NOTES

INTRODUCTION


2. On these and other myths surrounding the Taj and its construction, see Koch (2006: 249–50).


7. See, for instance, Yohannan (1977); Karimi-Hakkak (2002); and, for the larger context, Schwab (1984).


9. For a recent analysis of this process, see Travers (2007). For further context, see, for instance, Bayly (1996); Cohn (1996).

10. In Gladwin’s defense, however, we should point out that he had in fact already translated the Ā’īn-i Akbarī in 1783, dedicating the publication to the Company’s then-governor-general, Warren Hastings (1732–1818).

12. The corpus of scholarship on the connection between epistolography, other forms of “informal writing,” and early modern European (and American) self-fashioning is vast, but one might begin by examining, for instance, Redford (1986); Chartier, Boureau, and Dauphin (1997); Earle (1999); Gilroy and Verhoeven (2000); How (2003); Bannet (2005); Schneider (2005); Berg (2006); Brant (2006); Pearsall (2008); Whyman (2009); Smyth (2010); Daybell (2012).


15. For an overview of the curious publication history of Pepys’s diary, see Tomalin (2002): 378–86; “secret masterpiece” quote on 386.

16. For the most comprehensive available overview of these features of Mughal literary and political culture, see Alam (1998; 2003; 2004: 115–40).

17. On the “new” (*navya*) intellectuals of the early modern Sanskrit world, see, for instance, Pollock (2001b); Bronner (2002); McCrea (2002); Ganeri (2011). On the new wave of Braj intellectuals who flourished at the Mughal and Rajput courts of this period, see Busch (2011).


1. CHANDAR BHAN’S INTELLECTUAL WORLD

1. For an overview of Sher Shah’s life, career, and influence, see, for instance, Qanungo (1965); Aquil (2007).

2. Lane-Poole (1903: 237). For some more charitable, though still occasionally critical, reconsiderations of Humayun’s court and career, see Anooshahr (2008), Orthmann (2011, 2014), and Moin (2012: 94–129).

3. For the basic ideas, background, and debates surrounding the notion of *ṣulḥ-i kull*, see, for instance, Athar Ali ([1980] 2006); Rizvi (1999); I. A. Khan (1992: esp. 22–25); A. Nizami (1972: esp. 131–42). For an overview of Akbar and Abu al-Fazl’s religious and intellectual outlook more generally, Rizvi (1975) remains the most comprehensive study.


6. For an overview and critique of these debates, see Alam and Subrahmanyam (1998: 1–71; 2012: 1–32).


11. The quoted phrases are from Smith (2003: 60). For other versions of this general approach to Aurangzeb’s reign, see, for instance, Richards (1993: 151–84); Stein (1998: 176–89); Wolpert (2009: 156–72). Of course, there are some notable exceptions to this general
rule. The work of Muzaffar Alam (esp. 1986) and Satish Chandra (e.g., [1959] 2002; [1999] 2005: 267–357; and the various relevant essays reprinted in 2003: 71–127, 305–53, 485–94) comes especially to mind, along with more recent work by Katherine Butler Brown (2007) and Munis Faruqui (2009, 2013). But unfortunately, though a more nuanced approach to the complex relationship between Aurangzeb’s personal piety and his actual policies is slowly beginning to emerge, the old conventional wisdom (not to mention its implicit Islamophobia) still tends to trickle down to many textbooks and other general works on South Asian and global history.

12. It is only through such willful embrace of the logical fallacy of *post hoc ergo propter hoc* (“after it, therefore because of it”) that a modern commentator could write, in all seriousness, that under Aurangzeb “the Pakistan spirit gained strength” (M. A. Zafar, *Pakistani Studies for Secondary Education* [1986], quoted in Rosser 2004: 277). Another writes that the tension between Aurangzeb and Dara Shukoh, his famously liberal brother and chief rival for the throne, exhibited “those trends, which were to result finally in the partition of the subcontinent in 1947” (Schimmel 1980: 2). To another, “Aurangzeb’s reign thus marks an anti-climax in the otherwise glorious era of medieval Indian history and culture. The virus of religious communalism which subsequently infested the body of India, leading to the Partition of the country in 1947, had sprouted in the diseased brain of Aurangzeb, the perverted genius of his age” (Mehta [1983] 1990: 300).


14. Brahman (2007: 145). Subsequent citations of *Chahār Chaman* in this chapter refer, unless otherwise noted, to this printed edition edited by Yunus Ja’fery (hereafter CC) and are given parenthetically in the text with page numbers.

15. There was a well-known painter in Akbar’s time also named Dharam Das, but it is unlikely that this was the same person as Chandar Bhan’s father.

16. That is, because conventionally a *ghazal*’s final verse, or *maqta*, always contains the poet’s pen name. For some examples of the playfulness of Chandar Bhan’s *ghazals*, see chapter 5 below.

17. See, for instance, Brahman (2005: 75–80, 82–93, 105, 107–8, 110–16). Subsequent citations of *Munsha’āt-i Brahman* refer, unless otherwise noted, to this printed edition edited by S. H. Qasemi and Waqarul Hasan Saddiqi (hereafter MB) and are given parenthetically in the text with page numbers. See also below, chapter 4.

18. For an English translation of excerpts from one of these letters to Tej Bhan, see Alam (2003: 164–65); Alam and Subrahmanyam (2004: 62–63). For a more detailed discussion, see also below, chapter 4.

19. The passage does not appear in the printed edition of *Chahār Chaman* but is in the manuscript housed in the National Museum, New Delhi, MS #3340 (55043/2217), fol. 97a—quite possibly the oldest extant manuscript of the text. (The Banarasi Das mentioned here is almost certainly not the famous author of *Ardhakathānaka*.)


21. For samples of both kinds of letters, see MB, 62–73.

23. For Chandar Bhan’s letters to ‘Aqil Khan, see MB, 23–24. For an early mention of ‘Aqil Khan in Jahangir’s memoirs, see Jahangir (2007: 34 [Persian]); Jahangir (1999: 59 [English]).


26. Further information on Amanat Khan’s life, career, and architectural contributions is available in Begley and Desai (1989: xxxii–xl, 247–57), from which many of the details in this paragraph are taken.


33. Jahangir (1999: 219). We know from a surviving letter to one of Chandar Bhan’s brothers that the munshī did visit Malwa at least once in his life—where he was able to take in the local sights and tour the “great fort at Mandu, whose dimensions exceed the descriptive capabilities of mere writing” (sair-i qil’a-yi ‘umda-yi Mândû ki ihāta-yi ān az ẓâbt-i tahrîr bîrân wa afzûn ast)—but it appears from the context that this was several years later when he was working for Afzal Khan (MB, 93).


38. Harkaran Das Kamboh (1781: 2–7) (I have amended Balfour’s translation). Hatim was a sixth-century (i.e., pre-Islamic) Christian Arab proverbial for his generosity and kindness; “Anushirwan” refers of course to Khusrau I Anushirwan, the celebrated sixth-century Persian king renowned for his justice and virtue.

