THE INDIAN TEXTS SERIES—I.

EDITED UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF THE

ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

VOL. I.

A full index and a map will appear in the last volume

Nicolao Manucci

INDIAN TEXTS SERIES

STORIA DO MOGOR

OR MOGUL INDIA

1653—1708

BY NICOOLAO MANUCCI

VENETIAN

TRANSLATED

WITH INTRODUCTION AND NOTES

BY WILLIAM IRVINE

BENGAL CIVIL SERVICE (RETIRED)

MEMBER OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

VOL. I

LONDON

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET

PUBLISHED FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

1907

GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE INDIAN TEXTS SERIES

WHEN on an archæological tour in India in the cold season of 1899-1900, I obtained the honour of an interview with the Viceroy, and was permitted to lay before him the outline of a scheme for the publication of a series of books of reference on the history of India. Lord Curzon was pleased so far to approve of the idea that he wished to have the scheme laid in fuller detail before him. Accordingly, on my return home, I submitted a draft scheme to the Council of the Royal Asiatic Society. This received the approval of the Council, and the following letter was addressed to the Government of India:

ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY,
22, ALBEMARLE STREET,
LONDON, W.,
June 12, 1900.

SIR,

I am desired by the President and Council of this Society to ask you to be kind enough to lay the following considerations before His Excellency the Viceroy.

The Society venture to ask the Government of India to take into consideration the desirability of publishing a series of historical volumes corresponding to the Rolls Series and the publications of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, published by the English Government.

It is perhaps unnecessary to point out how great have been the results of the publication long ago of two such volumes. The 'Mémoires sur les Contrées Occidentales,' translated by

Julien from the Chinese of Hiouen Thsang, and published by the French Government in 1857, have been the foundation of almost all that has been written since on the Archæology of India. And the publication, in 1837, by the Government of Ceylon, of the 'Great Chronicle' of that island has afforded evidence on which many of the main conclusions as to the early history of India depend.

The cost of such a series as is proposed would be very small. It would be desirable only to undertake such works as are both of real importance, and also of such a character that their publication would not pay commercially — conditions also observed in the case of the Rolls Series. The Society could undertake to produce two volumes annually at a cost of £240 per volume (see detailed estimate annexed), and any sums received by the sale of them could be applied towards the cost of future volumes.

The volumes would consist partly of texts, partly of translations, such as the two above mentioned; partly of indices or dictionaries (similar in method to, but smaller in scale than, Smith's well-known dictionaries) of proper names, personal or geographical, of importance for the history of India; and partly of monographs summarizing the historical data scattered through the numerous Oriental texts now accessible to scholars.

The documents in question would have little or no literary merit. They would be materials out of which the history of the development of the social conditions, the industries, and the political relations of the peoples of India could be reconstructed. The texts to be translated or explored would not be histories in our modern sense, even when they purport to be chronicles. In both these respects they would be like the historical documents published in the Rolls Series.

The series might be called the 'Indian Historical Series.' To be a success it would have to be placed under skilled general editorship, and each volume should be entrusted to a scholar so trained in the methods of historical research as to be able, in introduction, notes, and indices, to gather together or elucidate all the historical information obtainable from the document he edits or explores.

For these reasons it would be desirable that, for the present at least, the series should be supervised here; and the authors of the first volume to appear should be European scholars of the first rank. But the editor might be instructed to make use also of native Indian scholarship whenever it should be possible to do so.

No money would be necessary till January, 1902, as at least eighteen months must elapse, after the approval of the scheme, before any payments would be required.

The above estimate of cost is inclusive—that is, it covers the cost of editorship, authorship, printing, binding, insurance, and other miscellaneous charges—and with the gradual increase of the number of volumes on sale the series would in course of time, it may be hoped, become self-supporting.

The publication of such a series is essential to the future progress of the study of Indian History and Archæology. And considering the smallness of the amount required and the number of precedents that might be quoted in its favour, this Society venture to hope that the proposed scheme will meet with the approval and support of the Government of India.

I have, etc.,

T. W. RHYS DAVIDS,
Secretary.

After some correspondence the scheme was finally adopted by the Secretary of State for India, in a letter to the Society, dated November 4, 1902, enclosing the following despatch from His Excellency the Governor-General in Council:

To the Right Honourable LORD GEORGE FRANCIS HAMILTON,
His Majesty's Secretary of State for India.

SIMLA,
July 3, 1902,
NO. 191 OF 1902.

MY LORD,

We have the honour to forward, for Your Lordship's information, a copy of the correspondence noted in the annexed list, on the subject of a suggestion made by the Royal Asiatic Society, London, regarding the publication by the

Indian Government of a series of historical volumes corresponding to the Rolls Series and the publications of the Historical Manuscripts Commission.

2. The Society suggest that the volumes should consist partly of texts and partly of translations; and should also include indices or dictionaries of proper names, personal or geographical, of importance for the history of India, and monographs summarizing the historical data scattered through the numerous Oriental texts which are accessible to scholars. The Society are of opinion that, while these documents would have little or no literary merit, they would constitute materials out of which the history of the development of the social conditions, the industries, and the political relations of the peoples of India could be reconstructed. They suggest that the series might be called the 'Indian Historical Series'; that each volume should be entrusted to a scholar trained in the methods of historical research; that the series should be placed under skilled general editorship in England; and that the editor might be instructed to make use of native Indian scholarship whenever it is possible to do so. The Society offer us their assistance in the matter of publication, and undertake to produce two volumes annually at a cost of £240 per volume.

3. The proposals of the Society meet with our cordial support, and we would make the following suggestions in connection therewith for Your Lordship's approval. We would divide the series into two parts—the one to be called the 'Indian Records Series' and the other the 'Indian Texts Series.' We propose that the 'Indian Records Series' should consist of selections, notes, or compilations from the records of the Indian Governments or of the India Office, supplemented and elucidated where necessary by local inquiry. This series would correspond generally with the English Historical Manuscripts Series, except that the latter deals with private, whereas the former will deal with public records. The greater part of this work would be done in India. But lacunæ in our records might often be supplied from the India Office records, and we are of opinion that the general editing of this portion of the work should be done in England.

4. The 'Indian Texts Series' should consist of annotated editions of or translations or abstracts of or compilations from the works of Indian writers, such as Blochmann's 'Ain-i-Akbari,' Stein's 'Raja Tarangini,' Julien's 'Hwen Tsang,' or Beale's 'Buddhist Pilgrims.' As regards less important authors, little more than brief tables of contents would be needed. At the same time, as suggested by the Royal Asiatic Society, indices, dictionaries, and monographs should not be neglected. The former should aim, not so much at complete information as at complete bibliography. The salient facts being given and sufficient information to identify the man or place, mere references would be sufficient to sources of information which are readily accessible to scholars, though information from sources more difficult of access might be abstracted with some fulness. This series would correspond generally with the Rolls Series, except that it would deal with times prior to British rule. We think that it should be not only edited, but also for the most part written at home, although we would emphasize the suggestion of the Royal Asiatic Society that the editor should be instructed to make use of Indian scholarship (European or Native) to the fullest extent. The management of the series should, however, be left to the Royal Asiatic Society.

5. The two series would thus be quite distinct as regards authorship and editing. We would propose that two volumes a year in each series should be published, and that the Royal Asiatic Society should be entrusted with the publication of both series if, after a scrutiny of their estimate, which we have no means of making, your lordship considers that their terms are reasonable. With this object we would make a grant of Rs. 15,000 a year for the next five years to meet the expenditure involved in the proposals, which we trust will meet with Your Lordship's approval. In that event, we would ask Your Lordship to inform the Royal Asiatic Society of what has been decided upon. We propose to retain in our own hands the decision as to what books should be published in either series, and in what order.

We have, etc.

As will be noticed, the scheme was, by this decision, not only accepted, but doubled; and shortly afterwards the Government added, to be reckoned as extra volumes in the Indian Texts Series, two volumes of the text, and two of the translation of an Arabic history of Gujarat, then recently discovered by Mr. Denison Ross, Principal of the Calcutta Madrasa. Extra volumes have, in like manner, been added to the Indian Records Series. And besides these additions the Government has, in several cases, made extra grants for special illustrations to be inserted in volumes sanctioned under this scheme.

