With A. S. B's compliments
Ind 553.15

# THE BABAR-NAMA:

## THE MATERIAL NOW AVAILABLE FOR A DEFINITIVE TEXT OF THE BOOK.

BY

ANNETTE S. BEVERIDGE.

[*From the* "JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY," *January*, 1908.]

Digitized by Google

Ind 553.15

HARVARD COLLEGE
APR 1 1918
LIBRARY
Wales fund

Digitized by Google

# VII.

## THE BABAR-NAMA.

### THE MATERIAL NOW AVAILABLE FOR A DEFINITIVE TEXT OF THE BOOK.

By ANNETTE S. BEVERIDGE.

I. The wording of the Haydarābād and Elphinstone Manuscripts.
II. General notice of the St. Petersburg Foreign Office Codex (copied by Dr. Kehr) and of the pseudo-Bābar 'Fragment.'
III. Dr. Kehr's transcript considered as text-material.
IV. Summary of the results in text-material of the examination of the fifteen manuscripts enumerated in this Journal in 1900.

## I. The Wording of the Haydarābād and Elphinstone Manuscripts.

AT the end of an article on the Elphinstone Codex which appeared in this Journal in January, 1907, I expressed the hope of being able later to offer information from which to judge how it compares in wording with the Haydarābād Codex, the ultimate aim of the whole investigation being the establishment of a definitive text of the Bābar-nāma. Since writing that article I have ascertained, by collating the two manuscripts, that in the matter of wording one cannot be ranked higher than the other because, trifling divergence excepted, they are verbally identical.

Digitized by Google

### (a) *Their variation.*

They differ in trifles easy to be dealt with; here and there one has a Turkī word, the other a Persian or Arabic equivalent, but one is not more consistently Turkī than the other. Here and there they give two forms of the same Turkī word, both forms being found in dictionaries. They are not consistent in their use of contingently variable letters. They vary much in their diacritical marking: the Haydarābād MS. is fairly well pointed throughout; the Elphinstone is profusely so, but much of its pointing seems of later date than its transcription; some of it is incorrect, and introduces pseudo-variants. Other such variants have been created by expunging original words and substituting others; fortunately, however, in most such cases, there are remnants which can be interpreted by the help of the intact manuscript.

The major omissions of matter from the Elphinstone Codex were enumerated in my article of January, 1906; a good many minor ones in both manuscripts have come to light while collating them, omissions mostly of the common kind which a scribe makes by skipping from a word to the place of its next occurrence in his archetype. I have not, however, when consulting other manuscripts, come across any instance of loss of material from their combined contents; they interdigitate conveniently.

### (b) *Their authoritative character.*

It should be remembered that although (trifling variation excepted) the two manuscripts are verbally identical, they are known by their contents to be mutually independent.[1]

[1] The Elphinstone MS. cannot be a copy of the Haydarābād, because it has many notes, written into its text, where the latter has none. The Haydarābād MS. cannot be a copy of the Elphinstone, because it contains material that is not in the latter, and has not been lost but omitted.

Digitized by Google

They are collaterals and are not in one line of descent from Bābar's draft. The high rank of the Elphinstone MS. is established by the testimony of its seals and notes; the Haydarābād MS. is its equal intrinsically.[1] Accepted, therefore, as they safely can be accepted, for first-rate copies of the Bābar-nāma, it is nevertheless worth while to state a plain argument in their favour which has been made clear by collating them. It is an argument which leads to the opinion that though neither is Bābar's first draft, both are mutually independent replicas of that draft, perhaps first copies of it. If they are this, they provide the best procurable basis for the definitive text. They may, indeed, be as much better than Bābar's original manuscript, more legible and less impaired by clerical error, as a fair copy usually is than a draft.

The argument is this: In the text of fols. 194 and 195[2] of the Elphinstone MS., there is legible the following partially expunged note:—

تا اینجا در دیگر رسالها بود باقی از مسوّدهٔ اصل یافته شد

(Up to this place was in other writings; the rest is taken from the original draft.)

According to this note, then, the Elphinstone MS., from fol. 194 onwards, is a copy of Bābar's draft.[3] The

[1] It is satisfactory to have ascertained their agreement for another reason than that of their service as text-material, viz., that a real warranty has been obtained for the Haydarābād Codex in confirmation of the mainly circumstantial one on which it has been accepted.

[2] Erroneously given in January, 1907, as fol. 198.

[3] Owing to the inconsistent entry of notes in the Elphinstone Codex, some in the text, some on the margins, my argument might be opposed by the presumption that the quoted note is one copied, not made, where it now is. But if it were copied, the argument would be still valid, since it applies to any replica of Bābar's draft. The Elphinstone Codex is doubly supported in its position as a replica, not only by the Haydarābād Codex, but, as I have quite recently ascertained, by that portion of Dr. Kehr's manuscript which follows the place of the quoted note.

Digitized by Google

Haydarābād MS. in its corresponding portion[1] has been found, by collating the two, to be a replica of the Elphinstone MS.; it is equally so, therefore, of Bābar' draft.

There is no sign in the Haydarābād MS. of any change in its archetype; its uniform merit allows the supposition that it is a copy of one good manuscript.[2] Its uniformity carries on the argument in favour of both manuscripts, because it dispels the doubt cast on the earlier portion of the Elphinstone MS. by the words "other writings" of the quoted note. As the identical wording of the two manuscripts in their second section (cut off by the quoted note) supports the Haydarābād in this section, so does the same identity of wording support the Elphinstone in their first section, and lift from it the doubt imputed by the words "other writings." In fact, the comrade transcripts are throughout mutually corroborative.

