manuscript, record when it was viewed by one of the emperors, and so on. The seal impressions include those of the rulers themselves and of earlier and later owners but otherwise can be taken to be for the most part those of more senior officials responsible for the supervision of the library, whose names are rarely found in the inscriptions. Joannes de Laet informs us, supposedly on the basis of an inventory dated 1605, that the number of books in Akbar's library reached 24,000 with a total value of 6,463,731 rupees. Whether these figures are reliable or not, for the system to work efficiently inventories and registers would have been needed to keep records of the books and where they were held at a particular time. However, none survive.

Notes in Mughal manuscripts

The potential interest of the notes on the manuscripts has long been appreciated and over the last century illustrations of a number of pages of this type have been published and partly read. Full decipherment and comprehension faced difficulties: in some cases, including that of Muhammad Jāki's Shāhānāmah, the edges of pages have been remargined or trimmed in rebinding with the partial or total loss of some inscriptions; in others, rubbing and other damage or repairs obscure the text. Many of the notes contain unusual technical terms, are written with largely undotted letters and with simplified word-forms, and even in good condition are not easy to read. Their placing on the pages, though perhaps not entirely random, is far from straightforward.

However, in a highly important article, which appeared in 1997, Professor Seyller presented in English translation a very large quantity of the notes appearing on manuscripts which had passed through the Mughal Library and with this material was able to reconstruct in some detail the working of the system, as well as to draw interesting conclusions about the value set on manuscripts by the Mughals. With the help of his work and the illustrations accompanying it even a relative outsider can endeavour to put the notes on the Shāhānāmah in order. Notes with identical or similar features, including dates, names, script and peculiarities of phrasing, occur on more than one manuscript. This helps to confirm doubtful readings and enables inscriptions that are only partially visible to be restored. Often groups of manuscripts were inspected or transferred at the same time, or within a short period. Not surprisingly, we learn from the 'sets' of parallel inscriptions that Muhammad Jāki's Shāhānāmah spent much of its time in the company of other sumptuous and now famous illustrated manuscripts. For the sake of brevity, reference to parallels is here confined as far as possible to a number of these: the Zafarnāmah in the Garrett Library, Baltimore, the Birzad Album and Haft Awarang in the Freer Gallery, the Khamsah Or. 6810 and the Hāfiz Or. 14139 in the British Library, and a Hadīqat al-Haqīqah in private possession. At the present stage the most conspicuous problem is the fact that most of the annotations are dated only in regnal years, which means that in many cases the date on an individual inscription, or on a set of similar inscriptions, does not of itself make it clear which reign is referred to. If the Muslim era dating from the Hijrah had been used throughout this difficulty would not arise—on coinage hijri and regnal years were sensibly used together. Writing in the reign of Aurangzeb, the chronicler Muhammad Kazim describes how, from Akbar onwards each monarch began a new era (sārkh). As he explains, these eras were not all based on one calendar. The use of two different calendars does give some assistance in assigning notes to particular reigns. Regnal years were introduced by Akbar in 992/1584, in what was calculated to be his twenty-ninth (solar) regnal year, in connection with the ilāhi calendar and its Persian months, which was part of his attempt to establish his own eclectic religion, the Din-i ilahi. In the practice of the librarians the ilāhi calendar largely replaced the Muslim hijri era, though the latter was used occasionally; it continued to be used in the library throughout the reign of Jahangir but the ilāhi months began to go out of favour quite early in the reign of Shah Jahan and were replaced by the months of the Muslim era. Regnal years continued to be used throughout Shah Jahan's reign, but it appears that in the latter part of it they did not begin at Naurūz but were based on the hijri year, which was lunar, and began on 1 Jamadā I 1037/7 February 1628, the hijri month in which Shah Jahan had ascended the throne. After a short period of uncertainty Aurangzeb's regnal years also were calculated from the first of a hijri month, Ramazān 1068/7 June 1658, and were based on the lunar year. Thus a note including an ilāhi month will almost certainly belong to the earlier period. Another of the notes phrase Allāha used as an in annotations, well be inter adopted by A reform, it w position of s as an opening are datable to but like the i fairly early in sometimes by particular rei the designatio jahān, 'year of about the san calendar, and of Shah Jahan Mughal pract formally beg but with a ce
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Another feature which helps with the dating of the note is the presence or absence of the phrase Allāhu Akbar ‘God is greatest’ (the iktāb) used as an invocation at the beginning of the annotations. The phrase, which could equally be interpreted to mean ‘Akbar is God’, was adopted by Akbar in connection with his religious reform, in which he himself occupied the position of supreme spiritual leader. It was used as an opening invocation for annotations which are datable to the reigns of Akbar and Jahangir, but like the ilahi months fell out of normal use fairly early in the reign of Shah Jahan. This sometimes helps in placing ambiguous notes in a particular reign. Another indicative feature is the designation of the regnal year as sanah-yi jafar, ‘year of enthronement’, which comes in at about the same time as the rejection of the ilahi calendar, and is occasionally found after the reign of Shah Jahan. It may be noted that in usual later Mughal practice the reign of an emperor did not formally begin with the decease of his predecessor but with a ceremony of actual ascent of a throne.

The Notes

The order is chronological except where no firm dating is proposed.

6. God is Most Great./ At the time of the beginning of the year 997 [1588], at the station ... RYTH the writer bestowed upon the repository of the vizierate ... Muhammad Sālīh.

7. God is Most Great./ The Shāhmirza of the age Firdausi, from the possessions of Shāh Bāq al-Dīn Ahmad Khan, for which previously fifty mohurs was the value set. When the slave of the Court brought it before the vision, most noble, most holy, [most exalted [of the King]]—may God make his Kingdom eternal for ever— / with the approval of Mīrzā A’zām Khan, the price was established as five hundred mohurs. / On the date of the month ilahi, year 47 [May 1602], / at the Abridge of the Sultanate Agra from the custody of Luqman the librarian it was ordered to be transferred to ‘Ali Chelah. Fins.

500 mohurs

Original value  Addition
50 mohurs  450 mohurs

8. God is Most Great./ 3 Āzār, year one [October 1605],/ it was inspected.

9. God is Most Great./ On the date 17 of the month of Balman ilahi, year 1 [February, probably 1606], from the custody of ‘Ali it was transferred to ‘Alih.

10. [On that occasion when before?] [the vision?]/ most noble, most holy it passed .../ A’zam Khan at the sum of five thousand rupees/the price was fixed. No more./ On the date 28 Shahrivar year 5 [July 1610].