Under the original scheme the Society undertook the publishing; and the proceeds of the sales, without any deduction for publisher's commissions, were to be applied towards the production of future volumes. In this way it was hoped that the scheme would eventually become self-supporting. Since then it has since been thought advisable to place the publishing arrangements in the hands of Mr. Murray; and the India Office has taken charge of the preparation and production of the Records Series, leaving the Texts Series in the hands of the Royal Asiatic Society.

Having accepted the chair of Comparative Religion at the University of Manchester, I shall only retain official connection with the scheme long enough to wind up work already commenced under the original publishing arrangements. At the moment of assisting at its launch I have, therefore (though glad to obtain leisure urgently needed for other work), with much regret, to bid it farewell. But it is in able hands. And I may be permitted to express the confident hope that a scheme so generously adopted by Government, and so generously enlarged and improved, will continue through the years to provide a succession of just the sort of books that, as tools to a craftsman, will enable the historian of India to trace out the evolution of social institutions, religion, and literature, in the same manner

as the provision of the necessary tools has enabled the historians of Europe to do for the West.

The result cannot fail to be of value for the history of humanity as a whole, for what, in the absence of a better word in English, we are compelled to call *Weltgeschichte*. Already, in the history of government, of tribal customs, of land tenure, and of marriage, the Indian evidence has been much used by, and has proved of considerable service to, Western scholars. It will certainly prove more so in proportion as it becomes fuller and more exact. There are many similar questions on which the Indian evidence has not been utilized merely because it is not sufficiently known. And there is action and reaction in all these matters. The more the Indian evidence is used and compared with evidence from other sources, the greater is the light thrown upon the real value and bearing and meaning of the facts recorded in India, the clearer are our views of the order in which they should be arranged, the more suggestive and instructive the study tends to be.

To make a few paths and clearings in the thorny jungle of Indian history is not, therefore, mere useless dry-as-dust work. And there is another consideration. It has long been a matter for regret that the natives of India afford us so small a degree of help in the study of the history of their own country or countries. For one Englishman who can read the ancient literatures with facility there must be scores of natives. Yet how very little of permanent value have they, as yet, accomplished in history. This cannot be for want of intellectual power. As lawyers they show great ability in weighing the value of evidence, and in drawing guarded and reasonable conclusions from complicated documents. And one or two of the native scholars who have devoted their attention to this branch of inquiry have rendered excellent service. Perhaps the methods of the University examinations in India, in which

literary fluency counts for so much, and historical criticism for so little, are in some measure answerable for this neglect. But is it too much to hope that, when this series of scholarly handbooks shall have placed in their hands sufficient examples of the right methods in historical research, some of them may be moved by emulation to take up these studies for themselves, and themselves to join, in much larger numbers, in the work? Is it too much even to expect that a more widely diffused knowledge of the history of their own land; of the causes that led to intellectual achievements, and also to long periods of intellectual decay; of the reasons why the social and economic conditions were in some times and places favourable, in others almost disastrous; of the predisposing factors of the rise and fall of governments—is it too much to expect that knowledge of such questions, and of the many similar ones that are included under the name of history, may incidentally also have its due effect in suggesting and strengthening, among the educated youth of India, high ideals of life and policy?

T. W. RHYS DAVIDS.

HARBORO GRANGE,
ASHTON-ON-MERSEY,
August 5, 1906.

CONTENTS

PAGE

General Introduction to Series v
Introduction xvii
List of Illustrations lxxxix

PART I.

Notice to the Reader 3

BOOK I.—MY JOURNEY TO INDIA.

CHAPTER

I. Of my Departure from Venice 5
II. Of the Town of Smyrna 7
III. Of the Town of Burca (Brūsa) 10
IV. Our Departure from Tocat 13
V. Our Arrival at Erzerūm, and our Journey to Erivān . . 16
VI. My Lord Bellomont declares Himself to be an Ambassador . 18
VII. Our Arrival at the Town of Tauris (Tabrīz) . . . 19
VIII. Arrival in the City of Casbin (Qazwīn), and how we were sent for Twice to the Royal Palace 21
IX. We Quit Qazwīn and Arrive at Iṣfahān 25
X. How we went a Third Time to Court 27
XI. Of the Present that the King sent to the Ambassador, and of the Fourth Time of our being at Court 29
XII. Reply of 'Aṣamat-ud-daulah to the Ambassador on the Part of the King 31
XIII. How the King of Persia made over to the Ambassador a Letter for the King of England 34
XIV. Of the City of Iṣfahān, and of Certain Events which happened there 36
XV. Of the Government of the Persian Kingdom, and of some Strange Events 40
XVI. Of our Departure from Iṣfahān and Arrival at the Port of Bandarabassi (Bandar 'Abbās) 54
Hormūz Island 57
XVII. Of our Arrival in the Port of Sindy and Departure for Surrati . 59
Sūrat 61
The Pārsīs at Sūrat 63

CHAPTER PAGE

XVIII. Of the Town of Brampur (Burhānpur), and of our Arrival in Agra (Āgrah), and Death of the Ambassador . . . 66
Henry Bard, Viscount Bellomont . . . 72

XIX. Two Englishmen seize the Ambassador's Property, I appear in the King's Presence, and the Englishmen are made Prisoners 84

XX. Of the Way I was sent for to the Court of Prince Dārā . . 93

BOOK II.—OF THE MOGUL KINGS UP TO THE REIGNING SOVEREIGN, AURANGZEB.

Taimūr-i-lang the Great 97
Mīrān Shāh 103
Abū Sa'īd 105
Shekh 'Umar 107
Maḥmūd 108
Bābar 109
The Paṭhān Kings (a list of thirty-one names) 110
Humāyūn 113-120
Saràes, 116; weights and measures, 116; Sher Shāh, 117
Akbar 120-157
Chitor, 123; revolt of Jahāngīr, 131; description of Āgrah, 132; pillars of heads, 134; English gunner, 139; Akbar's tomb, 140; the primeval language, 142; source of the Ganges, 143; Akbar and the *baniyā*, 143; the *be-qaid* and *be-tars* (*faqīrs*), 145; the divine faith, 148; poisons and poisoning, 149
Probability of the Chinese having been in Hindūstān (151-154): The Quṭb pillar, 152; Ellora caves, 152; Salsette caves, Kanheri and Thānā, 153; Mahābalīpuram and Sādrās, 153, 154; Akbar's artillery, 154
About the *baniyās* (155-157): Ganges venerated, 157
Jahāngīr 157-178
Jesuits, 158, 161; Padre Ātash, 161; Nūr Jahān, 162; essence of roses discovered, 164; avenue from Multān to Allahābād, 164; milestones and *saràes*, 164; Mogul love of flattery, 165; rise of Mahābat Khān, 167; his rebellion, 169; Jahāngīr's lavishness, 171; Monsieur Bravet, 171; Alexander, the weaver, 172; the drunkard, 173; the *be-qaid* mendicants, 173; Jahāngīr loved justice, 174; Jesuit fathers' church in Lāhor, 175; Jahāngīr's sons, Bulāqī, Khurram, 175; grandsons, Dārā, Shujā', Aurangzeb, 175; Jahāngīr's tomb, 176; Qāsim Khān, Persian, 177; Persians in India, 177; English at Sūrat, 177; king's death, 178
Sulṭān Bulāqī, eldest son (*grandson*) of Jahāngīr . . . 178-181
Pretended death of Khurram, 180; Bulāqī set aside, 181
Shāhjahān 181-386
Flight of Bulāqī and death of his sons, 181; sack of Hūglī, 182; description of Shāhjahānābād (Dihlī), 183; attack on Damān, 185; Balkh, 185; Aurangzeb's character, 186; Qandahār, 186;

