

Noles on the MSS. of the Turkī Text of Bābar's Memoirs

Author(s): Annette S. Beveridge

Source: *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, (Jul., 1900), pp. 439-480

Published by: Cambridge University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25208216>

Accessed: 09-01-2024 18:11 +00:00

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Cambridge University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*

ART. XIX.—*Notes on the MSS. of the Turkī Text of Bābar's Memoirs.* By ANNETTE S. BEVERIDGE.

THE information contained in the following notes on the MSS. of the Turkī text of Bābar's autobiography I have not seen put together elsewhere. It is offered as an *ad interim* contribution towards a better knowledge of the Turkī text.

The notes enumerate with some detail all the MSS. of which I have learned that they exist or have existed, viz. :

- I. Bābar's autograph MS.
- II. Khwāja Kilān's MS.
- III. (Humāyūn's transcript.)
- IV. Elphinstone MS.
- V. British Museum MS.
- VI. India Office MS. (Bib. Leydeniana).
- VII. Asiatic Society of Bengal MS.
- VIII. Mysore MS. (Tipū's).
- IX. Bibliotheca Lindesiana MS.
- X. Hyderābād MS.
- XI. St. Petersburg University Library MS.
- XII. St. Petersburg Foreign Office MS.
- XIII. St. Petersburg Asiatic Museum MS (Senkovskī).
- XIV. Bukhārā MS.
- XV. Nuzar Bay Turkestānī MS.

Two titles seem to be used for these MSS., viz. *Tūzuk-i-bābarī* and *Bābar-nāma*. A third name—*Bābarīyah*, بابریه—is given to the work in the last of the St. Petersburg fragments (cf. No. XII). Bābar uses وقایعی as a common noun when speaking of his writings. The title *Wāqī'āt-i-bābarī*, when

used exactly, seems to apply to the Persian translation only. The colophon of the St. Petersburg Asiatic Museum MS. supplies a new name, *Waqāyi'-nāma-i-pāulshāhī*.

For help in preparing these notes, I have to thank Mr. A. G. Ellis for his invaluable guidance amongst the catalogues and books used in the British Museum; Mr. C. Salemann (director of the St. Petersburg Asiatic Museum, and compiler with Baron v. Rosen of the Oriental MSS. Catalogue of the St. Petersburg University Library, 1888), for most useful and exquisitely framed notes on the Russian Turkī texts; Professor Nicolas Féodorovitch Katanoff, of the Kazan University, for much useful information and the trouble taken in collecting it; Mr. N. Schilder, director of the St. Petersburg Public Library; Miss Fanny Toulmin Smith, together with other friendly help, for a translation of Ilminski's preface; Mr. William Irvine; Professor E. Denison-Ross; and Mr. W. Hall Griffin and Mr. E. de Necanda-Trepka, who both helped me with Ilminski's preface. For the loan of MSS. I have to thank the Bibliotheca Lindesiana, the India Office, and the Asiatic Society of Bengal, and I am indebted to Professor Robert K. Douglas for enabling me to use these MSS. under his charge at the British Museum. Those who have worked much at the British Museum realize from time to time that one is made free of its vast resources and that it is truly our own national and individual possession. For this reason it does not always occur to us to express the gratitude we really feel, for its helpfulness and generous collaboration.

I. *Emperor Bābar's autograph MS.*

Certain divergencies in the substance of the Turkī texts have suggested to me that Bābar put forth two versions of his autobiography, a first which was based on a diary and a second which was in parts revised and polished.

The St. Petersburg MSS. appear to me to have descended from the first edition, the Elphinstone MS and its allies from the second. In speaking of the Russian Foreign Office MS. (No. XII) I have named some points which suggested this as possible. Their worth can only be judged by expert examination.

Whether any MS. that may be ranked as autograph still survives, I am not able to say. A little hope encircles some of the Russian set, and there are special features of the Elphinstone which forbid its exclusion until further examination of it has been made. Unfortunately I have not been able to find this most valuable copy.

The date of composition of even the earlier and elaborated portion of the *Tūzūk-i-bābarī* or *Bābarnāma* is fixed by internal evidence as being late in the author's reign. This is pointed out by Mr. Erskine; M. Pavet de Courteille supports it by citation of evidence, and to this evidence more might be added. The whole of the work (which, however, seems to be based upon a diary) appears to have been written in Hindūstān, where perhaps it filled the tedious leisure of hot seasons.

A portion of the *Bābarnāma* and a transcript of that portion (cf. No. II) existed prior to March 5th, 1529, since the transcript was despatched on this day to Samarqand.¹ That Bābar was working much later we gather from Gulbadan Begam. She went to Hindūstān with Māham Begam, who reached Agra on June 27th, 1529. Several months later she accompanied Bābar and Māham to Dhūlpur and Sikrī. In her narrative of incidents of this excursion she names a building in Sikrī where her "royal father used to sit and write his book," and these words, with their context, allow the inference that he was doing so at the time of her visit, i.e. later than the "Guūliār passage" (Mems., 425). The manuscript fragments which are attached to No. XII, reproduced by Ilminski and made familiar by Pavet de Courteille, carry down the narrative

¹ Memoirs of Bābar, Leyden and Erskine, p. 406.

which is, in them, attributed to Bābar, to within a few weeks at most of his death on December 26th, 1530.

II. *Khwāja Kilān's MS.*

This is the transcript already named as despatched on March 5th, 1529, to Samarqand. Of its survival I have no information. It was sent to Khwāja Kilān (a Samarqand *khwāja* and not Bābar's intimate friend of the same title), who, having been on a visit at Bābar's Court in Agra, took leave to return home on February 1st, 1529. He had preferred a request for a copy of Bābar's book, and under date March 7th, 1529, the Emperor notes its dispatch to him.

Of this MS., then, it is known that it was not carried beyond March, 1529. Also that it did not contain Humāyūn's notes of 1553-4 (961 H. Cf. No. III). In this last particular it agrees with St. Petersburg No. XII.

A minute point as to the date of this transcript is seen by considering the following parallel passages from the Persian and English versions. For the sake of comparison the Turkī and French are added.

I.O., Pers., No. 29 and No. 3,405 (old numbering) :

خواجه کلان نمبره یحیی از من وقایعی که نوشته شود میطلبید
استکتاب کنانده بودم از دست شهرک فرستاده شد

Memoirs, p. 405 :

"Khwāja Kilān, Khwāja Yahia's grandson, had asked for a copy of the Memoirs" [وقایعی memoirs] "which I had written. I had formerly ordered a copy to be made, and now sent it by Sherek."

Hlinski, p. 469, l. 12 :

خواجه کلان خواجه یحیی نینک نمبره سی مین دین بیتمی
تورکان وقایعی تیلایدور ایدی استکتاب قیلد وروب ایدیم شهرک
دین بیبار یلدی

Pavet de Courteille, II, 326 :

“Khwāja Kilān, petit-fils de Khwāja Yahia, m'avait demandé une copie des mémoires que j'étais en train d'écrire ; je la fis exécuter en effet et chargeai Sherek de la lui remettre.”

With the deference natural towards Mr. Erskine, I suggest that his “formerly” perhaps implies a time unnecessarily remote. *Istiktāb kunānda budam* may refer only to the interval between the request and its fulfilment by despatch of the copy, i.e. during the visit of Khwāja Kilān to Agra or even after his departure. If the copy had existed before the Khwāja left Agra, it would have been natural for him to receive it before he left.

In rendering *navishta shavad* by “had written” is not the subjective force of *shavad* wasted? Cannot *navishta shavad* contain the idea of “whatever might have been written,” i.e. incomplete as it was, and thus indicate a time less remote and definite than does “had written”? *Mitalbid* could also yield a fuller notion than “had written,” e.g. “kept asking,” or “used to ask,” either of which forms would modify the sense as to time of transcription.

III. (*Emperor Humāyūn's Transcript.*)

So far as I have been able to ascertain, the sole evidence of the existence of this MS. is afforded by a marginal note of the Emperor Humāyūn upon a copy of the *Tūzuk-i-bābarī*, and by Mr. Erskine's translation of that note. The words of the translation (Mems., 303) are as follows :—

“Now that I am forty-six, I, Muḥammad Humāyūn, am transcribing a copy of these Memoirs from the copy in his late Majesty's own hand-writing.”

Some doubt having arisen in my mind about this passage, I have not ventured to include Humāyūn's transcript amongst MSS. of which the existence is established. The matter is of great interest, for the words just quoted and their context are valuable both historically and critically. They are a part of one of two notes made by Humāyūn

and which Mr. Erskine says occur in the Elphinstone Turkī text, i.e. that with which he collated his finished work. They do not appear in all the Turkī texts. (This point is taken up in each section of these notes.) One only appears in any of the considerable number¹ of MSS. of the Persian translation in which I have looked for them.

Of Humāyūn's two notes, the second concerns a fruit—the *amratphul* (Mems., 329, n.). Of this it is sufficient to say here that it is not found in any MS.—Turkī or Persian—to which I have had access. The Elphinstone, I regretfully repeat, has eluded my search.

The first note (Mems., 302–3) is that of which part has been quoted. It is necessary to consider it somewhat in detail. I must then leave it to scholars to judge whether it justifies the admission of "Humāyūn's Transcript" amongst facts.

I cannot quote the note in Turkī because I have not seen it in that tongue.² It is given below in full from Persian and English versions; the former is strictly the source of the latter, since it is an extract from B.M. Add. 26,200, from which Mr. Erskine translated.