11. 524 folios.

12. God is Most Great./ 12 [?] Āzār, year 5 [December 1610], it was inspected.

13. God is Most Great./ 19 of the month of Shahrivar ilahi, year 7 [September 1612]/ from the custody of Muhammad Yusuf it was transferred to Mullā Habibullah. / Complete.

14. On the date 15 of the month of Shahrivar ilahi, year 11 [September 1616]/ from the custody of Habibullah it was transferred to Muhammad Mu’inin.

15. ... Khvājah Daulat, 9 Bāhman, year 17 [January 1624], 500 mohurs.

16. Inspected on the date 9 Bāhman ilahi, year 17 [January 1624].

17. ... it was [transferred to?] Daulat.

18. ... Khurdād ilahi, year 6, it was inspected.

19. God is Most Great./ On the date 31 Farvardin, year one [April 1628]/ it was inspected. No more.
20. God is Most Great./
On the date 25 of the month of Zil-Hijjah, year 11 [29 April 1639] of the noble royal entrnvironment, it was inspected and transferred to Khvājah Suhayl. /The slave Muhammad Šālih. 23

21. 26 Shavāl year 22 of the blessed entrnvironment, corresponding to 1058 [13 November 1648], /it was transferred to Khvājah Ni’mat./ The slave Muhammad Šālih, overseer.

22. 25 Safar, year 23 [25 February 1650] of the noble royal entrnvironment, /it was transferred from the account of Ni’mat to Khvājah Marjān. 34 /The slave Muhammad Šālih, overseer.

23. 25 Zu’l-Hijjah year 27 of the blessed entrnvironment [12 November 1653], /it was transferred from the account of Marjān to Khvājah Ikhtiyār. /The least slave Muhammad Šālih, overseer /300 mohurs./ ...25

24. Tenth Sa’ bān year 31 [24 May 1657], /from the account of Ikhtiyār it was transferred to Khvājah Hīlāl. /Folio as previously. ...[?] per page twenty-five lines of two verses.

25. 24 of the month of holy Muharram, year 41 of the blessed entrnvironment [22 August 1698], /it was transferred from the account of Suhayl to Muhammad Başjm. The least one /Muhammad Rashid, overseer. /Price/ 500 mohurs. /...26

26. Occurrence. [Twenty-fourth of the month of Muharram year 41 [22 August 1698], /it was transferred to Muhammad Başjm.] /The slave [Nūr Muhammad. Price 500 mohurs] /...26

27. [...] Muharram?] year 7 (?) of the lofty entrnvironment. /[From the account of Muhammad Başjm it was transferred to] Muḥāfīz Khān. 27

28. 27 [?] Shavāl year 16, from the account of Muḥāfīz Khān, accountant [I?] /it was transferred to Muhammad Ḥāfiz.

Description and value the same [as before].

29. On the date 29 Jumādā I, year 6, /it was transferred from the account of Muhammad Ḥāfiz to Muhammad Aḥfāz Khān. /500 mohurs.

30. 22 Shavāl [year 26 of the blessed entrnvironment, it was inspected.] /The slave ‘Abdullāh [Chalabi. No more.] 29

The Seal Imprints

On J, L and M the inscription is to be read from the bottom upwards, on K and N from the top downwards.

J. ‘lqwār/dust at the feet of/ Akbar Shāh. 10
K. ‘Abd al-Haqq/disciple of/ Shāh Ḫālid /Badīshah./ 10,37 [1628], Year one.
N. Muhīyy al-Dīn, ‘/Ali Khān. 3.
O. /Illegible, probably early

Period of Akbar

The unique series of royal seals on folio 3a has led to the assumption that the Shāhnāmah was uninterruptedly in the possession of the Mughal Emperors throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. However, the two earliest notes on folio 536b now reveal that in the course of the sixteenth century it left royal possession and passed through the hands of two or more owners. The earlier of the two (Note 6) is damaged slightly at the right-hand side. It was written in the early part (avd ‘lī) of 997 (hijrī), a year which began on 20 November 1588, at a place the name of which is partly obscured. It records a gift, which can hardly be other than that of the book, to a person the end of whose name as it appears is Muhammad Šālih, though that is preceded by what may be some kind of title or forename. Whatever his precise name or position, the recipient is alluded to as of the rank of a vīzer (vīzer-mā‘ī). The donor does not name himself 'bestowed', but with the use this shows that of Mughal so himself, since serious exten on his behalf identity is be the next note
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name himself but reveals by the use of the pronominal in jānāh and the verb balkhād, 'bestedowed', that he is the superior. Together with the use of the invocation Allāhu Akbar, this shows that the setting is the upper level of Mughal society. The donor cannot be Akbar himself, since he was unable to write to any serious extent and no scribe could have written on his behalf in such terms. The question of his identity is better considered in the discussion of the next note.

Note 7, much the longest one, describes an examination of the manuscript which took place at Agra on 14 Urdu ki气st of the regnal year 47/5 May 1602 in the presence of the Emperor Akbar. The anonymous writer, who describes himself as the slave of the court (bandah-yi āngāb), would be one of the library staff. It is possible that he is the 'Inayat the impression of whose seal (J) stands not far from the lower part of the note.32 The book is described as having been the property (az bāhait-i aswāl) of Shihāb al-Dīn Ahmad Khān. Also present were Mirzā 'Aziz Khāqān, referred to as A'zam Khān, and Āsaf Khān. In accordance with their judgement, the value of the book, which had been set at fifty mohurs, was re-estimated to be 300 mohurs—the higher figure continued to be accepted in the library later.33

Nothing quite like this conference seems to be known from any other book, but Akbar was taking well-informed advice. The two who gave their opinions were high-ranking and long-serving officials, as well as intelligent and cultivated men. Mirzā 'Aziz Khāqān, whose title is often given as Khān-i A'zam, was the son of Akbar's wet nurse Jī Jī Aṅgāna, and grew up with his foster-brother. For much of the reign he held important positions and for its last ten years he was Vakil, the highest ranking minister, who was normally at court. One of his daughters was married to Akbar's son Murād, another to Khurram, eldest son of Jahāngīr. Akbar was fond enough of him to pardon serious acts of disobedience earlier in his reign. Jahāngīr relates that his father appeared in a dream and asked him to treat Mirzā 'Aziz kindly—and although he imprisoned him several times for outright treachery, he did always forgive him. He died at an advanced age at Ahmedabad in 1633/1623–24.34 He had a reputation for learning and wisdom, and is known to have taken an interest in manuscripts and painting. He had once owned the Bihzād Album.

