4 fr. ft. read Khan-ulti and
   Karim-dad.
134 l. 3 fr. ft. and 136 l. 5 read in my
   19th (lunar) year.
144 para. 3 “rain” read grain.
148 n. 2 “f. 18” read f. 118.
149 l. 17 read Khanim.
154 n. 3 “f. 1836” read f. 1036 and for
   f. 264b read f. 264.
168 Sect. heading “Kasan” read
   Karnan.
175 l. 11 read Mirza-ulti.
183 last line “Kulja” read Khuldja.
192 l. 3 read Taliqan.
194 l. 12 read Quluhgha.

Pages
ib. n. 3 read Bai-sunghar.
204 l. 16 read Curriers’.
205 l. 5 read Sir; l. 13 read Wa(lian);
   l. 14 read Qibchaq.
205 l. 10 fr. ft. “three or four” read four
   or five (cf. omissions p. 205).
211 para. 3, end, “920” read 924.
212 n. 2 l. 2 read chipeq.
213 n. 5 “sarwan” read parran; and
   nn. 5, 6, 7 read Blanford.
244 ll. 8 and 25 “page” read preferably,
   brave; l. 19 read gallopers.
273 n. 2 read grand-“daughter”.
282 n. 3 l. 2 “345” read 348-9.
289 l. 5 “wonderful” read metaphorist.
342 mid-page read Pur-amin.
344 last line “Appendix” read Trs.’
   note 711.
351 l. 15 “Akhsi” read Archian.
387 n. 3 delete sentence 2.
410 last line “khuntul” read hunsal.
414 l. 2 “18th” read 13; and l. 2 fr. ft.
   “purslain” read poplar.
438 l. 15 “son” read grandson.
447 n. 3 para. 2 l. 1 “month” read week.
470 n. 1.5 fr. ft. “p.66” read p. 166.
482 n. 3 “Gujrat” read Malwa.
485 sec. l. 1 “Gumti read Gui.
499 l. 17 “yak-rung” read bak-ting (see
   Add. Note P. 499).
500 l. 15 s.n. crow “garcha” read
   garcha; n. 6 “f. 136” read f. 135.
505 l. 6 tr. n. ref. “2” to, buia.
520 n. 1 “1854” read 1845.
534 l. 2 fr. ft. “and” read 932.
535 l. 2 fr. ft. delete “others”.
579 l. 8 “April 13th” read April 3rd.
591 n. 2 “ghuraghir read gurugtir.
604 n. 1.1 read Afgahana.
616 l. 5 read Madakur; and Sect. m
   “gara-su” read darya garaghi or
   garaghina.
620 l. 7 rahim read rahman.
621 l. 11 after “servants” read Beg-gina
   “had come”.
622 l. 12 read Siunjuk; l. 13 Tashkint.
631 l. 13 delete the parenthesis (see Add.
   Note P. 631).
632 l. 4 read Farrukh.
636 l. 7 “rest” read eight others.
640 l. 1 read quili.
643 (Feb. 4th) “Muhammad” read
   Mahmud.
644 n. 5 “323” read 232.
699 l. 13 “935” read 938.
713 l. 3 read Salija; and l. 11 fr. ft.
   Miran-shahi.
ADDITIONAL NOTES

P. 16 l. 11.—Niẓāmī mentions “lover’s marks” where a rebel chieftain commenting on Khusrau’s unfitness to rule by reason of his infatuation for Shīrīn, says, “Hīnos asʾāshiqbāsī garm dāgh ast.” (H.B.)

P. 22 n. 2.—Closer acquaintance with related books leads me to delete the words “Chaghataī Mughūl” from Ḥaider Dughlāt’s tribal designations (p. 22, n. 2, l. 1). (1) My “Chaghataī” had warrant (now rejected) in Ḥaider’s statement (T.R. trs. p. 3) that the Dughlāt amirs were of the same stock (abnaʿ-i-jiins) as the Chaghataī Khāqāns. But the Dughlāt off-take from the common stem was of earlier date than Chingis Khān’s, hence, his son’s name “Chaghataī” is a misnomer for Dughlāts. (2) As for “Mughūl” to designate Dughlāt, and also Chaghataī chiefs—guidance for us rests with the chiefs themselves; these certainly (as also the Begchik chiefs) held themselves apart from “Mughūls of the horde” and begs of the horde—as apart they had become by status as chiefs, by intermarriage, by education, and by observance of the amenities of civilized life. To describe Dughlāt, Chaghataī and Begchik chiefs in Bābur’s day as Mughūls is against their self-classification and is a discourtesy. A clear instance of need of caution in the use of the word Mughūl is that of ‘Alī-shār Nawdī Chaghataī. (Cf. Abūl-ghażâl’s accounts of the formation of several tribes.) (3) That “Mughūl” described for Hindustānis Bābur’s invading and conquering armies does not obliterate distinctions in its chiefs. Mughūls of the horde followed Timūrids when to do so suited them; there were also in Bābur’s armies several chiefs of the ruling Chaghataī family, brothers of The Khān, Saʿīd (see Chin-tūmūr, Aisān-tūmūr, Tūkhta-būghā). With these must have been their following of “Mughūls of the horde”.