B.M. Add. 26,200, f. 248, l. 6:

در همین منزل همین روز همایون در روی خود استرہ یا مقراض
رساند چون حضرت مرحومی استرہ رساندن را در آن وقایع ذکر
کرده بودند بنده داعی بستمبعمآ آنرا ذکر کرد در آن تاریخ هشتده
ساله بودم الحال در سن چهل شش سال بوده باشم حررہ محمد
همایون از نقل نقل خط مبارک آن حضرت منقول شد

Mems., 302–3:

"(At this same station and this same day, the razor or scissors were first applied to Humāyūn's beard. As my

¹ Mr. Erskine worked from two Persian MSS., i.e. B.M. Add. 26,200 and B.M. Add. 26,201 (Mr. Metcalfe's), the latter being, he says, "defective and incorrect." In these more facile days *ابن حقیر* was easily able to consult a round dozen.

² Dr. Leyden's manuscript translation from the Turkī gives no help, because it ends before the notes of Humāyūn are reached.

honoured father mentions in these commentaries the time of his first using the razor, in humble emulation of him I have commemorated the same circumstance regarding myself. I was then eighteen years of age. Now that I am forty-six, I, Muhammad Humāyūn, am transcribing a copy of these Memoirs from the copy in his late Majesty's own hand-writing.)"

Having had occasion, on another ground, to note the occurrence of this passage in the Turkī and Persian versions of the autobiography of Bābar, I looked for it in all available MSS. I found it in none of the Turkī, but in at least fourteen of the Persian. Reiterated perusal awakened some deferential uncertainty as to Mr. Erskine's reading. It was a most regretful doubt, since this rendering not only provides a critical test of some points in the history of the MSS., but is full of human interest. Everyone would prefer to leave the king-in-exile to his pious task, untroubled by criticism. Everyone, too, who has enjoyed Mr. Erskine's writings, must desire to find him always in the right.

At this point occurred one of those fortuitous dovetailings which now and then fit into one's work the exact thing it needs. Mr. Beveridge, writing from India about a remarkable Persian *Wāq'āt-i-bābarī* which he had seen in Alwar, observed that it, as well as the lithograph of Mirzā Muḥ. Shirāzī, contains a copyist's note on the "shaving passage" (i.e. Humāyūn's note; Mem., 302-3), to the effect that this passage was copied from Humāyūn's own handwriting.¹

¹ The Shirāzī passage (171, foot), confused and defective in several places, runs thus:—

در همین منزل همین روز همایون در روی خود استره یا مقراض رساند چون حضرت محمدومی استره رساندن در آن وقایع ذکر کرده بودند (omission) در آن تاریخ هشتصد ساله بود من (بودم؟) در سن چهل و شش سال بوده باشم محمد همایون از نقل خط مبارک حضرت منتول شد

Seen by the light of this remark, the questioned portion of Humāyūn's note, i.e. from *dar san chahal*, appears to me to read more naturally thus:—

“I am 46. Signed [i.e. he writes, δ, γ] Muḥ. Humāyūn.”

“*Copied from a copy of a copy of the blessed handwriting of His Majesty*” (Humāyūn).

The sentence italicized would then read as a scribe's note.

As is well known from Mr. Erskine's preface to the Memoirs, he translated from the Persian text, and collated his finished work with the Turkī MS. which Dr. Leyden had used. He writes (preface, vii): “From some marginal notes which appear on both copies of the translation [Persian, B.M. Add. 26,200 and 26,201] as well as on the Turkī original [Elphinstone MS.], it appears that the Emperor Humāyūn . . . had transcribed the Memoirs with his own hand.”

Now the Persian note (Mems., 302-3) on which is based the statement that a transcript was made by Humāyūn, is not “marginal” in either of the above-named Persian texts. These two only were used by Mr. Erskine. In both, the whole of the passage which Mr. Erskine attributes to Humāyūn, is incorporated uncritically in the text. Nothing differentiates it in any way. This is true also of all the other Persian MSS. that I have examined.

Mr. Erskine, however, chose to use the word “marginal.” This raises the surmise that the note may be truly marginal in the Elphinstone Turkī MS., since if Mr. Erskine had seen it embodied only in the text, Turkī or Persian, it seems probable that some word other than “marginal” would have passed from his pen, e.g. *interpolated* or *reproduced from a marginal note*. On the other hand, it must be remembered that his considered translation was made from the Persian, and that he collated only with the Turkī. If in collating he had had revealed to him by a marginal note on the Turkī MS., a fact, veiled in the Persian wording, of such great interest as the copying of Bābar's book by Humāyūn, it would have accorded with his practice in the case of

variants elsewhere for him to comment upon the discovery and upon the variation of the texts.

If Mr. Erskine's reading be correct and indisputably based on the Turkī, the copyists of the Persian MSS. have gone wrong, since they vary the note as their copies descend from the original. (Cf. Table, *infra*.) The reading adopted by the later scribes is of course of little weight, since this is due to the initiative of the earlier ones and in particular and chief of the earliest.

The later copyists indicate for their work three degrees of descent from the source, viz. :

(a) Copied from a copy of a copy of the handwriting.

Going back a step, the passage stands :

(b) Copied from a copy of the handwriting.

Earlier than this must have been a form of which I have no examples, viz. :

(c) Copied from the handwriting.

Perhaps this (c) existed only in the Turkī texts.

It seems that the first scribe, i.e. he who wrote as in example (c), either did not read what Humāyūn wrote in the way Mr. Erskine has read and translated, or that he did not set down his reading so clearly as to prevent his successor from falling into error and adding a 'naql.'

Both the Persian texts used by Mr. Erskine are worded like example (a), which allows the inference of three descents from the "blessed handwriting." How would Mr. Erskine have worded his translation if example (b) had been before him?

If the whole of the note under discussion be attributed, as Mr. Erskine has attributed it, to one hand—Humāyūn's,

the reading is strengthened by the use of *ān* in *ān ḥazrat* and not *ain*. But if the words "Muḥ. Humāyūn" be taken as a signature and the following words as a copyist's note, the scribe would have no reason to make a distinction between Bābar and Humāyūn, and the grammatical force of *ān* would be less. As Mr. Erskine read the passage, *ān* is applied to the one person named by Humāyūn, i.e. Bābar.

Mr. Erskine's reading is not without a grammatical difficulty, since "Muḥ. Humāyūn" is the nominative of *manqūl shud*. Two other points attract attention in Mr. Erskine's translation—

(1) To allow of it, either the word *naql*, used without limitation, must be read in two senses in the same sentence;

(2) Or the passage contains the information that Bābar wrote down two MSS., since Humāyūn transcribes from the duplicate (copy, *naql*) of His Majesty's handwriting.

Mr. Erskine uses 'copy' as equivalent to 'MS.' Can a first autograph MS. be truly called, *Anglice*, a copy (i.e. as we speak of one book in an edition), or *Persice*, *naql*, a duplicate?

If *naql* be read as 'narrative,' the main difficulties would remain.

If one were to readjust a little and let in a copyist to account for one *naql*, an objection of a different nature would be started. Humāyūn would commemorate the descent of his transcript from Bābar, to the scribe, to himself—an undignified and improbable 'switchback.'

So much has of necessity been said as to the Persian MSS. that a few discursive complementary words further may be allowed.

In the thirteen MSS. tabulated below, the note attributed by Mr. Erskine to Humāyūn is essentially identical as far as and inclusive of the words *ḥarara-hu*, *Muḥ. Humāyūn*. The word *ḥarara-hu*, ^سحراره، was perhaps a puzzle to some of

the scribes ; it takes various forms, never carries the *zamma*, and has sometimes a vagrant dot.¹

After the word "Humāyūn" the MSS. show a good deal of variation. This may be seen in the following table. It includes some details of reference, and, moreover, indicates some correspondence between the date of the MSS. and their degree of descent.

¹ As illustrating the use of the Ar. \dot{y} in this expression, Mr. William Irvine referred me to the inscription under the portrait of Jahāngir which faces p. 115 of Mr. W. Foster's "Embassy of Sir Thomas Roe," and where the parallel expression *rāqama-hu* is used. The \dot{y} would explain the abnormal *mim* on which Mr. Wollaston comments (J.R.A.S., Jan., 1900, p. 71). Mr. Irvine has mentioned to me another instance of \dot{y} *ḥarara-hu*, which occurs in the colophon of a B.M. Persian MS., *Mūnisa-l-arwāḥ*, by Jahān-ārā Begam, daughter of Shāh-jahān.