Shāhjahān (*continued*): PAGE

quarrels among king's sons, 187; character of Shāhjahān, 188; practical joke of a musician, 189; a promoted door-keeper, 190; wrestlers, tiger-hunts, 191; women, 192; Ja'far Khān's wife, 193; Khalīlullah Khān's wife, 193; Shāistah Khān's wife, 194; hall of mirrors, 194; women's fair in the palace, 195; dancing and singing women (*Kanchanis*), 196; Shāhjahān's tests for sensible women, 196; good government, 197; punishment of death by snake-bite, 197; story of the *qāẓī*, honest though bribed, 198; cowardly generals punished, 198; Gujarāt, 198; false accusers punished, 199; Kābul woman who sells nineteen husbands, 200; another case, 201; Sa'ādat Khān, a slave, story of, 201; Jesuits' bell-tower at Āgrah destroyed, 202; instances of just decisions, 203; the soldier, the scribe, and the slave girl, 203; the four merchants and the cat with the broken leg, 203; thieves, how dealt with—case of the Dutch at Sūrat (1645), 204; dismissed official who sat down in king's presence, 204; clever reply of Gulkhandah envoy, 205; the noble's bequest to the king of horns and old shoes, 205; treasure-houses, 206; bribery, 207; Amar Singh, Rāṭhor, 207; traitorous Paṭhān officer and his son, 208; early child-bearing, 209; rebellion of Champat Bundelah, 209; Sa'dullah Khān and Dom Matheus, Archbishop of Bicholim, 211; astrologers, 212; death of Khān Khānān, 213; Sa'īd Khān Bahādur, 213; Shāhjahān and the Brahman, 214; war with the Rānā, 214; Srīnagar (Garhwāl), 215; Shāhjahān's children, Begam Ṣāḥib, 216; Dulerā, her lover, 218; Begam Ṣāḥib burnt by accident, 219; aromatic spirits made by her, 219; Begam Ṣāḥib's stately retinue, 220; Dārā Shukoh, 221; marries Ra'nā-dil, a public dancer, 222; his buffoons, 222; Dārā and Europeans, 223; Ḥakīm Sarmad, 223; Jesuits at Āgrah (1656-57), 223; astrologers, 224; Dārā's two sons, 224; Shāhjahān loved Dārā, 224; Dārā and the nobles, 225; Sa'dullah Khān's death, 225; Mīr Jumlah, 226; Shāh Shujā', 227; Rājmahal, invasion of snakes, 228; Aurangzeb, 229; Roshan-ārā Begam, 229; Aurangzeb's trick on the *faqīrs*, 229; Shekh Mīr's advice to Aurangzeb, 230; story of Aurangzeb and the Rājput, 231; Aurangzeb in love, 231; Mīr Jumlah, 231; Mīr Jumlah arrives at Dihlī, N. Manucci sees him, 237; preparations for a Qandahār campaign, 237; gift of a great diamond to Shāhjahān, 237; Ortensio Bronzoni, lapidary, 238; Mīr Jumlah sent back to the Dakhin, 238; Roshan Ārā Begam, 239; Murād Bakhsh, 239; Mihr-un-nissā Begam, 240; illness of Shāhjahān (1657), 240; Shāh Shujā' takes the field, 242; Sulaimān Shukoh and Jai Singh sent against him, 243; Aurangzeb's attitude, 246; he rebels, 247; persuades Murād Bakhsh to join him, 248; Mīr Jumlah's apparent neutrality, 249; the other generals, except one, join Aurangzeb, 251; Aurangzeb offers Murād the throne, 253; Dārā's preparations, 255; an imperial army defeated near Māndū, 258;

Shāhjahān (*continued*): PAGE

Jaswant Singh, Rāṭhor, story of his wife, 260; Aurangzeb advances on Āgrah, 263; Dārā entrenches himself on the Chambal, 269; Aurangzeb's flank march, 270; battle near Samūgaṛh (June 8, 1658), N. Manucci present, 271; defeat of Dārā, 282; Sulaimān Shukoh, 285; his flight to Gaṛhwal, 286; Dārā's retreat to Āgrah, 287; thence to Dihlī, 288; Aurangzeb occupies Āgrah, 289; N. Manucci returns to Āgrah, and attempts to follow Dārā, 289; Shāhjahān invested in Āgrah fort, 292; the fort occupied, 295; Aurangzeb and Murād Bakhsh leave Āgrah, 298; N. Manucci joins their camp in disguise, 298; seizure of Murād Bakhsh, 300; N. Manucci starts for Lāhor, 306; joins Dārā at Lāhor, 309; Sarūp Singh's breach of faith, 310; Dārā's march on Multān and Bhakkar, 312; Dā,ūd Khān Qureshi's fidelity, 317; pursuit by Aurangzeb's army, 317; Bhakkar garrisoned under Basant, eunuch—N. Manucci commands artillery, 318; Shāh Shujā' reappears, 320: Aurangzeb turns back, 320; meets Jai Singh, 320; account of the Panjāb and its rivers, 322; imports by caravans, 323; Dārā leaves Bhakkar for Sindi and Taṭṭah, 323; Dārā in Gujarāt, 325; siege of Bhakkar, 326; Aurangzeb's movements, 327; Battle of Kajwah, 328; retreat of Shāh Shujā', 331; Jaswant Singh's conduct, 332; Mīr Jumlah pursues Shujā' to Bengal, 333; Sulṭān Muḥammad deserts to Shāh Shujā', 336; leaves him again, 337; is imprisoned, 337; Mīr Jumlah's campaign against Shāh Shujā', 338; coins, 339; Dārā defeated near Ājmer, 342; is pursued, 344; a Dutchman killed, 344; Dārā not allowed to enter Aḥmadābād, 345; goes into Sind, 346; seeks shelter with Malik Jīwan, 347; his wife tries to kill herself, 348; a eunuch attempts Jīwan's life, 349; suicide of the Begam, 349; Jīwan delivers Dārā to Bahādur Khān, 350; Bhakkar, story of siege resumed, 351; capitulates, Dārā taken to Dihlī, 353; Sipihr Shukoh, his son, transferred to Gwāliyār, 356; Dārā executed, 357; his head brought to Aurangzeb, 359; he sends it on to Shāhjahān at Āgrah, 359; Dārā's widows, Udepurī and Ra'nā-dil, 361; Dārā's garrison evacuates Bhakkar, 362; returns to Lāhor, 365; Basant, eunuch, commander at Bhakkar, treacherously killed, 365; N. Manucci escapes with his bare life, 366; starts for Dihlī, 367; sees Jīwan's dead body outside Sihrind, 368; refuses Aurangzeb's offer of service, 368; campaign against Shāh Shujā' at Dhākkah, 369; he flees to Arakān, 370; digression on Arakān, 371; and on Pegū, 372; Shāh Shujā' in Arakān, 374; his death, 375; fate of Sulaimān Shukoh, 378; the Jesuits in Gaṛhwāl, 381; death of Murād Bakhsh, 382; Sarmad, the atheist, 384 181-386

INTRODUCTION

SECTION		PAGE
I.	OPENING REMARKS	xvii
II.	CATROU'S 'HISTOIRE GÉNÉRALE DE L'EMPIRE DU MOGOL'	xviii
III.	THE BERLIN MS., PHILLIPPS NO. 1945	xxvii
IV.	THE VENICE CODEX XLIV. (ZANETTI)	xxxiii
V.	THE VENICE CODEX XLV. (ZANETTI)	xlv
VI.	THE OTHER MANUCCI CODICES AT VENICE	l
VII.	THE VOLUME OF PORTRAITS IN THE BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE, PARIS	lii
VIII.	MANUCCI'S BIOGRAPHY	lvi
IX.	SUMMARY OF PLAN AND CONTENTS OF THE 'STORIA'	lxviii
X.	MANUCCI, THE AUTHOR AND THE MAN	lxx
XI.	CONCLUSION	lxxx
	NOTE ON A. BOUREAU-DESLANDES	lxxxi

I. OPENING REMARKS.

THROUGH the generosity of the Government of India the elaborate 'Storia do Mogor,' sent to Europe by Niccolao Manucci more than two hundred years ago, now first reaches the public as he wrote it (allowing for the change from Portuguese and French and Italian into English). It can hardly be said to have earned him the renown for which he laboured so long and so diligently. In his lifetime it was captured and practically suppressed by a Jesuit editor, and the work, as presented to the public by that editor, has ever since borne the brunt of much adverse criticism. Even the true spelling of the author's name has never yet been settled. Beginning with his own form of Manuci, it passed into Manouchi, until, after many variations, it appears as the Manuech of the Madras Records and the 'my old acquaintance Senor Monnock' of worthy

Jeremiah Peachey, dismissed 'Chief of Mauldah.' An attempt is now made to show the man and his book in their true light, so that in future the shortcomings attributed to the one and the other may be at least their own and not those of somebody else. The inclusion of the work in the present series is due to the initiative of Mr. A. N. Wollaston, C.I.E., of the India Office, following on the paper read by me before the Royal Asiatic Society in June, 1903, and the note subsequently drawn up, which appeared in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* for October, 1903, pp. 723-733.