## II. General Notice of the St. Petersburg Foreign Office Codex (copied by Dr. Kehr) and of the pseudo-Bābar 'Fragment.'

The account of this codex, which was published in the J.R.A.S. of July, 1900, suffered from being based on indirect information, and contains inaccuracies which can be corrected now that I have examined the volume itself.[3]

[1] i.e. from its fol. 240 to fol. 312, at which place it is left unsupported through loss of pages from the Elphinstone MS.

[2] Immediately after the quoted note there occur in the Elphinstone MS. an unusual number of slight mistakes and verbal variants, just what might occur if the handwriting, Bābar's that is, of the archetype were less clear than that of the earlier and presumably professional scribe. It soon, however, shows the advantage of familiarity by returning to its former agreement with its comrade.

[3] I am indebted to Mr. F. W. Thomas for being enabled to examine the manuscript in the I.O. Library.

Digitized by Google

Although Dr. Kehr's Bābar-nāma text is of admittedly doubtful authority, I have had to compare it closely with the true text of the Haydarābād and Elphinstone MSS., because its published form, the Kāsān imprint, does not exactly reproduce it. A reason for scrutinizing it, special to the seekers after text-material, is that with it is the 'Fragment,' a piece of Turkī writing as to the authorship of which expert opinion has differed.[1] M. Pavet de Courteille accepted it (down to its account of Bābar's death) for Bābar's composition; Dr. F. Teufel rejected it on a Turkī scholar's grounds. Neither critic saw it in Kehr's volume, or had knowledge of its place and purpose there. It is entered in the Kāsān imprint as a supplementary postscript to the recognized Bābar-nāma, and this mode of entry, there can be no doubt, has misled more than one of those who have written about it. I hope to define its place in Dr. Kehr's volume, and by so doing to make its purpose clear, to bring it into line with other parts of his transcript, and also to cast a light upon its genesis that brings real help to decide the issue "Is it Bābar's?"

Several excellent and unexpected results have followed the examination of Dr. Kehr's great volume; one provides an explanation of the enigmatical difference of view between the two Turkī scholars. For I find that while the volume bears varied testimony to confirm Dr. Teufel's rejection of the Fragment, it contains also what explains M. de Courteille's acceptance of it (cf. post (d)).

### (a) *A general characteristic of Kehr's volume.*

There can be few books which it is more necessary to examine as a whole in order to understand a part than the huge composite one written down by Dr. Kehr. The need

[1] Cf. "Mémoires de Bāber," vol. ii, pp. 443 ff. and notes; also Z.D.M.G., vol. xxxvii, pp. 141 ff., art. "Bābur und Abū'l-faẓl."

Digitized by Google

of a complete purview of it will become apparent, I hope, as this article proceeds to discriminate between what in its contents is of great value for the definitive Turkī text and what is corroborative only or useless altogether.

All its items, which are the Bābar-nāma, the Fragment, the Tīmūrid Biographies, and Dr. Kehr's Latin notes, have one thing in common: they seem to be parts of a private book and not to be offered for criticism. This is shown by his numerous entries of purely personal character; by the provisional quality of his Latin noting; by his unusual fashion of entering the Turkī writing. The personal notes were described in July, 1900; some are quoted by Professor Smirnoff in his Catalogue of the Library to which Kehr's codex belongs. The Latin notes are not, as they had been erroneously thought, a translation entered upon interleaves, but are rather what may be called a first snatch at the meaning of an unfamiliar tongue; they often give alternative readings, they are frequently incorrect, and they are made to a comparatively small portion of the manuscript. The curious way in which the transcribed writings are scattered over the pages assuredly shows a private end. At first sight the peculiarity seems explicable by the need of more space for Latin than for Turkī, but this interpretation does not hold good, because the Latin noting ends before the scattered Turkī. The advantage of the disarray in varying the visual field for easy reference leads one to explain it by the fact that it achieves this admirable result.

Dr. Kehr copied the Bābar-nāma in order to translate it into Latin, and he seems to have effected his purpose, because in Dr. B. Dorn's catalogue of the St. Petersburg Asiatic Museum (1846) there is the following item: "(62) Kehr. Latina interpretatio Mscti Tataro-Indici Baburnamah, i.e. Indo-Mongolici primarij Monarchae Baburi Historiae authenticae rerum ab ipso gestarum compositae. 2 voll. 4°."

Digitized by Google

(b) *The arrangement of the contents of Kehr's volume.*

The word 'arrangement' in connection with the items of Kehr's book is a misnomer, since they are in disarray. Of the four already enumerated, two only are included in the Kāsān imprint, viz. the Bābar-nāma and the Fragment; the said Fragment consisting of a summary of certain events described in full by Bābar himself, of certain passages taken from Gul-badan Begam's Humāyūn-nāma and from the Tārīkh-i-rashīdī, and of an account of Bābār's death, character, and court. The other two are named in the imprint preface, but not so to show how they, or any of the four, appear in the manuscript volume. Dr. Ilminsky has extracted from that volume a continuous Bābar-nāma and to this has added the Fragment as a postscript. Entered as Dr. Ilminsky has entered it, the Fragment stands out distinctly as matter extra to the recognized Bābar-nāma, and also, in the absence of information to contradict the inference, it cannot but be presumed to stand in the manuscript volume where it stands—postscript to the Bābar-nāma—in the imprint. Entered as it is in the imprint, it requires explanation; in Kehr's volume, however, it explains itself by its position.