Āsaf Khān, the third to bear that title under the Mughals, was Mīrzā Jafar Beg, son of Bādī al-Zaman of Qazvin. Towards the middle of Akbar's reign he had left Safa'īd Iran for India, where members of his family were already in Mughal service. He attained the manṣūb-i Commander of 2,000, and from between the forty-fourth and forty-ninth years of Akbar's reign held at court the post of Divān-i Kull, the ministerial position ranking after that of Vakīl. He occupied several high offices under Jahāngīr and died in 1621/1622–13. Mughal sources represent him as a man of genius, with a remarkable memory and a real talent for poetry.35

Shihāb al-Dīn Ahmad Khān is presumably the man of this name and these titles who had a long and successful career under Akbar. A Sayyid of a family from Nishāpur he was related to Māhmūd Anga, one of Akbar's nurses. He early attained the rank of Commander of 5,000 and died in 1599–1601 as Governor of Malwa.36 Obviously he could have received the Shāhānshāh from Muḥammad Sālīh and the latter could have been given it by somebody else and, in that case, it could have come into the Royal Library by escheat after Shihāb al-Dīn's death. Yet there are other possibilities. The phrase az bāhait-i aswāl, 'from the property of', is vague. It need not imply that the book came directly from Shihāb al-Dīn but could merely mean that it was known to have been his property at some stage. In which case, perhaps it came to the Library directly from Muḥammad Sālīh, who could have given it by Shihāb al-Dīn.

After examination the manuscript was transferred from the custody of the librarian (kitābdar) Luqmān to that of 'Alī Chelāb, and the revised valuation was noted.37 A note on the privately owned Haddiṣ al-Haqqah records its transfer from Muḥammad Yūsuf, the sīlahān (financially responsible official) of the painting atelier (naqāshkhānāb) to Luqmān the privy librarian (kitābdar-i khāṣṭāh). Though the note is undated the text of the manuscript had been written in 1598/1599–1600. Evidently, now that the illustrations had been completed it was fit to enter Akbar's library.38 Presumably, Luqmān is the man described simply as kitābdar in our note 17 and the transfer of the Haddiṣ al-Haqqah took place at a date not far from that of Akbar's inspection of the Shāhānshāh. There appears to be no other mention of a kitābdar-i khāṣṭāh; nor is it clear quite what the place of such an official might be, given Abu'll-Fazl's description of
the division of Akbar’s library between Birun and Harem, which is discussed below.

The question of the valuation of the manuscript may be considered in connection with the classification of it as of the second grade of the first class, as noted on f. 3a. Seyller has discussed this system of classification and provided a list of manuscripts ranked by quality, from first to fifth grade, with valuations where they are available. Some books are specified to be first, second or third grade within the first class, some to be first or second grade within the second class. In his description of the Royal Library as organised under Akbar, Abu'l Faiz mentions the classification of manuscripts by type and quality and it may be assumed that notes of this type on the manuscripts largely date from Akbar’s reign. In many cases these notes are introduced by Alībha Akbar; the traces of script appearing above the classification on f. 3a of the Shāhānāmah are probably the remains of that phrase. However, that this practice may have continued under Jahangir is showed by the fact that in notes in his hand we find mention of manuscripts being first class, or first class, first grade (arrad-i avval). Some of the notes of classification by grade are certainly written in one and the same hand, which is not that of any of the Emperors. As for the valuations, they do not all show a close connection with the system of classification by grade. Some second-class manuscripts are among the most highly valued, while in the first class there is one worth only 100 rupees. In the case of the Shāhānāmah, the initial value of fifty mohurs, equivalent to 500 rupees in this context, which had presumably been placed on it after it had re-entered Imperial possession and before it was examined in Agra by Akbar and the others, is itself a relatively high one, placing the book certainly no lower than the second class. After its revaluation by a thousand per cent to 500 mohurs it was one of the most highly valued items in the library, surpassed by only one book rated as first grade in the first class, one in the second grade of the first class, one in the first grade of the second class, though for this a lower value of 150 mohurs is noted several times, and one recorded simply as second class. Two others of the first grade of the first class, one of them the British Library Khamshah Or. 6810, at 5,000 rupees, were its equals in monetary terms. The question of what factors influenced the valuation process within the library is discussed by Seyller. As is true with objects of artistic or sentimental interest in any period, no precise answer is possible, but it is likely that the evidence of its long association with the Mughal dynasty contributed greatly to the value of the Shāhānāmah in Mughal eyes.

The repetition of the price in later notes of inspection and transfer is not without its purpose. A person who took responsibility for a book would be liable for it. In most cases such persons had more than a single book in their care. It would be helpful to have some idea of their total liability and a record of the price at the time of the transfer confirmed that they knew the value of what they were receiving. Though it may be doubted whether the loss of a valuable manuscript would ever be met with nothing more than a demand for its value.

The word khāṣṣ, written boldly on f. 3a, represents another form of appreciation. It is found on a number of the finest manuscripts in the Mughal Library. The fundamental meaning of the word is ‘special’. In many contexts in premodern Persian it is used to imply a close connection with the ruler, and sometimes demands to be translated as ‘royal’, but that can be misleading here, for all the books in the Library were royal possessions. What is meant rather is ‘selected’, ‘outstanding’ or, indeed, ‘special’. This is shown by the way it was used under Akbar to classify other royal possessions, elephants, for instance, or pigeons: of the 20,000 and more pigeons owned by Akbar 500 were khāṣṣ. Jahangir and Shah Jahan both used khāṣṣ in this sense for particular books. Of course, these would be the books that the Emperors would wish to keep close at hand.

Period of Jahangir

Jahangir’s enthusiastic interest in books and paintings is well known, not only from his own memoirs and the accounts of foreign observers but also from the many annotations in his hand found on manuscripts and miniatures. These were not normally accompanied by his seal. Its employment on the Shāhānāmah was no doubt suggested by the existing impressions of those of Bābur and Humayūn, themselves so far unparalleled.