II. CATROU'S 'HISTOIRE GÉNÉRALE DE L'EMPIRE DU MOGOL,' 1705.

Appearance of book (1705).

In 1705 there appeared at Paris a quarto volume of 272 pages entitled 'Histoire Générale de l'Empire du Mogol depuis sa fondation, sur les Mémoires de M. Manouchi, Vénitien, par le Père François Catrou, de la Compagnie de Jésus.' There is an epistle dedicatory to the Duc de Bourgogne (1682-1712), grandson of Louis XIV., and a preface of eight (unnumbered) pages. The subjects treated are Tamberlank, Miracha, Abou Chaid, Sec Omor, Babar, Amahum, Akbar, Jean-Guir, and Cha-Jahan, till the end of the war of succession (1659). The last of these reigns occupies 78 pages. The work concludes with 40 pages of a 'Déscription de la Cour, des Forces, des Richesses, et du Gouvernement, des Empereurs Mogols.'

Who and what was Catrou.

François Catrou was born at Paris on December 28, 1659, joined the Jesuit Society on October 28, 1678, and died at Paris on October 12, 1737. He was the author of some five separate works, among them a discredited 'History of the Romans' (21 volumes), published in 1721-1737, and translated into English in 1728-1737 (6 volumes, folio). For twelve years, 1701-1712, he edited the literary organ *Journal de Trévoux*, and acquired some reputation as a critic, though he displayed singularly little critical acumen in not discarding the earlier for the later and really valuable part of Manucci's historical notices. He was thus a practised and experienced literary

man; but on the whole it would not be a libel to style him something of a hack writer, ready to undertake any task, whether he knew anything of the subject or not. Certainly he managed to give the *coup de grâce* to the work sent home by Manucci, without establishing any permanent reputation for himself in the process. When he says in his second preface (1715) that the 'Mémoires' were confided to him by Manucci himself, he tells a deliberate lie; for, as we shall see farther on, the unfortunate Italian had vigorously protested nine years before—namely, in 1706—that his manuscript had been communicated to the Jesuits without his knowledge or consent.

Catrou's account of his original.

In his first preface of 1705 Catrou tells us, more truthfully, that he obtained Manucci's manuscript from M. Deslandes, a Pondicherry official, who had brought it to Europe in 1701 or 1702. As to the truth of the earlier historical events, Catrou (Preface, p. 2) relies for proof of authenticity on Manucci's assertion (Text, I. 55) that his facts were taken direct from official chronicles. But in reality, for the period preceding Shāhjahān—that is, up to the year 1627—Manucci's history is no more than a tissue of popular stories of no historical value whatever. Thus Catrou, in his volume of 1705, reproduced for the most part what are perhaps the least valuable chapters of Manucci's text. The volume of 1705 ends with the struggle in 1658 between Aurangzeb and his brothers for the imperial throne.

Use of other sources.

Catrou was not content to draw his matter from Manucci alone; he tells us in the *Journal de Trévoux* for 1705, p. 128, and in his first preface (p. 6), that he also had recourse to Maffei, Tossi, Texeira, Pietro della Valle, Thomas Roe, Jean de Laët, Bernier, Tavernier, and D'Herbelot. In the course of another notice on pp. 574-580 of the same volume of the *Journal de Trévoux* he boasts that Manucci is only the *fondement* of his work. He also in his preface acknowledges aid received from another M. Deslandes, connected with Tavernier's works, and still alive in 1705. This is evidently A. Daulier Deslandes, author of 'Les Beautés de la Perse' (1673), who, so far as I can find out, was never in

India at all.[1] Owing to Catrou's giving no indication of which of these sources he is at the moment using, and Manucci himself having hitherto been inaccessible, it has been impossible to know in reading 'L'Histoire' what statements are to be attributed to Manucci and what to other writers.

Mentions of Catrou's work. R. Orme (1728-1801).

Robert Orme, Historiographer to the East India Company, is, so far as I know, the first writer to make use of Catrou's 'Histoire.' After the publication in 1763 of his great work 'The Military Transactions of the British Nation in Indostan from the Year 1745,' Orme began to collect materials for a continuation, his plan including a résumé of Indian history from the year of Aurangzeb's accession (1658). At his death on January 13, 1801, his design was still incomplete; but we have the result of his forty years' labour in his valuable 'Historical Fragments,' the first edition published in 1782 (octavo), and the second (quarto) in 1805, after his death. As Orme himself says (p. 169), 'We have taken largely from this work'—*i.e.*, Catrou's. Although Orme knew that Manucci had been at Madras in 1691, he had no access to his manuscripts, and, while admitting the elegance of Catrou's style and the interest of his narrations, comments (pp. 168, 169) on the want of chronological arrangement, and the errors in the few dates given. To this subject of chronology we will recur. In Orme's book there are at least eighteen references to Catrou and Manucci combined.

Anquetil Duperron (1731-1805).

In 1778 A. H. Anquetil Duperron published at Amsterdam his 'Législation Orientale' (quarto), and in the index he describes Manouchi as a Venetian physician at the court of

[1] J. P. Maffeius, 'Historiarum Indicarum,' 1589.

Joannes de Laët, 'De Imperio Magni Mogolis sive India Vera,' 1631.

Pietro de la Valle, 'Les Fameux Voyages,' 4 vols., 4to., 1663, 1664; or in M. Thevenot's collection, 1696.

E. Terry (Sir Thomas Roe's chaplain), 'A Voyage to East India,' 1665; or in Thevenot's 'Divers Voyages,' 1663.

L'Abati Tosi, 'Dell' India Orientale Descrittione,' 1669.

F. Bernier, 'Histoire de la dernière Révolution des États du Grand Mogol,' Paris, 1670, 1671.

J. B. Tavernier, 'Les Six Voyages,' 2 vols., Paris, 1676.

P. Teixeira, 'Voyages' (French translation), 1681.

B. D. d'Herbelot, 'Bibliothèque Orientale,' 1697.

the Mogul, whose memoirs he saw in 1763 in the library of the Jesuit Professed House at Paris, this manuscript being the original of Father Catrou's work. Duperron makes over twenty quotations from Catrou in support of his various contentions.

J. Bernouilli (1744-1807).

J. Bernouilli in his 'Beschreibung von Hindustan' (founded on Père Joseph Tieffenthaler's papers), vol. ii., part ii. (1788), p. 192, has an interesting note on Manucci in reference to Tieffenthaler's criticism (vol. i., p. 29) of the erroneous latitudes and longitudes which appear in Catrou (edition of 1705, pp. 258-261). Tieffenthaler declares Manucci 'a better physician than geographer or astronomer.' If so, Heaven help him, for as a physician his learning was of the crudest. However, the whole of the statements so criticised are absent from Manucci's text, and must have come from some one or other of Catrou's additional sources. Similar instances of misleading interpolations will be referred to farther on. Bernouilli had, however, a most just sense of the need for the original text, for he says: 'This work (Manucci) is worth printing just as the author wrote it, in Portuguese. I invite its learned owner to endow the public with it' ('Recherches sur l'Inde,' 1787, ii., note *a* to p. 284).

J. Grant-Duff (1789-1858).

In his 'History of the Maratthas,' first published in 1826, J. Grant-Duff makes more than one reference to Catrou. On p. 88 (Bombay edition of 1873) he uses him to confirm Khāfī Khān's account of Shivā Jī's device for getting into Shāistah Khān's quarters at Poonah (see Manucci's text, Part II., 77), and again he quotes him on p. 92 (note) as to a point in Jai Singh's Dakhin campaign. On p. 99 he contests Catrou's assertion that the rebellion of Aurangzeb's son Mu'azzam was collusive (Manucci's text, Part II., p. 122; Catrou, p. 79 of part iii., edition of 1715).

M. Elphinstone (1779-1859).

Next we come to Elphinstone's 'History of India,' published in 1841. In at least one instance, p. 554, fourth edition, he quotes Catrou (or Manucci) for events in the reign of Aurangzeb; and although, in agreement with Grant-Duff's view, he considers the story absurd, it would be easy to show that the objection made by him on chronological grounds is untenable.

