

Notes on the Bābar-nāma

Author(s): Annette S. Beveridge

Source: *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, Apr., 1909, (Apr., 1909), pp. 452-460

Published by: Cambridge University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25210753>

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>



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*

JSTOR

this work is probably devoted to this purpose is confirmed by Paṇḍit Gaṇapatiçāstrin's letter to me. Paṇḍit Gaṇapatiçāstrin, formerly Principal of the Maharāja's Sanskrit College, Trivandrum, and now Curator, Department of Publication of Sanskrit Works there, promises to make this point clear in his Introduction to his edition of Mahimabhaṭṭa's *Vyaktiviveka*.

About the age of the *Hṛidayadarpaṇa*, we may say that it came after Ānandavardhana's *Dhvanyāloka* and before Abhinavagupta's *Dhvanyālokalochana*.

VENKATESH VĀMAN SOVANĪ.

NOTES ON THE BĀBAR-NĀMA

I. DR. HEINRICH JULIUS KLAPROTH'S PART TRANSLATION OF THE BOOK

II. ON THE ORIGIN AND MEANING OF THE WORD TĀSHKAND

I. DR. KLAPROTH'S TRANSLATION

In 1810 Dr. H. J. Klaproth published in St. Petersburg a volume entitled *Archiv für Asiatische Litteratur* which was meant to be the first of a series, but has had no successor. Amongst its contents is an article on the *Bābar-nāma*, consisting of a brief account of Bābar himself, a reference and part translation of certain extra *Bābar-nāma* matter he had found on the fly-leaves of his archetype, and a translation of Bābar's description of Farghāna. The extra matter he found in his archetype is what Dr. Kehr, having found in his, translated into Latin and entered on the first pages of the volume containing his Latin text. Klaproth does not mention from what MS. he translated, but there is strong general probability that he used Kehr's own copy which was in St. Petersburg, and this probability is strengthened by the fact that both men, and they only of writers yet known in Bābar literature, reproduce the fly-leaf items.

Presumably the original Turki of these was once with Kehr's *Bābar-nāma* MS., it is not there now, an absence which the disorder still existing in the volume explains as due to loss of early leaves before the last rebinding. With the fly-leaf items will have disappeared their antecedent title-page, which has been reproduced by Kehr in Latin and by Klaproth in Turki and German.¹

My attention was first drawn to Klaproth's article by a note in Ritter's *Erkunde* (v, 730), and, thanks to having examined already Kehr's Latin translation, what Klaproth has set down acquires the special value of supplementing Kehr in two interesting particulars, viz., by reproducing in Turki the missing title-page of Kehr's MS. and by giving the Turki of a Latin note which, I think, commemorates the transfer of a copy of the *Bābar-nāma*.

As a preliminary to considering these two items, an estimate, however rough, needs to be formed of the respective trustworthiness as translators of Kehr and Klaproth. Where they differ, what may be called now the established fact that Kehr was not well acquainted with Turki when he made his Latin translation of the *Bābar-nāma* would cast doubt upon his interpretation. If, however, Klaproth's translation of the description of Farghāna² be collated with that of M. Pavet de Courteille, made from the same strain (i.e. the Kehr-Ilminsky strain) of the text, it will be seen that, at least in 1810, Klaproth was not master of Turki. As both books are in the British Museum, it is not necessary to occupy space in the Journal by quoting from them.

a. Passing now to consider the two Turki passages quoted by Klaproth from his archetype, the first, the title-page, is as follows:—

¹ For full particulars of the fly-leaf entries, so far as they can be known from Kehr's translation of them, see *JRAS.* July, 1908.

² *Archiv*, etc., B.M. press-mark 441 + 24.

نصحت نامه ترکی حضرت بابر پادشاه غازی تاب سرد
Nasihat-nāma Turkī Hazrat Bābar Pādshāh Ghāzī
Tāb Sirra-hu.

Kehr translates this as follows: "Exhortationum atque Documentorum authenticorum Diploma regium et opus historicum Orientale Turcicum (i.e. Tataricum) Majestatis Baburi Monarchæ victoriosi qui in terra beata requiescat! ex India Kandaharam ad Mirzam Kamranum transmissum."

