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Chapter-I

Treatment of History by Muhammad Hādī Khān Kāmwar in Tāzkirat-us-Salātīn Chaghtā’ī

This important work has to be seen in the perspective of the historical works in Persian began to appear in India with the establishment of Muslim rule during 12th century. It revived and enriched exponentially during the Mughal rule and continued till eighteenth century¹. Despite the decline of Mughal power and consequent lack of official patronage it enriched to both method and coverage². Withstanding turmoil of every day existence, historians of this period did not allow the quality of their works to deteriorate³. Several eyewitness accounts were written by individual effort. Among them noteworthy is Tāzkirat-us-Salātīn Chaghtā’ī⁴.

Tāzkirat-us-Salātīn Chaghtā’ī is written by Muhammad Hadi Kāmwar Khān during early eighteenth century. It covers the history from the origin of the Turks to the six R.Y of Muhammad Shāh. The author had first served in the Deccan during the reign of Aurangzeb. After his death, he came to Delhi and held several post in central government. Consequently, he found an opportunity to collect original data for this contemporary historical work. The importance of this source lay in the fact that it was not written under the patronage of any Emperor or noble. Its contemporary account commences from the death of Aurangzeb till 6th R.Y of Muhammad Shāh. It is reflection of an impartial observer⁵.

By birth, author belonged to a Hindū family but later accepted Islam and became Muslim. His original name was Chandidās⁶. In the preface of the book, he

---

¹Hasan Muhibbul, Historians of Medieval India, op. cit., p. V.
⁴Khān Muhammad Hādī Kāmwar, Tazkirat-us-Salātīn Chaghtā’ī, Manuscript number University Farsia Akhbār 40/1& 40/2, Maulana Azad Library, A.M.U, Aligarh.
⁵Muhammad Hādī Kāmwar Khān, Haft Gulfišan, Rotograph No. 23 & 88, C.A.S, Department of History A.M.U, Aligarh, ff. 3a-12a.
narrates the story and reason of his conversion. Once, in the reign of Aurangzeb (city Aurangabād), he fell ill severely and was being disturbed for a year. As a consequence, he was confined to bed and no medical treatment was effective. A well wishers, seeing his condition believed that this disease would not be cured by medicine, instead it required some sort of prayers and attending it continuously might recover him. He did accordingly, within a few days the marks of recovery and purity (ṣḥifā wa safā) made their appearance in the body of the writer and after forty days he returned to the normal state.\(^7\)

Kāmwar Khān claims to be an excellent calligraphist and was a pupil of Kifayat Khān Jāfar (Khushnawis), whenever he got audience of the Emperor he offered at least two specimens of this writings in Ṭāliq and Shikast\(^8\).

The author calls himself a Khānazād\(^9\) however it is not possible to trace any of his ancestors or elders in imperial service. In July 1698, Bakhshi-ul-Mulk Bahramand Khān introduced him to the Emperor Aurangzeb and by virtue of his being Khānazād, through this way; he received a rank of 100/5 zāt and suwār\(^10\). Simultaneously, he was ordered to accompany Mir Muhammad Husain, the deputy dīwān of the Deccan and the real (asalta) dīwān of Bijapur and send to Aurangabad where he remained for the two years\(^11\). On 22\(^{nd}\) April 1701 A.D, when the Emperor was camping near Parnala\(^12\), Kāmwar Khān arrived from Aurangabād at the court. Subsequently, he was ordered to join the staff of Mir Muhammad Husain dīwān of the army which was deputed to invest the forts of Chandigarh, Dandigarh and Nandergarh. 2000 ashrafis, to be distributed to the Fath-ullāh Khāni Mughal, were handed over to him personally by the Emperor within two or three days\(^13\).

\(^7\) Muhammad Hādi Kāmwar Khān, Taẕkirat-us-Salātīn Chaghtō‘ī, op. cit., f. 3a.
\(^8\)Ibid., f. 293a.
\(^9\)Khānazād: Literal meaning; those born of persons already slaves of the Emperor, a primary claim on mansab was thought to vest in the sons and close kinsman (khānazād) of those already in service, ‘Ali M. Athar, Apparatus of Empire, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 1985, p. XXI.
\(^10\)Taẕkirat-us-Salātīn Chaghtō‘ī, op. cit., f. 289b.
\(^11\)Ibid., f. 290a.
\(^12\)Sarkār Parnala is called also called Hathi Shāh Durg after the name of its principal seat and fort. Shivaji’s troops occupied Parnala in 1673 and must have been in control of the entire territory of this sarkār from then on wards, An Atlas of Mughal Empire, New Delhi, 1986.
\(^13\)Taẕkirat-us-Salātīn Chaghtō‘ī, op. cit., f. 294b.
In June 1701 A.D, Mir Muhammad Husain was transferred to the dīwāni of Bidar, and author in the capacity of peshkār\(^{14}\) was ordered to accompany him. But the sudden demise of Mir Muhammad Husain further required his presence at Aurangabad and till his return to Delhi; the author was directed to act as the deputy dīwān of Bidar\(^ {15}\). During May and June he entered into the service of dīwān ‘Āla, as the keeper of public records and official documents and simultaneously he was promoted to 200/10\(^ {16}\).

What happened to him during the period of the wars of succession among the sons of Aurangzeb is mostly unknown to us. However, from a minor reference of the text, it seems that he was present in the Imperial camp when Prince Muhammad ‘Āzam Shāh, by the Emperor’s order left for Malwā. After the death of the Emperor, in all possibility forced by the circumstances, he was trapped in and consequently he had to sided with Muhammad ‘Āzam Shāh\(^ {17}\). In the battle of Jaju, ‘Āzam Shāh became the victim of his own haste and imprudence, but the fate of Kāmwar Khān remained unaffected. Bahādur Shāh followed the policy of conciliation and joining ‘Āzam Shāh was not treated as an offence. All those who presented themselves to him were readmitted into the imperial service\(^ {18}\).

The author also managed to approach Mahabat Khān who was the third bakhshī and the son of wazīr Mun‘im Khān. Sometime in July 1707 A.D, during the 1\(^{st}\) R.Y. of the Emperor Bahādur Shāh, Mahabat Khān introduced him to the Emperor and on his recommendation, author’s mansab was increased by 100 and he was promoted upto 300/10\(^ {19}\). About this time, he came in contact with Rafi‘-ush-Shān\(^ {20}\) and joined his staff. He remained in the service of the Prince, holding different positions till the latter’s death in the civil war at Lahore\(^ {21}\).

\(^{14}\)The duty of a Peshkār was to work as an assistant or subordinate officer.
\(^{15}\)Taṣkīrat-us-Salātīn Chaghtā‘ī, op. cit., f. 295a.
\(^{16}\)Ibid., f. 302b.
\(^{17}\)Muhammad Hādi Kāmwar Khān, Taṣkīrat-us-Salātīn Chaghtā‘ī, Eds. Muzaffar ‘Ālam. This edited portion commences from the accession of Bahadur Shāh to the end of this work, Bombay, 1980, pp.5-7.
\(^{18}\)Ibid., p. 17.
\(^{19}\)Ibid., p. 18.
\(^{20}\)Ibid., p. 81.
\(^{21}\)Ibid., pp. 150-158.
On 1st November 1707 A.D., the occasion of Ibrāhīm Khān’s appointment as the Deputy Governor of Kabul, he was made Sazāwal (monthly revenue collector) in the province. On July 30th, 1708, at the recommendation of Raft’-ush-Shān, he was promoted to 400/30 with the title of Kāmwar Khān, and on top of this existing office, he was appointed Mīr Sāmānī22 of the household of Prince Muhammad Ibrāhīm23. He remained attached to this office during the Emperor Bahādur Shāh in the Deccan, and after two and half year, on January 1711 A.D., he was transferred to the Mīr Samani of the household of Raft’-ud-Daulā. He received honour of band (girdle belt) and Khil’at from Emperor and prince respectively24. He also got his promoted to 500/30 on August, 1711. Simultaneously (August 1712 A.D), he was made the Mīr Samani of Raft’-ud-Darjāt25 and 3rd December 1712 A.D, he replaced Khwaja ‘Abd-ur-Rahīm as the Princes dīwān-i-tān and Bakhshi with a rank of 700/300.