M. Müllbauer.

In 1852 Maximilian Müllbauer brought out at Freiburg im Breisgau a most useful work on Catholic missions, 'Geschichte der Katholischen Missionen in Ostindien' (372 pages, 8vo.). He makes some thirteen citations from Catrou. Unfortunately for him, most of these passages are not to be found in Manucci's text, and cannot, therefore, be supported by his authority, whatever it may be worth. I will comment on this more precisely later on.

W. Erskine (1773-1852)

W. Erskine in his 'History of India' (Baber and Humayun), London, 1854, vol. i., pp. 542, 543, quotes with approval the statement of Aurangzeb's revenue given in Catrou, p. 264, 4to. edition of 1705; and Edward Thomas in 'The Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi' (1871), refers to the same passage, reproducing at the same time Mr. Erskine's misprint of Catron for Catrou. In his appendix (p. 443) he gives the figures in a tabulated form, and on pp. 447-450 inserts the French text of Catrou, pp. 264-267. By a supplementary treatise published the same year (1871) under the title 'The Revenue Resources of the Mughal Empire in India,' E. Thomas returns to the subject, and on pp. 44-48 gives the figures once again, with a further passage of the French text on the miscellaneous heads of revenue. Although rejecting Catrou as a worthless witness in himself, Mr. Thomas is, on the whole, inclined to accept Manucci's evidence. In fact, he places much more reliance on his figures than I should be prepared to do myself.

E. Thomas (1813-1886).

H. G. Keene (1823).

Considerable attention is given to Catrou's work by Mr. H. G. Keene in his 'Turks in India' (1879). On p. 14 of the introduction he quotes Manucci's value for a 'sol,' and on p. 15 he inserts his statements of the Mogul revenues. On p. 116 he notices with approval Manucci's refutation of Bernier's imputations on Jahān Ārā Begam, daughter of Shāhjahān. His comments upon Catrou's mode of dealing with his materials are excellent and to the point. We cordially agree with Mr. Keene's summing up, p. 118, that 'the Father would have done far better to have left his author to tell his own story.' Many details are given erroneously in Mr. Keene's account, as can be seen from our author's text and the rest of this Introduction. Manucci landed in India in 1656, not 1649;

the person to whom he entrusted his manuscript was not *Laudes*, but Deslandes (Catrou, Preface, 2); the 'favourable mentions' of Catholic missionaries are not Manucci's but mostly inserted by Catrou himself; in 1705 Manucci was certainly alive, but in India, not in Europe; the paintings have *not* disappeared: they are in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, Département des Estampes, and we give reproductions of them; the first edition of Catrou is of 1705, not 1708.

J. T. Wheeler (1824-1897).

The late J. Talboys Wheeler in the introduction to vol. iv., part i., of his 'History of India,' published in 1876, refers to his frequent citations from Catrou, whom he considered as the very best authority for Shāhjahān's reign. He had not then seen Catrou's continuation, published in 1715. In 1881, when part ii. of his fourth volume appeared, Mr. Wheeler returns to the subject. By that time he had obtained a copy of the volume of 1715, but hazarded the assertion that the original memoirs, written in Portuguese, had not then been discovered.

S. Lane-Poole.

Another writer who quotes freely from Catrou is Professor S. Lane-Poole, in his 'Aurangzīb' (Rulers of India), 1893. His view is that the work is full of errors, savours strongly of the *chronique scandaleuse*, and is the production of a malicious and disappointed backstairs underling. But he adds that Catrou's 'Histoire' would be 'invaluable if there were any means of authenticating it by comparison with Manucci's MS.' An article in the *Quarterly Review* for April, 1893 (p. 519), couched in the same strain, may probably be attributed to the same writer, since a desire for the production of the Portuguese text is again expressed. Our present volumes, giving a close and faithful rendering of that text, are, it is hoped, a sufficient compliance with Professor Lane-Poole's requisition. Until in 1893 Mr. Poole drew my attention to the French edition of 1715, I had read Catrou only in the English version of 1826.

Catrou's method of dealing with Manucci's text.

It is already abundantly clear that from the first Catrou's mode of editing his text has not met with approval. Anyone who consults the volumes now produced by me will agree, I think, that Catrou, for literary effect, acted wisely. He began by throwing overboard all, or almost all, personal narrative, looking on it as so much useless lumber, and then proceeded

to dress out the rest according to his notions of what a history should be. While he thus produced a more artistic book, he much diminished, if he did not totally destroy, the authority of Manucci as an original source of history. It might even be doubted, confining one's self to Catrou's pages, whether Manucci ever was in India; or, granting that he did reach India, whether he had ever seen any more of it than a little of the country round Goa, and perhaps the town of Madras. If Manucci's narrative had already been in print, and thus available for reference, Catrou would have been justified in rearranging the material in his own way. But our ideas on the use of original and inedited documents have changed since his time, and unless a man's actual narrative can be consulted we discard him as an original authority. Moreover, it is the personal detail, in which Manucci so abounds, that at once secures our interest in the man, and leads to our believing that he did see or hear or undergo what he tells us. Not only does Catrou omit, but he imports largely from other sources, without affording us any means of distinguishing between such additions and what he drew from Manucci's manuscript.

Consequences of Catrou's method.

Instances of the misleading consequences of Catrou's method can easily be adduced. The chapter on Bābar occupies pp. 38-52 of the quarto edition; yet of these fourteen pages almost all that can be assigned to Manucci are the names of Ranguil Das (p. 39, not including the speech), and Amuvi Xa (pp. 46, 47), with the last two paragraphs of pp. 51 and 52. Then, again, Müllbauer on pp. 135-137 of his 'Geschichte,' quoting Catrou in regard to the Jesuit missions to the Mogul Court, believes that he is appealing to the authority of Manucci. Not a word of all these statements is to be found in Manucci's text, as can be readily seen. Quite recently (Bombay, 1903) Mr. Jivanji Jamshedji Modi, B.A., published a most interesting account of 'The Parsees at the Court of Akbar,' where, on p. 26, he gives a table of the arrival and departure of the missions to Akbar, taken from Catrou, 'on the authority of Manouchi'; and again, on p. 80, a detailed account of Akbar's reception of Rudolfo Aquaviva. Mr. Modi will be somewhat surprised to learn that nothing about any of these missions is

to be found in the real Manucci text, and the statements made in Catrou obtain no confirmation from an appeal to it.

Catrou's edition of 1715.

In 1715, ten years after his first edition had appeared, Catrou produced a continuation, what he called a Third Part, which deals with the long reign of Aurangzeb and ends with the death of Kām Bakhsh in January, 1709. In the quarto edition this Third Part of 1715 covers 207 pages, and is thus almost equal in size to the earlier publication (272 quarto pages). The narrative, much more valuable than most of the historical matter in the previous work, is almost entirely taken from the Second Part of Manucci's manuscript, and deals with events of which he was a contemporary, and often an eye-witness. But Catrou claimed to have received from India other memoirs, though he admits Manucci to be almost the only writer he has followed in writing the life of Aurangzeb (Preface of 1715, p. 3); and he goes on to say how a person newly arrived from India, to whom he read the manuscript, confirmed whatever it contained. To allay a suspicion that he had tampered with Manucci, he relies upon the manuscript, which he still possessed and could show to anyone expressing such doubts. But, as he goes on to say, he preferred a metaphorical style, like that of the Greek and Roman historians, to the simpler language adopted by Manucci.

Did Catrou use Manucci's fourth and fifth Parts?

In preparing his volume of 1715, had Catrou access to the fourth and fifth parts of Manucci's work, sent home, one in 1706 and the other before 1712? I think not. It is true that Catrou carries his narrative beyond 1700, the period at which Manucci's Parts I., II., and III. terminate; but the probabilities are that, for the last twenty to twenty-five pages of his later volume, he relied on those other memoirs from India of which he speaks in his preface.

Bibliography of Catrou's 'Histoire.'

I have put together the following list of editions of Catrou from the catalogues of the British Museum and the India Office Library, from Carlos Sommervogel's edition of Backer's 'Bibliographie de la Compagnie de Jésus,' ii., column 882, *s.v.* Catrou, F., from Lowndes, ed. 1862, vol. i., p. 393, and from the exemplars in my own possession.