DESCRIPTION OF MSS. (Pers.).	FOLIO REF.	DATE OF MS.	VARIANTS.	REMARKS.	
B.M. Or. 3714 ...	363 ^a ...	End of 16th cent. (Rieu).	<i>naql az naql-i-i-khat-i-i-mubū, il</i>	An unusually fine illustrated MS.	
" Add. 24,416 ...	238 ^a ...	" " "	<i>manqūl shud</i> ...		
" " 16,623 ...	202 ^a ...	1638 A.D. (Rieu)	<i>az naql-i-khat manqūl shud</i>		
" " 26,200 ...	248 ^a ...	Prob. 16th cent. (Rieu).	" "		
" " 16,691 ...	131 ^a ...	1735 A.D. (Rieu)	<i>az naql-i-naql-i-khat manqūl shud</i>	Mr. Erskine's better MS.	
I.O. 29 (old cat.) ...	218 ^a	" "		
Bodleian 405 ...	264 ^a ...	Not dated, and no estimate made by the Bodleian ...	" "		
" 180 ...	141 ^a ...		" "	" "	
" 341 ...	165 ...		" "	" "	
A.S. Bengal 324 ...	No paging	No date	" "		
Bib. Lind. 160 ...	No paging	c. 1780 (Bib. Lind. Cat.)	" "		
B.M. Add. 26,201 ...	118 ...	Early nineteenth century.	<i>naql dar naql-i-khat</i>	Evidently related. Both have a mistake which makes Humayūn go to Kābul the day preceding the entry of his note.	
I.O. 330 (old cat.) ...	163	" "		

IV. *Elphinstone MS.* : *Tūzuk-i-bābarī* (*Mems.*, 183 n.).

This is the copy translated from by Dr. Leyden, and with it Mr. Erskine collated his finished work. It was purchased in Peshāwar by Mr. Elphinstone when on his mission to Kābul in 1809. On Dr. Leyden's death it would seem to have met with some misadventure, since Mr. Erskine speaks of it as "fortunately recovered" by Mr. Elphinstone, who had believed it sent to Europe with Dr. Leyden's papers. Mr. Elphinstone, having again become possessed of it, sent it to Mr. Erskine, and thus "reduced" him, "though heartily sick of the task, to the necessity of commencing work once more," i.e. of collating his own translation from the Persian and incorporation of Leyden's translation from the Turkī, with Leyden's original. This will have occurred before 1816, the date of completion of the Memoirs. Since that time I have found only one mention of the MS., viz. in a manuscript note made by Mr. Erskine and dated 1848, and I have not found the MS. It is one of special value and interest; by dwelling at length on my inability to find it, information may be obtained and the precious volume located.

Mr. Erskine's note is made upon a flyleaf of the B.M. *Tūzuk-i-bābarī* (Add. 26,324), which was once his own. This MS. is imperfect and disarranged. Mr. Erskine has analyzed its contents. The analysis is followed by the remark: — "N.B. The folios 25–38 are wanting in Mr. Elphinstone's copy of the original, *now in the library of the Faculty of Advocates at Edinburgh.*" The whole entry is signed by Mr. Erskine, and is dated Edinburgh, 25th December, 1848.

Led by this note, which was and is my only clue to the MS., I wrote to the Keeper of the Advocates' Library, Mr. J. T. Clark, for permission to see it. He replied that the Advocates' Library did not possess the MS., and incidentally mentioned that a copy of the Memoirs (Leyden and Erskine) had been missing for more than thirty years. After fruitless enquiry elsewhere for the MS., I acted upon

the coincidence of learning the loss of the translation when I had sought the original, and troubled the Keeper with questions as to the receipt of the Memoirs. It was possibly a gift, I thought, and some record of this might name the MS. This slender clue failed. The annals of the Library lead to the view that Mr. Erskine's work was received in due course under the Copyright Acts. The Keeper assures me as to the MS. that "recent exhaustive enquiries have failed to show that it has ever been the property of the Faculty of Advocates, there being no entry of it in either of the catalogues of the MSS., nor is it in the manuscript collection *uncatalogued*, as a recent individual examination of the contents of the MS. Room shows." The italics are the Keeper's. The word so distinguished is depressing to those who do not know the safeguards of the Library.

Of course, even Mr. Erskine may have been mistaken, but the reasons which led me to trouble the Keeper with repeated enquiries and to hope for success are not light. They are—

(1) Mr. Erskine's own intimate knowledge of and interest in Mr. Elphinstone's MS. This interest was persistent, as is shown by the memorandum just quoted, which was made thirty-two years after he had finished his translation. His literary work, however, had been faithful to *Bābariana*.

(2) Mr. Erskine made the note in the close neighbourhood of the Advocates' Library, i.e. in Edinburgh.

(3) The note is not hasty or casual. The information as to location of the MS. is designed and carefully inserted.

The MS. may be in private hands. It is not in any of the great libraries of London, Oxford, or Cambridge. It is not any one of the other MSS. enumerated in these notes. This is shown by consideration of their respective contents. It would be truly regrettable if it were lost. It has special features of great interest, and in particular the note which might decide the question of Humāyūn's transcript. Mr. Erskine describes it as "very correct" and "unfortunately

incomplete." Its continuous narrative ends before the battle of Khānwa¹ (Mems., 355 n.), and a short fragment only follows (Mems., 382 top to 389 top). It is unique amongst the Turkī texts which I have seen or know, in the particular that it contains both the notes of Humāyūn. This is a remarkable distinction. The notes may be autographic.

In quoting the *amratphul* note (Mems., 330 n.), Mr. Erskine says: "There is in the Turkī copy the following note of the Emperor Humāyūn. It is not found in either of the Persian translations." Unfortunately he does not quote any Turkī words, and it is only from his preface that one infers the note to be "marginal." It would be most useful to know in what way the note is vouched for in the Turkī as Humāyūn's. If with *harava-hu*, this would throw light on the other.

Dr. Leyden, as has been said, gives no help, his MS. ending at a point some eighty pages earlier in the Memoirs.

V. *B.M. Add.* 26,324. (Title absent.)

Mr. Erskine gives, on a flyleaf of this book, the following account of its contents: "This volume contains scattered fragments of the original Turkī Commentaries of Bābar, being apparently some leaves preserved from a copy that had gone to pieces, and which have been bound together out of order. These fragments are six in number, with a portion of a tailpiece containing the name of the transcriber and the date of transcription. The following table will assist in restoring them to their proper place."
 "N.B. The folios 25-38 *v.* are wanting in Mr. Elphinstone's copy of the original, now in the Library of the Faculty of Advocates at Edinburgh. See Memoirs of Bābar, p. 355, note." (Signed) "William Erskine, Edinburgh, December 25th, 1848."

¹ By a slip of memory Mr. Erskine (*pref.*, xi) has indicated Pānipat (307) instead of Khānwa (355) as the last topic of Mr. Elphinstone's MS. In the intermediate pages (307-355) are eight notes referring to the Turkī text, and these include Humāyūn's on the *amratphul*.

This volume was formerly Mr. Erskine's, and was given to him by Major Yule in 1836. It was therefore not used in the preparation of the Memoirs.

The tailpiece states that the MS. was transcribed¹ by the "humblest of those who have charge of the *khānazādān*, Daud, son of 'Alī'u-l-kashmīrī, in 1629-30." Eight years later this same copyist produced a fascinating *Wāqi'āt-i-bābarī* (which is catalogued as B.M. Add. 16,623), thus working twice after Bābar, once on the Turkī² and once on the Persian. The latter copy was made at Lahōr in 1638.

Neither of Humāyūn's notes occurs in this volume; their place falls in a *lacuna*.

رأى كمتريين خانزادان داود بن علي الكشميري¹

² The date of this transcript and its finished beauty testify to the continued interest felt at Akbar's Court in the Turkī text. Mr. William Irvine assures me that this interest persisted much later. "Turkī," he writes to me, "was spoken, i.e. understood, at the Mughal Court well into the eighteenth century, and up to that time there were numbers of Qalmaq, Uzbek, and Qirghiz women servants and slaves in the harems. Within 50 or 60 years of the Mughal arrival in India, how much more usual must such knowledge have been."

By critics, Bābar's literary style is accounted one of the best amongst Turkī authors. His writings, like Mir 'Alī Shīr's, would be a textbook for all who read Turkī and who could get access to them. 'Abdu-r-raḥīm presumably made acquaintance with them in early youth, since there must have been a strong Turkī element in his father's household. His mother was a Mewatī, and his father died when he was three; but Bairam Khān was a full-born Turkomān, and of a family so distinguished amongst the Black Sheep that tribal position would be a source of pride. Bairam was great-grandson, through a son, of 'Alī Shīr Bahārlū. His mother also was of good Turkī birth. One of his wives, Sālīmā, was of the same degree of descent from 'Alī Shīr, through a daughter, Pāshā. Sālīmā married Akbar later, and 'Abdu-r-raḥīm was brought up with Akbar's sons, of whom it is known that at least Sālīm learned Turkī.

'Abdu-r-raḥīm's parentage and upbringing presuppose familiarity with the Turkī language; his bias to learning presupposes that he would early become familiar with one of the masterpieces of that tongue. These things would naturally suggest him to Akbar as a fit translator of the *Tūzuk-i-bābarī*.

The author of the last fragment of Kehr and Ilminski's text says, in the words of Pavet de Courteille, "Quant au livre appelé *Bābarīyah*, بابرييه, Mirzā Khān, fils de Bairam Khān, a été chargé de le traduire du ture en persan pour en faciliter la lecture à ceux qui ignoreraient la première de ces deux langues."

It is somewhat strange that the earlier translation of this *Tūzuk*, by Mirzā Pāyanda Ḥasan and Muḥ. Qulī, which was finished in 1586, four years before 'Abdu-r-raḥīm's, is passed over by contemporaries. It may be noted here that the B.M. copy of this translation does not contain Humāyūn's notes. They fall in a *lacuna*.

[Cf. Pers. Cat., Rieu, p. 799; I.O. Cat., s.r. *Wāqi'āt-i-bābarī*; Bodl. Cat., s.r.]

VI. *India Office MS., Bib. Leydeniana, No. 178.* (No title.)

The India Office enjoys the reputation of possessing an unusually fine copy of the Turkī *Tūzuk-i-bābarī*. Several *à priori* considerations lead to the expectation that this will be the Mysore MS. (Tipū's), but the only example of our *Tūzuk* to be found in the Library is the one named above, which came from Dr. Leyden's collection.¹

Everyone approaches a famous MS. with deference and pleasurable anticipation, and in the case of the I.O. Turkī *Tūzuk-i-bābarī*, I most assuredly was not the proof of this rule. Unfortunately my respectful attitude towards it has been so rudely changed and by a disillusion so complete as to be comic. If I dwell upon my experience here, it is only to emphasize the case of the MS., and for this reason the personal intrusion will, I trust, be excused.