39. “‘Inayat Khan” was a title, not a name, so this particular acquaintance of Chandar Bhan should not be confused with the more famous author of the Shah Jahan Nama, Muhammad Tahir ‘Inayat Khan (d. 1670–71), who served for a time as Shah Jahan’s royal librarian, and whose father (Zafar Khan Ahsan, d. 1663) and grandfather (Khwaja Abu al-Hasan Turbati) had both served in Mughal governmental circles for decades. The usual sources contain very few biographical details about the earlier ‘Inayat Khan whom Chandar Bhan is discussing here, although Jahangir’s account of his death from alcohol abuse is very moving (1999: 279–81 [English]; 2007: 247–48 [Persian]). The Thackston edition of Jahāngīrnāma also reproduces an excellent portrait of him ca. 1610 (1999: 104), as well as the famous Balchand painting of the dying, emaciated khan in his final days (1999: 280).
For further details, and for a discussion of the art-historical significance of the latter painting, see also Smart (1999); Schimmel (2004: 195).

40. For details on Asaf Khan’s life and political career, see A. Kumar (1986); Shahnawaz Khan (1888–96 [I]: 151–60).


43. For details, see Pingree (2003: 269–70). Unfortunately, Nityananda’s efforts were not as well received in Sanskrit scholarly circles as they were among the various Mughal and Rajput courts where manuscripts were commissioned. In response, Nityananda wrote an elaborate defense of the Romaka (i.e., Greco-Roman) astronomical principles used by Muslim astronomers, aimed at his fellow pundits, and known as the Sarvasiddhāntarāja. For the larger context of traditional Sanskrit astronomy, or jyotih śāstra, including the response to Perso-Arabic learning, during this period, see Minkowski (2002, 2014).

44. See Pingree (1999).


49. For a general introduction to these thinkers’ lasting influence on scientific progress not just in Asia and the Middle East but in Europe as well, see, for instance, al-Khalili (2010). For the specific reception of their ideas in early modern India, see Speziale (2009a, 2010b).

50. For details, see, for instance, Speziale (2003).

51. See Speziale (2009b), from which most of the details about Nur al-Din’s career in the remainder of this paragraph are taken.

52. Speziale (2011; 2009a: 5).


54. For details on these poets, see, for instance, M. Lutfur Rahman (1970: 148–50).

55. For details on his career, see Shahnawaz Khan (1888–96 [III]: 441–42).

56. Chandar Bhan doesn’t specify the timing of this expedition, but perhaps he is referring here to the imperial camp’s departure from Lahore toward Kabul on March 6, 1639 (cf. ’Inayat Khan 1990: 256). That would, at any rate, be about the latest possible date for such an interaction, since Mu’tamad Khan died in 1049 AH, i.e., 1639–40 CE.


60. According to Shah Jahan Nama, the imperial camp left Agra on January 24, 1645 (’Inayat Khan 1990: 321–23). The plan was to go by way of Ajmer so that the emperor could visit the shrine of Mu’in al-Din Chishti after having vowed to do so during Princess Jahan Ara’s illness. But the princess had a relapse en route, and the imperial camp headed instead for Delhi. On the way, she was treated by “a mendicant named Hamun,” whose medicinal
plasters did indeed cure the reaggravation of Jahan Ara’s burns—for which “the indigent Hamun” and his entire family were rewarded handsomely, both by the emperor himself and by the rest of the royal family, with gifts ranging from gold and robes of honor to horses, an elephant, and a land grant in perpetuity in his native village. Chandar Bhan doesn’t mention any of these incidents, but ‘Inayat Khan, the author of Shah Jahan Nama, remarks: “Although many famous physicians from among the Farangis, Musulmans, and Hindus had exerted themselves to the best of their ability in concocting plasters, they had produced no beneficial effect; but as the good stars of Hamun and the page ‘Arif Chela—of whom mention has been previously made—were in the ascendant, their efforts were crowned with success.” At any rate, from Delhi the imperial camp proceeded toward Punjab via Sirhind, where it arrived on March 17, 1645. The Nauroz festival that Chandar Bhan describes here was held two days later.


63. See, for instance, Koch (1988, 1994).

64. “The moon” is often shorthand in Persian poetry for the radiant face of the beloved, and the moon’s dark spot—or in this verse technically its ‘freckle(s)’ (kalaf)—is seen as a beauty mark that only serves to highlight the brightness of the rest of its face. In the case of the moon, of course, that brightness comes from the sun. But even the sun, for all its brilliance, cannot fully remove the moon’s kalaf. Thus what Chandar Bhan is really saying with this image is that Shah Jahan’s face is so radiant that its light can overpower even the dark spots on the moon, something even the sun cannot achieve.


66. His dates are unknown, but for details on his career, see Shahnawaz Khan’s entry in Ma‘āsir al-Umarā (1888–96 [I]: 198–99), which I have relied on here.

67. Here, as elsewhere in much of his poetry, Chandar Bhan has adjusted the pronunciation of “Brahman” to conform with the requirements of Perso-Arabic meter—in this case, by changing it to “barahman” (short-long-long).


71. For details on his family and career, see Shahnawaz Khan (1888–96 [III]: 447–51).

72. For separate details on his career, see Shahnawaz Khan 1888–96 [II]: 307–9).

73. This is a reference to one of the most well-known topoi in all of Indo-Persian literature, that of the constellation of the Pleiades as a metaphor for the type of bejewelled necklace that a good poet might expect as a reward for a well-crafted verse.

74. On Mukhlis Khan’s career, see Shahnawaz Khan (1888–96 [III]: 566–68).

75. For brief details on Qudsi’s career, see A. Ahmad (1976: 123); M. Lutfur Rahman (1970: 141–46); Losensky (2006).

76. For details on Munir’s career, see M. Lutfur Rahman (1970: 148); Memon (1983); Rashid (1967: 348–51). For a discussion of the historical significance of Munir’s debates with

77. Quoted in Shafiq (n.d., 9). “Sahbān” refers to Sahbān Wā’il, the celebrated medieval Arab orator proverbial for his eloquence.

78. Bayāz-i Sā’īb, MS, Oriental Manuscript Library and Research Institute (OMLRI), Hyderabad, #6170 (Dawāwīn #344), fol. 193a (185a, according to the numbers penciled in the margin). The couplet in question is couplet 2 of ghazal 47 in the Dīwān-i Brahman 1967 printed edition edited by Farooqui (Brahman 1967). For an overview of Sa’īb’s career generally, see Losensky (2004).

79. Bayāz-i Bedil, MS, British Library, Add. 16,802, fols. 283a, 286b–287a, and 315a, and Add. 16,803, fol. 73b. For details on Bedil’s career, see A. Ghani (1960); M. Siddiqi (1989).


81. The others were Mulla Shaida, Munir Lahori, and Hakim Haziq; see Salih Kambuh (1967–72 [III]: 305–44).

82. Salih Kambuh, Bahār-i Sukhan, MS, British Library, Or. 178, fol. 96b.


84. See, for instance, the notices in Shahnawaz Khan (1888–96 [II]: 282); Marahravi (1910: 233–37).

85. Shahnawaz Khan (1888–96 [II]: 282). His death is also mentioned in various chronicles of Aurangzeb’s reign, such as Khafi Khan’s Muntakhab al-Lubāb, (1963 [III]: 166) and Saqi Musta’id Khan’s Ma’āṣir-i ‘Ālamgīrī (1947: 29).


87. MS, Akhbār papers (RAS Persian), entry 9/4, Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland. I am grateful to Munis Faruqui for originally bringing this reference to my attention and am especially grateful to Mr. Edward Weech, a librarian at the Royal Asiatic Society who provided me with digital images of the relevant pages.