The manuscript volume is far from being as orderly as the imprint; in it the Bābar-nāma is intermixed with the Fragment and the Biographies in a confusion not merely of pages and easy to remedy by the help of catchwords, but of matter also. This confusion notwithstanding, its total Turkī writings, are divided into two distinct works by a definite wrong plan. Their entanglement has needed the clue of the Persian and English texts to unravel into Ilminsky's orderly Bābar-nāma with postscript Fragment.

(c) *The two sections of Kehr's volume.*

The Turkī writings in Dr. Kehr's manuscript volume are divided into two sections, separated from one another by

Digitized by Google

blank leaves (pp. 1016 to 1020). The first section ends on p. 1015, and is followed by a note which, in Russian, states that here the writings of "Shah Babour" end. This note is appended to the Fragment account of Bābar's death, and by whomever made, testifies to opinion that where it stands the Bābar-nāma has come to an end. What is transcribed before it, begins with the Bābar-nāma narrative, but is not the true text, goes on with disordered portions of the true text, and is brought to an end by the Fragment on the page where the Russian note is entered.

What is transcribed after the blank pages begins (on p. 1021) with the Tīmūrid biographies; these end abruptly on p. 1084, with signs of a tattered archetype, and have for sequel the balance of the Bābar-nāma wanting in the first section. This balance is out of order, but it eventually ends in the normal way of the Bābar-nāma, with the Guālīār passage of 936 H.

(d) *The purpose of the Fragment in Kehr's volume.*

Kehr's first section splits into three portions, and if these are considered the purpose of the Fragment will be made clear. The first portion, which ends under 908 H.,[1] is Bābar-nāma's narrative, but it differs so curiously from the true text in its wording that for some time I was greatly puzzled to understand how such divergence could have been effected. Little by little, instances of Persification led me to form the hypothesis that this portion is not the Bābar-nāma text at all, but a re-translation into Turkī of 'Abdu-r-raḥīm Mīrzā's Persian one. As being this, I now definitely take it, and shall later give an example in support of my opinion. The second portion of the section, which begins in 908 H. and ends abruptly under 935 H., is

[1] A singular coincidence about the point of junction of these first and second portions will be found mentioned under (f).

Digitized by Google

true Bābar-nāma text, disordered, and, in parts, verbally inaccurate but still the text. The third portion is the Fragment, which, a few introductory lines excepted, is no part of the recognized Bābar-nama, but is, there can be little doubt, a translation from the Akbar-nāma. The purpose served by the first and third verbally foreign adjuncts to the centre of true text is unmistakable; they are used to complete a defective portion of Bābar-nāma text. They are in line, apart from the text in style, Persified and corrupt.

The Fragment as it appears in the manuscript volume, needs no explanation other than the one given by its position there—a position to which it has been brought from the Akbar-nāma for the purpose of completing the defective Bābar-nāma of Kehr's first section. The fact that this is its manifest purpose is not changed by the presence in Kehr's second section of the true end of the Bābar-nāma; that presence shows merely that the person who made up the first section had no grasp of his text-resources.

In the similar and corrupt wording of the two verbally foreign adjuncts of Kehr's first section, I find an explanation of M. de Courteille's acceptance of the Fragment as written by Bābar. He worked at the disadvantage all workers on the Bābar-nāma shared till the Haydarābād MS. brought in the help of a second Turkī MS.; he would first know the Bābar-nāma by the portion of Kehr's text which I take to be a translation from the Persian one, and this is one in defect with the Fragment. If he had doubts as to the wording of the Fragment, as he can hardly have failed to have, his linguistic warrant for smothering them lay in that first portion.

Dr. Teufel could not accept the Fragment, because he judged it absolutely as a Turkī composition, and also, as his critique shows, by the standard of the true text. It is literally true that each scholar could find in Kehr's



Digitized by Google

volume (N.B. they found it in the Kāsān imprint only) reliable ground for accepting or rejecting the disputed matter according to whether they referred for guidance to the corrupt text of its first portion or to its latter part, which is in verbal agreement with the Haydarābād and Elphinstone MSS.

### (e) *A few details about the Fragment.*

Where the Fragment stands in Kehr's volume, it is a formal misfit in date and topic. Of this Kehr knew, since before it begins, he has made this note—"Custos hic non convenit cum initio sequenti paginae."[1] What is wrong here is that an incomplete account of performers at a feast on December 19th, 1528, which precedes his note, is followed after the note by an account of reinforcing an amīr on February 17th, 1527.

Where the Fragment changes from being a repetition from the Bābar-nāma to be a translation from the Akbar-nāma, there are real misfits which it will be easy to define if reference be made to the reproduction of the Fragment in the Kāsān imprint.[2] The Bābar-nāma passage there ends in the twelfth line with the words *girdnī bīrkūt tūk*, and this ending is marked in the manuscript volume by a *v* placed, probably by Dr. Ilminsky, over the word *girdnī*.[3] The last topic of the passage is the linking of gun-carriages on February 17th, 1527. The first words of the Akbar-nāma translation (*wa rānā sangā*) belong to the account of the battle of Kānwāha, and are of date March 16th, 1527. It may be mentioned, moreover, that these are followed by

[1] The missing page is in his second section.