I had asked the loan of this MS., and the I.O. Library Committee had, upon a security bond, heavy as being the value of a book, acceded to my request. Pending final arrangements, I came to know more of our poverty in this *Tūzuk*, and took alarm at the risk to which a MS. is exposed in a private house, since a forfeited bond is no compensation for the loss of a valuable MS. I accordingly withdrew my request for the loan to be made to myself, and later on, by the kind intervention of Professor Robert K. Douglas, obtained permission for the MS. to be sent to his safe charge in the British Museum.

¹ A passage may be appropriately quoted from the *Journal Asiatique* (January, 1842) which shows that a bygone *savant* did not clearly distinguish between Tipū's MS. and *Bib. Leydeniana*. "Les Mémoires de Bābar, تُوْزُكُ بَابَرِي, faisaient partie de la bibliothèque de Tippoo Sahib, tué 4 Mai, 1799" "la bibliothèque entière fut offert à l'East India Company, à l'exception de quelques manuscrits réservés pour la société asiatique." "C'est maintenant dans cette bibliothèque, ainsi que nous lisons dans la grammaire turque de Davids que se trouve l'original des Mémoires." The writer of the above has not, however, observed that Davids names Leyden's MS. and not the East India Company's. "Heureusement," says Davids, "l'original de cet ouvrage intéressant existe encore, et le MS. se trouve dans la bibliothèque de la Compagnie des Indes. Il appartenait autrefois au feu Dr. Leyden." The *Journal Asiatique* leaps from the Mysore MS. to *Bib. Leydeniana, No. 178*. The former is not found in the Library; the latter is an ancient possession. It was at latest in 1832 that Davids saw it, and presumably, since Dr. Leyden died in 1811, it had passed much earlier into the hands of the East India Company.

It is with something like consternation that I find No. 178 unable to account for its reputation. It discloses itself so defective as to provoke the surmise that for some ninety years it has subsisted, in unquestioned honour, upon the fame of another transcript. It has contrived to deceive all round, and up till now, since the latest official utterance about it flatters it as "complete."¹

The grounds of this unpleasant surmise are as follows:—

(1) Competent advisers assure me that the transcript is modern and of nineteenth-century date. Its former owner, Dr. Leyden, died in 1811. The flyleaves of the binding are water-marked "S. Wise & Patch, 1805."²

(2) It carries no credentials either of its own rank or of owners earlier than Dr. Leyden. It does not bear the stamp of the East India Company or of the India Office. The sole indication of its ownership is "*Bib. Leydeniana*, 2,538" upon a flyleaf, an entry apparently made in its entirety in the library to which it passed after Leyden's death, i.e. either that of Fort William in Calcutta or of the East India Company in London. (The same flyleaf bears a pencilled "85" and an I.O. shelf-mark.) The binding is the identical brown of other books formerly Dr. Leyden's. The transcript has no distinction: no marginal frame, no frontispiece, no colophon, no title, no seals, no rubrics; year runs into year and event into event in the casual fashion of poorer Persian transcripts.

Dr. Ethé's description, which, it should be noted, is placed amongst those of Persian MSS., says nothing of how or when No. 178 passed into the possession of the India Office. It is catalogued as a *Wāqī'āt-i-bābarī*, but it bears, strictly speaking, no title, since these words are casually dropped by a hand not the copyist's on a binder's flyleaf.

(3) The earlier part of the MS. has been much corrected, roughly and with disrespectful pen. The corrections cease

¹ Cf. Dr. Ethé's as yet unpublished Catalogue of the India Office Library.

² The flyleaves of a volume of Dr. Leyden's own MSS. (B.M. Add. 26,253) are water-marked with the same names and dated 1809.

suddenly. Mistakes occur after this point. Perhaps the attempt at rectification was abandoned.

A few of the errors which lower the character of the MS. for accuracy and careful transcription may be enumerated :

- (a) Cf. Ilminski, p. 40, ll. 8 and 6 from foot, "*khalīfa*" in each line. In No. 178, f. 42*b*, the words between the two *khalīfa* are absent. On the same page and in the last line the same fault occurs between two *sī*.
- (b) On the earlier pages of No. 178 it can be seen that a considerable number of omissions have been supplied by marginal corrections in a hand not the copyist's.
- (c) No. 178, f. 97*a*, has a marginal note at the beginning of an erased passage, "*az īn jā tā nishān-i-dīgar ghalat ast.*" The complementary *nishān* is at the foot of f. 98*b*. Thus nearly two folios are interpolated. This is not a case of simple misplaced folios, since five and a half lines of the text are repeated. These are erased by the corrector at the beginning of the passage, and occur again f. 99*a* top.
- (d) No. 178, f. 223*b*. Here a few words which introduce the story of Bābar's poisoning by Ibrāhīm's mother (Mems., 347) are followed by a passage about Beg Mirak Mughal (Mems., 352, l. 9 ; cf. Ilminski, 396 and 402). After a few lines of interpolation the poisoning story is resumed.

Other similar errors might be added to this list.

(4) The MS. is singularly incomplete. This the following table (A) endeavours to show. Details are given to facilitate reference, and these include the initial page of each year. The English translation is the standard of reference, and this reference is further defined by mention of events. Through the events, collation with the French version is made facile.

The table sets down the minimum of *lacuna*. A second table (B) notes the gaps by the standard of Ilminski's imprint, and shows the maximum proportion of this which is contained in No. 178.

The four principal gaps in No. 178 swallow 247 pages of the Memoirs, viz. :

<i>Lacuna</i> (a).	94 to 246 = 152 - 4 pp.	Supplement	= 148
„ (b).	272 „ 290 = 18 - 5 pp.	„	= 13
„ (c).	331 „ 345		= 14
„ (d).	353 „ 425		= 72

Memoirs' pages lost by *lacunæ* in No. 178 ... 247

N.B.—Bābar's narrative ends with the Guāliār passage, Mems., p. 425. The 425 pages include 19 of Supplement (i.e. pp. 123 to 126, 236 to 245, 284 to 289), leaving a total of 406 pages of translation. At the most then, No. 178 contains the equivalent of 159 out of 406 pages of the Memoirs (425 - 19 = 406 translation pages of the Memoirs. 406 - 247 = 159 Memoirs pages in No. 178).

If we refer No. 178 to Ilminski's imprint we find :

<i>Lacuna</i> (a).	Ilminski, 111 to 276	= 165 pages.
„ (b).	„ 306 „ 324	= 18 „
„ (c).	„ 374 „ 394	= 20 „
„ (d).	„ 403 „ 494	= 91 „

Ilminski's pages lost by *lacunæ* in No. 178 ... 294

N.B.—Ilminski's 494 pages (to the Guāliār passage) are equal to 425 pages of the Memoirs.

At the most then, No. 178 contains the equivalent of 200 pages out of 494 of Ilminski's imprint (494 - 294 = 200).

There may be other gaps in No. 178. I have made no further examination.

Some marginal notes in the earliest pages, it is of interest to observe, do not seem to be emendations of mistakes but attempts to harmonize the text with some other. This may be a point of great interest in considering the history of the MSS. Words are struck out and others or phrases are substituted. This occurs certainly in some places where No. 178 is in accord with Ilminski; e.g. No. 178, f. 6a, has two lines marked with a marginal query and the word *rāq* erased. These lines are in accord with Ilminski, where the *rāq* occurs (p. 6).

It may be that No. 178 is a copy made for Dr. Leyden at the time when his interest was first drawn towards Bābar's book by acquaintance with the Mysore MS. Dr. Leyden obtained it, as may be inferred from the watermarks (1805) of the binding, before he became possessed of the Elphinstone MS., which was purchased in Peshāwar in 1808. The intimate relation subsisting between I.O. No. 178, and A.S.B. No. 121, is dwelt upon under the heading of the latter MS. (No. VII). Whether their common defects are due to the 'scamping' of their copyists or are reproductions from their source, I am unable to say.

No. 178 is annotated here and there by an English hand, in writing which, to the amateur eye, resembles Dr. Leyden's. The same may be said of those Turkī notes which I have conjectured attempt to harmonize the text with that of some other example.¹ Corrections of faults seem to be in another hand.

No. 178 does not appear to have had honour from Dr. Leyden. He did not translate from it. Nor, it may be added, did Mr. Erskine collate it with his translation or name it amongst MSS. which he used or knew. Having regard to his account of his work with Leyden's original (Elphinstone MS.), this seems to be an early disparagement of the copy.

It may be that the marginal notes, which appear to aim at producing agreement with some other text, are taken from the Elphinstone, one of the MSS. which most unfortunately I have been unable to trace.

Three facts, amongst others available, support the statement that Leyden did not translate from No. 178,—

(a) The broken passage about Bābar's flight from Akhsi (Mems., 122) is not in No. 178. It, together with the copyist's note quoted by Mr. Erskine and Dr. Leyden's own ejaculation, occurs in Leyden's MS. of his translation from the Turkī (cf. B.M. Add. 32,629-30).

¹ Specimens of Dr. Leyden's English and Arabic writing can be seen in his manuscript remains at the British Museum.

(b) No. 178 does not contain Humāyūn's notes; their place occurs on f. 176*a*, last line, and the passage (marked with asterisks by Ilminski) is absent.