On many manuscripts, for instance, the Khamshah Or. 6810, a note written by Jahangir is followed by a note of Shah Jahan in close proximity, and in a whole group of such inscriptions Jahangir records that manuscripts (which had left his library of his reign, 1605). The these—then suggested in to be associa notes of insp Ağar year on 3 Ağar (Note 3) and therefore have also of the fir manuscript v No. 8 and 9

Jahangir again on 28 S 10). Unusual gold ink in a faint part have been trio clear: in the Π A’ zam the value of 5,000 rupees is most unusual this simply the presence of a number of folio quite early, Si A note of ta’līfat and dated 1610 (Note 1) of Jahangir, for the first year of Si partly due, inspected and turn. When it is but on 19 Sha Shāhānāmah w Yusuf to Mul Mull 15 Shahrivar y latter to Muḥā note begins w not. 2 That the of Jahangir is a pairs of trans recording tran tālīfat dates in a that of Shāh Ja 15, recording
(which had belonged to his father) entered his own library on the fifth of Azar in the first year of his reign, in 1014 of the Hijrah/ October 1605.\textsuperscript{42} The Shāhnāmeh does not have one of these—though the trace of a note on 3a is suggested in the previous chapter—but probably to be associated with this burst of activity are notes of inspection of various dates early in Azar year one, similar to the one on f. 536b dated 3 Azar (Note 8).\textsuperscript{43} Jahāngīr’s seal, stamped on folios 3a and 536a and dated 1015, would therefore have been applied later. On 17 Bahman, also of the first regnal year (February 1606), the manuscript was transferred from ‘Ali to Šāhīn (Note 9).\textsuperscript{44} ‘Ali is likely to be the ‘Ali Chelah, who, as has been seen, was given charge of the book towards the end of the reign of Akbar.

Nos. 8 and 9 both begin with Allahu Akbar. Jahāngīr himself looked at the manuscript again on 28 Shahrivar year 5/July 1610 (Note 10). Unusually, the record of this was written in gold ink in a loose hand. Much of the writing is faint and parts of the top and right-hand edge have been trimmed. However, the substance is clear: in the presence of the Emperor and, once again, A’zam Khān, that is Mirzā A’ziz Kokah, the value of the book was considered and set at 5,000 rupees.\textsuperscript{45} Since in these records ten rupees is most usually taken as equivalent to one mohur, this simply confirms the value agreed in the presence of Akbar. The nearby note giving the number of folios as 524 (Note 11) is likely to be quite early. Similar ones are common.

A note of inspection, beginning with the takbir and dated 12(I?) Azar year 5/December 1610 (Note 12), can also be assigned to the reign of Jahāngīr, for which must belong to the first year of Shah Jahan (Note 19) is written partly over it. Many other manuscripts were inspected during the same month.\textsuperscript{17}

When it left the care of Šāhīn is not recorded, but on 19 Shahrivar year 7/September 1612 the Shāhnāmeh was transferred from Muhammad Yūsuf to Mullā Ḥabiballah (Note 13), and on 15 Shahrivar year 11/September 1616 from the latter to Muhammad Mu’mīn (Note 14). The first note begins with the takbir; the second does not.\textsuperscript{18} That these are to be assigned to the reign of Jahāngīr is assured by the existence of similar pairs of transfers accompanied by a third recording transfer from Muhammad Mu’mīn on Šāhīn dates in a regnal year 1, which can only be that of Shah Jahan.\textsuperscript{19} To be placed next are Note 15, recording transfer to Khwajah Daulat, without mention of from whom, on 9 Bahman of the 17th year/January 1624 and Note 16 noting inspection on the same date. These too lack the takbir; like some other transfers to Daulat this one is written in a rather careless fashion. While Seyller places Daulat’s activity entirely within the reign of Shah Jahan it seems to me that in fact it began in the latter part of that of Jahāngīr and continued into the next reign.\textsuperscript{20} Nearly all, probably all, notes mentioning the name of this Daulat are dated within the first six months, the highest year noted being 21. By the twenty-first year of Shah Jahan the Šāhīn months had for some time been out of normal use in the library, indicating that the reign in question is that of Jahāngīr.\textsuperscript{25} The higher regnal years, with Šāhīn months, such as the present year 17, can therefore be taken to come from Jahāngīr’s reign.

The mutilated Note 17 appears to be a second record of transfer to Daulat, but cannot be placed precisely. Note 18, an inspection note of Khurداد Šāhīn regnal year 6, may come from the time of Jahāngīr or perhaps that of Shah Jahan.

Period of Shah Jahan

Shah Jahan’s note on folio 3a (Note 2) is ostensibly of the very day of his enthronement, and his seal that accompanies this and many other inscriptions, is dated regnal year 1 and 1037 (Seal E).\textsuperscript{46} The earliest item from the reign on folio 536b is the impression of the seal of ‘Abd al-Haqq, muṣri, (disciple) of Shah Jahan (Seal K), dated regnal year 1 and 1037. This stands below a record of inspection opening with the takbir and dated 31 Farvardin year 1/April 1628 (Note 14). The seal is found in several manuscripts near notes of inspection dated in the early months of regnal year 1\textsuperscript{17} and this helps to confirm that the notes also belong to Shah Jahan’s reign.

Who held the book at the beginning of the reign is not recorded. On 25 Zu‘l-Hijjah year 11/29 April 1639 it was inspected and transferred to Khwajah Suhayl, as noted by the ‘slave’ Muhammad Sadiq (Note 20), who, to judge by similar later signatures, may have been a muṣri, overseer or inspector, in the library. The hijri month appears for the first time here; the Šāhīn months have evidently fallen out of use. There are a number of similar notes recording transfers to Suhayl at nearby dates in the same regnal year and some of them are certainly in the same bold hand.\textsuperscript{28} However, this one is unusual.
in certain respects. It is the only one which begins Allāhu 'Akbar, the last appearance of the invocation in this manuscript; and it is the only one which is signed by Muhammad ʿṢādiq. The other also helpfully provide the hijri year, 1048, confirming that they belong to the period of Shah Jahān. On some manuscripts, a second note of the same or nearby date is found transferring the book to 'the slave of the Court (bandah-yi daqīq) Suḥayl', a formula which indicates that these notes were written by Suḥayl himself. It is unusual for a transferee to personally accept the transfer in this way. In some cases a third record of a transfer to Suḥayl accompanies the other two, anonymous this time and of a slightly later date.

The later part of the reign of Shah Jahān is represented by a series of transfers which are comparatively straightforward. All those entrusted with the book are, like Suḥayl, called Khwājah, a title discussed later. The transfer from Suḥayl, who had received the book in year 11, was made we are not informed. On 26 Shawal, regnal year 22, it was transferred to Khwājah Niʿmat (Note 21). The note, and the parallel ones, are unusual in also giving the hijri year, 1058. The equivalent in the Christian era is 13 November 1648. On 20 Safar year 23/25 February 1650 the Shāhānāmah was transferred from Niʿmat to Khwājah Marjān (Note 22) and on 25 Zuʿl-Hijjah year 27/12 November 1653 from Marjān to Khwājah Iḵtiyār (Note 23).