P. 34 l. 12.—“With the goshawks” translates gīrchīgha bīla of the Elph. MS. (f. 126) where it is explained marginally by ba bāzī, with the falcon or goshawk. The Ḥaṭī MS. however has, in its text, ṁaṣā bīla which may mean with arrows having points (Sanglahā f. 144b quoting this passage). Il’ininski has no answering word (Mem. i, 19). Muh. Shirāzī [p. 13 i. 11 fr. ft.] writes ba bāzī mianqd[h]ītan.

P. 39.—The Ḥabībū’s-siyar (lith. ed. iii, 217 i.16) writes of Sayyid Murād Aūglāgüği (the father or g.f. of Yūsuf) that he (who had, Bābur says, come from the Mughūl horde) held high rank after Abū-saʿīd Mirzā, joined Husian Bāh-garā after the Mirzā’s defeat and death (873 A.H.), and (p. 218) was killed in defeat by Amīr ‘Alī Jalālīr who was commanding forDgār-i-muḥammad Shāh-rūkhī.

P. 49.—An Atmāq is a division of persons and not of territory. In Mongolia under the Chinese Government it answers to khante. A Khān is at the head of an atmāq. Atmāqs are divided into koshung, i.e. banners (Mongolia, N. Prejevasky trs. El. Delmar Morgan, ii, 53).

P. 75 and n. 1.—For an explanation, provided in 94 AH., of why Samarkand was called Baidat-i-mahfūṣa, the Guarded-city, see Daulat-shāh, Browne’s ed. s.n. Qulaiba p. 443.

P. 85 n. 2.—The reference to the Ḥabībū’s-siyar confuses two cases of parricide:—‘Abdu’ll-tattīf’s of Aulugh Beg (853–1447) to which H.S. refers [Vol. III, Part 2, p. 163, l. 13 fr. ft.] with (one of 7–628) Shirūya’s of Khusrau Parviz (H.S. Vol. I, Part 2, p. 44, l. 11 fr. ft.) where the parricide’s sister tells him that the murderer of his father (and 15 brothers) would eventually be punished by God, and (a little lower) the couplet Bābur quotes (p. 85) is entered (H.B.).

P. 154 n. 3.—The Persian phrase in the Sīyāṣat-nāma which describes the numbering of the army (T. dīm kūrmand) is ba sar-i-tātāna shumvrdan. Schafer translates tātāna by cravache. I have nowhere found how the whip was used; (cf. S.N. Pers. text p. 151 1.5).

P. 171 n. 1.—Closer acquaintance with Bābur’s use of daryā, rūd, sī, the first of which he reserves for a great river, casts doubt on my suggestion that daryū may stand for the Kāsān-water. But the narrative supports what I have noted.

H. OF B.
The "upper villages" of Akhsi might be, however, those higher up on the Salihun-darya (Sir-darya).

P. 189 and n. 1.—A third and perhaps here better rendering of bi dagi is that of p. 662 (s. d. April 10th), "leaving none behind."

P. 196.—The Habibis-siyar (lith. ed. iii, 250 l. 11 fr. ft.) writes of baradarvan of Khusrau Shâh, Amîr Wâli and Pîr Wâli. As it is improbable that two brothers (Anglicë) would be called Wâli, it may be right to translate baradarvan by brethren, and to understand a brother and a cousin. Babur mentions only the brother Wali.

P. 223 ll. 1–3 fr. ft.—The French translation, differing from 'Abdu'r-rahim's and Erskine's, reads Babur as saying of the ranges separating the cultivated lands of Kabul, that they are comme des ponts de treifle, but this does not suit the height and sometimes permanent snows of some of the separating ranges.—My bald "(great) dams" should have been expanded to suit the meaning (as I take it to be) of the words Yâr-ünkcha' pul-dik, like embankments (pul) against going (yâr) further ; (so far, ancha). Cf. Griffiths' Journal, p. 431.

P. 251.—Niacki expresses the opinion that "Fate is an avenging servitor" but not in the words used by Babur (p. 251). He does this when moralizing on Farhad's death, brought about by Khusrau's trick and casting the doer into dread of vengeance (H.B.).