The death of his patron Prince Raft’-us-Shān affected heavily his fortune. But his rank remained stationary till he retired into an uneventful and isolated life. During the reign of Emperor Jahāndār Shāh, he never expected any favour from him, but the news of Farrukh Siyar’s approach for the contest of throne against his uncle Emperor Jahāndār Shāh, must have delighted him. Author expected that Farrukh Siyar’s accession to the throne would bring him big fortune. With this calculation, he chose to approach Samsām-ud-Daulā Khān-i-Daurān26 to facilitate his access to the Emperor and perhaps did get more than what he had expected. Other than this, at the same time, he separated himself from the Saiyid Brothers who dominated the court politics, for the next eight years.

On November 1714 A.D, on the recommendation of Khān-i-Daurān, besides dīwānī of the house hold of ‘Azmat-un-Nisa Begum, he was entrusted with the office of Amīn of the Haft Chawkī and the Dāgh-o-tashiha of the servants related to the

22It was also called Khān-i-Sāmān or imperial steward he used to organise public event and was responsible for supply of food, The Apparatus of Empire, op. cit., P. XXV.
23Tażkīrat-us-Salātīn Chaghtā’ī, op. cit., p. 32.
24Ibid., p. 86.
25Ibid., p. 129.
26During the reign of Emperor Farrukh Siyar, he was promoted to the rank of 6000/6000 with the title of Khān-i-Daurān. He was appointed on the post the daragha-i-khas and also appointed the bakhshi of the wālā shāhī, Khān Shāhnawāz, Ma’asir-ul-Umarā, Eds. Maulvi ‘Abdul Rahīm, A.S.B, Calcutta, 1888, Vol I pp. 819-825.
topkhāna. Simultaneously, 400 out of his zāt rank were converted into cash (naqdī). 27 For the next few years; he seems to have been watching with great concern the confusion and disorder caused by the conflict between the Emperor Farrukh Siyar and the Saiyids. In the mean time, having assessed the changes in the position of various sections of the nobility which followed the struggle, it seems, he managed to win the favour of Zafar Khān 28 who was respectable to both the Emperor and the Saiyid Brothers. On 25th February 1719 A.D, through the efforts of Zafar Khān he was made incharge of treasury of the Ahādis (Indian military corps) and the superintendent of the court of the wālā shāhī 29.

His isolation and breakup alleged alliance with the Mughal nobles, however, did not prove rewarding. About himself he says nothing more than a reference to his only visit to the court of Rafī‘-ud-Daulā while giving the accounts of the reigns of Rafī‘-ud-Darajāt and Rafī‘-ud-Daulā. 30 Thus we know nothing as to what happened to his career during the brief period of the Saiyids’ unprecedented supremacy. From a minor reference to his visit to the court of Emperor Muhammad Shāh during the latter’s second R.Y, it seems that he became almost helpless during the early years of Muhammad Shāh’s reign. He first approached to Zafar Khān, then Roshan-ud-Daulā, but in all probability achieved nothing. Finally, on the recommendation of Inayat-ullah Khān the dārogha-i-dāk, on May 1724 A.D, he was made sawāniḥnigār of Machhli Bandar 31.

The post of the sawāniḥnigār of a provincial town was certainly inferior to the offices he held earlier, might have been much below of his expectations. But we know nothing from the text as to why and when he retired from the imperial service and chose to live an undisturbed life in Delhi. From the preface of the Haft Gulshan it

27 Taḏkiraṭ-us-Salatīn Chaghtā’ī, op. cit., p. 203.
28 Raushan-ud-Daulā Zafar Khān Rustam Jang is also called Turabāz. He was a Naqshbandī Shaikhzāda of Panipat, and first he entered into the service of Bahādur Shāh. After the murder of Farrukh Siyar, he reached the height of power and wealth under Emperor Muhammad Shāh. He was one of the supporters of Kokiji and held the office of Mir Bakhshī of Ahadi, Shiv Dās, Shāhnāma, Rotograph No. 139, C.A.S, Department of History, A.M.U, Aligarh, f. 68a.
29 Taḏkiraṭ-us-Salatīn Chaghtā’ī, op. cit., p. 256.
30 Ibid., p. 277.
31 Ibid., p. 335.
seems that his fluctuating fate and plotting and counter intrigues at the court had made him disappointed. Thus some time during the early years of Emperor Muhammad Shāh’s reign he decided to refrain from the flattery of the arrogant people and be content with the small jāgīr that he held as his sustenance.

On several places he had also written about his adopted son (mutabanna) Khidmatyāb Khān who was earlier in the service of Prince Kām Bakhsh and his post, promotions and mansāb in details. Further he writes about himself that from the occurrence of certain miserable incidents, he conceived a disgust for the entire world and every worldly things. During those days he found the company of Inayat-ullāh Khān who assisted and advised him in reading and writing of books. So he started wandering among the pleasant leaves of a book. He altogether abandoned the fruitless attendance upon the gates of the proud and arrogant, and shook sorrow and discontent from the skirt of his heart.

While he was so happily occupied in the revival of his former pursuits, he met severe shock in the form of loss of his adopted son Khidmatyāb Khān and after sometimes the death of his dearest friend (rafiqan-i-az jan-i-‘aziz), that might be his wife. He again mentions about himself that the fire of grief (shola-i-ghum) burnt up the harvest of his hopes destroying the stocks of his patience (khirman-i-sabr) and nothing remained to him but sighs and tears. From this grief he was not helped by any human. On this occasion a divine inspiration told him (dar ain bayak nida raseed) that he should not grieve without hope, but to occupy his mind by composing some works and devote rest of his life to the study of saints and Kings of past. Thus the author recomposed himself and began to compile the notes he had from time to time taken from the books of the histories of the past Kings. Finally his day and night labour produced three books.

---

32 Taṣkīrat-us-Salātīn Chagḥtā’ī, op. cit., p. 79.
33 Haft Gulshan, op. cit., ff. 3a-9a.
34 Ibid., f. 9b.
Kāmwar Khān’s first work as a book dealt with the lives of the prophet (👨‍[text:prophet]) of Islam, the pious Caliphs (👨‍[text:Caliphs]), the Imams and the other saints, in one volume entitled Guldasta-i-Sa’ādat\textsuperscript{35}.

In second book, he has written a general history of Hindustan from early times to 1724 A.D. and in the first gulshan (chapter), includes the account of the Sultans and the Rajas who had ruled in Delhi, Jaunpur, Malwā, second gulshan, deals Gujarat and Khāndesh, third, covers only Bengal, fourth, related to five states of Deccan, fifth deals with Sindh and Multan, sixth, covers Kashmir only and last gulshan, is related to the account of saints and ‘ulema of Hindustan. It is written in one volume under the title of the Haft Gulshan (seven rose gardens). In other words it is compendium of Indian History particularly of the minor dynasties, written in 1719-20 A.D and revised in 1723 A.D\textsuperscript{36}. This work is also considered as an abridgement of Farishta and Brindaban’s Lubb-ut-Tawārīkh\textsuperscript{37}. But important and creditable information reveal from its introduction, as compared to others sections of this compilation\textsuperscript{38}. He includes the account of all minor dynasties, but the Rulers of Delhi are not carried down later than Babur and at the conclusion of the account of that conqueror, the author promised a compilation of the history of the Timūrian family in a second volume promise has been fulfilled in the Taẅkirat-us-Salātīn Chaghtā’ī\textsuperscript{39}.

He does not confine himself only to these works. The most important task of Kāmwar Khān is to compile a history of Mughals, right from the legendary origin of the Turks down to author’s own time. After finishing the Haft Gulshan, three year later he started this work around 1135 A. H. /1722-23 A. D. It became very heavy in quantity so he decided to divide it into two volumes (ba sabāb-i-ifrat-i-safhat azan kitab dar do jild kardah ast), entitled it as Taẅkirat-us-Salātīn Chaghtā’ī also known as Taẅkirih-i-Chaghtā’ī. The first volume deals with the Mughal history from the origin of the Turks, history of Mongol, Timūr, Ulugh Beg, Safavids, Bābur, Bābur, Bābur,
Humayun, Akbar and Jahāngīr. The first volumes got completed on 22\textsuperscript{nd} Sha‘bān 1135 A.H/ 17\textsuperscript{th} May 1723 A.D in the fifth R.Y of Muhammad Shāh. The second volume deals with history of Shāhjahān, Aurangzeb, the contest between the sons of Aurangzeb and the reign of Bahādur Shāh, his death, war of succession during 1712 A.D, the reign of Farrukh Siyar, Rafī‘-ud-Darajāt, Rafī‘-ud-Daulā and ends abruptly with the six year of Muhammad Shāh’s reign (29\textsuperscript{th} Rabī‘ II, 1136 A.H/ 26\textsuperscript{th} January 1724 A.D).\(^{40}\)

Although the author is quite unprejudiced and the account of the post Aurangzeb period is almost free with his personal feelings, but his claim to objectivity, like that of all the other historians, cannot be uncritically accepted. His claims are no doubt partly true. The account is interpretative, the greater portion appearing not more than a coherent and faithful imitation of the official news letters. In the collection and selection of the facts, however, the operation of author’s prejudices cannot be ignored.