89. Note that in the 2005 printed edition of Munsha’āt-i Brahman (MB, 14) this letter appears to be merely a continuation of the previous one, with no separate heading (probably the result of an earlier scribal error that in turn wound up being reproduced by the modern editors). But the context—and the content—make clear that it is a separate piece of correspondence.

2. A MIRROR FOR MUNSHĪS

1. For background on the Indo-Persian secretarial culture generally, see, for instance, Mohiuddin (1971); Zilli (2000, 2007); Hanaway (2012); Alam and Subrahmanyam (2004); Kinra (2010).

2. Brahman (2007: 171–77); subsequent citations of Chahār Chaman refer, unless otherwise noted, to this printed edition edited by Yunus Ja’fery (hereafter CC) and are given parenthetically in the text with page numbers. Brahman (2005: 95–101); subsequent citations of Munsha’āt-i Brahman refer, unless otherwise noted, to this printed edition edited by S. H. Qasemi and Waqarul Hasan Saddiqi (hereafter MB) and are given parenthetically in the text with page numbers. A brief excerpt of this letter has previously been translated in Alam (2003: 164–65) and in Alam and Subrahmanyam (2004: 62). All translations here, and any errors in them, are, however, my own.
3. Note that the version of the letter in the printed edition of Munsha’āt-i Brahman (MB, 95–101) does not contain this list of recommended poets at the end of the letter. It is not clear if this was an intentional omission on Chandar Bhan’s part or if it is simply due to some quirk or variation in the particular manuscripts consulted. But this is a question that can be answered only by further research.


5. The scholarly literature on these and other texts in the genre, many of which have also been ably translated into English, is far too extensive to list here. But for an overview of their specific reception in India and influence on Mughal culture and politics, see Alam (2000; 2004: 26–80).


8. Richards (1993: 121–23). There is, however, a recent and growing body of work that is starting to take the continuing role of mysticism and religious dialogue in the seventeenth-century Mughal culture, politics, and society of the post-Akbar period more seriously. See, for instance, Alam and Subrahmanyam (2009); Alam (2012); Lefèvre (2012); Moin (2012: 170–240); Kinra (2013); and the various relevant articles in Dalmia and Faruqui (2014).

9. For details on his life and career, see Das (1979); Marahravi (1910: 122–38); Shahnawaz Khan (1888–96 [II]: 123–29).


11. For details on Abu al-Hasan Tumbati’s career and family connections, see Shahnawaz Khan (1888–96 [I]: 737–39).


13. ‘Inayat Khan (1990: 32; 2009: 78–79); Shahnawaz Khan (1888–96 [I]: 149). A chronogram is a verse or short phrase used to mark the date of an important occasion, the talent for composing which was highly esteemed among Indo-Persian literati. Each letter in the Perso-Arabic alphabet also has a corresponding numerical value; thus, to find the value of a simple chronogrammatic phrase like this requires one merely to add up the values of the various letters.

14. Chandar Bhan was clearly quite taken with his new mode of transportation and notes with pride in a separate letter to his brother Ray Bhan (undated) that he rode the elephant while accompanying Afzal Khan on a trip to Daulatabad (MB, 75–76).

15. See, for instance, CC, 152; MB, 16–17, 55–57.

16. This is very likely Aqa ‘Abd al-Rashid Daylami (d. 1670–71), one of the most celebrated Persian calligraphers of the seventeenth century. He was Prince Dara Shukoh’s personal calligraphy instructor (Hasrat 1982: 160–61) and is said to have made a copy of [Thattawi’s?] Muntakhab al-Lughat personally dedicated to Shah Jahan. Details about his career are available in Gulam Muhammad “Haft-Qalami” Dihlawi’s Taṣkira-yi Khyush-Nawisān (1910: 95–100), where he is described as the “prophet of the empire of penmanship” (paighambar-i mulk-i khattāt). There is also a brief mention of him in Salih Kambuh’s ‘Amal-i Šālih (1967–72 [III]: 344), where the author notes that “for exquisiteness of calligraphic line, loveliness of œuvre, and gentility of character, he is famed throughout the world.”

17. Mu’izz al-Mulk was governor of Surat from 1629 to 1636, and again from 1639 to 1641. For details on his career, see Flores (2011); F. Hasan (2004: 31–43).
18. For more on Nilakantha’s *Mahābhārata* commentary, including his mention of eyeglasses, see, for instance, Christopher Minkowski (2010), to whom I am also grateful for bringing Nilakantha’s work to my attention and clarifying its meaning in conversation and private correspondence.

19. Perhaps an allusion to the four “servants essential to kings” famously outlined in Nizami’s *Chahār Maqāla*, first among whom is none other than the imperial secretary, “for the maintenance of the administration” (1921: 12).

20. That is, he works for the justice and benefit of all, instead of using his position for personal gain. This passage bears a striking resemblance to an aphorism that appears in the *Fārs-nāma* of the eleventh-century Persian historian and political theorist Ibn Balkhi—who was, incidentally, himself part of a family of revenue administrators (mustaufiyān): “The Persians based their notion of kingship on justice [‘adl], and their way of life on equity and liberality [dād-o-dishish]. Whenever [a king] designated his son heir, he advised him to ponder this saying: ‘There is no dominion [mulk] without an army [‘askar], and no army without wealth [māl], no wealth without development [‘imārat], and no development without justice [‘adl];’ and this maxim has been incorporated into the Arabic tongue from the the *pahlawi* language” (1921: 4–5). According to A. K. S. Lambton (1962: 99–101), the original source of this saying was al-Tha’ālibi, who attributed it to Ardashir, the celebrated founder of the Sasanian Empire; she adds that it “became one of the stock themes of the writers of mirrors [for princes],” appearing in the works of such widely read authors of *naṣīhat-nāmas* as Nizam al-Mulk, al-Ghazali, and Kay Ka’us ibn Iskandar.


22. *Rāy* (sometimes spelled *rā’ī*) was a Hindi variant of *rājā* that appears to have been used in Mughal parlance largely as a Hindu equivalent of *khān*. Thus a rāy who achieved special preeminence could be further promoted to the title of *rāy-i rāyān* (*rāy* of *rāys*), exactly analogous to the term *khān-i khānān* as used for elite Muslim notables. One suspects that this use of the term was a convenient way of assigning honorific titles to non-Rajput Hindus at court without creating confusion—but I don’t believe anyone has actually studied the question systematically.


25. The *mustaufi* was the chief auditor in the department of *istifāʾ*, a kind of comptroller’s office that worked under the direction of the Mughal state’s chief financial officer (*dīwān*), and was usually tasked with things like auditing accounts and settling claims submitted by provincial estate holders (*jāgīrdārs*) and other revenue collectors (cf. Richards 1986: 25, 63–64).

26. The circumstances are somewhat mysterious, but for details see ‘Inayat Khan (1990: 325 [English]; 2009: 299 [Persian]).