This Klaproth renders: "Buch des Rathes Türkisch verfasst von der Majestät des Kaisers Bābur, des Siegreichen, der friedlich in der Erde ruhe."

It will be noticed that Kehr's is the title-page not only of the *Bābar-nāma* but of the letters prefixed to it in his archetype. Klaproth states only as a separate fact that a letter went with the book to Kāmran.

b. The Turki of the entry I suppose to indicate transfer of a MS.¹, is thus given by Klaproth:—

بو وقایع نی دو شنبه کونی جمادی الاول نینگ ایکیدا سنه
 ۹۵۷ سیمو تو (sīmū tū) دا هو جی تاش دیکن منزل دا محمد بز
 تک (b-z t-k) تحفه کیلتوردی

Bū waqā'ī nī dū shanba gūnī Jumāda'l-awwal nīng
ihī dā sana 957 sīmū tū dā Hūjī tāsh dīkn
manzil dā Muhammad b()z t()k tuhfa kiltūrdī.

Kehr's translation is as follows: "Has res gestas feriâ secundâ (i.e. die Lunæ) mensis Dschumadi prioris die secundo, anno Hegiræ 957 (i.e. 1550) in statione (vel hospitio) Haudschî - Tash Muhammedes nobis donum attulit."

Klaproth thus translates: "Die Erzählung dieser Thaten gab mir Muhammad an einem Montage, dem zweiten Tage der ersten Dschumadi des Jahres 957 (1550) zum Geschenk; auf der Station die Hudschi-Tash genannt wird."

¹ JRAS., July, 1908, para. No. 6.

In the above extracts several things attract attention. One is a point of translation, *gab*, "gave," being written for *kiltārdī*, "brought."

Again, to find the name Muḥammad standing alone is unusual; Kehr's "Muhammedes" allows of Muḥammadi, the home-name of a foster-brother in Bābar and Humāyūn's entourage.

Again, there is the word spelled "Hüdschī", which would lend itself to interpretation as Hāji or Khoja if written with *Hā'* or *Kha* instead of *Hā*.¹

Again, there is the strange *b()z t()k*, which, by the process of elimination, seems left to represent Kehr's *nobis* and Klaproth's *mir*. It might well be *bīz ghā*.

Lastly, there is the, to us, meaningless word following "957" and between it and the enclitic *dā*. This is unmistakably *sīmū tū* in Klaproth's quotation. The date (957) in words would well fill the space. Mr. Beveridge has suggested to me that an entry appropriate here would be a year of the Turkī cycle. This suggestion has support in Klaproth's uncertainties, since these allow one in his Hüdschī to guess at Khoja, and this Eastern Turkī form of the word Khwāja is one that might well have been used by the Uzbegs who in 1550 (rulers in Bukhārā) routed the Timūrids, Humāyūn and Kāmran, plundered their camps and were in a position to receive spoil. This disaster occurred at no great distance from the only place which Mr. Beveridge's search has found in maps as promising an equivalent for (surmised) Khwāja Tāsh, namely, Khwāja Tāgh, to the north of Qūndūz and between it and the Oxus.²

¹ Dr. Schuyler (*Turkistan*, Sampson Low, 1876) spells Khujend "Hodjent" both in map and text. He also writes "Hodjas" (see index *s.n.*). This variant may serve to partly explain Klaproth's "Hüdschī".

² As to the suggestion of a year of the Turkī cycle, Mr. Beveridge has given me the following note:—"As regards the mysterious word *sīmū tū*, I make two suggestions, neither of them, however, having weight. One

II. ON THE ORIGIN AND MEANING OF THE WORD TĀSHKEND

The question of the origin and meaning of the word Tāshkend offers an entertaining and, as it seems, a still open little problem of research. To decide amongst the suggestions made in literature about it, needs light from Sanscrit, Persian and Turkī sources, both historic and of philology. I propose to note down here what has come before me about it while working on the *Bābar-nāma*, and I do this in the hope that experts may care to solve the problem.

Popular translation declares that Tāshkend is the Stone Village; from Mr. von Schwarz,¹ whose fifteen years of residence in the place allows acceptance of his statement, comes the assurance that, except on the *lucus a non lucendo* principle, this translation does not suit the case, since Tāshkend is built on and of loess and has no stone.