[2] See, too, Haydarābād MS., fols. 353 and 310*b*; Ilminsky, pp. 457 and 403; Memoirs, pp. 395 and 352. Also Akbar-nāma, Bib. Ind. ed., vol. i, p. 106, and trans. H. Beveridge, vol. i, p. 260.

[3] A discrepancy in the MSS. about *bīrkūt* it would be tedious to draw attention to.

Digitized by Google

the ineptitude of reducing Abū'l-faẓl's statement of the basis of the feudal levy in Hindūstān to one of mere mode of reckoning.

(f) *Light on the genesis of the Fragment.*

It is strange that a narrative which reproduces one work in the way that the Fragment, down to the *v*, reproduces the Bābar-nāma, should there diverge to translate another, the Akbar-nāma. Why at the *v*? why in the middle of a sentence, and with misfit of time and topic?

A chance light which goes far towards ascertaining the genesis of the Fragment, has disclosed an answer to these questions. For I find that where, at the *v*, the Bābar-nāma passage ends, the Calcutta A.S.B. and I.O. MSS. also end. Moreover, they have variants from the true text which are in that passage, the most distinct of which is the substitution of *daryā har dā* for the *yānīmīz dā* of the true text.

The Calcutta MSS. are too modern to have influenced the Fragment; the inference I draw from the coincidence is that they and its Bābar-nāma passage have for common source a manuscript which breaks off, or (if it be as confused as Kehr's) seems to break off at the *v*, and that this the Akbar-nāma passage was translated to complete.

Many considerations tend to locate that common source in Bukhārā, the city from which the three St. Petersburg manuscripts seem to have issued. The coincidence which brings the two Calcutta MSS. into relation with Kehr's, recalls the fact that when, in India and in 1809, Elphinstone mislaid his own, he intended to write to Bukhārā for a copy of the Bābar-nāma manuscript known then to be in that city.

The extraordinary confusion in Kehr's volume is presumably reproduced from his archetype. This presumption makes fruitless all speculation about the earlier condition

Digitized by Google

of his Bābar-nāma text, and this the more that the text varies so much in accuracy that it may be composite and parts of more than one manuscript.

Kehr's volume contains a second instance of coincidence which it is appropriate to mention here, and which, in quiet literary way, is startling.

I have expressed the opinion that his text down to within 908 H.[1] is a translation from the Persian one of 'Abdu-r-raḥīm Mīrzā. This supposedly translated portion leads up to a broken passage of true text, and it is at their point of junction that the coincidence occurs. For the translation breaks off (where Bābar, in extremity, is quoting a Persian verse) at one of the definite lacunæ of the archetype of the Elphinstone Codex, of that codex, and of their descendants, the Persian and English texts.[2] This is, however, the less important part of the coincidence; the more important one is that after the supposed translation, Kehr's manuscript goes on with what is missing from those MSS. and texts of the narrative of 908 H., in the true Turkī text, precisely as if the translation had been made to lead up to the passage lost from the archetype of the Elphinstone MS. It is an extraordinary coincidence, and is the more so that Kehr's true text contains (s.a. 925 H.) a note which is parallel to those preserved in the part of the Elphinstone Codex which was "copied from the draft" (see Section I (b)) [there are none in the part taken from "other writings"], and which is in the portion of Kehr's true text where the Elphinstone MS. and its archetype have a lacuna. One cannot but wish the more strongly for this coincidence to examine the Bukhārā Bābar-nāma which appears to be Kehr's source, direct or indirect.

[1] Ilminsky, p. 144, line 5; Memoirs, p. 122.

[2] The missing narrative is contained in the Haydarābād Codex.

Digitized by Google

## III. Dr. Kehr's volume considered as a source of text-material.

Classed by their wording, the differing portions of Kehr's volume fall into two opposed divisions. One is of true Turkī text, although not uniformly accurate; the other is of translations from the Persian, and is composed of three items, viz., the Bābar-nāma narrative down to the point of coincidence just described, the Akbar-nāma portion of the Fragment, and the Tīmūrid biographies.

### (a) *Its true text.*

The contribution made by Kehr's transcript to the definitive text is of high and surprising value. Beginning at the point of coincidence in 908 H., his copy contains at first many verbal inaccuracies, but as it proceeds, it comes into closer agreement, until it becomes identical with the Haydarābād MS.

Their agreement is a surprising fact. For when he began his transcript Dr. Kehr was inexperienced in Turkī; his work must have been copied by Dr. Ilminsky for the Kāsān imprint; the transcripts and the imprint were effected without the help of a second Turkī MS. That the Kāsān imprint for a considerable portion of its great length should be found in agreement with the true text of an early manuscript, reveals in its three copyists work too faithful for praise.

What the fidelity of the Oriental and German scribes and of the Russian scribe and editor has provided for the definitive text possesses extraneous value, for where their work has issued best into the Kāsān imprint, is precisely where pages are missing from the Elphinstone MS., and where, as a consequence, it cannot support the Haydarābād MS.

Digitized by Google

This is not all, however; the overlappings of accurate text begin before the lacuna of the Elphinstone Codex begins, and thus, as far as they extend, provide a triple basis for the definitive text. Moreover, this is an understatement of advantage, because the earlier and less accurate parts of Kehr's text also are highly serviceable.

For convenience of reference, I have written thus far of Kehr's text as it appears in the orderly imprint, but it is well to add that reliable as the best part of the imprint is proved to be by its agreement with the Haydarābād MS., Kehr's MS. must not be neglected in establishing the definitive text, and this especially in the less accurate parts which are often verbally changed in the imprint.