P. 266 n. 7.—On p. 266 Babur allots three daughters to Pâpâ Aghâcha and on p. 269 four. Various details make for four. But, if four, the total of eleven (p. 261) is exceeded.

P. 276 para. 3.—Attention is attracted on this page to the unusual circumstance that a parent and child are both called by the same name, Junaid. One other instance is found in the Babur-nama, that of Babur's wife Ma'suma and her daughter. Perhaps "Junaid" like "Ma'suma" was the name given to the child because birth closely followed the death of the parent (see s.n. Ma'suma).

P. 277.—Concerning Bih-bud Beg the Shaihâni-nama gives the following information :—he was in command in Khwârizm and Khiva when Shaiibâni moved against Chin Sufi (910 AH.), and spite of his name, was unpopular (Vambery's ed. 184, 186). Vambery's note 88 says he is mentioned in the (anonymous) prose Shaihâni-nama, Russian trs. p. lxi.

P. 372 l. 2 fr. ft.—Where the Hâi. MS. and Kâsân Imp. have mu'araz, rival, E. and de C. translate by representative, but the following circumstances favour "rival" :—Wais was with Babur (pp. 374–6) and would need no representative. His arrival is not recorded ; no introductory particulars are given of him where his name is first found (p. 372); therefore he is likely to have joined Babur in the time of the gap of 924 AH. (p. 366), before the siege of Bajaur-fort and before 'Alâ'ud-din did so. The two Sawâdî chiefs received gifts and left together (p. 376).

P. 393 l. 4.—In this couplet the point lies in the double-meaning of ra'iyat, subject and peasant.

P. 401.—Under date Thursday 25th Babur mentions an appointment to read figah sabaqi to him. Erskine translated this by "Sacred extracts from the Qur'an" (I followed this). But "lessons in theology" may be a better rendering—as more literal and as allowing for the use of other writings than the Qur'an. A correspondent Mr. G. Yazdání (Gov. Epigraphist for Muslim Inscriptions, Haidarabad), tells us that it is customary amongst Muslims to recite religious books on Thursdays.

P. 404 l. 7 fr. ft.—Bâbâ Qasbqa (or Qâshqâ)'s family-group is somewhat interesting as that of loyal and capable men of Mughul birth who served Babur and Humâyûn. It must have joined Babur in what is now the gap between 914 and 925 AH., because it is not mentioned earlier and because he is first mentioned in 925 AH. without introductory particulars. The following details supplement Babur-nama information about the group:—(1) Of Bâbâ Qasbqa's murder by Muḥammad-i-zamân Bâd-garâ Gul-hadan (f. 23) makes record, and Badâyûnî (Bib. Ind. ed. i, 450) says that (cir. 952 AH.) when Bâbâ's son Hajî Muh. Khân Kûkî had pursued and overtaken the rebel Kâmrân, the Mirzâ asked, as though questioning the Khân's ground of hostility to himself, "But did I kill thy father
Bābā Qashqa?" (Pīdrat Bābā Qashqā magar man kushīta am?).—(2) Of the death of Bābā Qashqā's brother "Kūkt", Abū'1-faţl records that he was killed in Hindīstān by Muḥammad Sl. M. Bāt-garā (952 A.H.), and that Kūkt's nephew Shāh Muḥ. (see p. 608) retaliated (955 A.H.) by arrow-shooting one of Muḥ. Sl. Mirzā's sons. This was done when Shāh Muḥ. was crossing Mīnār-pass on his return journey from sharing Humāyūn's exile in Persia (see Jauhar).—(3) Hāfīz Muḥ. Khān Kūkt and Shāh Muḥammad Khān appear to have been sons of Bābā Qashqā and nephews of "Kūkt" (supra). They were devoted servants of Humāyūn but were put to death by him in 958 A.H.-1551 A.D. (cf. Erskine's H. of I. Humāyūn).—(4) About the word Kūkt dictionaries afford no warrant for taking it to mean foster-brother (kohak). Chīngiz Khān had a beg known as Kūk or Kouk (or Gūk) and one of his own grandsons used the same style. It may link the Bābā Qashqā group with the Chīngiz Khāndī Kūktī, either as descendants or as hereditary adherents, or as both. (See Abū'1-faţl's Shajarat-i-Turk, trs. Désmaisons, Index s.n. Kouk and also its accounts of the origin of several tribal groups.)

P. 416.—The line quoted by Abū'1-lāh is from the Anwār-i-suhailī, Book II, Story 1. Eastwick translates it and its immediate context thus:—

"People follow the faith of their kings."