In French.

1705, Paris, 4to., 1 vol., pp. 272. (In B. M.)

1705, Paris, 12mo., 2 vols., pp. 403, 434. (Partly in B. M.)

1708, La Haye, 12mo., 3 parts, pp. 380. (Partly in B. M.)

1715, Paris, 4to., reissue of 4to. edition of 1705, pp. 272, plus a third part of 207 pp. (In B. M.)

1715, Paris, small 8vo., 4 vols., pp. 403, 334, 301, 285. (In B. M.)

1715, Paris, 12mo., 3 vols., pp. 301, 285, 207.

In Italian.

1731, Venice, 8vo., 1 vol., pp. 306. (Translated from the edition of 1705, the only additions being a very fanciful portrait of Taimur and a short address from the printer to the reader about the translation. Copies exist in the Biblioteca Nazionale di San Marco and at St. Lazzaro, Venice, and I have recently acquired one.)

In English.

1709, London, 8vo. (Translation of 1705 edition. In I. O. Lib.)

1722, London, 12mo. (Translation of 1705 edition. In I. O. Lib.) [I have compared this edition with that of 1709. It is nothing more than a reissue of the earlier edition with a new title-page, in which F. Catrou is ignored. There is no justification for the statement on this new title-page that it was an Italian text from which this edition, either of 1709 or 1722, was taken.]

1826, London, 8vo. (Translation of the Hague edition of 1708. In B. M.)

In Portuguese.

My friend Mr. J. Batalha-Reis, M.V.O., Consul-General for Portugal in London, and Commercial Attaché, was under the impression that an edition had been published in Portuguese; but I can find no mention of any such work in Innocencia F. da Silva's 'Diccionario Bibliografico' (fifteen vols., Lisbon,

1858-1862). I therefore come to the conclusion that there was no such edition, and the supposition of its existence may be attributed to an unsupported statement in the 'Nouvelle Biographie Générale' (Didot, Paris, 1860), tome xxxiii., *s.v.* Manucci (Nicholas), an article in which almost every sentence contains an error of fact.

III. THE BERLIN MS., PHILLIPPS No. 1945.

Its supposed disappearance from 1763.

Many writers have lamented the disappearance of the manuscript from which Catrou drew his 'Histoire,' beginning with Robert Orme in 1782, and ending with Mr. S. Lane-Poole in 1893. It was in this latter year I first heard that it had found its way to Berlin, and through the intervention of the late Dr. Rost, librarian, was then temporarily at the India Office in London, for the use of Mr. A. Constable, who at that time purposed an edition. During this long period of a century or more the manuscript had never really disappeared; a little search could have found it, and for sixty years or so it was even lying in England, had anybody cared to look for it. Orme himself had a pretty accurate knowledge of where it was when he was writing between 1763 and 1782. Nor was Catrou's text a mere short, mutilated abstract, as J. Bernouilli was led to surmise from the discrepancies between the 'Histoire' and the Venice Codex (see 'Recherches sur l'Inde,' Berlin, 1787, vol. ii., note *b* to p. 284). The mistake was, under the circumstances, very excusable.

Bourean-Deslandes.

We know from Catrou's preface (p. 2) that M. Deslandes handed him the manuscript on which he founded his book; while Manucci in various places states that he made over the text of his 'Storia' to that gentleman for conveyance to Europe. Evidently his hope was that it would be published at the expense of Louis XIV.

This M. Deslandes must not be confounded with another gentleman of the same name, André Daulier Deslandes, who went to Persia with Tavernier in 1664, and in 1673 published a book called 'Les Beautés de la Perse.' In 1704 or 1705, according to Catrou (Preface, p. 6), this Daulier Deslandes was

still living, but was not the Deslandes who lent him Manucci's manuscript. As to the latter M. Deslandes, known as Boureau Deslandes, he was in the service of the French East India Company at Sūrat as early as 1673; in 1679 he was sent to Siam, where he remained for some time (Jules Sottas, 'Histoire de la Compagnie des Indes,' Paris, 1903, p. 136). He was thus mixed up with the French transactions in Siam during 1680-1683, in which he and Governor François Martin were interested. They were supporters of the Greek adventurer Constantin Phalkon, who rose to be Prime Minister of Siam. There is also a 'Histoire de Constance, Premier Ministre du Roi de Siam' (12mo., 1756), by the younger Deslandes, founded on his father's and the Chevalier Martin's memoirs and letters, the object being to refute Père P. J. d'Orleans' Life of the same man (1690). I have seen the copy of Deslandes' book in the Bibliothèque Nationale (55 pages, small 8vo). A fact or a name might be gleaned from it here and there, but on the whole it adds little to our knowledge of Siam politics, and yields nothing new about the elder Deslandes himself. The most pungent and characteristic passage is on p. 12, where Père Tachard, S.J., and Mr. l'Abbé de Choisy (both of whom went to Siam and published books on it) are described as 'deux des plus insignes charlatans qu'on puisse lire.' Deslandes married one of Martin's daughters, and was sent to Bengal in charge of the French *comptoir* of Chandernagore, where he remained until 1701. In 1689 he had a son, André François Boureau-Deslandes (just referred to), who became notorious as a sceptical writer, was the author of many books and pamphlets, and died in 1757 (see 'Biog. Uni.' (Michaud), ii. 195, and 'N. Biog. Gen.'). In 1731 the son brought out a book entitled 'Rémarques Historiques d'un Cosmopolite,' of which the authorship is attributed to his father.[1]

[1] But I think erroneously, for it refers to events long subsequent to the date of the elder Deslandes' death (1706), and makes the writer present at Constantinople and elsewhere, statements quite inconsistent with the known facts of the elder Deslandes' Indian career. The book is a literary medley, and in it may be embedded a fact or two that the son had heard from his father, such as the remarks about faqirs at Sūrat, and the mention of De Forbin, Des Farges, and others in Siam.

The elder Deslandes left India in February, 1701, and on his reaching Paris lent Catrou the MS. Memoirs of Manucci for perusal. Shortly afterwards, on December 28, 1703, Boureau-Deslandes was appointed Commissaire de la Marine in the West Indies, and left France without obtaining a return of Manucci's manuscript. After doing good work for the State, he died at Laogane, in St. Domingo, on February 13, 1706 (Adrien Desalles, 'Histoire Générale des Antilles,' 5 vols., Paris, 1847-1848, vol. ii., pp. 320, 333, 346).[1] Manucci's manuscript remained with Catrou, and when he had done with it he deposited it in the library of the college of his society at Clermont in Paris (now the Lycée Louis-le-Grand, in the Rue St. Jacques, near the Sorbonne). There it remained till the expulsion of the Jesuits from France, and there, in 1763, Anquetil Duperron saw the three volumes.

MS. in Paris (1705-1763).

In 1763 the Jesuits were expelled from France, and their property sequestrated. Mr. Henri Omont, in his 'Documents sur la Vente des Manuscrits du Collége de Clermont à Paris, 1764' (Extrait du 'Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de Paris et de l'Isle de France,' 1891, I., xviii., pp. 7-18), gives the *arrêt* by the Parliament of July 5, 1763, decreeing the sale of the MSS. Dom Clement, author of 'L'Art de verifier les Dates,' aided for the Oriental MSS. by de Guignes and Bernard, for the Greek and Latin by Brequigny, produced a catalogue, of which the title-page is: 'Catalogus | manuscriptorum codicum | Collegii Claromontani | quem | excipit Catalogio Mss^{m} | Domes Professæ | Parisienses | . . . . | Parisiis in Palatio | apud Sugrain subsigno Bonæ Fidei coronatæ Leclerc subsigno Prudentiæ | M DCC LXIV.' In it Manucci's 'Storia' appears on p. 324 as No. DCCCLVI.[2] Orme is wrong in asserting it does not appear there, perhaps because he

Sale of Paris Jesuits' library.

[1] As Boureau-Deslandes was an important personage in the history in India of the French Company, and his name has not yet found its way into any biographical dictionary, I place a note on him at the end of this Introduction. Most of the manuscript materials of this note have been collected for me by M. Pierre Bernus, recently a student of the École des Chartes.