### (b) *Its translations.*

It is in connection with the three items which in Kehr's volume depart, in fact or wording, from Bābar's known compositions, that the need of studying it as a whole becomes apparent. The item in the imprint to understand which complete purview is needed, is the Fragment only; that purview brings to light in the manuscript volume two other items which are in line with the Fragment in purpose and by appearing to be translations from the same hand. These three items stand or fall together; that all fall below the rank of text-material there is certainly warrant to believe.

Complete purview of the volume defines what appears to be its compiler's purpose. He meant his first section to be the Bābar-nāma, and he led up to and finished off his modicum of true text by translating from the Mīrzā's and from the Akbar-nāma. From the facts of position assigned, it is clear that he thought he had wound up the Bābar-nāma when he supplemented it by an account of its author's death. The compiler's second section I surmise that he meant for a Humāyūn-nāma, because the Tīmūrid

Digitized by Google

biographies which introduce its modicum of true text have Humāyūn for their objective. They lead up to that sovereign, and to his Accession (?) Feast through "Bābar Mīrzā, who was the father of Humāyūn Pādshāh." I have not had time to try to trace their starting-point; they are strange and highly Persified productions.[1]

(c) *An illustration of the (supposed) translations from the Persian.*

Since the Haydarābād Reproduction and the Kāsān imprint are accessible in many libraries, it is not necessary to encroach on the space of the Journal with much extract in support of the opinion that Kehr's volume contains three translated items. One illustration will suffice, which will be quoted in all known versions and will serve: (1) to illustrate the hypothesis of translation that explains the aberrations of a part of Kehr's text; (2) to illustrate, in support of that hypothesis, the opinion Mr. Erskine formed of the Mīrzā's text;[2] (3) to show (as at a convenient place) a specimen of Pāyanda Ḥusain's text; (4) to show a sequel of error which, through text

[1] The following significant words appear in a few lines of the "Bābar Mīrzā" biography: *sipāḥ-sālār, Qāsim Qūchīnī, amīr-malik, tawājī-beglār, parwāna-beglār, auighūr* to describe Turks, *tūzūk-rosh, ba daulat wa ẓafar.*

[2] "The translation which he executed (the Mīrzā) of the Memoirs of Bābar is extremely close and accurate, and has been much praised for its elegance. But, though simple and concise, a close adherence to the idioms and forms of expression of the Turkī original, joined to a want of distinctness in the use of the relatives, often renders the meaning extremely obscure, and makes it difficult to discover the connection of the different members of the sentence. The style is frequently not Persian, and a native of Persia would find it difficult to assign any sense to some of the expressions. Many of the Turkī words are not translated, sometimes because they had no corresponding term in Persian, and sometimes perhaps from negligence; or, it may be, because they were then familiar to the Turkī nobility of the Court of Agra." (Mems., Preface, p. ix.)

Digitized by Google

after text, has followed one of the Mīrzā's ambiguous phrases and enforces the need of revising the English text; (5) to show the newly enhanced worth of the Haydarābād MS. as being the complete revisor of all other texts.

(d) *The illustrative passage.*

My illustration is taken from the Bābar-nāma narrative of 907 H., at which date Bābar, still under 19 years of age, was a wanderer in the hills to the south-west of Farghāna, after expulsion from Samarqand by Shaibānī Khān.

A.—The Haydarābād MS., fol. 97, l. 2 from foot, and the Elphinstone MS., fol. 71, l. 2.

دخکت ته ایکاندا دخکت نینگ گرد و نواحی سیداغی تاغلارنی همیشه ییاق [Elph. یایاق] یوروب سیر قیلور ایدیم اکثر یالانگ ایاق یورور ایدیم یالانگ ایاق کوب یوروکاندین ایاق‌لار انداق بولوب ایدی کیم تاغ و تاش تفاوت قیلماس ایدی اوشول سیر اثنا سیدا بیرگون نماز دیگر بیله نماز شام اراسیدا بیر اینچکه نامشخص یول بیله بیر اوی توشوب بارا دور ایدی مین دیدیم کیم بو یول قایانغه بارور ایکین اوی غه گوز سالینگ اوی نی ایتور مانگ تا یول نینگ قایساری چقاری معلوم بولغای خواجه اسد الله ظرافتی قیلدی دیدی کیم کاوگون [گم] شود چکار کنیم

This passage I construe literally, and as follows:—

While in Dekhkat دخکت ایکاندا

دخکت نینگ گرد و نواحی سیداغی تاغلار

the hills belonging to the environs of Dekhkat

Digitized by Google

constantly going out on foot همیشه پیاق یوروب

I used to wander over سیر قیلور ایدیم

often I used to go barefoot. اکثر یالانگ ایاق یوروب ایدیم

Through much going barefoot یالانگ ایاق کوب یوروکاندین

the feet became so ایاق‌لار انداق بولوب ایدی

کیم تاغ و تاش تفاوت قیلماس ایدی

that hill and stone made no difference.

One day in the time of this wandering اوشول سیر اثنا سیدا بیر گون

between the Other Prayer and Vespers نمازدیگر بیله نماز شام اراسیدا

on a narrow, ill-defined road بیر اینچکه نامشخص یول بیله

a cow was going down. بیر اوی توشوب بارا دور ایدی

I said (i.e. to his companions, or soliloquizing) مین دیدیم

کیم بو یول قایانغه بارور ایکین

To which side may this road be about to go?