30. For details, see Jagadish Sarkar (1951); Shahnawaz Khan (1888–96 [III]: 530–55).
32. The letter is addressed to “Mu’azzam Khan,” Mir Jumla’s official title following his promotion to wazīr.
33. Chandar Bhan, incidentally, appears not to have been the only person with a low opinion of Muhammad Amin Khan, who according to several accounts seems to have been somewhat of a boor. See, for instance, the anecdotes of his bad behavior recounted in Shahnawaz Khan (1888–96 [III]: 531).
34. 'Inayat Khan (1990: 546). For details on Ja’far Khan’s career, see also Shahnawaz Khan (1888–96 [I]: 531–35).
35. Shahnawaz Khan (1888–96 [II]: 282). His death is also mentioned in various chronicles of Aurangzeb’s reign, such as Khafi Khan (1963 [III]: 166); Saqi Musta’id Khan (1947: 29).
36. Aurangzeb (1880: 21 [#56], 46–47 [#149]).
38. Alam and Subrahmanyam (2010).
41. 'Inayat Khan (1990: 149); note that Jadunath Sarkar, following ‘Abd al-Hamid Lahori, gives the victim’s name as Bhim Narayan, not Prem (1920 [I]: 18).
42. E.g., 'Inayat Khan (1990: 165).
44. 'Inayat Khan (1990: 84–85).
45. For more details on this campaign, see 'Inayat Khan (1990: 233–43).
46. For extended discussions of the powerful effect of these strains of Mughal cultural memory on their imperial ideology, see, for instance, Foltz (1998: 12–51); Balabanlilar (2012); Moin (2012: 23–93).
47. 'Inayat Khan (1990: 335).
48. For details on these grievances and Sa’d Allah Khan’s efforts to address them, see, for instance, 'Inayat Khan (1990: 339–40).
49. Even Mughal charity was kept up while the army was on campaign, as this moving anecdote from 'Inayat Khan’s Shāh Jahān Nāma indicates. In the same month that Murad Bakshsh and ‘Ali Mardan Khan were dispatched for the campaign in Balkh and Badakhshan, the chronicler tells us, “It was reported that in consequence of the high price of food, some of the poorer classes of the province of the Punjab were selling their children. Accordingly, an edict was issued from the benevolent and indulgent threshold, directing that whosoever sold his child should receive the price out of the royal coffers, and have the child restored to him again. By this kindness, a great number were relieved from the anxiety of procuring food, the pangs of hunger, and the hardship of being separated from their offspring. A sublime farman was also promulgated to the effect that alms houses should be
opened in different places, and that two hundred rupees’ worth of meals should be distributed daily in charity among the poor and destitute” (1990: 337).

50. For details on all of these developments, see, for instance, G. Sharma (1954); Sri Ram Sharma (1971).

51. Note that while CC lists the boy’s name as “Subhāg Chand,” a number of other sources call him Subhāg Singh. See, for instance, Salih Kambuh (1967–72 [III]: 149).


53. Jahangir (1999: 164–65). For further details on Afzal Khan’s role in these earlier events, and his life and career generally, see Kinra (forthcoming).

3. KING OF DELHI, KING OF THE WORLD

1. Two classic examples of this branch of Mughal scholarship are R. P. Tripathi’s “Turko-Mongol Theory of Kingship” (1936) and J. F. Richards’s “Formulation of Imperial Authority under Akbar and Jahangir” (1978). Both have been reprinted in Alam and Subrahmanyam (1998: 115–25 and 116–67, respectively). More recently, Lisa Balabanlilar (2007, 2012), for instance, has examined the continuing impact of the Central Asian Timurid tradition on Mughal politics; A. Azfar Moin (2012) has examined the role of astrology, millennial thinking, and the occult sciences in Mughal theories about the king as the semidivine embodiment of certain astrological phenomena; and Munis Faruqui (2012) has comprehensively established the crucial role of princely competition in the more mundane—but of course essential—quest for worldly power within the Mughal dynasty, through their role as frontier administrators and their efforts to build up princely households and networks of their own.

2. Tārik_h -i Rājahā-yi Dehlī-yi Hindūstān, MS, Gujarat Vidya Sabha, Ahmedabad (Main Catalog #46). Subsequent citations of the Tārik_h -i Rajahā-yi Dihlī in this chapter refer, unless otherwise noted, to this manuscript (hereafter TRD) and are given parenthetically in the text with folio numbers.

3. It should be noted, however, that Qaiqubad’s reputation in many other Indo-Persian sources is not nearly so good as Chandar Bhan suggests. See, for instance, Khwajah Nizamuddin Ahmad’s Ṭabaqāt-i Akbarī ([1927] 1973 [I]: 119–31).

4. Note that the word Chandar Bhan uses here is jahd—“toil, struggle, effort,” etc.—and not jihād, the more infamous term usually (mis)translated as “holy war.”

5. Several books examine Delhi’s importance as a political center from ancient times through the Mughal period and down to the present. For a good distillation of the British colonial perspective on this history, see, for instance, Fanshawe (1902) or Hearn (1906). And for more recent considerations, see K. Nizami (1989); Blake (1991); S. Kumar (2010).


8. Lord (1839: 159). I am grateful to Manan Ahmed Asif for referring me to this inventory of Moorcroft’s possessions. See also his note on Moorcroft in a blog post (Ahmed [Asif] 2007).


10. (1) ‘Abd al-Salām Collection, #289/59, copied in Bengal in 1209 AH (1794–95 CE), seems originally to have referred to the text as per the colophon, which gives the title Guldasta-yi Qawā’id al-Saltanat, with someone later adding “-i Shāh Jahān”; (2) ‘Abd al-Salām
Collection, #291/61b, copied during Shah 'Alam’s reign in 1194 AH (1780 CE), lists it in the front matter as *Guldasta-i Saltanat*, while the colophon simply calls it *Guldasta-i Chandar Bhān Munshi*; (3) Subhān Allah Collection #891’5528/20, copied in 1146 AH (1733–34 CE) or possibly 1126 (1714 CE), describes it variously in the front matter as *Guldasta-i Munshi Chandar Bhān* or *Guldasta az Taṣnīf-i Chandar Bhān Munshi*, and in the colophon as *Guldasta az Taṣnīf-i Chandar Bhān Brahman*; (4) Suleiman Collection #664/42, copied in 1196 AH (1781–82 CE), refers to the text in the colophon as *Guldasta, mausūm ba-Qawā'id al-Saltanat*; (5) Suleiman Collection #664/44, which is missing a colophon, also refers to the text by both names; and finally (6) Habib Ganj Collection, #56/1, refers to the text in one place as *Qawā'id al-Saltanat-i Shāh Jahān* but notes that it has been copied from a fellow scribe’s version of *Chahār Chaman*.


12. This emphasis on the routine business of government on Chandar Bhan’s part is the reason for my somewhat idiosyncratic translation of *qawā'id* (sing. *qā'ida*), which Gladwin is technically correct in translating as “rules,” instead as “routines.” It may be unconventional, but I think it goes much further in capturing the sense of what Chandar Bhan is trying to convey in this text than any of the typical alternatives for translating *qā'ida*, which Steingass (1892: 948), for instance, lists as “base, basis, foundation, ground-work; a pedestal; capital of a column; a metropolis, capital, seat of government; rule, custom, institution, mode, manner, style, etiquette; regulation; a rule of grammar; first reader, primer; construed with the verbs sust kardan, shikastan, nihādan, &c.” One gets closer to the sense in which I’m using it here, actually, with Steingass’s subsequent definition of the related term *qā'ida-dān* (i.e., “one who knows *qā'idas*”) as “one versed in rules of practice, or forms, or customs, or ceremonies; an expert, an authority” (948).


14. Brahman (2007: 85). Subsequent citations of *Chahār Chaman* in this chapter refer, unless otherwise noted, to this printed edition edited by Yunus Ja’fery (hereafter CC) and are given parenthetically in the text with page numbers.