From the very beginning of his career it seems that he was directly or indirectly associated with those nobles who appeared to him the favourites of the reigning Emperor and were also popular among the court nobles. During the beginning of Bahādur Shāh’s reign, he approached the Emperor through the intervention of Mun‘im Khān\(^{41}\) as he was one of the most influential nobles at the time of Bahādur Shāh. In several instances like; on Mun‘im Khān’s recommendation that Ghazi-ud-Dīn Firoz Jang was appointed the governor of Gujarat and Chīn Qūlīch Khān withdrew his resignation from his mansab and sūbedārī of Awadh.\(^{42}\)

In the following years, when a kind of ill will grew between the wazīr and the Turānī’s, Kāmwar Khān seems to have sought the patronage of Prince Muhammad Rafī‘-ush-Shān. Žu‘lfiqār Khān was also an influential noble of Bahādur Shāh, but he

\(^{40}\)Haft Gulshan, op. cit., f.11a.
\(^{41}\)Mun‘im Khān, son of Sultan Beg of the Barlas tribe was born in 1651. He started his career as a keeper of the seal under Ruh-ullāh Khān, the Mīr Bakhshī of Aurangzeb. Later he was appointed diwān of Shāh ‘Ālam to manage his jāgīrs. In anticipation of civil war, he made secrete preparations to strengthen the cause of Shāh ‘Ālam. He raised a strong army and collected necessary equipment like artillery, beast of burden and boats. Bhūmsen says that Mun‘im Khān spent the entire money accumulated in the treasury of Lahore in recruiting troops and collecting war material, Bhūm Sen, Nuskhā-i-Dilkusha, , Rotograph No. 43, C.A.S, Department of History A.M.U, Aligarh, f. 164a.
\(^{42}\)Tazkīrat-us-Salātīn Chaghtā’ī, op. cit., p. 79.
was much clever and kept himself away from him. As Žu’lfiqār Khān was not acceptable to a powerful faction of the nobility and was strongly disliked by Prince ‘Azim-ush-Shāh. The wazīr Mun’īm Khān, was not liked by Bahādur Shāh for his unsuccessful Sikh campaign and died in desolation. None of his sons, Khān Zaman and Mahabat Khān acquired reputation in the later regimes. Kāmwar Khān thus very easily dissociated himself from Mun’īm Khān and states rather unjustly that he received no favour from Mun’īm Khān. During the reign of Emperor Farruḵh Siyar, he approached Samsām-ud-Daulā Khān-i-Durān and then Zafar Khān, as they were prominent noble of that period and among the favourites of Emperor. They were also acceptable to the Saiyid brothers and none of them ever came into conflict with the Turānī nobles.

It seems that such conscience and calculation must have affected his selection of facts. This is considerably evident from his account of the achievement of Mun’īm Khān, Prince Muhammad Rafī’-ush-Shān and Asad Khān. His treatment of the reign of Bahādur Shāh, Jahāndār Shāh and Farruḵh Siyar has nothing to indicate the author’s special favour for any particular faction or individual. The accounts of Rafī’-ud-Darajāt, Rafī’-ud-Daulā and of the first two years of Muhammad Shāh’s reign are however noticeably biased against the Saiyid Brothers. The Saiyids were widely condemned by him, for their cruelty to the deposed Emperors which had happened for the first time in the history of Indian Mughals. This also leads for his admiration of Turānī nobles who were then the chief opponent of the Saiyids.

**Purpose**

He mentions clearly that he has written for the students of history, regardless of the impropriety of the words and want of elegance in style. It is written without any royal order and without the aid or assistance of any of the nobles of the times. So taking these into consideration do justice to be remembered in future. In other words his purpose of history writing is to occupy himself in the writing of history in order to shake the distress of his heart and hand down his name to posterity. He also wanted

---

that the history of Aurangzeb would be remembered till the day of \textit{qiyāmat} (last day) and people would converse about him\textsuperscript{47}.

It seems that he was not fully aware of the importance and role of a contemporary historian. From the study of his account of the Later Mughals, his ideology seems unbiased for any faction of the nobles. The author says that a historian should be as impersonal as possible while dealing with the history of his own time. The aim of a historian must be to write the truth (\textit{sidq})\textsuperscript{48}. Thus account of post Aurangzeb period is less interpretative and is largely based upon the daily official records. Moreover, it appears that while he was writing his personal history, he neither rejoiced nor lamented on his fate (his offices and promotions), nor he associated himself with the rise and fall of any particular group of the court or individual\textsuperscript{49}.

He mentions that from early days of his life he used to read the history of kings and saints. But, because of his preoccupation with imperial service he was for long time prevented from writing of this work. After the death of Aurangzeb, he became disgusted with contemporary situations. He therefore returned to Delhi and resumed his reading and writing. Moreover, it comes out that he was extremely depressed while he was writing his contemporary history. He himself mentions that he writes just to while away this time\textsuperscript{50}. He also believes that the foundation of history rests upon reliability and historian should do this with his utmost ability, be exact and accurate in his account and avoid exaggeration. For example, he writes about the murder of his most favourite prince Rafī‘-ud-Daulā, which was done by Saiyid Brothers. It was extremely heartrending, but he says that he has not written much against these Saiyids\textsuperscript{51}. Hence he is very particular in mentioning the sources of his information whenever and wherever they are other than \textit{waqā ‘i} and the \textit{swānih}\textsuperscript{52}.

Like most of the historian, the author’s belief in history, is the history of the Kings and saints mainly. Moreover, he seems to be of the belief that the personality

\textsuperscript{47}Tazkirat-\textit{us}-\textit{Salātīn} Chaghtā‘ī, op. cit., p. 30.
\textsuperscript{48}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 109.
\textsuperscript{49}\textit{Haft Gulshan}, op. cit., f. 9a
\textsuperscript{50}\textit{Ibid.}, f. 9b.
\textsuperscript{51}Tazkirat-\textit{us}-\textit{Salātīn} Chaghtā‘ī, op. cit., p. 282.
\textsuperscript{52}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 281.
and the character of the Emperor determine the course of events in history. Bahādur Shāh’s generosity and mercifulness, according to him, was responsible for the orderliness and the prosperity all around while Farrukh Siyar’s cruelty and atrocities breed the famine and the chain of incidents which eventually brought the ruin of his own.53

**Style**

The book is written in a very simple and straightforward style. The author was himself aware of the simplicity and the coarseness of his style and requests his readers to ignore the impropriety of the words and want of elegance in his style.55 For the most part, where the account runs from month to month and often from date to date, it seems to have only rendered the Akhbarāt into a new form. He had also used the poetry quotation of Sadi, Firdausī, Shaikh Baha-ud-Din Amalī and others to make his work more interesting and meaningful. Meaningful stanzas also appear in several place of this work. This shows his talent as an elegant writer in prose and his proficiency in versification. Several verses of Quran were also written, that show his scholarly command on Arabic. Overall his style is polite, sweet and simple but some time figurative.