(c) No. 178 ends with a passage corresponding to Mems., 353. Mr. Elphinstone's MS., which was used both by Leyden and by Erskine, ends on Mems., 389.

VII. *Asiatic Society of Bengal MS. D. No. 121 (Cat. 1890):*
 "Tūzuk-i-bābari."

This MS. was formerly the property of the College of Fort William, and on this ground may earlier have been in Tipū's Ṣāhib's library.

Ignorance as to the details of the College library system forbids my knowing the import of the date given on a book-plate which, in this MS., is inscribed "C. of F. W., 1825." Many other MSS. formerly in the College and now in the India Office Library bear the same date. One has an interpolated "[1809]" before the 1825. This suggests that 1825 is not a date of acquisition, but of binding or cataloguing or inspection.

If it were a date of acquisition, the fact would make against the supposition that A.S.B. No. 121 came to the College from the Mysore library, because the great gift of the Mysore MSS. to the College was in 1800 (*cired*).

A consideration which predisposes against the conclusion that No. 121 was in the royal library at Seringapatam is its insignificance. All that has been said of I.O. No. 178 as an undistinguished MS. may be applied to this one. It has no mark of ownership earlier than the College stamp with date 1825.

It is closely related to I.O. No. 178.¹ Possibly they are parallel in descent, and possibly they are source and copy. In every point which I have examined they are identical. By rough computation, the volume of their

¹ This I have been able to ascertain by the courtesy of the Council of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, who have sent it for me to the British Museum, through the kind intervention of Professor Robert K. Douglas.

contents is the same. Both have the error of transposing the poisoning of Bābar with the affair of Beg Mirak. Both have been much and carelessly corrected. In both are changes which take them out of verbal agreement with Ilminski. Neither has Humāyūn's note of Mems., 302-3. At the place of its possible occurrence (*circa* 339*b*; there is no paging) the two MSS. are identical, and the text runs on from "Raḥmat *pūda*" to the "Sun in Aries."

Unlike I.O. No. 178, A.S.B. No. 121 has a tailpiece. It is of no value unfortunately, being merely "*Tamām shud ain kitāb ba 'awan-i-mulku-l-wahhāb; tam-tam-tam.*" (These words occur also in No. XI, St. Petersburg University Library MS.)

If this were the Mysore *Tūzuk*, one would expect to find its satellite dictionary in the same library. This is not included in either of the A.S.B. Catalogues, at any rate under Stewart's designation of it—*Kitāb-i-ṣarfū nehv turkī*.

The size and character of A.S.B. No. 121 are those noted of Tīpū's by Stewart.

This MS. is shown by the "No. 241" inscribed on a fly-leaf to be the example catalogued by Zuhūr 'Alī Barelawī in A.S.B. Cat. 1837.

VIII. Mysore MS. (Tīpū's): "*Tūzuk-i-bābarī*."

This and No. VII may coincide. If they do not, I am unable to locate the Mysore MS.

The only places where I have seen it mentioned by name are Stewart's Catalogue of the Mysore MSS. (1808) and B.M. Add. 26,583. This latter is a volume of Dr. Leyden's own manuscript remains, the paper of which is water-marked "S. Wise & Patch, 1809." It contains a list of books which "formed part of the library of Tippu Sulṭān, and still [N.B., Dr. Leyden died 1811] remain in the College of Fort William, viz. exclusive of those taken to England by Marquis Wellesley and of the books presented by the prize agents to the Asiatic Society [1808]." In this list the *Tūzuk-i-bābarī* and its satellite dictionary are catalogued.

It is not altogether clear whether the MS. went from the College of Fort William to the Asiatic Society of Bengal or to the India Office. Inferentially the following two statements concern it, and would locate it in the library of the A.S.B. :

(1) Stewart (pref., i) writes : "Marquis Wellesley was pleased to order [*circa* 1800] that the Mysore MSS. should be transferred [i.e. from the E.I.C.] to Fort William and deposited in the College."

(2) In the Centenary Review of the A.S.B., Bābu Rajendra Lall Mitter writes (i, 25) : "On the abolition of the C. of F. W. the whole of its Sanscrit, Arabian, Persian, and Urdu works . . . were placed [1835] under the custody of the [A.S.B.] Society. . . . In 1846 . . . the books and MSS. became the property of the Society."

But there is evidence, as to the first of these statements, that *all* the Mysore MSS. did not go to the College of Fort William ; and as to the second, that all which went to the College did not go on to the A.S.B.

This can be conveniently seen by consulting Dr. Loth's Arabic Catalogue of the India Office Library in connection with Stewart's Mysore Catalogue. If one takes (e.g.) Stewart's Arabic list (p. 31 ff.), one finds that of ten MSS. named, three went, not to the A.S.B., but to the India Office. (Loth, s.n. *Rausatu-l-abrār*, *Mululu-l-nabbī*, *Bohjatū-l-muḥāfiḥ*.) Dr. Loth notes them as "C. of F. W., 1825," and in the case of the first-named "C. of F. W., [1805] 1825." Another of the same set of ten is marked "[Tippu]," from which it would seem that it went neither to the College nor to the A.S.B. This is the *Mirātu-l-jinān* (Loth, No. 706).

Dr. Loth's Catalogue has other MSS. marked in both the above ways. It would therefore not be safe to accept either Stewart's or Rajendra Lall Mitter's statement without restriction.

If we now turn to what points to possession of the Mysore *Tūzūk* by the A.S.B., we find that an example of the

work is included as No. 241 in A.S.B. Cat., *Zubūr 'Alī Barelawī*, Calcutta, 1837, 8vo, and again in A.S.B. Cat. 1890 (D. No. 121). In neither place is any description given. This example is our No. VII. As has been said, it bears no marks which may allow of its identification with 'Tipū's.'

If now we turn to consider the possibility that the Mysore *Tūzuk* went to the India Office. It is not certain that it went to the A.S.B. The alternative location is the I.O. It is, however, not catalogued in this library.

It would be strange that the I.O. Library should acquire the reputation of possessing a fine *Tūzuk*, if it had never owned another example than Leyden's (No. 178). When Stewart catalogued 'Tipū's and had to get information as to what it was, from an Afghān trader, the rarity of the MS., taken with the almost certain absence of another copy for comparison, would explain an over-estimate by him of an inferior MS. (e.g. if A.S.B. No. 121 were 'Tipū's). But this would not account for the high repute in which Leyden's is held at the India Office. Can the past century, since 1811, have slipped by and left it unchallenged? The publication of the Memoirs aroused interest abroad and at home,—witness the works of Kaiser and Caldecott. Did Mr. Erskine never consult an I.O. copy, who knew well a good MS. (the Elphinstone), and was even in 1848 examining another?

There is a point in Dr. Ethé's Pers. Cat. which stirs hope that the I.O. may possess two *Tūzuk-i-bābarī*, and that one is good and the Mysore. The Turkī No. 178 (Bib. Leydeniana) is there said to be "complete." Of No. 180, an 'Abdu-r-raḥīm translation, Dr. Ethé says that it

¹ In considering questions of A.S.B. MSS. regard must be had to the great losses of which Babu Rajendra Lall Mitter speaks as occurring from 1835 to 1884, and which exceeded 167 in Persian MSS. only. It is to be feared that losses continue. At the risk of being thought ungrateful for the kindness of the Society which has lent me two MSS., I cannot, when on the topic of losses, omit to say that both these MSS. brought to the British Museum a goodly company of book-worms, plump if sluggish. Both the books have newly cut incisions, the work of the worms. So much they gain by their European trip: they have been dealt with as mummies and quarantined in naphthaline. They will exist at least until their return to Calcutta. Everyone who has lived in Bengal knows the uphill fight for books. Should MSS. be allowed to remain in a climate which favours the book-worm and disfavors its pursuit?

corresponds with the Turkī text, and that both end with the Guālīār passage. The Turkī text he refers to cannot, as the Catalogue stands, but be the "complete" No. 178 (Bib. Leydeniana). This, however, does not contain the Guālīār passage.

Has there been a slip in the printing? Did Dr. Ethé describe two Turkī MSS., and have the two notices been disarranged and mutilated? Dr. Ethé compared Pers. No. 180 with a complete text (i.e. containing the Guālīār passage). He incidentally names Ilminski's imprint under No. 180, but if he had compared No. 180 with this, he could hardly have avoided reference to Ilminski's continuation—the "fragments"—and he would also certainly have compared the Bib. Leydeniana MS. with Ilminski's imprint before pronouncing it "complete."

A priori the double mistake in Dr. Ethé's catalogue seems more probably to have come in at the printing stage than at the time of his inspection of the MSS.

It is not practicable for me to judge (1) whether the A.S.B. No. 121 is Tipū's, or (2) whether Tipū's came to the I.O. or went to the A.S.B.? To decide this, more acquaintance with library annals and catalogues than is in my reach is needed. If evidence is forthcoming that the A.S.B. *Tuzuk* is really the Mysore, a part of what has been said here falls to the ground. It would be satisfactory to find that a more regal and worthy MS. had been Tipū Ṣāhib's, and that the I.O. and A.S.B. copies are (scamped) extracts from this.

IX. *Bibliotheca Lindesiana* (Lord Crawford's).

This MS. was purchased in Paris at the sale of M. Alix Desgranges in 1865, and is now kept at Haigh Hall, Westmoreland. Its date is estimated in the Bib. Lind. Catalogue as *circa* 1780.

It is incomplete, ending with Mems., 75, where Qambar 'Alī asks leave to go to his country. It therefore stops far short of Humāyūn's notes, the first of which is on Mems., 302-3.