Mr. von Schwarz and Dr. Eugene Schuyler have taken "Tāshkand" as a hybrid of Turkī *tāsh* and Pers. *kand*², but is there any need to suppose a hybrid compound inevitable? Apparently not, since if *Tāsh* be Turkī, with whatever meaning, it would be followed by *kīnt*, not by *kand*,—*kīnt* being the form in which *kand* has been

is that *simū tū* may be a corruption of Sin-mao, the Chinese name for the 25th or 28th year of the Jovian cycle. (See Prinsep's Useful Tables, p. 31.) If the note were made by a Kāshghari, he might have inserted the Chinese year. Sin-mao means Iron-ape, and seems to correspond to Maimūn (ape), one of the years of the Igurian cycle. This leads me to my second suggestion, which is that *simū tū* is a mistake for *maimūn*. Unfortunately, I cannot make the Maimūn year fit in with 957 A.H. It may be that if the Igurian cycle be taken as beginning with Taushqān, the Hare, as the Chinese does, Maimūn, the Ape, could be brought to harmonize with 957 A.H., and thus to explain Klaproth's *simū tū*."

¹ *Turkestan* (Freiburg am Breisgau, Herder, 1900), pp. 149-50. This article was in print before I became aware of the death of Mr. F. von Schwarz.

² The Russian Government has adopted the form *kend*, and this is found in many books.

received into Turki. It is not usually transliterated *kīnt*, but *kend*, as may be seen in many instances by reference to Zenker's Dictionary. De Meynard also should be seen; both authorities giving the Turki form *kent* or *kend* as well as the Persian *kand* or *kant*. The place-name Yiti-kint,¹ Seven Villages, is a clear example of a pure compound and of one which writes the full-vowelled Turki form of the second factor.

This brings up the question of what was the original spelling of the word which Mr. von Schwarz and Dr. Schuyler would write Tāshkand. In the Haydarābād Codex of the *Bābar-nāma*, which bears signs of close relation with Bābar's original MS., the word has uniformly a Persian form, i.e. Tāsh k()nd. I have seen it written Tāshkint in the Elphinstone Codex, a significant form whether entered by the scribe or by the later annotator of that much emended MS. The question of its original form is part of the general problem, and might be settled if once the meaning of the word itself were decided.

Besides the plain translation of *tāsh* as stone, there has been another equally plain, namely, that of reading it as the measure of distance. There is yet a third plain rendering, which I have not come across but which has at least the merit that it cannot be rejected at once. This is to read *tāsh* as 'outer' and Tāshkend, a pure Turki name, as the Outer Village. To decide in favour of this would require the establishment of historic facts, easily imagined as appropriate, e.g. as expressing a relation to Farghāna proper or to villages nearer to the Sir. To translate the compound itself by Outer Village would be normal; parallels are not scarce, e.g., *tāsh yān*, *tāsh tūn*, the outer side, the outer coat.

In the way of such plain interpretation, however, there must be the difficulty that it is too obvious when a very ancient site is in question. Tāshkend is such a site;

¹ Haydarabad Codex, f. 5b.

early cultivated because of its advantages of shelter and of water, and consequently early named.

I pass on to a suggestion made by Mr. von Schwarz which with certain disadvantages, has this gain, that it brings the form Tāshkend into relation with Shāsh, a known old name for the place. His suggestion is that Tāsh is corrupted from Shāsh and that Shāsh is the "Sanskrit" *śṣṣh*, "six," and the whole, Six Villages, the place being so called because the principal member of a league of towns, a Hexapolis.

This obviously requires historical or traditional support. It needs, too, examples of the vowel change it demands—examples which *à priori* would not seem hard to find, since Turki loves the long *ā*. But other preliminary work is needed before accepting his theory—it is needed, indeed, in any case. Such is the definition of the use of the several names which, even on the small historic oasis of *Bābar-nāma* work, are applied to Tāshkend and its neighbouring lands. Such are Shāsh and Chāch, both perhaps merely one name uttered differently, Fanākat, i.e. the Village of Fanā, Shāhrukhia as Tashkend and Shāhrukhia as Bābar distinguishes between them. Which is the original form, Shāsh or Chāch? What is their meaning, the meaning of Fanā, with its other forms Banākat, Fiākat, Fāka? Each variant may have its history if only in the vocal organs of a tribe.¹