All three of these transactions were recorded by the 'slave' Muhammad Ṣāliḥ, who describes himself as muṣārīf. Above these and perhaps associated with Note 18 is the impression of the seal of Muhammad ʿAlī Shahjāhān (Seal I), dated 1590 and regnal year 14, which occurs next to the similar entry on several other manuscripts. Next, on 10 Shaʿbān year 31/24 May 1657, not long before the end of Shah Jahān's reign, comes the transfer from Iḵtiyār to Khwājah Hīlāl (Note 24). This note, like some others in the same set, is unusual in giving physical details, including the number of lines per page. Also to be assigned to near the end of the reign is the seal of ʿlī ʿtimād Khān, 'slave of Shah Jahān', (Seal M) dated regnal year 26 and 1063 hijri. Impressions are numerous elsewhere. He is known to have acted for a time as dārūḡah or superintendent of the library.

As has already been mentioned, Abuʾl Fażl records that part of Akbar's library was held in the Birūn, the outer part of the king's domestic establishment, and part within the Harem.

It appears that the Shāhānāmah, and many other of the finest manuscripts were held for long periods, notably in the reign of Shah Jahān, in the Harem Department. In Shah Jahān's first year the Hālīz Or. 14139 was transferred from Anbar, the tabwīldar of the Birūn Library to Daulat, the tabwīldar of that of the Maḥbūb, i.e. the harem. The date is given in hijri as well as tabār form: 12 Mihār and 5 Saḥā 1038/4 October 1628. A Divān of Jamī was transferred in the reverse direction, from Khwājah Daulat, tabwīldar of the Harem to Khwājah Anbar on 11 Khurābād tabār in regnal year 2, no doubt of Shah Jahān. The honorific title Khwājah was quite widely used in the Mughal period but was applied in particular to eunuchs. Khwājah-sārā, the usual polite term for eunuch, itself indicates the association of eunuchs with the sārāy, the seraglio or harem. Khwājah Daulat's position as tabwīldar of the harem also suggests that he was one. All the transfers of the Shāhānāmah which can be dated to Shah Jahān's reign involve persons entitled Khwājah. All of the Khwājahs have names which, with their ironic implications, were regarded as particularly fitting for eunuchs, especially those of African origin, ones implying brightness (Suḥayl, the star Canopus; Hīlāl, the new moon), colour and high value (Marjān, coral), wealth (Niʿmat, fortune (Daulat) and power (Iḵtiyār). The harem did have a large female staff, including guards, and, according to Abuʾl Fażl, the khwājah-sārā occupied a position between the women of the harem and the outer guard of soldiers. That the finest books were kept in the harem agrees with what we know of the part played by women in Shah Jahān's life. The contemporary chronicler 'Abd al-Hamīd Lāhūrī provides a description of Shah Jahān's daily routine which confirms that he was read to within the harem. After the evening prayer and disposing of any outstanding business he used to retire to the harem (nasḥbāy). After listening to music for two or three ghāris he would go to bed and then he was read to until he went to sleep. The books chosen, according to this account, were the histories of the prophets, saints, and kings, known for their instructive nature. One favourite was the Zafarnāmā, on the life of the Emperor's ancestor Timūr. As has been said, on the Garrett Zafarnāmā Shah Jahān noted that it should always be with him and frequently read.

Period of Aurangzeb

During the latter continued to be revealed by the fact that there is much less than the seal of the Shāhānāmah. On 24 Muharram year 11 (22 August) from Suḥayl to 'Abd al-Raḥīm by the muḥārī the figure of entries on the same day, preceding one note represent procedure; hence that he may be recorder. For the last, Suḥayl can be noted 20, datir but the name: this was a eunuch.

After Aurangzeb

The remaining precisely, but t of them must i century, Seals i
The other work mentioned was the Bābarmānāh. The readers are described as 'eloquent-voiced members of the (royal) company (mašfīyān-i shirā-bayān) situated ‘behind the curtain' (dar paš-i pašah). We know that some women, members of the Royal Family are of course the best known, were literate, and women must have handled some of the books in the library. It is not impossible that some at least of the readers referred to here were female. On the other hand, so far as is revealed by the existing records, the administrative staff of the Imperial Library was entirely male and it is probable that the eunuchs who had charge of the manuscripts, and perhaps also others, were also employed to read from them.

Period of Aurangzeb

During the long reign of Aurangzeb, which continued until 1707, the level of activity revealed by the annotations on manuscripts is much less than under his predecessors: other than the seal on f. 3a, only two more items from the Shāhnāmeh can be securely assigned to it. On 24 Muharram of the forty-first year of the reign (22 August 1698) the transfer of the book from Subayl to Muhammad Baqir was recorded by the musafir Muhammad Rashid (Note 25). To be associated with this is the fragment (Note 26) which, from the unusual opening can be restored from the parallels as a record of transfer to Muhammad Baqir of the same date as Note 25, written by ‘the slave’ Nūr Muhammad and ending with a statement of the value of the manuscript, the figure being written in sīyāq. The similar pair of entries on the Freer Hafiz Aurang are dated to the same day, those on the Bihād Album to the preceding one. The Nūr Muhammad of these notes represents an extra layer of bureaucratic procedure; his use of the word vaqī'ī suggests that he may have been described as a vaqī'ī ah-niris or recorder. Evidently this innovation did not last. Subayl can hardly be the Subayl named in Note 20, dating from some sixty years earlier, but the name suggests that he too may have been an eunuch.

After Aurangzeb

The remaining items are not easy to place precisely, but the evidence suggests that most of them must be assigned to the eighteenth century. Seals from later than the death of Aurangzeb which appear on a number of manuscripts are evidently those of senior officials with some responsibility for the library. One instance is that of Arshad Khân, ‘the house-born servant (khānāhād) of Shāh Alām, dated reign year 2 and 1121/1709–10. Another, represented by two different seals, is Lutfullā Khân Saqīq, whose name occurs in chronicles and whose career is briefly described in the Mo‘āzir al-Unsār. He frequented the court of Shāh Alām and a seal with his name dated 1119/1707–8 is found on a royal copy of the Rāmāyana. His tenure of important positions at court alternated with periods of disgrace. He served Muhammad Shah for a time as Khānsāman or Steward, and by him was given the high mansab of 6,000 and the titles Salam al-Daulah Bahadur Mubakhtvir Jang. His seal with these titles and the date, probably 1 45/1732–33, appears on several manuscripts. His position of Steward would seem to have involved some kind of supervision of the Royal Library. As for the Shāhnāmeh, the seal of Mu‘tayy al-Din ‘Ali Khân (Seal N), dated reign year 3, can, like those just considered, be placed in the eighteenth century, in this case probably in the reign of Muhammad Shah. A note mentioning someone of the same name, likely to be the same person, is dated 1135/1722–23, corresponding to reign year 5 or 6 of Muhammad Shah. A Yūnuf u Zulaykhā taken at Bijapur, and discussed below, has a different seal which includes the name Muhiyy al-Din ‘Ali Khân, with the addition of the title Bāshār, though no date is given. This is likely to be a later seal of the same man. Year 3 of Muhammad Shah falls in 1133–4 and 1721–22.