Thus the information regarding the same thing which is found in other sources in one place, but it is scattered in the Tażkirat-us-Salāṭīn Chaghtāī. Mostly information is broken according to the entries of the dates. Also the author’s own assessment of a situation and his occasional comments can be easily separated from the factual narrative of the text. The manner of narration seems coarse and sometimes even irritating also. But the language of this work is entirely devoid of any polish. He uses many Hindustani words for his narration.56

The most important part of this book starts from the death of Aurangzeb. Though he was an eye witness to most of the events, but he seldom appears to have relied solely upon his memory. His account is almost entirely based upon the

55 *Haft Gulshan*, op. cit., f. 11a.
56 *Tażkirat-us-Salāṭīn Chaghtāī*, op. cit., pp. 92, 166.
information obtained from the daily court records like waqā‘ī, sawāniḥ and akhbārāt. The account of this period seems like diary of events. He made deliberate attempts to avoid the contemporary story teller temptation of giving personal interpretation of the events. Most of the facts are without personal feeling of author and seem as documentary records. He has also written this account with detailed chronology of almost all the events of that period. Inspite of being contemporary to the events, he uses straightforward manner of writing which inspires the confidence of the reader. But like his contemporaries he also treats events individually without antecedents and consequences.

There are several manuscripts of the Taẕkirat-us-Salāṭīn Chaghtā‘ī kept in different libraries of the world. Out of them around six manuscripts are preserved in different libraries of India. The Aligarh University Library possesses two manuscript copies of the Taẕkirat-us-Salāṭīn Chaghtā‘ī bearing Nos 333 and 334. Of them the MS No 334 or University Farsiya Akhbār 117 is incomplete and covers only up to 374 folios and is useless for our purpose. The MS No. 333 or University Fārsiyā Akhbār 40/1 and 40/2 is bound in two separate volumes. Both volumes combined comprise 381 folios with 19 to 29 and 14 to 29 lines in each folio of volume I &II respectively. It is written in Tāliq mixed with Shikast with red headings. Second volume seems to have been transcribed by some other person. It is in a brittle condition and its script is very difficult for an average reader. It also seems transcribed hastily with minor mistakes. In the colophon to volume first the date of transcription has been given as Wednesday, 19th Rabī‘ II 1212 A. H. / 12th October 1797 A.D. But second volume has two missing folios at the end of the manuscript and so we don’t find colophon of the manuscript.

**Attitude Towards the Sources of Information**

The account of the early Timūrīds down to the 10th R.Y. of Aurangzeb seems to be a summary of the earlier sources like Akhbār-ul-Akhya‘r, Taẕkirat-ul-Auliya‘, Na‘fat-ul-Uns, Samrat-ul-Quds, Rauz-us-Safa, Habīb-us-Siyar, ‘Ālam-Arayi-‘Abbāsi, Muntakhab-ul-Tawārīkh, Akbarnāma, Tārīkh-i-Farīshta, ‘Ālamgīrnmāma, Ma‘asir-i-
ʻĀlamgīri, etc. The author has based himself mainly on Tārīkh-i-Farīshṭā for writing his early work. But the account from 11th R.Y., Aurangzeb to his death, the author could not accept any single existing history as his main source. He had obtained information for this period from the waqā'ī and sawāniḥ also.

For the post Aurangzeb period Kāmwar Khān based mainly on four types of sources first; Bahādurshāhnāma written by Dānishmand Khān, second; Official records of the imperial court, third; author’s own observation and fourth; statements of others eye witnesses. The account from the death of Aurangzeb to the 2nd R. Y. of Bahādur Shāh’s reign is explicitly taken from the Bahādurshāhnāma. But the author’s account is not only a summary of Bahādurshāhnāma, as he tried to avoid the verbosity of style and the abounding of Persian and Arabic quotations. It also seems that author has used other sources of that period.

Besides, few events the rest of the account from 15th Zi qādā 1120/15th January, 1709 A.D up to the end of the book is based upon the Akhbarāt-i-Darbār-i-Mualla and the reports the waqā’i’ nawis and sawāniḥigār. For the details of Bahādur Shāh’s Rājpūt campaigns, his expedition against Muhammad Kām Baksh, the Sikh wars and war of succession among the sons of Bahādur Shāh to which he himself was an eyewitness, it shows that he has drawn conclusion upon his own observations and contemplation. But the description of the capture of Farrukh Siyar,
the Saiyids and plot to poison Rafi’-ud-Daulā are based upon the oral reports of Zafar Khān and the aghabāns respectively.65 For few events, he also bases his information on which he gathered from some reliable persons (baaz siqat). But for some incidence, he did not go into the depth to know the causation of those events. At that instance and matters, he only use phrase like Allah ‘ālam bil sawāb (only God knows the truth).67

Content

The whole work is written in two volumes but the important part of this work starts from the death of Aurangzeb. So he mentions about the death of Aurangzeb and enthronement of prince ‘Āzam Shāh in details. For ‘Āzam Shāh he writes that he disregarded the development in the Deccan and hastened towards north. As he was passing through the narrow and dry Tomri hills, a great suffering caused to his army and several soldiers died in this journey. The author points out the doubt of ‘Āzam Shāh on his son Bidār Bakhat and about his hasty steps which resulted in the defeat of the prince. There is also great detail about the battle of Jaju and the nobles who participated in this battle. But he has not given much description about the preparation of battle. Only author quotes a verse of ‘Āzam Shāh in reply of his brother Mu‘azzam Shāh.

من و گرز و میدان و افراسیاب
چو فردا برا آید بلند افتتاب
(When sun will rise tomorrow, there will be myself, mace, battle field and Afrāsiyāb)

The author has given detail for the reign of Bahādur Shāh and the opposite side nobles like Zu’lfiqār Khān, Hamid-ud-Dūn Khān, and a number of the others who supported Prince ‘Āzam Shāh in the battle of Jaju. After the defeat of ‘Āzam Shāh, they fled to Gwalior. While on a way, these nobles were plundered by the Jats and the Rohilas of Dholpur. Immediately after the victory in Jaju, Bahādur Shāh dispatched farmān to Asad Khān and Zu’lfiqār Khān in Gwalior, directing them to arrive at Delhi and escort the princess Zinat-un-Nisa Begum to court.

65 Tazkirat-us-Salātīn Chaghtā‘ī, op. cit., p. 281.
66 Ibid., p. 5.
67 Ibid., p. 5.
68 Ibid., p. 12.
Kāmwar also mentions about the names of those nobles who left Kām Bakhsh\textsuperscript{69} and joined the army of Bahādur Shāh and the expedition against Muhammad Kām Bakhsh. He also deals with Rājpūt campaigns, Jāt uprising and the Sikh war in which the author himself participated with Price Rafī'-ush-Shān\textsuperscript{70}. All the court celebrations gifts, grants and animals fighting are described in details. Kāmwar Khān had great regards for Bahādur Shāh and he writes that there was prosperity in his reign. All the people were happy and grain was cheap. Emperor distributed a lot of Jewells and cash among people. Scholars were promoted and awarded with title and robes of honour\textsuperscript{71}. Furthermore, he praises the personality of Bahādur Shāh and writes that he had good knowledge for Arabic, Persian, Turkish, Afghani and Kashmirī. Emperor usually quoted the quotation of Holy Quran and hadīth in his argument\textsuperscript{72}.

Besides political history of that period, he also noted some interesting events of his reign. On 21\textsuperscript{st} Rajab A.H., when the Emperor was returning from Deccan, two children who belonged to village Sahuganu in the province of Berar came for the audience with Emperor. Both the children were joined by their back, when one take food the stomach of other also got full. At the time of speaking only one could speak and other had no energy to speak. Emperor had awarded them with three thousand cash and three robe of honour\textsuperscript{73}. Other interesting event that took place was noted from the waqā‘ī of Ambala that a snake (mār) around 16 or 17 yards came from his hole in the morning with 600 or 700 other small snakes. All got assembled on one place and returned to their hole at evening. People used to go to see that scene, but those snakes did not hurt any person.\textsuperscript{74} The author also writes that astronomer Mubasshir Khān informed the Emperor that next day, on 2\textsuperscript{nd} Safar, there was transfer of sun (tahwil-i-aftāb) from one sign to another and advised him to wear black colour

\textsuperscript{69} Muhammad Kām Bakhsh, the youngest and the favourite son of Aurangzeb, was born on March 7\textsuperscript{th} 1677 A.D. He was appointed governor of Bijapur in February, 1707, and few days before his father’s death. When Aurangzeb died Kām Bakhsh assumed the royal title of ‘Din Panah’ and ordered the Khutba to be read and coins to struck in his name, Khān Khāfī, Muntakhab-ul-Lūbāb, op. cit., pp. 589-590.

\textsuperscript{70}\textit{Tazkirat-us-Salātīn Chaghtā‘ī}, op. cit., p. 104.

\textsuperscript{71}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 155.

\textsuperscript{72}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 155.