اوی غه گوز سالینگ

Fix your eyes on the cow (i.e. said to his companions),

do not lose the cow اوی نی ایتور مانگ

(or, possibly, do not press the cow forward—Zenker, 142*a*)

تا یول نینگ قایساری چقاری معلوم بولغای

till of the road the direction of the outlet shall be known.

Khwāja Asadu'llāh made his joke خواجه اسد الله ظرافتی قیلدی

Should the cow be lost, what do we do? کیم کاوگم شود چکار کنیم

How far Kehr's text is removed from this can be seen next.

B.—Kehr's Text, 264; Ilminsky's imprint, fol. 119, l. 1.

اوشال گونلار دخکت ته ایکانیمدا همیشه پیاده سیر قیلور ایدیم

کوپحی [Ilm. کوبیچی] یلنگ ایاغ یورور [Ilm. بوروب] ایدیم کوب

Digitized by Google

ایاغ یلنگ یوروکایدین ایاغ لاریم انداغ بولوب ایدی کیم تاغ و تاش تاثیر قیلماس ایدی اوشال وقت ته بیرگون نماز دیگر بیلان نماز شام اراسی بیر اینچکه یول بیله بیر کیشی بیر اوکوز (Kāz. ox) آلیپ باره دور ایدی مین سوردوم که بو یول قایدا بارور ایتی کیم اوکوز کا قرالانگ دیو تور مانگ تا قیدا بارغای بو سوزنی ایشیتیب خواجه اسد الله زرافت قیلدی دیدی کیم اگر اوکوز ییت سانه [Ilm. یتسانه] قیلور

My next extract is from 'Abdu'r-raḥīm Mīrzā's Persian text.

C.—Wāqi'āt-i-bābarī, I.O., No. 217, fol. 63.

در آن ایام که در دحکت بودم در کوهای گرد و نوحای دحکت همیشه پیاده سیر می کردم اکثر پای برهنه‌ی میگشتم از جهت پای برهنه گشتن بسیار پایهای انچنان شده بود که کوه و سنگ تفاوت نمیکرد در اثنای همین سیر یک روزی میان نماز شام و نماز دیگر در یک راه باریک با شخصی کاوی میرفت من گفتم که این راه کجا میرفته باشد گفت بکاو نظر اندازید وگم مکنید تا بکدام طرف بر آمدن راه معلوم شود خواجه اسد الله ظرافتی کرد وگفت که گاوگم شود چه کار کنیم

The three versions quoted so far show several clear instances of the dependence of Kehr's text upon the Mīrzā's Persian translation. They contain, moreover, several instances of divergence from Bābar's mode of expression. These points it is essential to consider in detail in order to judge the textual quality of Kehr's first portion.

Digitized by Google

(1) *Instances of Kehr's wording following the Persian text.*

Line 1. اوشال گونلار is the Persian در آن ایام, and has no equivalent in the Turkī text.

Line 2; B, l. 1. پیادہ is from the Persian where the Turkī has ییاق or ایاق.

Line 4. اوشال وقت تہ is nearer to the Persian در اثنای همین سیر than to the Turkī اوشال سیر اثنا سیدا.

Line 5; C, l. 4. اراسی translates the Persian میان but not the Turkī اراسیدا.

Line 6; B and C, l. 5. Here is an important point, and one which has a claim on attention beyond that of its testimony to my translation hypothesis.

Bābar wrote "a narrow ill-defined road," بیر اینچکه نا مشخص یول. Kehr's text writes "a narrow road, a person," thus reading [in its Persian source, as I take it] شخص for مشخص. In doing this it follows what is in many manuscripts of the Persian text, but what there is no reason to suppose the Mīrzā wrote. Pāyanda Ḥusain reproduces Bābar's term "ill-defined" نامشخص; there may be MSS. of the Mīrzā's text equally faithful to their original. [I have not found one, but time has failed me to look into those of the Bodleian Library, which are, I think, amongst our best. Those I have seen agree in error here and vary mutually in other words of the passage under discussion.] Scribes unfamiliar with Turkī, and unaware of the peculiarities of the Mīrzā's text, might be misled by his two adjectives without conjunction. Doubtless they found in copying many difficulties where Mr. Erskine found them in translating.

Through this phrase, "a narrow ill-defined road" بیر اینچکه نامشخص یول, a clear instance comes to light of the translation of Kehr's text from the Persian one; Kehr's text writes کیشی (person); this is the word Bābar would have used if he spoke of a person; it is the word natural to use if translating into Turkī the Persian شخص (person); it is not

Digitized by Google

in Bābar's text; if the supposed translator of Kehr's had before him a Persian manuscript in which شخص had taken the place of مشخص he naturally would translate it by کیشی.

To this verbal testimony in support of the hypothesis that Kehr's text is (in part) a translation from the Mīrzā's, it is hardly necessary to add the following item of what is circumstantial. If the cow of the story had been going "with a person," as the incorrect Persian manuscripts oddly put it, or if, as Kehr's text embroiders it, "a person was taking a cow," the small point of the Khwāja's story would become smaller, for why, if there were a human guide, fix eyes on the cow?

Kehr's text takes the story still further from Bābar's. Its "person" was taking an "ox" (اوکوز, taureau, bœuf, Kāz. ox, say dictionaries). اوکوز strikes one as a strange representative of the indeterminative اوی or کاو, and destroys the image called up by the hour specified by Bābar (surely with intention), of the cow homing at milking-time.