Next to be considered are a series of transfers, from Muhammad Baqir to Muhāfīz Khān, incomplete, but which the parallels indicate took place in a reign year 7 (Note 27), from Muḥāfīz Khān to Muhammad Ḥāfīz in reign year 16 (Note 28), and from Muhammad Ḥāfīz to Muhammad Ḥafiz in reign year 5 (Note 29).

Evidence for the eighteenth-century dating of the series is provided by a copy of jāmā‘ī Yūnuf u Zulaykhā in the Bibliothèque nationale, taken at the surrender of the city of Bijapur, which then finally fell to Aurangzeb in September 1686. A note states that as booty from Bijapur it was entrusted to a certain Muhammad Fāzil on 3 Rajah, year 31/23 April 1689; a second similar note, seemingly of the same date, names Khwajah
Fazl, presumably the same person. On 1 Ju'mada I year 49, 1117/21 August 1703, close to the end of Aurangzeb's reign, it was transferred from Muhammad Fazl to somebody whose name is not fully legible. The remaining notes all come from regnal years under 31 and therefore must belong to later reigns. Two are of particular interest in this context. One records the transfer of the manuscript from Mughal Khan to Muhammad Hafiz, in this respect similar to Note 28, but dated to a regnal year 23, rather than 16. After Aurangzeb, the next Emperor to reign for more than twenty-three years, or even sixteen, was Muhammad, under whom these notes were presumably written. The second transfer was from Muhammad Hafiz to Muhammad Ahfaz, similar to Note 29, but dated to regnal year 3 rather than 6. This presumably takes us into yet another reign.

A terminus ante quem for the series is provided by the manuscript of the Fathnama-i Nur Jahan in the Bibliothèque nationale, evidently quite a late addition to the library. It records transfer to Mughal Khan in regnal year 4, from him to Muhammad Hafiz in year 25 and from the latter to Muhammad Ahfaz in year one. It had left the Royal Library and was in Lucknow by 1177/1763, early in the reign of Shah Alam II (1759–1806).

As already noted, parallels indicate that the mutilated Note 27 recorded a transfer from Muhammad Bakhtr to Muhammad Khan in regnal year 7, probably in Muhammad. It is clearly later than the reign of Aurangzeb, or of his successors, Farrukhshyar's reign extended into a seventh year, but the only other possibility is the far longer one of Muhammad (1719–48), which seems more likely. His seventh regnal year falls in 1137–38/1726–27.

As argued above, Note 28 recording transfer from Mughal Khan to Muhammad Hafiz on 23 (1) Shawwal, year 16 (1146)/29 (2) March 1733 can be placed in the reign of Muhammad Shah. Note 29, transferring the book from Muhammad Hafiz to Muhammad Ahfaz on 29 Ju'mada I, regnal year 6, must then belong to a later reign. Those of Muhammad's immediate successors, Ahmad and Alamgir II, both extending into a seventh year, are possibilities. No transfers from Muhammad Ahfaz are recorded in Seyller's corpus.

One final item, Note 30, cannot be precisely placed. The name of the writer can be completed from the parallels as 'Abdullah Chalabi (Chelebi) and the regnal year is probably to be restermed as the twenty-sixth. Some two dozen similar notes from almost every month of the same year are known, representing a major effort to inscribe the library. The reign referred to cannot be earlier than that of Aurangzeb, for one occurs on a manuscript which had belonged to Daru Shukoh and is recorded as having been entrusted to Lutfullah, one of the library officials, in Ramadan 1069/June 1659. This indicates that it had been acquired with the possessions of the brother whom Aurangzeb had recently defeated and whom he was about to put to death. It is at present uncertain whether these notes belong to the reign of Aurangzeb or that of Muhammad Shah.

There are no obvious signs that the system set up by Akbar continued to operate much after the middle of the eighteenth century. The later Mughal Emperors were cultivated men and possessed books, but the earlier organisation of the Imperial Library was no longer maintained and most of its more valuable items were dispersed considerably before the British took control of Delhi in 1803, and even longer before they finally deposed the last of the Emperors in 1858.

As is well known, after Aurangzeb's death the Empire entered a long period of confusion and decline. Like other institutions the library suffered. It has been said that Ghulam Qadir Rohilla, in the course of his brief reign of terror in the palace at Delhi in 1788, 'despoiled the imperial library of many of its treasures'. However, the dispersal of the library had certainly begun much earlier and was probably far advanced by this time. As early as 1712, in the struggle for the throne after the death of Shah Alam I, the desperate need for money to pay Jahandar Shah's troops led to the disorderly dispersal of long-handled valuables and stores kept in the palace in the Red Fort at Delhi. Books are not mentioned on this occasion. Successive occupations of Delhi by Nadir Shah, Ahmad Shah Abdali, and Maratha armies did not last long but certainly provided opportunities for the removal of books. The oppression and maltreatment of several figurehead Emperors at the hands of their own over-mighty officials was probably even more significant. We are told that in the reign of Ahmad Shah (1748–54), when, as so often, the treasury was empty, all articles remaining in the imperial stores in Delhi, including the library, were sold off in
the attempt to satisfy the unpaid soldiers. Shākir Khan, our source for this, was the son of the Lutfullāh Khan Šādīq, whose own connection with the library has been discussed above, and, like his father, was well-informed about the royal establishment. The fort at Agra, which still contained a huge accumulation of military stores and other valuables, was cleaned out by the Jats under Šuraj Mal in 1761. The silver plating of the royal palace there had been stripped off before this, and the unpaid garrison had been supporting itself by the sale of vessels of precious metal. Several of the best known illustrated manuscripts are known to have left the collection before 1788. The British Library’s Ḥāfīz Or. 14139 had been presented to Ahmad Shāh Durānī as early as 1168/1755, even before the Afghan ruler’s first occupation of Delhi; the Khamsah Or. 6810 entered the library of Richard Johnson in 1782.