"My heart is like a tulip scorched and by sighings flame;

"In all thou seest, their hearts are scorched and stained the same." (H.B.)

The offence of the quotation appears to have been against Khalīfā, and might be a suggestion that he followed Bābūr in breach of Law by using wine.

P. 487 n. 2.—The following passages complete the note on wulsa quoted by Erskine from Col. Mark Wilks' Historical Sketches and show how the word is used:—

"During the absence of Major Lawrence from Trichinopoly, the town had been completely depopulated by the removal of the whole Wulsa, to seek for food elsewhere, and the enemy had been earnestly occupied in endeavouring to surprise the garrison." (Here follows Erskine's quotation see in loco p. 487).

"The people of a district thus deserting their homes are called the Wulsa of that district, a state of utmost misery, involving precaution against incessant war and unpitying depredation—so peculiar a description as to require in any of the languages of Europe a long circumlocution, is expressed in all the languages of Deckan and the south of India by a single word. No proofs can be accumulated from the most profound research which shall describe the immemorial condition of the people of India with more precision than this single word. It is a bright distinction that the Wulsa never departs on the approach of a British army when this is unaccompanied by Indian allies."—By clerical error in the final para. of my note ālavaš is entered for ālavan [Molesworth, any desolating calamity].

P. 540 n. 4.—An explanation of Bābūr's use of Shāh-zāda as Thāmāsp's title may well be that this title answers to the Timūrid one Mir-zāda, Mirzā. If so, Bābūr's change to "Shāh" (p. 635) may recognize supremacy by victory, such as he had claimed for himself in 913 A.H. when he changed his Timūrid "Mirzā" for "Pādshāh".

P. 557.—Husain Kashīfi, also, quotes Ferdau's couplet in the Anwār-i-suhailī (Cap. I, Story XXI), a book dedicated to Shaikh Aḥmad Suhaṭī (p. 277) and of earlier date than the Bābūr-nāma. Its author died in 910 A.H.-1505 A.D.

P. 576 n. 1.—Tod's statement (quoted in my n. 1) that "the year of Rānā Sangā's defeat (933 A.H.) was the last of his existence" cannot be strictly correct because Bābūr's statement (p. 598) of intending attack on him in Chitor allows him to have been alive in 934 A.H. (1528 A.D.). The death occurred, "not without suspicion of poison," says Tod, when the Rānā had moved against Iraj then held for Bābūr; it will have been long enough before the end of 934 A.H. to allow an envoy from his son Bīkramājīšt to wait on Bābūr in that year (pp. 603, 612). Bābūr's record of it may safely be inferred lost with the once-existent matter of 934 A.H.

P. 631.—My husband has ascertained that the "Sayyid Dakni" of p. 631 is Sayyid Shāh Thāhir Dakni (Deccani) the Shiite apostle of Southern India, who in 935 A.H. was sent to Bābūr with a letter from Burhān Nizām Shāh of Ahmadnagar, in which (if there were not two embassies) congratulation was made on
the conquest of Dihlī and help asked against Bahādur Shāh Gujratī. A second but earlier mention of "Sayyid Daknī" (Zaknī, Ruknī?) Shīrāzī is on p. 619. Whether the two entries refer to Shāh Ẓāhir nothing makes clear. The cognomen Shīrāzī disassociates them. It is always to be kept in mind that preliminary events are frequently lost in gaps; one such will be the arrivals of the various envoys, mentioned on p. 630, whose places of honour are specified on p. 631. Much is on record about Sayyid Shāh Ẓāhir Daknī and particulars of his life are available in the histories by Bādāyūnī (Ranking trs.) and Fīrishta Nawal Kishor ed. p. 105); B. M. Harleyan MS. No. 199 contains his letters (see Rieu’s Pers. Cat. p. 395).
P. 699 and n. 3.—The particulars given by the Ṭaḥāqāṭ-i-akbarī about Mūltān at this date (932-4 AH.) are as follows:—After Bābur took the Panj-āb, he ordered Shāh Ḥasan Arghūn to attempt Mūltān, then held by one Sī. Mahmūd who, dying, was succeeded by an infant son Ḥusain. Shāh Ḥāsan took Mūltān after a 16 (lunar) months’ siege, at the end of 934 AH. (in a B.N. lacuna therefore), looted and slaughtered in it, and then returned to Tatta. On this Langar Khān took possession of it (II.B.). What part ‘Askari (et. 12) had in the matter is yet to learn; possibly he was nominated to its command and then recalled as Bābur mentions (935 AH.).
Bābar, Emperor of Hindustan
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