\textsuperscript{73}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 71.

\textsuperscript{74}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 140-141.
clothes and also take blackish stuff in his food. Other black things like buffalo, elephant, black sesame seeds etc should be given in alms.\textsuperscript{75}

On 14\textsuperscript{th} Zi qādā there was lunar eclipse (kasuf-i-mah) and astronomer advised Emperor to give charity of one horse, one elephant, one slave, few items of decorated utensils (‘ālat) of gold and other metals\textsuperscript{76}. Such historical records about astronomical phenomenon suggest that this information, even if it adds little modern scientific knowledge, may yet have importance in the history of astronomical beliefs and tradition and for historians of intellectual development.

The author has also written about some strange and incredible episodes of that period. In the month of Sha’bān 1123 A.H/ September 1712 A.D, it has been noted from the swānih of Chaklā Barely by the author that it had rained of flesh (gosht) for three days\textsuperscript{77}. On 15\textsuperscript{th} Shawwāl again a strange incident took place that one Hindu safed baf (?) had died. When his sons laid him on pier and fired it, the man got re alive. In the ritual process of burning that man got some injuries in his hand and returned home. Earlier he was a blind man but now he was able to see. Emperor had ordered to bring him to hear narrative of new life. He came and told to Emperor that some people grabbed his soul and were taking away, but they were intervened by two muharrir (giver of liberty) appeared at a place near to a river in the way. They (muharrir) said to him that eight years of his life are still remaining and left him alive. During the conversation with muharrir, old man requested that he was blind and had suffered a lot previous time in this world. They told that his eye sight should be given also and thus he found himself alive with sight. Hearing it, Emperor had given fifty rupees to him.\textsuperscript{78}

For the reign of Emperor Farrukh Siyar he mentions about the two famines, prices of grain, marriage celebration with Rājpūt Princess, tussles with Saiyids, imprisonment of Emperor, his murder and his funeral\textsuperscript{79}. When we read about the major appointments and promotions, related to the accession of Farrukh Siyar and

\textsuperscript{75}Tazkirat-us-Salātīn Chaghtā’ī, op. cit., p. 119.
\textsuperscript{76}Ibid., p. 134.
\textsuperscript{77}Ibid., p. 131.
\textsuperscript{78}Ibid., p. 190.
\textsuperscript{79}Ibid., pp. 177-270.
which greatly influenced the course of the political history of the next eight years, we find that other contemporary sources have a confused account as they mention them in one place in fact under one date. From Kāmwar Khān’s account, we know that the process of appointment to different offices was extended over more than a year in chronological order.

If Kāmwar’s chronology is supported by documentary evidence, can it be suggested that Mir Jumla and Khān-i-Daurān’s elevation of mansabs to 7000/7000, ten months after the accession was not merely in recognition of their services to Farrukh Siyar in his contest for the throne, but to counteract the growing threat from the Saiyids. The absence of the wazīr Saiyid ‘Abd-Ullah Khān from the court was reported to the Emperor on 9th Rabī’ I 1125 A.H/ 1713 A.D which according to Kāmwar Khān was the first disclosure of the ill feeling. This again is misleading as Kāmwar Khān gives different date for the death of Firoz Jang, according to him, it was reported to the Emperor much earlier on 9th Ziqād 1130 A.H. Muhammad Murād Khān (then the third Mir Tuzuk) was given khil‘at (rob of honour) and the post of Amīn of the dagh-o-tasiha. On 21st Muharram Muhammad Murād Khān presented a horse to the Emperor. The Emperor bestowed special favour upon him and foundation of the disaster was further

---

80 Mīr Jumla was the native of Turān, and had been the Qāzī of Decan and later Patna. After the accession of Farrukh Siyar, he was raised to the rank of 6000 zāt and also rewarded with the post of the dārogha-i-khawassān and dārogha-i-gusulkhāna and few other small posts, Mirzā Muhammad bin Mu’tamad Khān, ‘Ibrat Nāma, op. cit., f. 27a.
81 Tazkirat-us-Salātīn Chaghtā’ī, op. cit., p. 192.
82 Ibid., p. 172.
83 Ibid., p. 114.
84 Ibid., p. 233.
strengthened. On 30th Muḥarram he replaced Fidai Khān as the second Mīr Tuzūk with ‘asa and a khil’at.

On 17th Safar, at Mahdipur, he was appointed as the dāroga of the Harkāras, replacing Imtiyaz Khān. A farmān was issued for him so that he could have audience with Emperor at all times. Consequently he began to remain with the Emperor both in the private and public chambers right from early morning to till the mid night. His prestige got increased gradually. Simultaneously, his son in law Khair-ud-Dīn Khān was made the Karorī of the treasury replacing Rahīm-ud-Dīn Khān and also got a khil’at. On 19th Safar, his son Zafar-ullāh Khān entitled as Ījaz Khān and replaced him as Amīn of the dagh-o-tashiha. On 22nd Rabī’ I (the 7th R.Y.) he replaced Mahabat Khān as the dāroga of gurzdārān (mace bearers) with khil’at (robe of honour).

On 10th Rabī’ II he replaced Saiyid ‘Āmir Khān ‘Alamgiri as the dāroga of khwasān. Simultaneously he received the title of Ītīqād Khān Farrukh Shāhi and a rank of 5000/ 2000 with a robe of honour, standard, kettle drums, two elephants and few horses. During this time, he was increasing in favour day by day and thus foundation of disaster was further strengthened.

Since he had a bad reputation for his intimacy with the Emperor, point towards derogatory image and dignity of Tūrānī nobles. On Rabī’ II to the great disgust of eminent nobles, Badr-ud-Dīn Khān a worthless servant of Ītīqād Khān was appointed the Deputy dārogoa of Khwasān and was also given the robe of honour. On 21st Rabī’ II Muhammad Amīn Khān’s mansion was conferred upon Ītīqād Khān. On 9th Jumādā II he was appointed the faujdār of Jammu and was promoted to 6000/ 5000 with robe of honour and horse with jeweled arms. Simultaneously, his son Ījaz Khān

---

85 Taẓkiraṭ-us-Salāṭīn Chaghtā’ī, op. cit., p. 234.  
86 Ibid., p. 234.  
87 Ibid., p. 235.  
88 Ibid., p. 235.  
89 Ibid., p. 236.  
90 Ibid., p. 237.  
91 Dārogoa-i-Khwasān used to sit behind Emperor upon the elephant in the back seat of hauda.  
92 Ibid., p. 237.  
93 Ibid., p. 237.
and his servant Khān Muhammad and Jan Muhammad, each being promoted to 1000/100 were admitted to the circle of the close of the Emperor.94

Further he writes for him that on 29 Rabī‘ II he replaced Darbār Khān as nazīr of the haram sarai khās, and was promoted to 7000/7000, with Emperor’s own khil‘at (robe of honour), a jamadāhar (dagger) studded with Jewels and a palki mounted with an embroidered fringe worth Rs.20,000. Simultaneously his son in law Khair-ud-Dūn rose to 1500/200.95 On 2nd Rajab he was given a gold cot that was prepared for khuld Makan. Day by day he got a lot of wealth and precious jewels from the Emperor. He also collected soldiers around three to four thousand.96 On the order of Farrukh Siyar he went to meet both wazīr Qutb-ul-Mulk and Mīr Jumlā.97 The author writes that all Farrukh Shahi ʻulemā were not happy from Emperor on his intimacy to İtiqād Khān.98

On 8th Safar İtiqād Khān was given a mansab of 7000/7000 with the title of Rukn-ud-Daulā99. Needless to point out that at the same time, Kāmwar Khān gives additional information regarding İtiqād Khān’s relations and associates as well. The account of the Rājpūts and their role in imperial politics of that period are written in details. He provides unique information about the Saiyid Brothers, as he writes about their mutual clashes and role of Raja Ratan Chand as mediator and whom the author has used a title Kulid-i-‘Aqal (key to wisdom) of ‘Abdullāh Khān. He writes about every step taken by Farrukh Siyar for the destruction of Saiyids and also about the expose of those scandals, those evoked suspicion and alarm in quarters of all nobles.