As for Muhammad Žāki’s Šāhnāmah, it was once owned by Šalār Jang (Note 3). In the reign of Ahmad Shāh he was living in Delhi together with his elder brother. Thus he could have had the opportunity to purchase items in the sale of royal property including, one may speculate, the Šāhnāmah, long before his death in 1787.  

3
Notes

1 For the Persian texts see appendix D, Notes 6–30 and 33–50.

3 A careful reading of the manuscript shows that the portions of margin trimmed away were relatively narrow.

5 For the Persian texts see appendix D, Notes 6–30 and 33–50.

6 A careful reading of the manuscript shows that the portions of margin trimmed away were relatively narrow.
Jalālīn̄ḡ̱'s viewing of the Ḥāfiz Or. 14139, which includes the words 'it passed through the most noble, most holy, most exalted vision (an naqūs al-safīfā; ajkīla tawāsul) a 'llī garū'a'. A note mentioning a royal viewing (by Hāramqāb) on the Khunā Khān Or. 6810, has it passed through the most noble vision (an naqīs al-safīfī garū'a).

Among the symbols used to indicate that an entry is complete, and thus to prevent any addition, is a mark like the Arabic numeral 5, which apparently represents the word jāla. It also occurs at the end of Notes 2 and 19 and originally, it can be assumed, stood in Note 30.

The word jāla, which means 'individual' or 'item', has also the less common meanings of 'sheet' or 'folio', which is standard in similar annotations on the royal manuscripts. The more common variant is found in other notes, e.g. Notes 16 and 24.

21 Xana, 'it is complete', is found at the end of manuscripts, often, as here, in abbreviated form.

22 Trace of beginning to right.

23 An obscene word to the lower left does not seem to be part of this.

24 On similar entries Marjīn has been read as Mir Khān and Mir Jan but Marjīn, 'council', is used as a name and is one suitable for this context, as discussed in the commentary. 'Account here' and in several other items below translates ajman, plural of ajmīn, which is probably best understood in a sense not far from 'sum of money' or 'financial obligation'. The books in this collection are often, to speak in terms of their function for which he was responsible.

25 What seems to be an extra word stands between the two elements of 'Qā'ir Hajj, but notes of a similar transfer dated two days earlier on other manuscripts (Bālākh Album, Khunā Khān Or. 6810, Hajj Or. 14139) suggest that this is merely a minor verbatim blunder. The final line remains undeciphered. It appears, like the price in mohurs just above, to be in the ajqīl accounting column. Notes 25 and 26 end in the same way.

26 Most of the note has been trimmed off but with the help of the unusual opening word the text can be restored from parallels, which accompany a second note of the same date like No. 25, which partially duplicates its contents. See the commentary. 'Qā'ir', here translated 'occurrence', is probably to be interpreted as a conventional heading to the entry, somewhat like 'item'.

27 Only the ends of the lines survive but the uncommon epithet willi 'lefty' for the evocative and the name of the transference find parallels in manuscripts often associated with the Shafī'īs. There can be little doubt the manuscript was transferred from Muhammad Bākīr and that the year should be 7; the month is probably Muharram but the actual day is uncertain. See commentary.

28 The word after tāḥīslāḥ is found in the parallels, and occasionally in notes referring to other officials, as mālik 'ulūm, 'deceased', an interpretation that is graphically attractive. However, several notes record transfers from Muharram Bākīr to Muhammad Ḥāfiz in year 23 and in these the word does not occur.

29 Ḥāfiz was read in the publication of the Ferey Ḥafiz chained. This word is normally used to mean an audit accountant, and some kind of accounting responsibility is conceivable as the context of the library. 'Description' here translates takhliṣ, literally 'face'. The rather unusual application to manuscripts derives from its use in army affairs where it refers to the record at review of the appearance and personal details of individuals (and their horses) in a descriptive roll or chihabānīnāh. See, e.g. Ferey Ḥafiz, text, ed. Börschmann, I, p. 190 and, for ajqīl chihāb, p. 191.

30 For the restoration see Seyller, 'Inspection', p. 310 and fig. 24 etc.

31 Professor Seyller informs me that the seal is dated 1011/1602-3.

32 A scrawl which Ḥāfiz al-Sulṭān is recorded as being (one of) the librarians in the reign of Akbar (Bālākh unī, Manṣūr al-Jawāhīrī, ed. Ahmad 'Ali, Kāhir al-Dīn Ahmad and W. Nasiru Lees, Calcutta, 1866–69, III, pp. 283–84; tr. George Ranking, W. H. Lowe and Sir Walsley Hay, Calcutta 1884–1923, III, pp. 391)., and the name Taiyārīlī is found in notes of transfer for a long period in the latter part of Akbar's reign and the very beginning of Jalālīn̄ḡ̱'s (Seyller, 'Inspection', p. 348).

33 Seyller has drawn attention to revivals of other manuscripts, 'Inspection', pp. 258–79.


36 Börschmann, ' in , I, pp. 332–33; Kāhir al-Dīn Ahmad and W. Nasiru Lees, Calcutta, 1866–69, III, pp. 283–84; tr. George Ranking, W. H. Lowe and Sir Walsley Hay, Calcutta 1884–1923, III, pp. 391), and the name Taiyārīlī is found in notes of transfer for a long period in the latter part of Akbar's reign and the very beginning of Jalālīn̄ḡ̱'s (Seyller, 'Inspection', p. 348).

37 A note in the title-hand on the Hijār Or. 14139 records its transfer from Lughūnā to 'Ali Chehab (to be read as rather than Hukmā) in Agra in the next month, Khaṣīdī.

38 Seyller, 'Inspection', pp. 348, 350 and fig. 14, where ṣā'īl al-tamyūl is clear.


40 Ferey, I, p. 110; tr., I, p. 130.

41 Seyller, p. 281, fig. 3 (Ross Bein), p. 395, fig. 5 (Windsor Naval'i).

42 The Ferey Ḥafiz chained was valued at 5,000 rupees. If it was classified the record is missing; it may have entered the library after the practice had fallen out of use.

43 In the one recorded case when a book in the library was mishap Bālākh unī, who was considered responsible, was ordered to be deprived of his maintenance-grant as well as to return the book, at all costs, Seyller, 'Inspection', p. 351.