In the lower margin of the last page is a confused signature, of which so much is legible: *dastkhat Nūr Muḥ.* . . . *Abū'l-faẓl* . . . (?) *tamām*. This is written over what may be the catchword of the page next due.

X. *Hyderābād MS.*

Mr. Beveridge recently (February, 1900) saw this MS. in Hyderābād. It is a fine example, and owned by the family of Sir Salar Jung. I regret that the fuller information for which I hoped, has not reached me in time for insertion.

XI. *St. Petersburg University Library MS., No. 683 : Bābarnāma.*

For most of the following particulars about this MS. I am indebted to Mr. C. Salemann, the director of the Asiatic Museum in St. Petersburg.

Its former owner was Mirzā Kāzīm Beg on whose death in 1871 it was purchased by the University. It was No. 193 in his collection catalogue, and is a comparatively modern transcript which Mr. Salemann thinks, on consideration of the handwriting, may have been made by Mullā Faizkbānov (فیض خان اوعلی). Its source is not known, but a marginal note on the last folio reads, ¹⁶²⁶ اصل نسخه ده تمت سنه یازلمشدر i.e. the original of this copy was written in 1026 (A.D. 1617).

Comparison of the dates of transcription shows that it is not Kehr's source, but Mr. Salemann states that its text is "nearly the same" as Ilminski's. It and Kehr's may be copies of the same source.

It has no seals. It ends with the words which conclude the narrative of 935 H. (Ilminski, 494, l. 2). These are followed in the same line by *و تمت ال کتاب بعون الملك و الهاب*. Then, after a blank, *سه شنبه . . . تابشوروب*. The colophon runs: *تمت فی سلخ شعبان سنه خمس و خمسين و* *ماتت بعد الألف*, "Finished on the last day of Sha'bān in

the year 155 after the thousand (i.e. 1155 H., 1742 A.D.)." Kehr's transcript was made in 1737.

XII. *St. Petersburg Foreign Office MS., No. 360 (Cat. 1890): Bābarnāma.*

This MS. was the sole source of Nicolai Ivanovitch Ilminski's imprint (Kazan, 1857).¹ It was transcribed in St. Petersburg in 1737, from an unnamed source, by Dr. George Jacob Kehr.

A few words as to the life of this German scholar are fitting in view of his important services to Bābariana. He was born on August 8, 1692, at Schleusingen, was educated at Hallé, and became in 1727 Professor of Arabic and Hebrew at Leipzig. His first book was published in the town of his birth when he was 19. Five of his works—all unrelated to the *Bābarnāma*—are catalogued by the B.M. and Bodleian Libraries. These were published in Leipzig from 1724 to 1730. One of them deals with Muḥammadan coins. In 1731 he was attached to the College of the St. Petersburg Foreign Office, and here, as he tells us himself, became Professor of Arabic, Persian, and Turkī. He was also entrusted with the task of elucidating the Muḥammadan coins of the Foreign Office.

Bernhard Dorn enumerates others of his works, of which one has the great interest of being a Latin translation of the *Bābarnāma*. Judging by Dorn's place and mode of entry, this seems to be an imprint in two quarto volumes. The MS. of this work is on the interleaves of Kehr's transcript of the *Bābarnāma*. Dr. Kehr's varied and laborious work marks him as a devotee of literature. He died in St. Petersburg, *circa* 1760.

Kehr's transcript being, comparatively, so ancient, the greater value attaches to his source. What this was, it is clear that Ilminski did not know; Kehr, he says, tells us nothing direct. All one learns of it, either from Kehr

¹ A translation of Professor Ilminski's preface is appended to this article.

or his editor, Ilminski, is that it contained so many folios, and that in the opinion of the latter it was written in Māvāran-negra (? Māvāru-n-nahr). Kehr's silence appears to point to the fact that the MS. from which he copied was well known and—of MSS. within his reach—unique.

It strikes one as singular that Ilminski should not have discovered and mentioned what was Kehr's source. One wonders the more at his silence on the point, because he regrets the defects in Kehr's MS. and is clear in his perception of the need of collation for production of a good text. There must have been difficulties in his way of which we are not informed. It should also be borne in mind that, in publishing his imprint, he did not aim at more than the production of a Chaghatai-Turkī textbook. His object was not primarily historical, but scholastic. This comes out clearly in his preface; so that, however much one may regret the limitations he has imposed on himself, one cannot blame him for keeping within them. Still, one regretfully wishes he had been more adventurous in his search for another MS. with which to collate Kehr's. Confessed failure to find one would have been more instructive than silence.

If, allowing a digression, we pass on from Kehr and Ilminski to the latter's translator, Pavet de Courteille, we are again confronted by a silence, and one still more remarkable, as to the source of the material worked upon. M. Pavet de Courteille relies implicitly on M. Nicolaï Ivanovitch Ilminski. He looks no further back than the printed *Bābarnāma* of 1857, and does not name the source even of this—i.e. Kehr's transcript. He does not appear to know that Ilminski expresses great obligation to Erskine's translation for the solution of difficulties and the filling up of *lacunæ*. It is therefore not without amusement that he is found in his preface underrating the direct Turkī element of the Memoirs (Leyden and Erskine) and highly estimating the purity of his own original—German-copied, Russian-edited, English-amended, and uncollated. While there is nothing in his own preface to indicate that he had

read the Russian preface of Ilminski, there is a good deal in the latter which leads to the supposition that he had not.¹

At the time when he undertook the monumental labour of copying the *Bābarnāma* and of translating it into Latin, Kehr was Professor in the College which now owns his transcript. As has been said, his Latin version is written on the interleaves of the Turkī MSS. Ilminski judges from it and from defects in the Turkī text that Kehr was not master of the Turkī tongue. He appreciates the patience and exceeding carefulness of the German scribe, and notes that on close examination every sign set down by him proved to have value. In worm-eaten passages the remnants of words were copied, and forms were traced where there had been failure to read sense. These difficult places were amended by Ilminski, with Erskine's help, and are indicated by him in his imprint.

The St. Petersburg Foreign Office Catalogue, for acquaintance with which in the B.M., I am indebted to Mr. A. G. Ellis, contains an interesting notice of Kehr's work on the *Bābarnāma*, from which the following passage may be quoted. The annotations of the patient scribe which it chronicles will say a good deal to those readers who are initiated in the same toilsome Way.

“Le professeur Kehr écrit de sa main en 1737 cet exemplaire, sur lequel a été faite l'édition de Kazan de 1857 entreprise par Nicolai Ivanowitch Ilminski, et la traduction française, due à la plume de Pavet de Courteille. Gr. in folio, papier fort et blanc, très gros caractères nasta'liq; les lignes, d'inégale grandeur, sont tantôt plus, tantôt moins nombreuses à la page. De loin en loin, une note en Latin ou en allemand nous renseigne sur la marche du travail de Kehr (f. 370, r.): ‘Huc usque scripsi ad vesperam d. 28 Martii, 1737’ . . . ‘d. 1 Aprili, 1737, Petropoli.’ ‘Bisher sind 17 Blätter vom dritten Zwölftheil’; enfin ‘d. 27 Maji, 1737, Petropoli, huc usque scripsit Georgius

¹ Since writing this, I have seen some words of Professor F. Teufel which may indicate an opinion that Pavet de Courteille did not read, or at least assimilate, Ilminski's preface, since he says of some parts of this that Pavet de Courteille “hat [sic] nicht beachtet oder nicht bekannt” (D.M.G., vol. xxxvii, 112).

Jacobus Kehr, doctor philosophiæ et professor linguæ Arabicæ, Persicæ atque Turcicæ in Russo - Cæsareo Legationum Collegio.' ”

Again: “Hier endigt sich das achte Zwölftheil, folglich das zweite Drittheil von dem original Codice des *Bābar-nāma*; sind also von *den darinnen befindlich 420 Blättern* abcopirt 280. Restiren demnach noch 140 Blättern.”

Kehr's MS. opens with a pious invocation, which I have not found elsewhere, and has the distinction, rare amongst the Turkī texts, of carrying the narrative down to the Guāliār passage which ends the Persian translation (936 H.—1529 A.D., *Mems.*, 425). The following table gives details which allow comparison on the point of completion with other Turkī texts. The standards used are the *Memoirs* and *Ilminski's* imprint.

	MEMOIRS AND ILMINSKI.	LAST TOPIC.	LAST PAGE.	
			MEMS.	ILM.
1.	Bābar's autograph MS.	Guāliār	425	494
2.	Khawāja Kilān's MS.	Not known to exist now.		
3.	(Humāyūn's transcript)			
4.	Elphinstone MS.	Khaw. Obeidu-l-lāh	389	448
5.	B.M. MS. (fragments only)	Rawal Udi Singh	367	419
6. ¹	I.O. Bib. Leydeniana MS.	Guns	353	403
7.	A.S.B. MS.	Guns	353	403
8.	Mysore MS.	(No information.)		
9.	Bib. Lindesiana MS.	Qambar 'Alī	75	88
10.	Hyderabad MS.	(No information.)		
11.	St. Petersburg University MS.	Ḥasan 'Alī	424	494 ²
12.	St. Petersburg Foreign Office MS. (exclusive of fragments)	Guāliār	425	494 ²

¹ This MS. is erroneously reputed to be complete, and is so catalogued. Cf. No. VI.

² Supplementary fragments extend to p. 506.

Besides giving us this valuable addition of Turkī text, which is equivalent to 54 pages of the Memoirs, the F.O. MS. has with it the interesting supplements which are well known through the French version. Ilminski regards at least one of these as indisputably authentic, viz. the plain tale of the battle of Khānwa. There is no inherent improbability of the authenticity of some other portions, which fill out or carry on Bābar's own narrative. They await the criticism and judgment of an expert.