15. The Huma is a legendary bird of fortune in ancient Persianate mythology. Merely catching sight of one was thought to be a good omen, but to have the Huma’s shadow fall upon one, or to have it alight on one’s head, was considered an especially auspicious sign of royal destiny. Here Chandar Bhan seems to be inverting the usual hierarchy, suggesting that Shah Jahan’s kingly qualities are so magisterial that even the Huma bird, typically the creature that confers royal favor, actually seeks the shade of his royal parasol. For further details on the Huma, along with other examples of references to it in Persian literature, see for instance Schimmel (1992: esp. 187–88).

16. Like a number of manuscripts of *Chahār Chaman* and *Guldasta*, the text of this section of the 2007 printed edition of *Chahār Chaman* (CC, 88–89) skips over Chandar Bhan’s full inventory of the fruits available at the palace breakfast, so here I have relied on the version in Gladwin’s *Persian Moonshee* (1795: 45), though I have also revised Gladwin’s English translation for accuracy and readability. Cf. also *Guldasta / Qawā'id al-Saltanat*, MS, Azad Library, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh (Suleiman Collection #664/44: fol. 3a–3b); and *Qawā'id al-Saltanat-i Shāh Jahān*, MS, Azad Library, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh (Habib Ganj Collection, #56/1:1–2).
17. Gladwin reads this as “musk-melons of Balk, and those cultivated near watercourses,” presumably reading kārīz (or perhaps kārez) to mean the notable water regulation system developed among the Uighurs of ancient Turpan, an important Silk Road oasis on the edge of the Taklamakan desert. But Chandar Bhan was almost certainly referring, not to melons “cultivated near water-courses,” but rather to those from Kariz, a town in Khurasan just inside modern Iran’s northeastern border with Afghanistan (about midway between Mashhad and Herat), which was apparently famous for its delicious melons. Indeed, Joseph Pierre Ferrier, the nineteenth-century French adventurer who traveled across much of Central and West Asia, makes a special note in his memoir Caravan Journeys and Wanderings of Kariz’s onetime reputation for great melons: “The melons of this locality were in ancient days considered the best in Asia, and were reserved for the courts of Teheran, Kabul, and Delhi: but the village having been destroyed at the close of the last century, and consequently deserted, the seed was lost, or degenerated from change of soil. Kariz had recently been re-peopled by Hazarahs, who are taking pains to re-establish the reputation of its melons—judging by the two I ate, they have not yet succeeded” (1856: 138).

18. Here again, Gladwin’s reading of shaftālū-yi kārdī as “apricots fit for the knife” is surely mistaken. The “Kardi” was a variety of peach common to Central and West Asia. Babur refers to them in his memoir by way of comparison with the Indian mango, which, he says, “resembles the kardi peach” (2002: 344). They are also clearly listed among the varieties of Persian peaches (Amygdalus persica) in Edward Balfour’s Cyclopaedia of India (1885 [III]: 166–67).

19. Gladwin (1795: 45).

20. Satish Chandra has rightly noted that the Mughal ritual of jharoka-darshan was specifically intended to link their style of rule to the deeper practices of Indian kingship and to inculcate certain values among the nobility and bureaucracy: “Since the ruler was the centre of government his attitude towards public business set a standard and a norm. These, in turn, were widely emulated by the nobles. . . . The morning appearance which was called jharoka darshan was an innovation of Akbar, and was designed to establish a personal bond between the ruler and his subjects. This was an occasion when people could submit their petitions and present their cases without hindrance. A decision could be taken on the spot, or, as under Shah Jahan, the clerks of the judicial department took notes, and placed them before the ruler in the open darbar, or in the private audience chamber. The jharoka darshan was sometimes used for witnessing animal fights, or reviewing the contingents of nobles. In course of time, as Akbar’s prestige rose, some people made it a rule not to eat or drink till they had the darshan of the king. This was a practical demonstration of the old Indian traditions of attaching divinity to the office of the king” ([1999] 2005: 145–46).


22. Note that here the word sultān does not mean “king” or “ruler,” as it did in much of the larger Islamic world, including India in the pre-Mughal era. As Alam has noted, in Mughal parlance the meaning of sultān by the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries “had expanded, or rather degenerated into denoting even cousins, distant cousins, and nephews of the reigning monarch—that is to say, even those with no plausible pretensions to power” (Alam 2004: 2).
23. For details on some of their celebrated careers and works, see, for instance, Roxburgh (2005); Dihlawi (1910). Samples of the works of Sultan ‘Ali Mashhadi, Mir ‘Ali Haravi, and Mir ‘Imad al-Hasani were also recently displayed in the exhibit “Nasta’liq: The Genius of Persian Calligraphy” at the Smithsonian’s Arthur M. Sackler Gallery (September 13, 2014, to May 3, 2015); details of the calligraphers’ lives, and specimens of their work, can still be viewed on the exhibit’s website: www.asia.si.edu/explore/nastaliq/default.asp (accessed May 10, 2015).

24. It is not clear exactly what Chandar Bhan means by the distinction between brahmans and hindīs—probably he just means to indicate that the astrologers whom Shah Jahan consulted were not exclusively Brahmans, that there were “other Indians” as well.

25. This discussion of justice leads directly into one of the strangest passages in all of Chahār Chaman (CC, 99), in which Chandar Bhan essentially narrates the famed biblical story of King Solomon and the baby of disputed identity (1 Kings 3:16–28) as if it had happened at Shah Jahan’s court! It is not clear what to do with this passage, analytically speaking. Chandar Bhan was not in the habit of using parables, and this, as far as I can tell, is the only such passage in his entire surviving oeuvre. Whether he thought that his readers would not make the connection to the famous story, or he simply did not care, is not readily apparent. It is also not clear what his source for the story might have been. Perhaps he borrowed it from the version recounted in Mir Khwand’s fifteenth-century compendium Raużat al-Ṣafā (The garden of purity), which, as he tells us later in Chahār Chaman, was regularly read aloud as part of the evening entertainment at Shah Jahan’s court (see below). For an English translation of Mir Khwand’s version of the story, see Mir Khwand (1892 [pt. 1, II]: 73–74).

26. For extended discussions of this Timurid-Mughal genealogy, see, for instance, Anooshahr (2009: 15–57); Balabanlilar (2007, 2012); Moin (2012).

27. The text was translated into English in the nineteenth century by E. Rehatsek under the title Sacred and Profane History According to the Moslem Belief and then reedited by F. F. Arbuthnot and published by the Royal Asiatic Society in 1892 (Mir Khwand 1892).

28. Woods (1987: 99–100). For further details, as well as a general discussion of how such Timurid historical scholarship influenced later Mughal and Safavid historiography, see, for instance, Quinn (2003).