A trifling discrepancy from Bābar's precision can be fitly mentioned here where it occurs, though of the third class of these instances. To agree with his habit, there should be the accusative sign (نی) after اوکوز (see line 7).

Line 6 (B). The Persian که remains for the Turkī کیم.

## (2) *Instances other than verbal of what shows a Persian original for Kehr's text.*

Line 8. Here is the speech of Khwāja Asadu'llāh already mentioned. In Bābar's text it is entered in Persian; it is also in Persian in the Mīrzā's text. If the supposed translator of Kehr's text saw it in the Mīrzā's, he would naturally put it into Turkī with its context. If, however, he had seen it entered in Persian in the Turkī text, he would, or at least might, have kept it as he found it. The words which Kehr's text substitutes for the Khwāja's speech require illumination to show point.

Digitized by Google

(3) *Points in which Kehr's text departs from Bābar's customary wording.*

Line 1. The possessive pronoun in ایکانیم is not according to Bābar's style, he being as a rule distinctly impersonal in his wording. This same divergence occurs in line 3, ایاغ لاریم.

Line 2 (B). The word کوپچی is not in Bābar's text, and certainly is not one usual with him. In de Courteille's dictionary it is given with this passage to illustrate its use by Bābar, but it is in Kehr's text only. Dr. Teufel (l.c., p. 148) also refers to this passage, and his reference fails as does M. de Courteille's because not made to Bābar's text at all. The word is in the Fragment also.

Line 3; B, l. 2. یلنگ for یالانگ, Bābar's usual form of the word. So too غ for ق (as in the Fragment).

Line 3; B, l. 2. کوب is out of place, as it easily might be if an inexpert person worked from the Mīrzā's phrase in which it occurs, پای برهنه گشتن بسیار

Line 4. A new word تاءثیر has been brought into the texts to translate تفاوت, the one used in Bābar's and the Mīrzā's.

Line 6. Here is a development of the mistake which started from the reading of the Persian manuscripts, "with a person" in place of "ill-defined." If there were a person taking the cow as Kehr's text has it, there might be conversation; therefore the translator (supposed) has carried the دیدی and گفتم of the Turkī and Persian texts on to سوردوم (asked).

Line 7; B, l. 6. Naturally, after سوردوم (asked) there follows a direct question. "Where does the road lead?" Thus, the subjective sense of Bābar's ایگین and of the Mīrzā's باشد is lost. In the Turkī text there is nothing to cause the change of mood made in Kehr's; in the Persian text there is the interpolated گفت; I say "interpolated" of the گفت because the Mīrzā's verb remains in his text unaltered by it and subjective. Kehr's text translates that گفت (which is not in the Turkī text) by ایتی.

Digitized by Google

Line 7 (B). دیو تور مانگ is a remarkable phrase. It may account for the intrusion of the *diabolus* in the Latin notes (*vide infra*).

Line 8; B, l. 7. قایدا بارغای. Cf. this with Bābar's idiomatic phrase. The word قایدا is not one of those he habitually uses.

Line 7. بوسوزنی ایشیتیب. This embroidering is against Bābar's economy in words.

Line 7. قرالانگ. This word seems special to Kehr's text. M. de Courteille's dictionary gives it as Bābar's with a reference to this passage. Zenker does not give it in this form with the meaning 'to observe,' 'look at.' As it is written here, it accounts for Dr. Kehr's *niger*. (Zenker (678*a*) translates it *devenir noir*.)

I quote next from the older Persian translation of Pāyanda Ḥusain *Ghaznavī* and Muḥammad *Ḥiṣarī Mughūl*.

D.—Wāqi'āt-i-bābarī, I.O., No. 215, p. 79*b*, l. 2 from foot. Pāyanda Ḥusain *Ghaznavī's* text:—

چند کای که بودیم کوهای اطراف دکترا همیشه پیاده سیر میکردیم اکثری پا برهنه از بس که پا برهنه می گشتم پاها بنوعی شده بود که کوه و سنگ چندانی تفاوت نمیکرد در اثنای سیر بوقت نماز دیگر به یک راه نامشخص افتادیم بخاطر رسید که به بینیم این راه بکدام جانب میرود حقیقت معلوم شود اما منزل را ملاخطه فرمایید مبادا گم کنیم خواجه اسد الله ظرافتی کردند که کاو اگر گم شود چکنیم

In this singularly differing version of Bābar's anecdote, two points concern the hypothesis that a part of Kehr's text is a translation from the Mīrzā's, viz. Bābar's phrase in it, نـاشخـص, 'ill-defined,' and the expression in it,

Digitized by Google

definitely and in varied words, of the fact conveyed by the subjective wording in Bābar's text, that he had a 'thought' or 'wondered' about the road, and did not ask 'a person' a direct question about it.

This extract from the older translation certainly indicates a ground for Akbar's asking to have a second one produced by 'Abdu'r-raḥīm Mīrzā.

E.—I quote now from the English text (Memoirs, p. 100), giving it, as the older, priority over the French:—

"While I remained in Dehkat, I was accustomed to walk on foot all about the hills in the neighbourhood. I generally went out barefoot, and, from this habit of walking barefoot, I soon found that our feet became so hardened that we did not mind rock or stone in the least. In one of these walks, between afternoon and evening prayers, we met a man who was going with a cow in a narrow road. I asked him the way. He answered: 'Keep your eye fixed on the cow, and do not lose sight of her till you come to the issue of the road, when you will know your ground.' Khwāja Asadu'llāh, who was with me, enjoyed the joke, observing: 'What would become of us wise men were the cow to lose her way?'"