It is clear that Kehr's MS. and its attached fragments are likely to yield valuable results. As yet they are practically uncriticized,¹ since uncollated.

Besides the *Bābar-nāma* (Turkī and Latin) and the "fragments" above referred to, Kehr's great volume contains a second work. It is separated from the first by two blank pages, and is thus described in the F.O. Catalogue:—

"Un autre ouvrage chaghatai, incomplet d'après Ilminski dans la copie de Kehr, occupe les ff. 778-836. Une longue introduction vaute la haute mission qui incombe aux souverains terrestres, et particulièrement aux monarques musulmans (ff. 784*b*-787*b*), après quoi on lit de courts extraits de la biographie des princes Timurides qui ont régné sur l'Asie Centrale jusqu'à Humāyūn, sur lequel l'auteur s'arrête plus complaisamment. En voici la table des matières." The names which follow are (stripped of titles): Tīmūr, Shābrukh, Ulugh Beg, Sa'īd (Kūshgharī), Husain (Herāt), Ahmad (Mirzā), Maḥmūd (Mirzā), 'Umar Shaikh, Bābar, Humāyūn.

At this point the Foreign Office Catalogue has: "La date 1126 (1714) qui clot l'ouvrage est selon toute vraisemblance celle de l'original qui a servi à Kehr." Its position would seem to negative Ilminski's suggestion that it is the date of Kehr's source.

I have had occasion to collate somewhat in detail the

¹ Cf. Toufel, l.c., for philological criticism of the "fragments" and conjectural source.

French and English versions of the *Bābar-nāma*. This, with some other convergent work, has made it seem to me possible that Kehr's original may claim descent from Bābar's earlier and less polished MS. This view rests, lightly and conjecturally only, upon the following considerations :—

(1) Some minor divergencies of statement (omissions, additions, variants), seem to indicate revision.

(2) Kehr's text includes an important passage about the adoption of Hindāl by Māham Begam, which is not in Erskine,¹ and therefore presumably not in the Elphinstone MS. As a record of domestic life and custom it is interesting, and it is, moreover, the only place where Bābar names Dildār, the mother of Hindāl, Gulrang, Gulchahra, and Gulbadan. Its intimate character, however, would lead to the expectation that it would be omitted rather than inserted on revision.²

(3) Neither of Humāyūn's notes is included (cf. *Ilm.*, 340, 372).

(4) With Kehr's MS. is Bābar's plain tale of Khānwa. It may have formed part of another MS. It looks as though it were the original for which Bābar substituted Shaikh Zain's ornate *farmān* (*Mems.*, 359). This *farmān* is in Kehr's MS.

A most interesting passage given by Kehr is that which P. de Courteille (*II*, 459) entitles "Dévouement de Bābar." It is followed by an account of Bābar's death; and of this *Ilminski* says that it differs from the *Bābar-nāma* in diction and orthography, and is clearly the production of a person well acquainted with Bābar and his surroundings. He

¹ For a curiously contracted and, as it seems on examination of facts, erroneous parallel passage, cf. *Mems.*, 350.

² Pavet de Courteille, *II*, 44-5. Bābar's mother is here spoken of in the French translation as alive and active in the episode of the adoption, i.e. in *II*, 925 (1519). Qutlūq-nigār Khānan died in 911 (1505-6). *Ilminski's* words which Pavet de Courteille transforms into "ma mère," i.e. Bābar's, are *hazrat wālida*. This is, I think, the counterpart of *sultān wālida*, the mother of the heir-apparent, here Māham. To Māham the context applies.

hazards the suggestion that it is taken from the introduction to the *Āin-i-akbarī*.¹

Another of the advantages afforded by Kehr's MS. is that it contains the conclusion of Bābar's adventurous flight from Akhsi (Mems., 122), a passage provokingly interrupted in the Persian translation. It was this rupture that prompted the double note (1) on the Elphinstone Turkī text by the copyist—"The remaining transactions of this year, 908 H., may God grant that they come to hand"; and (2) on Leyden's manuscript translation of the same text,—“In this I heartily join.” The St. Petersburg MS. fulfils the petition.

Before leaving this topic, it is useful to remember that although the Elphinstone MS. appears to be of early date, it was copied from another which was also incomplete, whether by reason of the loss of pages or of unfinished work. The fact is singular in view of the early date of the *lacuna* and the value of the MS. I have not yet examined earlier Persian texts on this point, and these may contain the passage wanting in No. 26,200.

¹ ? The *Akbar-nāma*. In the *Biographie Universelle, Ancienne et Moderne*, art. Bābar, M. Langlès writes: “Ces Commentaires, augmentés par Jahāngir, ont été traduits en persan par ‘Abdu-r-rahīm.” Mr. Erskine (prof., ix), who had no acquaintance with the St. Petersburg MSS., expresses doubt as to the statement that Jahāngir added to the *Wāqīāt*. It may be that M. Langlès' statement is based on the St. Petersburg MSS., and that both scholars are right as far as each knew the MSS.

It is not groundless to conjecture that Sālim (Jahāngir) wrote the Kehr MS. fragment about his father's death, character, deeds, etc., under counsel of eye-witnesses. Sālim studied Turkī; ‘Abdu-r-rahīm was his *atāliq*; Gulbadan Begum, whose interest in Sālim is historic, was alive after the presentation of the Persian translation of Akbar by ‘Abdu-r-rahīm in 1586, and so too were other contemporaries of Bābar. Jahāngir (Sālim) says that he made additions to his father's book. Mr. Erskine emphatically states his opinion that as we have them, i.e. as he knew them, *excluding the St. Petersburg MSS.*, the Memoirs are as Bābar left them. This opinion does not touch the fragments which continue the narrative close down to Bābar's death.

The last fragment, which is by another hand (? Sālim's), (P. de C., II, 462), contains this passage: “Quand au livre appelé *Bābariyah*, Mirzā Khān, fils de Bairām Khān, a été chargé de la traduire du turk en persan, pour en faciliter la lecture à ceux qui ignoraient la première de ces deux langues.” Why was this irrelevant information about the Persian translation inserted? Is it a touch of local colour, as it well might be, if the fragment were Sālim's, and issued from the Turkī studies connected with his readings in Turkī and ‘Abdu-r-rahīm's translation of the *Tūzuk-i-bihārī*?

XIII. *St. Petersburg Asiatic Museum MS., No. 590^{bba} :*
Bābarnāma of Senkovskī.

For knowledge of the existence of this MS. and for the following particulars, I am indebted to Mr. C. Salemann.

This copy is known as the *Bābarnāma* of Senkovskī, a designation drawn from its colophon, which reads: "N.B. J'ai achevé cette copie le 4 Mai, 1824, à St. Petersburg; elle a été faite d'après un exemplaire appartenant à Nazar Bay Turkestānī, négociant Boukhari, qui était venu cette année à St. Petersburg. J. Senkovskī."

The MS. is incomplete, and ends on p. 183 with the words خیللی بخشلی طوی بولدی. Immediately follows the original colophon—

وقایع نامۀ پادشاهی موسوم | و مستوی بولغای بید و نویش و ما
 عبد الوهاب | اخوند غجدوانی عفا الله تعالی عما غلطت [یدد]
 | و قصر جدّه سنه احدى و عشرين و مائة و الف | مطابق بارس
 ثملی رجب و رجب آیی نینک بیسی دا | دو شنبه کونی
 بخارای شریفدا | منسوخ بولدی | و تمام بولدی | الحمد | لله | م

This gives a new designation for Bābar's book, i.e. *Waqāyī'-nāma-i-pādshāhī*. From the emphatic *pādshāhī*, this title may indicate a distinguished source which seems likely to be the MS. belonging to the brother of the Amīr of Bukhārā (cf. No. XIV). Senkovskī's original was, we learn from the above colophon, copied by Mullā 'Abdu-l-wahāb, *akhūnd*, Ghazdewānī, in Bukhārā, and finished on Tuesday, Rajab 5th, 1121 H. (1709 A.D.).

The MS. opens with a passage of which I have seen no other example:

بسم حق سبحانه عز و جل | حمد و سباس بی نهاییه عالم نینک
 اول خداوندیغه و کایشات نینک پرورد کار یغه | بولسون کیم روی
 • مین نبی ادمیلارغه میراث بویوروب و انینک اوستیدا کوناکون
 ز

این لار | و طایفه لار نی احداث و ابداع قلیب استیفا مراسم نسق
و عدالت و اداه لوام [sic] لوازم [i.e.] ضبط | و محافظت اوچون
سلاطین و ملوک نینک طبقاتی نی اول طایفه لار نینک اوستیکا
تیکیب | آلا نی اوزی نینک حمایت و رعایت شریفه سیدا
قویدی و اول مصطفی پیغمبر شه بی حد و بی حساب ثنا
و ستایش بولسون کیم جبهانی لار غه دین و شریعت بیریب الارنی
دوسرا نینک | افلاح و سعادت لاری شه مستحق قیلدی امین
وصف ولایت فرغانه تنکری تعالی نینک | الحمد

It is of interest, as indicating Professor Ilminski's continued occupation with Bābar's text, to know that this MS. was sent to Kazan for his use, and was returned by him on March 12th (st.v.), 1885. Copied as it was from a MS. belonging to an inhabitant of Bukhārā, its penultimate source may be No. XIV.