29. Reeve (2012: intro.).

30. Astonishingly, the very same exhibition catalog appears to reverse itself just a few lines later by describing Shah Jahan as “a very hands-on ruler.” But the author, unlike Chandar Bhan, clearly does not see this as a good thing. Rather, according to him: “Shah Jahan emerges as a rather aloof perfectionist, put on a pedestal as a symbol of the just Islamic ruler. . . . He was, however, a very hands-on ruler, travelling around his kingdom to be seen and to enforce Mughal authority and central control, not least on taxation. Unlike Akbar and Jahangir, he was an orthodox Islamic ruler” (Reeve 2012: pl. 18). Note that other than the English ambassador Sir Thomas Roe (who, by the way, had left India in 1618, some ten full years before Shah Jahan even became emperor) not a single contemporary seventeenth-century source, in Persian or any other Indian language, is cited to support these assertions. Yet the author clearly feels confident characterizing Shah Jahan as an “orthodox” sectarian figure and further implying that even Shah Jahan’s “hands-on” approach to governance was largely, if not entirely, in bad faith—cultivated solely for the self-serving purposes of van-
ity (“to be seen”), intimidating his subjects (“to enforce Mughal authority”) and extracting more taxes from them. In other words, the idea that Shah Jahan’s “perfectionism” and belief in “justice” could actually have provided a sincere impetus to improve governance and the administration of “state affairs,” or that they could have coexisted with a robust sense of Muslim piety, is apparently inconceivable. Shah Jahan could not actually be a “just Islamic ruler,” he could only pose as a symbol of one in order to disguise his true nature as an “orthodox Islamic ruler” unlike his father and grandfather. Beyond this, Lives of the Mughal Emperors spends barely three pages on Shah Jahan’s actual life and career, one of which is entirely on the Taj Mahal (pl. 19), and another of which is almost entirely focused not on Shah Jahan himself but on Dara Shukoh and Aurangzeb’s struggle to succeed him (pl. 21) (completely neglecting to mention, incidentally, that there were two other princes, Shah Shuja and Murad Bakhsh, who played major roles in that struggle).

31. For a detailed discussion of early modern horse trade and breeding practices in India, see Gommans (1995: 68–103), according to whom “the horses from Kutch were particularly celebrated and could not be easily distinguished from Arabians.” In fact, there were even legends about the Arabian origin of the Kutch horses. According to the early nineteenth-century European adventurer George Augustus Frederick Fitzclarence’s Journal of a Route across India, through Egypt, to England: “The breed of horses in Kutch is very fine; they have a peculiar dip in the back, and their superiority over the other horses of India is accounted for in the Ayen Akbaree [sic], by the following anecdote. A long time ago an Arab merchant ship was wrecked on the coast of Kutch, and seven chosen Arab horses were saved from the wreck, which are reported to have been the progenitors of the present race” (Fitzclarence 1819: 144).

32. The reader familiar with South Asian languages will note that these elephant names were often Hindi, or a mix of Persian and Hindi, perhaps owing to the fact that, unlike the horses, they were bred and trained almost exclusively in India.

33. The printed text of Chahār Chaman has neza (spear) (نیزہ) here, but Gladwin (1795: 66) is probably correct in reading it as tīr (arrow) (تیر), since the latter would logically go with kamān (bow), the next thing on the list—not to mention the fact that neza appears again in the list just a few items later, which would be an odd redundancy.

34. For some interesting examples of such gossip, see, for instance, Mukhia (2004: 113–55); Naim (2004).

35. Pace Richards (1993) and Blake (1991), respectively.

36. Note that here again I have broken up some of Chandar Bhan’s lists into columns, in order to make the syntax a bit clearer.

37. All three were eminent saints of the Chishti order, renowned for its tolerant disposition, and especially influential among the Mughal dynasty. For further details on the tombs specifically mentioned by Chandar Bhan, see, for instance, Blake (1991: 152–56). There is also an extensive bibliography on the Chishtis, but for basic details see, for instance, Rizvi (2002 [I]: 114–89); Ernst (1992: 5–93); Ernst and Lawrence (2002); K. Nizami (2002: 186–280); Digby (1990); Suvorova (1999: 105–31).


41. Again, cf. the title of Kavuri-Bauer (2011): Monumental Matters, which treats such trends purely as a modern phenomenon.
42. Koch (2008: 562). Again, not to beat a dead horse, but one has to wonder: If Shah Jahan had been so intent on rejecting the Akbari dispensation and replacing it with a more orthodox stance (as so much modern historiography seems to want to insist), then why would he so publicly exalt his illustrious grandfather by giving Agra Akbar’s name?


47. On Miyan Mir’s life and career, see Rizvi (2002 [II]: 103–8).

48. Like Miyan Mir, Shaikh Bala’ul was a Sufi of the Qadiri order whose khanqāh was just outside Lahore. For details, see Rizvi (2002 [II]: 66).


50. Annemarie Schimmel, for instance, in her Empire of the Great Mughals (2004: 48, 135), goes so far as to describe Miyan Mir variously as Dara Shukoh’s “guru” and spiritual “master” after the two “came into contact,” without ever once even mentioning Shah Jahan’s own relationship with the saint, much less pointing out that it was Shah Jahan who actually put them “into contact.” Similarly, John Richards cites Dara’s relationship with Miyan Mir and Mulla Shah as proof that, unlike his father, the prince was a “throwback” to the tolerant attitude of Akbar—again, without ever mentioning Shah Jahan’s connection to the two Qadiri saints: “In his intellectual curiosity, his open-mindedness, and his mystical interests Dara was in many ways a throwback to his great-grandfather, Akbar. He was an active disciple of Mulla Mir (d. 1635) [i.e., Miyan Mir] and Mulla Shah Badakshi (d. 1661), two leading Shaikhs of the Qadiri order of Sufis” (1993: 151–52).


52. These last three were all highly regarded Chishtis of the period, and among them Sayyid Muhammad Qanauji is probably the best known today. He was a disciple of the famous (though somewhat controversial) Chishti philosopher Shaikh Muhib Allah Allahabadi (ca. 1587–1648) (on whom see Rizvi [2002 [II]: 268–71]); and in addition to advising Shah Jahan on spiritual matters during his reign, he continued to do so even after the latter was imprisoned by Aurangzeb, and then served as one of the officiants at his funeral in 1666 (cf. Begley and Desai’s epilogue to ‘Inayat Khan [1990: 564–65]). Notably, he had also been one of Aurangzeb’s childhood tutors, and he continued his connection to the court later in life, for example when he was recruited by Aurangzeb to assist in the compilation of Fatāwā-yi ‘Ālamgīrī (Faruqui [2012: 81 n.]), a massive and influential compilation of Hanafi jurisprudence.

53. All three were very influential early saints of the Suhrawardi order. For details on their careers, see Rizvi (2003 [I]: 190–215).

54. “Baba” Farid al-Din Ganj-i Shakkar was one of the most popular Sufi saints of medieval India, and his shrine in Pattan became a well-known site of pilgrimage, and popular religious expression, among both Hindus and Muslims alike. For general details on his life, career, and influence, see, for instance, Rizvi (2003 [I]); K. Nizami (2002); Suvorova (1999: 81–104). For a study of the culture of popular religion surrounding Baba Farid’s shrine, see also the classic article by Richard Eaton (1984).
55. For basic details on Shaikh Jalal Makhджum Jahaniyan’s life and spiritual career, see Rizvi (2003 I: esp. 277–82). For a recent analysis of his thought and philosophy, see Steinfels (2012). And for a poignant meditation on the continuing reverberations of both Baba Farid’s and Shaikh Jalal’s memory in the political landscape of Pakistan today, see Ahmed (Asif) (2013).

56. Though Babur died in India in 1530, his body was later transported for burial in Kabul, in accordance with his wishes.

57. Asher and Talbot (2006: 92). For the details of Khattu’s life and career, see Rizvi (2003 I: 404–8). And for the larger context of Gujarati trade, commerce, and politics, including brief discussions of the influence and political connections of both of these two saints, see Shaikh (2010).