44 Ferey, I, p. 217; tr., I, p. 312.

45 See, e.g., the notes in their hands on the Gazīr Zihrūsīnā and the Bālākh Album. The term was used for the books lost and recovered by Hārīn̄ḡ̱, as mentioned above.

47 In addition to Ot. 6810, the Bilādī Album and Hājī Or. 14139.

Under Akbar’s disposition of the alīn era, regnal years began with Naurūz, marking the entry of the sun into Aries in late March. The period between his enthronement and Naurūz was included in regnal year 1. (Askaridah, II, pp. 18, tr., II, pp. 32–33). Similarly for Jangirī, whose enthronement took place on 20 Jamādī II 1014 / 2 November 1605, in Abān, the eighth Persian month. Azār is the ninth month. There was thus a second Azār in Jangirī’s regnal year 1, but that fell in 1015/1606.

48 E.g. Garrett Zafarmand, Bilādī Album, Khasmā Or. 6810.

49 Similar ones of the same date in Bilādī Album, Khasmā Or. 6810. Bahman is the eleventh lunar month, falling in January–February and Jangirī’s first regnal year included two Bahman, the first in 1014/1605, the second in the next year. See note 47 above.

50 ‘Azīz Kukah, though nominally Governor of Gujarat, was in Agra with Jangirī at this time. Tārīkh, pp. 88, 95, 105; tr., 1, pp. 153, 165, 183–84.

51 E.g. Garrett Zafarmand, Bilādī Album, Khasmā Or. 6810.

52 Corresponding pairs with nearby dates are found in Bilādī Album, Khasmā Or. 6810, Hājī Or. 14139; dates of 13 are very close; those of 14 spread over 28 May to 17 June.

53 E.g. Šamsūn, private possession (Seyller, ‘Inspection’, pp. 304–5, fig. 26); Sfahānī, City of British Museum and Art Gallery (Seyller, p. 289).


55 In confirmation, a copy of the Divān of Shībuḥ Husain Bāyamī was transferred from Dastān in Istanbul in a twelfth regnal year and back to him in Bahram alīhī of a twenty-first one, but also bears a note in the hand of Shīb Jalānī recording that he gave it to his son Dār Shīb Jalānī on 10 Ramazān, corresponding to 24 Farvardīn in his fifth regnal year (14 April1632). See Seyller, ‘Inspection’, p. 317; Sfahānī, Persian Courts, p. 130, where the fifth regnal year is incorrectly given as the second.

56 Seyller, ‘Inspection’, p. 245, has pointed out that it is impossible that all Shīb Jalānī’s inscriptions dated to his enthronement were in fact written on that day and the wording does not necessarily imply that they were. As with Akbar and Jangirī, the first regnal year of Shīb Jalānī included the period between the enthronement itself and the subsequent Naurūz, so that Bahman (January–February) was included twice. This may explain why the hijri date was given. As noted earlier, at about his tenth year Shīb Jalānī adopted regnal years based on the Muslim year.

57 E.g., Garrett Zafarmand, Khasmā Or. 6810; Hājī Album.

58 E.g., Khasmā Or. 6810; Hājī Or. 14139; Bilādī Album; Hājī Album.

59 E.g., as preceding note, plus Hādīqat al-μqābīṭ.

60 E.g., Hājī Or. 14139; Bilādī Album; Hājī Album; Hādīqat al-μqābīṭ. Cf. Garrett Zafarmand.

61 Parallel to all three transactions with the same or nearby dates are found in the Khasmā Or. 6810; to Notes 21 and 22 in the Bilādī Album; to Note 21 in the Hājī Or. 14139; and the Hādīqat al-μqābīṭ.

62 E.g., Bilādī Album; Khasmā Or. 6810; Hājī Or. 14139; Hādīqat al-μqābīṭ.

63 Garrett Zafarmand, Bilādī Album; Khasmā Or. 6810; Hājī Or. 14139 (Seyller restores as 11); Hājī Album. Of the same or the following day.


66 Cf. the Persian proverb: Bar ‘aṣb minhī nan i sangi kīffī. ‘By inversion the negro is called Kīffī (Camphor, symbol of whiteness)’. Of course those names were not entirely confined to eunuchs.

67 7, i, p. 40, tr. l, p. 47.


70 On the Hājī Album of the year Nīr Muhammad’s name is apparently illegible, but it must have been 41.

71 E.g., Khasmā Or. 6810; Bilādī Album; Hādīqat al-μqābīṭ; Hājī Album, presumably.


73 Seyller, ‘Inspection’, pp. 344–5 and fig. 75.

74 E.g., Khasmā Or. 6810; Hādīqat al-μqābīṭ.

75 Other impressions, e.g.: Khasmā Or. 6810; Hādīqat al-μqābīṭ.


80 Seyller, ‘Inspection’, pp. 341–42. The parallels indicate that the transfer must have been to Muhammad Hājī rather than the Muhammad Khan printed here. The date 1177 is in a note of inspection and transfer map inspection and a Mughal Library thorough, but it sometimes used, other collections Shīb Jalānī, thus as Emperor, was he appears never S1 Parallel to Ot. 6810, Hājī Moharram year ‘Qu’drāthī year 7.

82 Parallel to Ot. 6810, both 14 Z. A., Amurī, 28 Shaw
and transfer made at Lucknow. The inspection and control system of the Mughal Library was exceptionally thorough, but similar annotations were sometimes used, if less consistently, in other collections. For twelve years Shah 'Alam, though generally recognized as Emperor, was absent from Delhi, but he appears never to have visited Lucknow.


82 Parallel: Bihai Alhous, Khamus Or. 6810, both 14 Zu'll-Qa'dah, year 16; Hafl Asnaq, 28 Shavsi, Hadiqat al-Haqiqah, 6 Zu'll-Qa'dah. In all these notes, and others of the same year, Muhtasir Khan's name is followed by the word read here as munafiq.

83 Parallel: Khamus Or. 6810, same month—only one in the total group.

84 Parallel: Khamus Or. 6810, 26 Shavsi; Hafl Asnaq, same day, Seyller, 'Inspection', pp. 287–88, Gulistan, Art and History Trust (Illustrated Soudavar, Persian Court, 36a-c), 27 Shavsi.

85 Seyller, 'Inspection', p. 316, Batulvandul.

86 Percival Spear, Twilight of the Mughals, Cambridge, 1951, p. 60.


90 Though it should also be mentioned that, in the violence leading up to the deposition and murder of Ahmad Shah the houses of the brothers were plundered and they were imprisoned (Sarkar, Fall, I, p. 274).