[2] 'Historia do Mogol, en tre parte de Nicolao Manuchi Veneziano . . . do Reinado de Orangzeb, guerra de Golconda e Visapur com varios successos athe a era de 1700.'

only looked at the catalogue of printed books, which is a separate work. The manuscript is described as written in Portuguese, with several portions of it in French; three volumes in folio, the first of 142, the second of 151, and the third of 132 folios. A notice is inserted that the contents were to be sold on September 1 next (1764) unless bought in bulk, and offers were invited. The king's librarian, Bignon, refused to buy. Baron Gérard Meerman, of the Hague, began negotiations, and a price of 15,000 livres was agreed on for 856 manuscripts, among them being included the three volumes of Manucci. Omont gives an amusing account of the after-attempts to cancel this transaction, and the difficulties surmounted by the purchaser in removing his acquisitions from France. His boxes were stopped at Rouen, and forty-two volumes relating to the history of France were claimed. He gave up thirty-seven works (thirty-nine volumes). The remainder reached the Hague in April, 1765. As a reward for this concession, Louis XV. conferred on Meerman the Order of St. Michael (see 'Histoire générale de Paris—Le Cabinet des MSS. de la Bibliothèque Impériale,' by Leopold Deslisle—folio, Paris, 1868—section xix., pp. 434, 435).

Baron Gérard Meerman and Comte J. Meerman.

This learned Dutchman, Baron Gérard Meerman, was born at Leiden in 1722, and died at Aix-la-Chapelle on December 15, 1774, leaving an only son, Comte Jean Meerman, who was born at the Hague on November 1, 1753, and died there on August 19, 1815 ('Nouvelle Biog. Générale,' Didot, 1861, vol. xxxiv., p. 74). Some years after the son's death the family library was disposed of. The printed catalogue appeared at the Hague in 1824 in four volumes, 8vo.: 'Bibliotheca Meermanniana sive Catalogus . . . morte dereliquet Joannes Meerman, toparcha in Dalem et Vuren, etc. . . .' There were nineteen sale days fixed, between June 8 and July 3, 1824. I have a copy of vols. i. and ii., but have not been able to procure vols. iii. and iv.; and, so far as I can find, the work is not in the British Museum. The 'Storia do Mogor' must have been entered in vol. iv., 'MSS. François, Italiens, Espagnols, Portugais, Hollandois et Allemands, livres Chinois, etc[a],' Nos. 832-1100, pp. 143-182, of which the sale day was Saturday, July 3, 1824.

At this sale Sir Thomas Phillipps, the well-known collector of Middle Hill, co. Worcester, was a large buyer. Among other purchases were the three volumes of Manucci's manuscript 'Storia.' They appear thus in his 'Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum in Bibliotheca Medio Montanis Dom Thomae Phillipps ab anno 1824 ad 1837,' under 'Codices MSS. ex Bibliotheca Merman Hagae Comitis olim ex Bibliotheca Collegii Societatis Jesu Claromontanis Parisiis nunc ante D. Bibliotheca Phillippicae,' p. 21, viz.: Sir Thomas Phillipps, born 1792, died 1872.

Codices MSS. Italianici, etc^{a}.

General number, 1945.	Number of this collection, 917.	Historia de Mogol.

In 1887 the Königliche Bibliothek at Berlin bought the Meerman manuscripts from the heirs of Sir Thomas Phillipps for a sum of 375,000 marks ('Bibliothèque de l'école des Chartes,' 1888, vol. xlix., p. 694). In the twelfth volume of the Berlin catalogues, 'Verzeichniss der Lateinischen Handschriften,' vol. i., 1893, by Valentin Rose ('Die Meerman Handschriften des Sir Thomas Phillipps'), we are informed that, whereas Baron Meerman secured 349 of the Clermont MSS., there were only 250 left at the sale in 1824, and of these 190 were bought by Sir Thomas Phillipps, and transferred in 1887 to Berlin. Between 1765 and 1824, 159 of the MSS. bought by Meerman had been lost. The Königliche Bibliothek acquires MS.

The description of the Manucci 'Storia do Mogor,' acquired by the Royal Library in Berlin, appears in 'Die | Romanische Meerman Handschriften | des | Sir | Thomas Phillipps | in der Königliche Bibliothek zu Berlin' | beschrieben | von | Alfred Schulze | Berlin | 1892 |, 4to., p. 24, in the following terms as translated by me from the German original: The Berlin Codex, Phillipps 1945, described.

Codices Phillipici.
Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese Manuscripts,
39 Phill. 1945.

Paper, three folio volumes, of 144, 155, and 135 folios respectively (size 33 to 35 mm. by 21 to 23 mm.) of the eighteenth century.

Leather binding, Meerman No. 917, Coll. Paris. Soc. Jésu, No. 856. The Portuguese text shows the following gaps, which were afterwards filled up in French: Vol. I., leaves 1 to 6; Vol. III., leaves 1 to 34 and 47 to 49. In Vol. II., on leaves 23 to 43, is a French text, giving a translation of the Portuguese on the preceding leaves 1 to 22. Vol. II., leaf 44, and Vol. III., leaves 44 to 46, 70 to 73, 80 to 84, 94, and 125 are blank.

Nicolao Manuchi, 'History of the Mogul Kingdom.'

Vol. I., folio 1[a]: 'Voyage et histoire du Mogol divisé en trois parties par M. Nicholas Manuchi, Venitien. Première Partie, contenant le voyage de Nicholas Manuchi, son arrivée au Mogol, etc[a]. L'histoire des rois Mogols, depuis Tamerlang jusque à l'evènement d'Aurangzeb au trône.'

Vol. II., folio 1[a]: 'Parte segũda da istoria' [*correction* into 'historia' (*sic*)] 'do Mogol de Nicolao Manuchi Veneziano: do reinado de Orangzeb, guerras de Golconda e Vizapur com varios successos athe a era de 1699' [figure struck out, and inserted beneath in another handwriting, '1700'].

Vol. III., folio 1[a]: 'Troisiesme partie de l'histoire du Mogol par Nicolas Manouchy Venisien premier médicin du Chaalam fils aisné d'Aurangzeb, dans laquelle on donne un compte' [struck through and replaced by 'conte'] 'exact des richesses et du grandeur des Mogols et de celles des princes gentils ses voisins, avec plusieurs particularitez curieuses et evenemens remarquables.'

The work of Manouchi has never been printed. On the other hand, founding himself on this production, the Jesuit Father François Catrou published 'Histoire générale de l'Empire du Mogol depuis sa fondation jusqu'à présent sur les mémoires portugais de M. Manouchi, Venitien.' The first two parts appeared in Paris in 1705 in small octavo,[1] the last two parts much later.[2] As to the different editions, see Backer, 'Biblioth. des Ecriv. de la Comp. de Jésus,' tome i., pp. 1135 *et seq.*; and refer also to J. Talboys Wheeler, 'The History of India

[1] Also in 4to. (see *ante*, p. xxvi).

[2] In 1715 (see *ante*, p. xxvi). Catrou published only one more part—that is, a Third Part.

from the Earliest Ages' (London, 1867), vol. iv., part i., Preface, pp. xii.-xiv. Since the English translations of 1709 and 1826 were both prepared from the re-impression of the French issue published at the Hague in 1708, and end with the accession of Aurangzeb, Wheeler was misled into the statement on his p. xiii that Catrou's work was never completed.[1] Phillipps 1945 is with very little doubt the manuscript mentioned by Catrou in his preface (not paged).

Remarks on Berlin Catalogue.

On the above the only remark I have to make is, that I doubt if the French passages are subsequent additions. Manucci, in one of his letters reproduced further on, ascribes the changes from Portuguese to French, or *vice versâ*, to the necessity of using a language understood by his amanuensis of the moment. Certainly, as Herr Schulze points out, there is a long passage in vol. ii. where we have two versions, one Portuguese and one French, of exactly the same matter. I may add from a note by my copyist, Herr August Otto, that vol. i. is in four handwritings: (*a*) pp. 1 to 10, (*b*) 11-160, (*c*) 161-208, and (*d*) 209-280. On the margin of folio 2 in all three volumes are the words: 'Paraphé au devis de l'arrest du 5 Juillet, 1763, Mesnil.'