To these names another can be added appropriately, since to Six Villages a seventh is a natural sequel, and this Yiti-kint provides. It seems from Haidar M.'s narrative to have been north of Khujend and, within the elbow of the Saihūn, to have lain north of Tāshkend. Arrow-smith's map of 1878 marks it somewhere about modern Kurāna. Haidar M.² calls it both Yiti-kint and Haft Dih. Again, the modern name of a stream and a village

¹ See *Ṭabaqāt-i-nāṣiri*, trs. Raverty, index *s.m.*

² *Tārīkh-i-rashīdi* and trs. Ney Elias and E. Denison Ross, p. 180, n.

in the same neighbourhood is Bskend, which on examination may disclose Five Villages.¹

Another point of some difficulty in the way of accepting Mr. von Schwarz's theory is this: if Shāsh implies six, where is its complement of cognate lineage, such perhaps as Sanscrit *nagara*? Has Sanscrit *khaṇḍ* been changed to *kand*?

No word Shāshkand appears in the many books which the *Bābar-nāma* has put in my way (I am anxious to define my close limitations); the alternative name of Tāshkend is in them always Shāsh or Chāch. To this it might be opposed that Bābar mentions two forms of another place-name, one as the colloquial, the other as the book-name, in the same way that he mentions Tāshkend and Shāsh or Chāch. These other names are Akhsi and Akhsiket.² There is, however, this significant distinction between the two cases: Akhsiket is the book word, Akhsi its shortened form and a form good when used alone, while Tāshkend (Shāshkand), the longer form, is the colloquial name, and Shāsh, the book word (as interpreted by Mr. von Schwarz) is merely the number six.

A further matter needing definition is the use of Shāsh (Chāch). Was it first the name of the village, then of the Saihūn? Did they share it originally, and from what cause? Mr. Ujfalvy³ states that Shāsh is an ancient name for the Saihūn. The basis of his opinion appears to be a passage translated in his volume from Yāqūt's geographical work. In writing of Kāsān, Yāqūt's words are translated by "au delà du Saihūn, au delà du Shāsh". This redundant phrasing makes one desire further knowledge of the Arabic original.⁴

Full of images of fertile oases and desolate steppes as

¹ Perhaps these numbered places are groups of adjacent hamlets or villages using the same water-supply.

² Haydarābād Codex, f. 4b.

³ *Expédition Scientifique Française* (Leroux, 1879), ii, pp. 3 and 181.

⁴ Mr. Ujfalvy's reference to Yāqūt's book is "iv, 13 and 227".

the mind of a reader of Mr. von Schwarz's pages must be, and still more so if Colonel L. F. Kostenko's¹ have deepened impressions of the climatic hardships of Turkistān, the resulting thought about place-names is that they would be prompted by the comfort and life-sustaining power the places provided. Though, as Col. Kostenko says (i, 320), "the beginnings of Tāshkend are lost in the depth of time," and though it appears that once climatic conditions pressed less hardly on the Central Asian, yet it is likely that any old place would have a name marking its relation to human needs. Such eloquent names are plentiful in Turkistān: many locate water in a thirsty land; many bespeak the fruit harvests precious to a fruit-eating people, e.g., Almāligh and Almātū, to which the apple has been sponsor, and Kand-i-badām, the village of the almond. There is, over and above, the classic instance of the river neighbour of the Saihūn, the Zar-afshān, Scatterer of (Harvest) Gold. It would be in line with this last if taking Tāshkend as pure Persian Chāchkand and the Saihūn for the Chāch Daryā, one read in these words the beneficent meaning of the Village and the River of the Garnered Grain. Such a name still suits the first, such a name once suited the second.

ANNETTE S. BEVERIDGE.

NOTES ON SANSKRIT SIMILES

As some of the readers of the Journal may be interested in my attempts to collect and explain the nyāyas employed by writers on Indian philosophy, I should like to set before them a few additional notes on some of those contained in the second edition of my first *Handful* and in the third. I omit the second, as a new and considerably enlarged edition of it is now in the press.

¹ *The Turkistan Region*, Simla, trs. 1882.