58. For details, see above, chapter 2.

59. For details, see, for instance, Currie (1989); Asher (1992: 77–80; 2009).

60. 'Inayat Khan (1990: 558).


62. The brevity of Chandar Bhan’s discussion of Banaras is, perhaps, especially ironic because as we will see in the final chapter one of the most potent myths about the munshi in the later Indo-Persian cultural memory is that Banaras is the city to which he ultimately retired, supposedly in mourning over the execution of his alleged benefactor, Prince Dara Shukoh. This myth is completely unfounded, and is, in fact, easily refuted by evidence available in Chandar Bhan’s own letters.

63. On Sharaf al-Din Ahmad Yahyá Maneri’s career, see Rizvi (2003 I: 228–40).

64. For details, see, for instance, Richards (1993: 133–35).

4. WRITING THE MUGHAL SELF

1. Brahman (2007: 145). Subsequent citations of Chahār Chaman in this chapter refer, unless otherwise noted, to this printed edition edited by Yunus Ja’fery (hereafter CC) and are given parenthetically in the text with page numbers.

2. For a basic overview of this distinction between ‘ishq-i haqiqi and ‘ishq-i majazi, along with many examples of how it was deployed in late Mughal poetry (especially in Urdu), see, for instance, Russell and Islam ([1969] 1998: 169–231).

3. See, respectively, O’Hanlon and Minkowski (2008); O’Hanlon (2010); Guha (2010); and Chatterjee (2009, 2010).

4. Cf. the letter to his brother, MB, 75–76.

5. The building is situated just outside Amritsar, and though parts of it are crumbling it is still standing and still known locally today as the Sarai Amanat Khan. These curious architectural tastes appeared to run in the family, for Afzal Khan’s own body was reportedly conveyed to Agra, where it was interred in a tomb of his own design that also had a number of novel structural features, leading the locals to refer to it as the Chinese Mausoleum (Chīnī kā Rauzā). (For details, see Koch [2006: 43–45; 2008: 573].) The calligraphic inscriptions on Afzal Khan’s tomb, like those on the Taj, also appear to have been designed by his brother Amanat Khan. For further details on his life and career, see Begley and Desai (1989: xxxii–xl) and above, chapter 1.

6. There are a handful of references to a certain “Indar Bhan” in a couple of Chandar Bhan’s letters, some of which suggest that he may have also been the munshi’s son. But the
wording is ambiguous, and it is possible that he was some other kind of relation, or even just a disciple, who was “like a son” to him. Be that as it may, he does not figure prominently in Chandar Bhan’s work, so there is not much more we can conclude about him.

7. Brahman (2005). Subsequent citations of Munsha‘at-i Brahman refer, unless otherwise noted, to this printed edition edited by S. H. Qasemi and Waqarul Hasan Siddiqi (hereafter MB) and are given parenthetically in the text with page numbers. Note that on the English title page of Qasemi and Siddiqi’s edition the title is listed as “Munshi‘at-e-Brahman.”

10. Muhammad Salih Kambuh, Bahār-i Sukhan, MS, British Library, Or. 178, fols. 96b–98a; cf. also MS, British Library, IO Islamic 3154, fols. 67a–68a.
12. Maktūbāt-i Mukhtalifa, MS, Bombay University Library, #82, fols. 6b–8a. For details on the other contents of this collection, see Sarfaraz (1935: 222–23; n.b., in Sarfaraz’s catalog it is listed as Majmū‘a-e-Khut-tūt (A collection of letters), but the spine of the manuscript’s actual binding calls it Maktūbāt-i Mukhtalifa (Miscellaneous writings).
13. Majma’ al-Afkār, MS, Khuda Bakhsh Oriental Public Library, #872, fols. 207a–208a. I am very grateful to Arthur Dudney for sharing his digital copy of these folios with me, as I have not had the opportunity to travel to Patna to review the manuscript myself. An abridged selection of a few notable parts of Majma’ al-Afkār was published some years ago (I. Siddiqi 1993), but it does not include Chandar Bhan’s letters. For a detailed summary of the overall contents of Majma’ al-Afkār, see Muqtadir (1925 [IX]: 82–100).
14. For details on Qudsi’s career, see Losensky (2006).
15. Cf. the version of this letter in MB, 15–16.
16. Cf. MB, 16–17 (where it has a slightly different heading that describes Afzal Khan as a latter-day Plato or Aristotle).
17. Note that this was not the same Ishwar Das (ca. 1655–1750) who later served under Aurangzeb and composed the Futūhāt-i ‘Ālamgīri.
19. i.e., it is impossible to go to the beloved except in complete submission and prostration. Thus the true lover (‘āshiq) has the look of a madman as he makes his way to the beloved, because he is constantly hunched over, crawling, etc.
25. The printed text reads khurrāmi-yi naqḍ-i sukhn; but interestingly enough, the Khuda Bakhsh manuscript of Majma’ al-Afkār has sāraﬁ-yi naqḍ-i sukhn, i.e., “the broker of literary capital”—yet another commercial metaphor.
26. I would suggest that this means “It’s not the road’s fault that you came crookedly down the path of love.”
27. For details on Munir’s life and works, see Memon (1983).
28. Cf. MB, 74–75. The translation here is a composite of the variants found in these two texts, along with those in Qadiri’s dual Urdu-Persian edition (Brahman 1992: 148–51).

29. The printed edition of Chahar Chaman has niz (“also”), but virtually all the manuscripts, and the Urdu edition (Brahman 1992), have beshtar (“greater”).


32. Cf. MB, 77. The couplet itself does not appear in the version of this letter in the printed edition of Munsha’āt, nor does there appear to be any corresponding ghazal in the printed Diwān of his poetry.


34. Cf. MB, 78–79.

35. Cf. MB, 93–95.


5. MAKING INDO-PERSIAN LITERATURE FRESH


2. Some conservative Mughal intellectuals, like the historian ‘Abd al-Qadir Badayuni (ca. 1540–1615), explicitly used such millenarian discourse to criticize Akbar’s humanistic policies of suhli kull as too open to heterodox influences. See, for instance, Moin (2009; 2012: 152–55). Others, like the famed Naqshbandi Sufi Shaikh Ahmad Sirhindi (d. 1624), who boldly cast himself as the “Renewer of the Second Millennium” (mujaddid-i alf-i šānti), drew energy from the moment to couch their own mystical visionary claims in terms of messianic reform. For a bibliography of further reading on Sirhindi and a recent reconsideration of his career and milieu, see Alam (2009). For comparison with the Safavid context, see, for instance, Babayan (2002). And for the Ottoman context, see, for instance, Fleischer (1992, 1994b); Şahin (2010).