I would draw attention in this, certainly free, rendering of even the Persian text, to the loss of precision which follows from reading 'with a person' for 'ill-defined.' A merely 'narrow' road might have been the better to follow as being the more trodden by cattle; Bābar gives point by saying 'ill-defined.'

F.—The French version of the illustrative passage is at vol. i, p. 210 of the Mémoires de Bāber:—

"Durant ce séjour que je fis à Dekhket, j'avais pris l'habitude de me promener à pied. Le plus souvent je marchais pieds nus, et la répétition fréquente de cet exercise les avaient tellement endurcis qu'ils ne craignaient ni les aspérités des montagnes, ni les pierres. Un jour,

Digitized by Google

entre la prière de l'après-midi et celle du soir, je rencontrai un homme qui conduisait un bœuf dans un sentier étroit. 'Où mène ce chemin ?' lui demandai-je ? 'Ne perdez pas de vue le bœuf,' me répondit-il, 'et ne vous arrêtez pas tant qu'il marchera.' En entendant ces paroles, Khodja Açad-Allah dit en plaisantant, 'Si le bœuf s'égare, que deviendrons nous ?'"

G.—There remain to be quoted Dr. Kehr's Latin notes (p. 265) on the illustrative passage in proof of the opinion I have expressed that they are private and provisional only.

"Illo tempore, die quodam inter preces pomeridianas solemus vespertinas post occasum Solis, fiere solitas (peragendas). Per tenuem viam quandam nos quendam oculo nostri virum videbamus qui bovem capiebat (tenebat) ambulantem. Ego interrogabam, Quorsum haec via abit (sc. ducit) ? Dicebat (Oghus versum) bovem de nigra (nigrum fac) diabolus erit (sc. potius, Bovem cornu tene eoque mactato hilaris esto). Vid. in Meninski قد et قرن et *almaq*. Ego ad montem abeo (accedo, ascendo). Hoc sermone audito Chadsha Asadus (bovem illum sumsit ) societatem (ceterorum decem hominum circiter) congregavit ad conviviam dixitque. Antequam bos comestus fuerit anni spatium conficitur."

To these notes Dr. Kehr has appended another :—

"En ambiguitatem notionis vocum duplici sensu praeditarum. Duplex hîc interpretatio datur ; alterutra tamen juxta connexionem textûs tantum toleranda quam hîc vides. Sed hinc judicare quivis poterit quantum difficilior Orientalium linguarum interpretatio sit expositione linguarum Occidentalium et quam longe harum linguarum interpres interpreti Orientalium linguarum in dignitate postponendus est ob altiorem eruditionis gradum ad Orientales linguas."

Digitized by Google

## IV. Summary of the Results of Examination of the Bābar-nāma MSS.

In 1900 I enumerated in this Journal fifteen manuscripts which I had found mentioned in various places, as being copies of the Bābar-nāma. The fifteen can now be classified according to their value as material for a definitive text of the book. The MSS. are numbered as they were in 1900:—

I. Bābar's autograph MS. This has not been found; an additional item of information about it has been given to me by Mr. Beveridge, namely, that the Pādshāh-nāma (ii, 703) mentions under date 1057 H. (1647) the existence of a copy of Bābar's book (the word used is "Wāqi'āt-i-bābarī," according to Indian habit) in Shāh-jahān's special library, written with Bābar's own hand or by Ashraf (a known scribe) (*ba khatt ashraf*).

II. Khwāja Kilān's MS. Of this nothing further has been learned.

III. (Humāyūn's transcript.) The supposed existence of this has been disproved by examination of the textual basis on which it was presumed.

IV. Elphinstone MS. This has been ascertained to provide excellent text-material.

V. British Museum MS. The fragments of which this volume consists are serviceable for the text.

VI. India Office MS.
VII. Asiatic Society of Bengal MS.
VIII. Mysore MS.

The Mysore appears to be now the ASB. MS. It must be said that Nos. VI and VII are worthless for the text.

IX. Bib. Lindesiana (Rylands Library) MS. This has not been seen since 1900. It is a mere fragment.



Digitized by Google

X. Haydarābād MS. This is the one complete and intact manuscript yet found, and is the reliable basis for the text.

XIV. The Bukhārā MS. This has not been seen, but as it appears (inferentially) to be the original source of Dr. Kehr's, amongst others named below, it cannot but be of great value.

XV. Naẓar Bāy *Turkistānī's* MS. This has not been seen; it is the archetype of the Senkovski and belonged to a Bukhariot.

XIII. St. Petersburg Asiatic Museum MS. (Senkovski). A partial copy only, which resembles Kehr's.

XI. The St. Petersburg University Library MS. This has been seen again, and still appears to be a copy of Kehr's.

XII. St. Petersburg Foreign Office Library (Dr. Kehr's). This has been examined and is described in the earlier part of this article.

---

The net result of the above summary is that there is available now as text-material, the complete Haydarābād MS., which is good throughout; the Elphinstone MS., which is identical with it, but has lost many pages; the British Museum MS., which is a collection of short fragments; and Dr. Kehr's, which is of the important help detailed in the preceding article.

It appears desirable to wait somewhat longer before undertaking the definitive text, in the hope of examining the Bukhārā MS. Meantime the revision of the English text can be effected, and this would provide a useful circumstantial guide to the final text.

---

Digitized by Google