There is rich information related to Emperor Farrukh Siyar and many interesting events of his reign. He has written about the celebration of marriage, birth, accession, iden, and other court festival of Emperor Farrukh Siyar. Natural calamities

94Taṣkirat-us-Salātīn Chaghtā’ī, op. cit., p. 239.
95Ibid., p. 240.
96Ibid., p. 241.
97Ibid., pp. 245-246.
98Ibid., p. 241.
99Ibid., p. 250.
like flood and earthquake were also written by him. He quotes several natural calamities in chronological order:

It is narrated from the harkūra (news personnel) of Ahmadabad, in effect of heavy rain; river Sabarmati flooded and three thousand haveli (building) turned into dust, in result almost all resident as well as animal killed of that area.)

(From a waqai of Allahabad, on Sha’bān 6th, it is reported an accident of strong earthquake which lasted for half an hour and resultanty collapsed several buildings.)

On 8th Jumādā II he writes two persons named Raman and Lakshman who belonged to Berar, came for the audience of Emperor. He quotes as;

---

103 Ibid., pp. 221-222.
104 Ibid.
(A strange event reported from Berar on eight of the month. Unique twin named Raman and Lakshman came for audience before Emperor; they were joined completely except from legs and hands, if one eat other remained silenced and one was healthy other one thinned. Emperor awarded them with khilāt, an Elephant, necklace of Pearls, ten ashrafi, two hundred rupees and two villages for their sustenance and maintenance).

An incredible account was also copied from the waqā‘ī of Orissa that on 10th Rabī’ II in a village two Black Demons (deva siyah fom) with mace of heavy stone (gurzha-i-sang-i-ghiran) appeared and they fought with each other for two hours (sa’āt) in the heavy rain. After few times, they got disappeared and many people, 400 horses and plants were destroyed.105

Other minor and interesting event of that time, a man came into dīwān-i-‘ām and sat on the place where khawasān used to stand. That person offered salute three times to Emperor and on the check of qolarān (troops) he injured them and finally that man was also killed. Nobody knew about him and from where he belonged.106 There is also detailed panegyrical account for Farrukh Siyar’s murder and his tadfīn (funeral)107. On 29th Rabī’ II, 1131 A.H./21st March 1719 A.D, Kāmwar Khān further noted about the transmigration of sun (tahwil-i-aftāb) during the reign of Rafī’-ud-Darajāt. The author mentions about the plot of Saiyids that they wanted to give poison to Ītimad-ud-Dualā Amīn Khān through bakāwal (superintendent of the kitchen)108.

The author has also noted several other incidents related to reign of Emperor Muhammad Shāh. On 19th Sha’bān 1132A.H/ July 1720 A.D, there were three earthquakes from early morning to evening in Darulkhilafat. Several buildings and twenty five kangurā (beams) of the fort got destroyed109. On 26th Sha’bān / July 1720 A.D there was kasuf-i-aftāb (solar eclipse) in its full form and Emperor had made charity of one horse, elephant, one chariot with bulls, five tula (2.50 misqāl) gold, few man (40 seers) wheat and other grains. Around twenty prisoners were also

105Taḵkār-at-us-Salātīn Chaghtā’ī, op. cit., p. 231.
106Ibid., p. 243.
107Ibid., p. 270.
108Ibid., p. 286.
109Ibid., p. 303.
In the month of 3rd Jumādā I /February 1720 A.D, there was severe earthquake at the city of Tabrez in Iran and half of the city collapsed. Around three thousand and four hundred residents and animals had ruined.\textsuperscript{111}

He writes about his astrological prediction that was common at that time. It also shows his belief in superstitious. Referring to the earthquake of 2nd Ramzān 1132 A.H/ June 1720 A.D, he writes all the astrologers and star knower of Delhi interpreted the calamity as star foreboding of the downfall of the Emperors opponents (Saiyid Brothers). They had predicted that one would be killed and other would be imprisoned (\textit{yake baqatāl me rasad wa degar mahbus me shawād}), and this was what actually happened\textsuperscript{112}.

On 4\textsuperscript{th} Jumādā II / 12\textsuperscript{th} March 1723 A.D, other important thing that was noted by the author, that Emperor Muhammad Shāh ordered for the destruction of Banghla of Tirpulia (where princes were kept as prisoner) which was situated in the fort of Ark in Darulkhilāfā. Kāmwar Khān also mention about the practice of phlebotomy (\textit{fasd})\textsuperscript{113} that was done by Hakim and Barber (\textit{hajjām}) and the award given by Emperor\textsuperscript{114}. The author has also written in detail about a boat (\textit{kashṭi}) gifted by Hakim Mutabar-ul-Mulk Shirazī to Emperor Muhammad Shāh.\textsuperscript{115} One of the shortcomings of this book that the author end his account abruptly with the details like:

\textit{بست و چہارم ماه مسطور فرمان عالی قدر وسربیچ مرصع ویک عدد انگشتی یاقوت جبہ عمدو امروا وزیر عیل انذریم عیل امیرالمرما بہادر حوالو بخت مند خان وكیل شد ک سرعت روئے سازد او اخراین مائه حافظ خدمت گار خان را ک ار چنین گوش ک گزین شده بود اعتمادالدولہ بہادر بحضور اشرف فایز ساخت بعنائیت خلعت خاص و سربیچ مرصع ممتاز گشت.}\textsuperscript{116}

\textsuperscript{110 Tażkirat-us-Salātīn Chaghtā‘ī, op. cit., p. 304.}
\textsuperscript{111 Ibid., p.335.}
\textsuperscript{112 Ibid., pp. 303-304.}
\textsuperscript{113 Phlebotomy or Veinsection is, in which blood was drawn from one or more of the large external vein such as those in forearms or neck. It was very old practice that was performed by Greeks in 5\textsuperscript{th} century B.C and continued till late 19 century.}
\textsuperscript{114 Tażkirat-us-Salātīn Chaghtā‘ī, op. cit., p. 352.}
\textsuperscript{115 Ibid., p. 347.}
\textsuperscript{116 Ibid., p. 359.}
(On 24th of the month, a farman was issued along with a jewel for turban and a piece of ring tagged yaqut (ruby), instructed by Bakhsī-ul-Mumālik to wakīl Bakhtmand to carry and handover this present to wazīr. At the end of this month, Hafiz Khidmatgār Khan, who was retired, was brought for the audience of Emperor by Itimad-ud-Daulā Bahadur and he (Hafiz Khidmatyār Khan) received khilāt and a gem of turban.)

The post Aurangzeb portion of the Tażkīrat-us-Salātīn Chaghtā’ī has been poorly treated in the contemporary historical literature. Kāmwar Khān’s account of this period is quite different to all other contemporary chronicles. It is fairly objective and unprejudiced and probably none of them, with the possible exception of Khāfi Khān, can be compared with it. In comparison to Khāfi Khān, it has more detailed chronology of every events of the period.

Special merit of Kāmwar Khān’s history of the post Aurangzeb period lays in the details which he has given about appointments and promotions of the nobles. On the basis of his account, we can draw a detailed list of almost all the officials at the court as well as of those who held key post, e.g. subedārī, faujdārī, qilādārī, kotwālī, bakhsī, waqa-i-nigārī etc, in the imperial as well as in the provinces. A comparison of the list of the governors of Awadh as given by Kāmwar Khān with the same account in the other major contemporary histories is, more in details, for examples, according to Kāmwar Khān, Awadh was governed by four subedār’s in the reign of Bahādur Shāh. Chin Qulich Khān was appointed on 15th Ramażān 1119 A.H/30 November 1707 A.D. 117. (2) ‘Alī Quli Khān s/o Mahabat Khān was appointed in Zi qādā 1119 A.H/ January, 1708 A.D. 118. (3) Khān-i-Durān alias Chin Qulich Khān was reappointed on 5th Zil-hijja 1119 A.H/ 16 February, 1708 A.D. 119. (4) Shamsheer Khān was appointed on 8 Sha‘bān 1122 A.H/ 21 September 1710 A.D. 120. (5) Muhammad Amīn Khān was appointed on 1 Ramażān 1122 A.H/ 13 October, 1710 A.D. 121.