5. See, for instance, Bronner and Shulman (2006).


8. For Tulsidas’s literary debt to the Sufi premākhyanas, see de Bruijn (2010). On Banarasidas, see Mukund Lath’s and Rohini Chowdhury’s introductions and notes to their respective English versions of his work (Banarasidas 2005, 2009). For a detailed analysis of the innovative “vernacular aesthetics” deployed throughout Banarasi’s autobiography, see Snell (2005).
11. For an extended discussion of rīti-style poetry’s marginalization in modern Hindi literary scholarship, see Busch (2011: 3–22, 202–48). For the similar fates of classical Persian and Urdu poetry, see Kinra (2011a); Faruqi (1998, 2001); Pritchett (1994); and Pritchett and Faruqi’s respective introductions to their translation of Muhammad Husain Azad’s Ḫābre-e Ḥayāt (2001: 1–17, 19–51). On the widespread modernist rejection and neglect of the šlehā (bitextual) tradition of classical Sanskrit, see Bronner (2010). To my knowledge, no comprehensive examination of the modern critique of classical Persian prose (inshā) has been published to date, though I explore some aspects of the largely dismissive colonial and nationalist attitude toward the genre in my PhD dissertation (Kinra 2008) and touch on them briefly in the Conclusion below.
12. The most detailed recent assessments in English of the poetics and logic of tāza-gū’ī are found in Losensky (1998: esp. 193–249) and Faruqi (2004). In Urdu, see, for instance, S. M. ‘Abdullah’s (1977d) very informative article. For a more general historical overview of Indian Persian and its place within the wider culture and politics of South, Central, and West Asia, see Alam (2003).
14. Of course, even Pound attributed the original formulation of his famous twentieth-century dictum to a certain Tching Tang, who ruled China in the seventeenth century BCE (cf. Cantos, #53). In other words, even for the quintessential modernist the ancient, classical, and exotic were not to be simply jettisoned but rather to be reconfigured and “made new” and relevant again.
16. There are scores of manuscripts of Chandar Bhan’s Dīwān in archives all over the world, and there have also been at least four printed editions (though two of them are very recent). The first, published as Gulzār-i Bahār, Ma’rūf ba Bazm-i Naẓm-i Brahman (“Spring’s Bouquet, also known as the Banquet of Brahman’s Verse”; n.d. [1930s?] ), was compiled with accompanying biographical information in Urdu by a poetically inclined civil servant named Bhagwant Rai “Bahar” Sunnami, according to what he claims was a (now lost) manuscript in Chandar Bhan’s own hand that he discovered in a private library in Lahore. It is extremely rare; in fact, in years of studying Chandar Bhan, I myself have only seen one actual copy of Sunnami’s text. The second, which itself relies mainly on Sunnami’s edition, has been edited with a nice English introduction by Muhammad ‘Abdul Hamid Farooqui, under the title Aḥwāl-o-Āṣār-i Chandra Bhān Brahman wa Dīwān-i Pārsī (“Life and Works of Chandra Bhan Brahman, along with His Persian Dīwān”; 1967). There are also two relatively new editions that have both appeared in the last decade. One was edited by Muhammad Amin ‘Amir, under the title Dīwān-i-Brahman az Rā’i-yi Rāyān Munshi Pandit Chandar Bhān Brahman (Brahman 2008); the other was edited by Shahid Naukhez Azmi under the title Chandar Bhān Brahman ki Fārsī Shā’irī (Brahman 2012) with an Urdu introduction and, in addition to Chandar Bhan’s ghazals and rubā’īs,
reproduces much of the poetry found in his other works and even the (probably spurious) Urdu ghazal occasionally attributed to him in modern scholarship. Unfortunately, I was not able to access a copy of Azmi’s edition until the final stages of editing the present work, so all citations of Diwān-i Brahman in this chapter refer, unless otherwise noted, to Farooqui’s edition (hereafter DB) and are given parenthetically in the text with a ghazal number followed by a period and then a couplet number.


18. Quoted as translated in Yarshater (1988: 251 n.).

19. For details on the fatwā and other particulars of Ghazali’s life and poetry, many of which come from Badayuni’s account, see Hadi (1978: 23–78).


22. For details on Sa’īb’s life and poetic career, see, for instance, M. Lutfur Rahman (1970: 135–41); Losensky (2004). For details on Iranian travel and migration to India more generally, see A. Ahmad (1976); Subrahmanym (1992a); Alam and Subrahmanym (2007).

23. Nahawandi (2002: 480). This passage is also quoted and discussed in ‘Abdullāh (1977b: 114) and Losensky (1999: 206). Because they were never patronized directly by ‘Abd al-Rahim Khan-i Khanan, there are no separate entries in Ma’āṣir-i Rahīm for Abu al-Fath Gilani and his brothers, who are instead discussed under the heading of Abu al-Fath’s nephew Hakim Haziq, who was himself a noted poet and prose stylist of the seventeenth century (Nahawandi 2002: 478–84). For further details on Abu al-Fath’s career, see also Shahnavaz Khan (1888–96 [I]: 558–62) and Muhammad Bashir Husayn’s introduction to the modern edition of Abu al-Fath’s letters, Ruqāṭ-i Ḥakīm Abū al-Fath Gilānī (Gilani 1968).


25. For ‘Urfī’s life and career, see Shiblī Nu’mānī (2002–4 [III]: 65–107); Ali (1929); M. Ansari (1974); Barq (1986); Losensky (2003).


30. Indeed, Losensky’s Welcoming Fighani (1998) is arguably the only modern book-length study in English that examines the poetics of tāza-gū’ī in terms of the fresh poets’ own literary critical claims and vocabulary, rather than imposing the anachronistic sabk-i hindī model on them retroactively. There are a handful of other excellent recent analyses, most notably Shamsur Rahman Faruqi’s “Stranger in the City: The Poetics of Sabk-e Hindi” (2004); but, as the title of the latter essay indicates, even Faruqi’s otherwise brilliant literary analysis remains committed to the notion of a discernible “Indian Style,” generally sidestepping the poets’ own claims that such inventiveness was “fresh” and new—rather than merely “Indian”—and thus largely bypassing the question of early modernity altogether. Meanwhile, Muzaffar Alam, in his “Culture and Politics of Persian in Precolonial
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64. For instance, where Lodi said that when Chandar Bhan retired to Banaras he “busied himself there with his own [i.e., ‘Hindu’] ways and customs” (ba râh-o-rasm-i khwesh mashghûl mibûd) (Lodi 1998: 123), Sandelvi states much more plainly, “He went to the city of Banaras and became a hermit after the manner of the Hindus” (dar shahr-i banâras bâtarz-i hinduwân gosha-gûr gashta). It’s a relatively minor change, obviously, but it shows that Sandelvi was not just mindlessly parroting Lodi’s text but in fact actively trying to gloss it in the process.
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CONCLUSION

1. Friedman (2007). (“Akbar wasn’t just tolerant. He was embracing of other faiths and ideas, which is why his empire was probably the most powerful in Indian history. Pakistan, which has as much human talent as India, could use an Akbar. Ditto the Arab world.”)

2. For an exhaustive critique, see Subrahmanyam (1992b) and the introductions to Alam and Subrahmanyam (1998, 2011).
Indeed, the idea that culture might have been at all relevant to Mughal history seems anathema to Habib, as he reiterates in the preface to the second edition: “The reader would find that I do not engage in debates with critics on such broad matters as the nature of the state (in respect of which since the early 1960s fashion has shifted from ‘Oriental Despotism’ to ‘segmentary state’ and ‘ritual kingship’), or the Price Revolution (on whose possible occurrence in India the first edition had touched upon), or the agrarian factors behind the decline of the Mughal empire (dealt with in Chapter IX). I have thought it best to use the space available to me mainly for presenting the further evidence that I have gathered and letting it speak for itself.” This posture might explain, at least in part, why Habib remained quite unwilling to give up on the colonial archive: “In the preface to the first edition [1963], I especially acknowledged my debt to W. H. Moreland and P. Saran, major precursors in the field. My consciousness of the debt to them and to others like H. M. Elliot, S. H. Hodivala, Jadunath Sarkar and Ibn Hasan, has only grown with time” (Habib 1999: xi).