XIV. *Bukhārā MS.*

Mr. C. Salomann informs me that his friends in Turkestān say the Amīr's brother at Bukhārā possesses an old and very fine copy which he will not even show to Europeans.

XV. *Nazar Bay Turkestānī MS.*

This is the MS. named as the source of the *Bābarnāma* of Senkovskī (No. XIII).

APPENDIX.

APPROXIMATE TRANSLATION OF THE PREFACE OF THE *Bābarnāma*
OF N. T. ILMINSKI. (KAZAN, 1857.)

The personality and deeds of the author of the *Bābarnāma*, Zāhīru-d-dīn Muḥammad Bābar, as well as the importance of his book, have been made known in the learned article *s.r.* Bābar, of the "Encyclopædic Lexicon" (vol. iv). The work itself has been translated into English ("Memoirs of Bābar," Leyden & Erskine, 1826). It remains for me to give some information about my edition of the Chaghatāi text. My object in publishing it is to facilitate the study of the Chaghatāi dialect and of Turkī in general.

Chaghatāi, one of the numerous group of Northern Turkī or Tātār dialects, is the speech of those countries in which science and poetry flourished under Timūr and some of his cultivated descendants. Although in Māvāran-nagra (? Māvāru-n-nahr), as in all Musalman lands, Arabic was exclusively the organ of learning, and although its poets liked to use the language of Sa'dī and Ḥafīz, they did not abandon their mother tongue. The greatest and most important monuments of Chaghatāi literature are the writings of Rubguzī, Mir 'Alī Shīr, and Bābar, which belong to the ninth and tenth centuries of the Hījra. Foreign influence is clearly seen in them by the use of Arabic and Persian words and expressions, and not infrequently by the combination of sentences according to the Persian idiom, but, nevertheless, the structure of the sentence itself remains Tātār.

We may also conclude that Arabic and Persian had succeeded in influencing equally the conversational language of the more highly educated inhabitants of Mavranagra. No admixture, however, of other Turkī dialects can be traced in the above-mentioned writings.

Bābar remarks that the "common speech of Andijān is the same as the correct language of composition, so that the works of Mir 'Alī Shīr, though he was born and flourished at Herī, are written in this dialect." [*Bābarnāma*, 3; *Memoirs*, L. & E., 2.] Bābar, writing without pretension to literary style and having

Mir 'Alī Shīr's works before him, has undoubtedly preserved his native Andijānī tongue in all its purity. The writings above-named afford the opportunity of studying Chaghatāi at its best period. Amongst them the *Bābarnāma* is pre-eminent: since it at once sets forth the author's personal impressions, is interpenetrated by his¹ character, and shows the natural force, precision, and flexibility of the language.

Chaghatāi, if it cannot serve as a basis for the investigation of other northern dialects, can at least afford important help towards forming conclusions as to the essential features of the original form of primitive Turkī. It was spoken in lands close to the cradle of the Turkī tribes, and the nomadic life in which Turkī thought and speech were born offered elements familiar and easy of comprehension to the townsfolk of Māvaran-negra, who were in constant intercourse with the wandering tribes. Later on, the primitive faith underwent change (? by conversion to Islām) and science introduced new ideas, but, nevertheless, the persistent conditions were more favourable to the preservation of the primitive tongue than of any other Tātār dialect. Moreover, the Turkī authors named above are more than 300 years older than the Tātārs of to-day. It follows that we may with greater confidence look to the works of Rubguzī, Mir 'Alī Shīr, and Bābar for authentic features of primitive Turkī than to modern dialects, although these are more accessible to us. So far as can be judged by their transcription² (i.e. in Arabic character) the Chaghatāi sounds have retained their ancient guttural character and force, and Chaghatāi words form an obvious link between their corresponding words in modern Turkī and the primitive forms from which, by the action of phonetic laws, they have departed. In Chaghatāi the verbal forms are more numerous, more varied, and more comprehensive in meaning than in modern Turkī; and they reveal the origin of the altered forms existing in living dialects, and sometimes explain even their formative elements.

To serve as a trustworthy basis for the study of Chaghatāi, the *Bābarnāma* ought to be edited with the greatest accuracy from reliable and, as nearly as possible, contemporary MSS. written by native scribes. Unfortunately the Chaghatāi text is now forgotten

¹ Translation doubtful. I have brought it into agreement with the facts of Bābar's work.

² Perhaps "transliteration" is better. I am not sure whether the action is from spoken Chaghatāi to inscribed Arabic character or from sounds written down in the Chaghatāi character and transliterated to the Arabic.

in the very scene of Bābar's achievements; partly owing to the existence of the Persian translation, and partly because of the habitual indifference of Musalmans to works of secular history.

The sole source of my edition is a MS. which belongs to the School of Oriental Languages at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (St. Petersburg), and which was transcribed by Professor Kehr in 1737. It is an enormous volume of 837 folios, interleaved for a Latin translation. The Chaghatāi text is written in a large, clear hand; the lines are far apart and of unequal length. Kehr gives no important information as to his source, saying merely that it contained 420 folios. At the end of his copy he has entered, in Arabic, the words "Finished in 1126 [A.D. 1714]." This is probably the date of his source.¹ From certain orthographical marks and signs which Kehr endeavours to reproduce, we are led to conclude that his original was written in Mavraanagra.

If Kehr's MS. be collated with the English translation of the *Bābarnāma*, it is found defective in few points only. Of these the following may be named:—

(a) Kehr, 188. The Chaghatāi text is interrupted, and in its place is written, in the margin, an extract from the Persian translation, in which also several words are mutilated. I have restored this to its right place in the narrative, and have indicated the passage by asterisks. (*Bābarnāma*, 38-9.)

(b) In some places a few words and proper names are missing. Relying upon the English translation, I have indicated them by brackets.

(c) Kehr, 586-7. Here occur dotted spaces, which lead one to suppose that this passage was worm-eaten in the original MS. After comparing the remnants of words with the English translation, I have inserted conjectural readings and have indicated these by quotation marks. (*Bābarnāma*, 260-1.)

(d) Manifest omissions from Kehr's MS. (ff. 672*b* and 763*b*) are to be found at the end of his volume (ff. 809*b* and 813*b*).

On the other hand, Kehr's MS. makes important additions to the English version (cf. *Mems.*, 122, and *Bābarnāma*, 144-6; *Mems.*, 334, and *Bābarnāma*, 379-80):—

¹ Cf. No. 12. Foreign Office MS., where it will be seen that the application of this date to the *Bābarnāma* is of uncertain accuracy.

(1) The events of 908 H., which are broken off in the English version (Mems., 122) at their most interesting point, are completed here.

(2) A detailed account of the revenue of the Indian provinces is given, of which the English version names the total only.

The text of the *Bābarnāma* terminates on the last folio of Kehr's copy,¹ but ff. 764b and 809b contain some additions:—

(1) A detailed account of Bābar's battle with the Indian *rājas* (i.e. Rānā Sangā), a brief enumeration of subsequent events, and details of Bābar's last illness.

The last fragment, which begins abruptly, differs in style and orthography from the *Bābarnāma*. Moreover, the description of the battle with the *rājas* appears from some emphatic expressions to have been written by Bābar himself and given to the *munshī* Zainu-d-dīn, as the basis of his verbose *fīrmān*. It is impossible to refuse positively to regard this as authentic.

(2) Next comes a curious *addendum* about Bābar's death, his merits, writings, children, learned friends, etc., by an unknown writer, who was evidently intimately acquainted with Bābar and his surroundings. Possibly it is taken from the introduction to the *Āīn-i-akbarī* of Abū'l-faḡl. Both these supplements are placed at the end of my edition.

Following the *Bābarnāma*² is a distinct and unfinished work—a brief review of the Tīmūr dynasty down to Humāyūn, about whom there are many details.

Kehr's determination to devote some months to the labour of copying the *Bābarnāma* is evidence that he esteemed it highly. His Latin translation shows that he was not fully master of Chaghatāi. There are indications throughout of scrupulous and laborious transcription. Where he failed to read or understand a word he was reduced to tracing, by guess, indistinct signs, and his pen, owing to his inexperience in writing Chaghatāi, of necessity made some lapses and omissions.

Faulty though it be as a MS., Kehr's copy can serve for an edition of the *Bābarnāma*. Exclusive reliance, however, must not

¹ This form of translation has been given to me by each of my several helpers. There is a mistake somewhere, since the statement is contradicted both by Uminski's context and by Professor Smirnov's account of Kehr's MS. in the Catalogue of the Foreign Office Library. An appropriate reading would be "Kehr's transcript contains the last page of the *Bābarnāma*," i.e. the Guāliār passage.

² *Bābariana* would be more correct, since the fragments are also indicated.

be placed upon it, and other help must be had. For these reasons,¹ I have tried to purify the text of the *Bābarnāma* by eliminating, on examination, what seemed faulty in Kehr's transcript. For this purpose the MS. itself served me best, since, after careful scrutiny of every (doubtful) word and turn of expression, I concluded that their employment by Kehr had weight. Next, the English translation was of constant and valuable assistance. Lastly, help was found also in a Chaghatāi-Persian dictionary, published in Calcutta, and in the Chaghatāi-Turkī dictionary attached to the works of Mīr 'Alī Shīr.

I cannot hide from myself that, these being the means at my disposal, it was not possible to make my edition wholly exact and accurate. To have done this it would be indispensable to collate several good Chaghatāi texts. Notwithstanding its defects, I venture to hope that it will prove of use to students of Chaghatāi and of general Turkī philology.

¹ Variant translation: "Such is the basis upon which I have tried," etc.