---

117 Tażkīrat-us-Salātīn Chaghtā’ī, op. cit., p. 23.
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Out of above mentioned appointments, only the subedārī of Chīn Qūlī Khān, without the date of his reappointment, is mentioned by the other chronicles. Again for all the chroniclers, it is only Kāmwar Khān who records five subedārs between the transfer of Chhabela from, and posting of Girdhar Bahādur in Awadh. Kāmwar Khān writes as:

1. Saiyid Muzaffar ‘Alī Khān was appointed on 11th Zil-hijja 1127 A.H/ 27 November 1715 A.D.

2. Aziz Khān Chaghtā’ī was appointed on 8th Sha’bān 1128 A.H/ 17 July 1716 A.D.

3. Khān Zamān was appointed on 5th Safar 1130 A.H/ 23rd December, 1717 A.D.

4. Mahabat Khān was appointed on 22nd Rabī‘ I 1130 A.H/ 12th February 1718 A.D.

5. Mīr Musharraf was appointed on 22nd Shauwāl 1133 A.H/ 7th September, 1718.

The Subedārī of ‘Aziz Khān and Mīr Musharraf have however been mentioned by Mirzā Muhammad and Shiv Dās.

The author tries to give a comprehensive picture of that period. He writes every detail of peshkash and an‘ām with its current value. He shows a good picture of the imperial journey of Bahādur Shāh. All the arrangements, average distance covered by Emperor, place and date of halt of Emperor and his visits to the khānaqāh are given in details. All the celebrations like idain, birthday and succession to the throne of the imperial court are written in details. Marriages of princes are mentioned on several places.

---

122 Taṣkīrat-us-Saltān Chaghtā’ī, op. cit., p. 214.
123 Ibid., p. 223.
124 Ibid., p. 234.
125 Ibid., p. 236.
126 Ibid., p. 244.
127 Any payment given by Emperor and not linked to military obligation, often in the form of revenue free grant, not linked to military obligation; often in the form of revenue free grant was called an‘ām, Khan Īqtidar ‘Ālam, Historical Dictionary of Medieval India, The Scarecrow press, UK, 2008, p. 78.
The author has given an eye witness account for Sikhs as he was appointed to fight with Prince Rafi’-ush-Shan during the reign of Emperor Bahādur Shāh. Kāmwar Khān is the only writer who gave this name. Other called him the false Guru or second Govind Singh and Sikhs call him Bandā (slave)\textsuperscript{128}.

Ambassadors of neighbouring countries as Iran, Rome, English, Bukhara and Balkh in the imperial court were written by the author in details that sheds light about the relations of Later Mughals with other countries. He also writes about Mr John Sarman’s approach through Samsām-ud-Daulā and his audience to Emperor Farrukh Siyar.\textsuperscript{129} He also writes that on 15\textsuperscript{th} Jumādā II 1129 A.H/27 May 1717 A.D., an order was issued for the exemption of mahsūl (collected tax) from the ship of English\textsuperscript{130}. Jizya is also mentioned in several places by the author. The book would thus be extremely useful for examining the working of the central and provincial government of the Mughals in the early eighteenth century. Similarly, the details of asl-o-izāfa (increment) in the mansabs would greatly help us in analysing the position of different section of the nobility.

The author was also interested to write about the other aspects. One of the uniqueness of this source, that he tries to cover most of the important ladies of that period and particularly writes about the role of the mother of both Emperor Farrukh Siyar and Muhammad Shāh, and their influences in the court politics of that period. But he has not gone into details for those ladies, only mentioned whom she married and when she died. There is also information about the Sati which took place in Srinagar on 25\textsuperscript{th} Zi qādā 1126 A.H. by the wife of zamīndār Madan Singh son of Fateh Singh\textsuperscript{131}. He has mentioned about Solar and Lunar eclipse (kusūj) on several places with details of its obligations by the Emperor on the advice of astronomer

\textsuperscript{128}After the death of tenth Guru Govind Singh, his family and follower brought forward a man who exactly resembled the deceased. It was not clear who this man was, he is generally spoken of either as Banda (the slave) or as false Guru. He wanted to take revenge of the murder of Guru Govind Singh and his Children. He was supported by the zamīndārs of neighbouring villages, thus, he collected a large followers and killed the faujdar of Sarhind and his relatives, Khan ‘Ālam, Muzaffar, ‘Sikh uprising under Banda Bahādur’, P.I.H.C, Hyderabad, 1978, pp. 509-519.

\textsuperscript{129}Tażkīrat-us-Salāṭīn Chaghtā’ī, op. cit., p. 211.

\textsuperscript{130}Ibid., p. 222.

\textsuperscript{131}Ibid., p. 204.
(akhtarshinās)\textsuperscript{132}. He writes for tahlīl-i-aftāb (change in the position of Sun) and also about the observation of rituals by Emperor as suggested by astronomer of his court\textsuperscript{133}.

The author has also written about the earthquakes at many places in his work. At one place, he writes that, there was severe earthquake experienced in Delhi, on 24th Sha'bān 1132 A.H/ July 1720 A.D, many buildings of the fort had collapsed and this earth quake continued for three months.\textsuperscript{134} He has written about other calamities like drought and flood of that period.\textsuperscript{135}

Further he highlighted many qualities of Bahādur Shāh and his son and patron prince Rafī'-ush-Shāh also\textsuperscript{136}. Unlike other sources he gives a very rich account for the prince Rafī'-ush-Shāh and about his sons. He writes in detail about the pleasing environs of the tomb of Qutb-ud-Dīn Bakhātyar Kāki where his patron Khuld Ārām Ghāh (Prince Rafī'-ush-Shāh) was buried\textsuperscript{137}. Besides, he gives a very rich and eyewitness account for the leading nobles of the court. He writes a very frank account not biased for any particular group of that period. For Jahāṅdār Shāh, he gives a brief account and after his defeat, author mentioned him by his original name Mu'izzud-ud-Dīn only. He mention bout the reaction of common people at the seeing of the death body of Jahāṅdār Shāh as he quotes;

اَزْ مَشَاَبَدَهُ ان واقعہ، هِیج زِی حیاتِی نِمناد کِ لب بِ لاحولِ نُکْشَا و هِیج فرَدی نُبود
کِ کلمہ استغفار زبانِ نیاورد.\textsuperscript{138}

(There was no single individual who did not recite lāhaul and asontvangstta ḡfar (seeking protection and forgiveness of Allah) after looking over this incident).

He always mentioned to Rafī'-ud-Darajāt and Rafī'-ud-Daulā as Sultān majbūr (constrain).\textsuperscript{139} Being close to them his account for them are more reliable. He explains their helplessness and about the suffering of Rafī'-ud-Darajāt, who finally left

\textsuperscript{132}Taẕkirat-us-Salātīn Chaghtā'ī, op. cit., pp. 134 &204.
\textsuperscript{133}Ibid., pp. 119 & 268.
\textsuperscript{134}Ibid., p. 203.
\textsuperscript{135}Ibid., p. 202.
\textsuperscript{136}Ibid., pp. 155-157.
\textsuperscript{137}Ibid., p. 157.
\textsuperscript{138}Ibid., p. 177.
\textsuperscript{139}Ibid., pp. 265-280.
the throne in favour of his brother Rafi‘-ud-Daulā. According to Kāmwar Khān Rafi‘-ud-Daulā was one of the smart and intelligent princes. It was also the main reason for the jealousy of the Saiyids who later started to give poison to him\(^{140}\). On seeing Rafi-ud-Daulā in such a worst condition, he laments;

> گر برسرش می نشید مگس

(If housefly dare to site over his head, they (well-wisher) became over concerned and anxious.)

He praises Emperor Muhammad Shāh for his qualities and steps taken by him. He also writes in detail about the role of Ratan Chand, murder of Husain ‘Alī Khān and the battle of Hasanpur\(^ {142}\). During the downfall of the Saiyids he quotes’

> چہ خوش گفت داًا تسی است

(What a best quotation place by a great intellectual that there is abundance of Intelligent but misfortune associated with every individual.)

The importance of the work lies that this can be used as supplement to the \textit{Ma‘asir-ul-Umarā} of Shāhnawāz Khān and the \textit{Tazkirat-ul-Umarā} of Kewal Ram. As Kāmwar Khān supplies valuable biographical details about his contemporary Mughal officials. Besides, he helps us in reconstructing the biographies of the minor nobles and \textit{mansabdārs} who have not been noticed by Shāhnawāz Khān or Kewal Ram. For example Murtaza Khān who held the \textit{sarkārs} of Banaras etc, as his permanent \textit{jāgīr} during the reign of Muhammad Shāh. From Kāmwar Khān’s account, we know his originality and earlier career at the court and the position of his father, brothers and his other relatives in the nobility.

Again Kāmwar Khān gives a detailed account of the routes of the following imperial Journeys especially about Emperor Bahādur Shāh. First, from Hyderabad to Ajmer via Ahmadnagar and Aurangabad, second, from Ajmer to Lahore, via Karnal, Indri and Sadhaura, third, from Agra to Delhi, fourth, from Agra to Toda Bhīm and


\(^{141}\)\textit{Ibid.}, p. 139.

\(^{142}\)\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 301-341.

\(^{143}\)\textit{Ibid.}, p. 304.
fifth, from Toda Bhūm to Delhi. Besides, the book contains some new information about the Rājpūt and Mughal nobility. This work also contains some other valuable information like per day distance covered by Emperor, prices of the presents, duration of court celebrations and the hunting expeditions of Emperors as well.

This work is not free from flaws. It can be said that it is not more than a dry catalogue of the events of merely political and administrative significance. For the reign of Bahādur Shāh, he mainly based himself on Bahādurshāhnāma\textsuperscript{144} that is an official history of Bahādur Shāh, so an inbuilt prejudice seems for the Emperor. At some places his account seems copious work also. The author in several places fails to give causation and pre planning for the numerous events. He also notes down several important happening of that time. Again there is more than one kind of omission in the book. About the Marathas it contains nothing more than occasional references to their reappearance and encounters against the Mughals. Besides, a deliberate attempt of author to remain detached has made him omit any comment on events even when such a comment would have enabled us to assess the event better. Other drawback of the author is that he does not mention the title of this monumental work. Only in the preface of Haft Gulshan the proper title of this work appears\textsuperscript{145}.

Kāmwar Khān recorded the appointment of Munʻim Khān and Asad Khān as the wazīr and wakil by Bahādur Shāh, without indicating the background of dispute which they brought to the front \textsuperscript{146}. It appears; Kāmwar Khān records the appointments but fails to note the significance of this arrangement. Once he writes that Bahādur Shāh was interested to know the genealogy of Rana Amar Singh but he does not mention any reason for it \textsuperscript{147}. Other negative aspect of this work that author’s unwillingness to write for the details of the reign of Jahāndār Shāh and use of callous words for him. His account is most informative and interesting, but how he ends his work abruptly, cannot be stated definitely\textsuperscript{148}.

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{144}Tazkirat-us-Salātīn Chaghtāʾī, op. cit., p. 41.
\textsuperscript{146}Tazkirat-us-Salātīn Chaghtāʾī, op. cit., p. 17.
\textsuperscript{147}Ibid., p. 70.
\textsuperscript{148}Ibid., p. 359.
\end{flushleft}
The first notable comment which we find in this work is on Saiyid ‘Abdullah’s dispatch to Delhi for the purpose to confiscate the possessions of the supporters of Jahāndār Shāh. The comment (ien asas e munāziyāt bud) sums thus and this was the wazīr which ultimately cultivated into a disaster. But his work says nothing clear-cut terms as to how it laid the foundation of the dispute between Emperor Farrukh Siyar and Saiyid brothers. Over all his account for the Saiyids appears bit harsh.

Further he records that on 1\textsuperscript{st} \textit{Rabi’} I 1128 A.H due to arrival of Mir Jumla from Patna without the prior permission of the Emperor, all the titles of Mir Jumla were taken away from him, and he was ordered to withdraw to Lahore\textsuperscript{150}. But in reality we find nobles like Nizām-ul-Mulk and Hāmid Khān went to give him company \textit{(mushayaat)} up to Mandī Namak. It raises a question whether Mir Jumla’s arrival at Delhi was in response to a secret letter from the court or the order for retirement to Lahore which constituted a part of the intrigues against the Saiyids which was meant to conciliate the wazīr Saiyid ‘Abdullah Khān\textsuperscript{151}. For these, Kāmwar Khān gives no answers. Similarly, Kāmwar Khān records the arrival of the eminent nobles at the court of Farrukh Siyar, but nowhere does he point out the reasons of their frequent visit.

Further, he records that after the death of Ītimad-ud-Daulā, the affairs of \textit{wīzārāt} were made over to Inayat-ullāh Khān in addition to his existing office of the Imperial \textit{Khānsamāni}\textsuperscript{152}. Why and how can Muhammad Shāh over look the other powerful claimants to this office, and select Inayat-ullāh Khān who was apparently not contestant? Was it a temporary? To these questions Kāmwar Khān supplies no answer. Moreover, the book refers to various local uprisings but we know nothing from the internal evidence about the causes and the context of these disturbances. He also seems to be very particular in recording the arrival and departure of even minor nobles and giving details of their offerings to the Emperors and receiving gift from latter. But he never cares to record the grant of the land assignments, salaries of officers and transfer of \textit{jāgīrs}. He does not give static details of his period. There is

\textsuperscript{149}Tazkirat-us-Salātīn Chaghtā’ī, op. cit., p. 273.
\textsuperscript{150}Ibid., p. 217.
\textsuperscript{151}Ibid., pp. 217-218.
\textsuperscript{152}Ibid., p. 334.
also not any information about the *jama*’ and ʰʰᵃˢʰⁱˡ of the empire, only with the exception of revenue from Bengal\textsuperscript{153}.

There is no doubt that such omission in most cases diminish the value of this work as a historical narrative and sometimes they even curtail its importance as a source of history. A historian with these principles and with such a narrow and limited historical perspective was expected to produce nothing more than a mere faithful catalogue of political events. His colourless accounts are unrelated to the social and economic background of the period. We can know nothing from the *Taẓkirit-us-Salāṭīn Chaghtā’ī* as to what social and economic forces were at work when one of the greatest empires of medieval times was going towards collapse. How did the forces of disintegration gain strength? To these questions and the like Kāmwar Khān gives no answers. The most surprising in the fact that inspite of his long association with administration, his work nowhere shows his awareness of the problems of the weakening administration. For the later years of the work this book is mainly a record of appointment, promotions, presents and offerings. It would be unfair to claim that Kāmwar Khān has no bias; however he is seldom unfair to the characters he portrays in his book\textsuperscript{154}.

The author’s wide range of learning, his Knowledge of Arabic and Persian classics and his keen and critical faculty has considerably enhanced its literary charm. Personally occupying high position and being close to many nobles of the first rank, he witnessed all the events, which occurred so rapidly after the death of Aurangzeb. He is gifted narrator and proved his intelligence in casting on light on every worth mentioning occurrences like war of successions among the sons of Aurangzeb, Bahādur Shāh, rise and fall of Saiyids Brothers, the punitive measures of ʻAbd-us-Samad Khān against Sikh in the Punjab and the execution of Banda Bairāgī, Rājpūt’s relations with imperial, Jat problems and details about the leading nobles etc. The later portion of this work as he himself says is based on his personal observation and verbal account of the men who had watched the occurrences of the time.

\textsuperscript{153} *Taẓkirit-us-Salāṭīn Chaghtā’ī*, op. cit., p. 299.
He generally noted what he himself saw and what he heard from the tongues of men, who were from time to time associated to Emperor and leading nobles and those were companions at the banquet table and battle. Perhaps no other work introduces us about so many ladies of the Mughal Haram as Taškirt-us-Salātīn Chaghtā’ī mentions. The anecdotes and incidents which bound in large numbers in this work, helps us in understanding the spirit of the times and the social and cultural milieu of the period. This work can be said is curious mixture of facts fiction, history and tradition. Furthermore, I can say it is Kāmwar’s work and probably there alone that we details the find of minute appointments, promotions and transfers with dates.

We can conclude that inspite of his few shortcomings which impair its values; Kāmwar Khān’s account is indispensible for the historians of the Later Mughals and may be considered as one of the most important sources of the period. The author has given many details about himself, natural calamities and ambassadors of different countries. He also provides unique information in the form of anecdotes, performance royal marriages and role of imperial ladies. Though, the account is brief and weak in the case of the reign of Emperor Jahāndār Shāh and of the later three years of Emperor Muhammad Shāh. But the treatment of the reigns of Bahādur Shāh and Farrukh Siyar is probably more detailed. It is one of the reliable sources with its rich chronology. We can say that Muntakhab-ul-Lubāb is the only other comparable among contemporary histories. On the whole the account of Kāmwar Khān from the post Aurangzeb period is not mere gazetteer of appointment and promotions. But also it does add much valuable information.