For the present (translated) edition of Manucci, Parts I., II., and III., I have used the text of the Berlin MS., Phillipps No. 1945, in addition to pp. 417 to 477 of the Venice Codex, XLIV. (Zanetti), as at that point the two texts appear to diverge somewhat widely. I saw and made notes from the original at Berlin in June, 1901, and my transcript was made by Herr August Otto, whose services were kindly procured for me by Direktor-Professor Dr. L. Stern, of the Manuscript Department of the Royal Library.

IV. THE VENICE CODEX, XLIV. (ZANETTI).

N. M.'s protest and his Latin letter (1706).

Some time in 1704 or 1705 Manucci received from Catrou an advance copy of his 'Histoire,' or of the preface to it.

[1] See, however, Wheeler's introduction to vol. iv., part ii., 1881, by which time he had procured a copy of the whole of Catrou's work.

A perusal of this communication aroused intense indignation in the Italian author, and in January, 1706, he resolved to despatch to Europe the original draft of his Parts I., II., and III., together with the Part IV. on which he had been engaged since the beginning of 1701, accompanied by a Latin letter to the Venetian Senate, of which the following is a translation, made for me by my friend Mr. James Kennedy:

'MOST SERENE PRINCES!

'Love of travel and inborn inclination to visit foreign nations caused the writer, Nicolo Manucci, a client and nursling of the Most Serene Republic, to leave Venice when he was only fourteen, and led him happily to the Empire of the Mogul (Mogor), in which he served divers princes of the blood royal for a period of fifty-four years, as this history shows. There, at the request of certain friends, Frenchmen by race, he began a most extensive account of this despotism, and finished it in 1700. Of which work as soon as the Reverend Fathers of the Society of Jesus residing in India got wind, they left no stone unturned to appropriate it, as if it were their own. But considering my many vigils and the sundry expenses I had to incur, it did not seem to me right that the aforesaid Fathers should transfer to themselves the glory won by another's labour, nor that I should be cheated out of my expectations.

'Wherefore I placed in the hands of a certain friend of mine this work, divided into four parts,[1] in which I treat carefully and accurately of the times from Tamerlane to Aurangzeb, who now holds the sceptre, as well as of all his family and of the principal chiefs of the army. With it I handed over to him sixty-four[2] coloured pictures now in Paris. And these' [*i.e.*, the books and pictures] 'ought, according to my directions, to have been forwarded to the Reverend Father Eusebius, a Capuchin of Bourges' [Bituriens, the mediæval name for that province], 'Apostolic missionary in the East Indies, that he might offer them on my part to the Most Serene Senate to dispose of them

[1] Really only three parts.

[2] Should be fifty-six; he is confusing the volume of portraits with that containing the gods and goddesses.

as they might think best. But my friend died at Galle' [? Egellia in text], 'and, as I had feared, my said book fell into the hands of the aforesaid Fathers, who wrote to me on this matter. But little gratification did I get from their writings, with selections from my works, for they only set forth what was of comparatively little value in the book, and what was best they kept to themselves.

'Wherefore I earnestly and prayerfully beg and entreat that Your Most Serene Highnesses will deign to order the publication of this little work, which is likely to be of the greatest use to travellers, missionaries, and merchants, etc[a]. asking them to add a short and befitting preface, such as may appear best suited for it. If I could issue it at my own expense, right willingly would I do it; but for such an expenditure my own resources, as well as the resources of my relations living in Venice, are too limited, therefore I have ventured to give this trouble to the Most Serene Senate.

'The original text, which I have always kept by me, I send to Your Most Serene Highnesses by the hands of the said Reverend Father Eusebius (which is a right good opportunity) —namely, the First, Second, and Third Parts already completed. At the same time I send the Fourth Part, written in French, which has always remained with me, and has never heretofore been sent to Europe. In it the life of the Mogul and various events of the government, besides other things omitted in Parts I. and II., are clearly narrated. I am now proceeding indefatigably with the Fifth Part, in which I examine in detail all and every event happening in these last days of King Aurangzeb's life, and I shall willingly give it to the Actor' [who is referred to is not clear] 'if I am alive.

'The said Reverend Father Eusebius [also] takes with him a book containing sixty-six drawings of the false Hindu gods, wherein Hindu marriages and other ceremonies are represented, all of which the Agent (?) will find explained towards the end of the third part. Nor must it be thought strange if various languages appear in the work now sent, for according to the amanuensis whom I chanced upon, did I compose the work sometimes in French, sometimes in Italian, and occa-

sionally in Portuguese. All of which defects, as well as others that may possibly have occurred, I beg the charity of Your Most Serene Highnesses to excuse, whom Almighty God preserve for many years.

'Madraspatanam, the 15th January, 1705 [*i.e.*, 170$\frac{5}{6}$],
'Your Most Serene Highnesses'
'Most humble and devoted
'Client and Alumnus,
'N. MANUCI.'

N. M.'s second letter of 1706 in Italian.

Inside Codex XLIV. (*Z*anetti) there lie two loose leaves in Italian, which I imagine to be *Z*anetti's notes for the article in his catalogue. But these embody a second letter from Manucci in Italian, which seems to vary somewhat from the one in Latin. I extract any additional facts yielded by this second letter.

He says he began to write to oblige some Frenchmen[1] for the favours they procured him from their king, who in 1699 sent him some medals, one of gold with the image of the king on one side and of the *falfi* (?) on the other, and six others of silver bearing the figure of Victory.[2] In order to show himself grateful for so many favours, he forwarded his history to France in 1700 by one of his faithful friends, a person of consideration, loved and esteemed by all in India. This person on his arrival in France was the object of much honour from the French monarch. But having been sent by his king to the West Indies,[3] he was unable to procure the printing of the

[1] In Part II., 53 (Phillipps), two of these are named—viz., 'Chiefly Monsieur François Martin, Director-General, and Monsieur Deslandes.'

[2] I have tried, without much success, to identify these medals in 'Médailles sur les Principaux Événements du Règne de Louis le Grand,' folio, Paris, 1701, to which Professor E. G. Rapson, of the Coin Department, British Museum, was so kind as to refer me. The first medal mentioned by Manucci might be that struck for the Peace of Ryswick (1697), with the head of Louis on one side, and on the other standing figures of Justice and Valour; and the others, either the medal showing France kneeling at the king's feet, or the one with a standing figure of Peace. Both these also commemorate the same Peace (see pp. 272-274 of above work).

[3] Though he is not named, this passage identifies the person meant as M. Deslandes (see *ante*, p. xxvii). Mark also the contradiction between this and the Latin letter, where he says the friend died at 'Egellia' on his way home.

three volumes on the Mogul Empire. He was obliged to leave them behind him, and another with sixty-four (fifty-six) portraits. The friend gave these (? the three volumes) for inspection as a curiosity to the Jesuit Father Catrou, a young man of great astuteness, to whom the Jesuits had already written from India requesting him to secure the work if he could, which he thus succeeded in doing. Catrou forwarded to Manucci the preface of the book it was his intention to print. 'I saw that he meant to make the work one to his own glory, and mix me up with the fables told by other authors, thereby usurping the result of my labours and fatigues during so many years, and of such great expenditure, while he would have all the coin and the honour. I therefore requested him to return the work to me. But fearing from what I know of him that this will be of no effect, I have in order to get it back appointed as my attorney the Reverend Father F. Eusebius, of Bourges, a Capuchin and French missionary in this land of India, who is now departing for Europe.'

The fourth part.

Further on Manucci says: 'This' [the Fourth Part] 'the Jesuits have not had, nor had I ever sent it; but now I send it, and I will employ all my diligence to prepare the Fifth Part, if God should grant me life, in order to display my sincerity, and to give ample satisfaction to the inquiring reader.' Again, further on: 'The inquisitive Reverend Fathers above named' [*i.e.*, the Jesuits] 'made great exertions to get hold of these two books' [the Fourth Part and the pictures of gods and goddesses], 'but my answer to them was "Nescio vos."'

Languages used.

On the question of language he says: 'The reason is that I have not found in this country any Italian amanuensis.' In conclusion he says: 'Demanding pardon if I have made mistakes in words or in spelling, for in this land of India I have employed my maternal language only on this occasion, in which I profess myself,

'Venerable Signors,

'NICOLAO MANUCI.'[1]

[1] In making this last statement, he seems to have quite forgotten the fact that in 1699 and 1700 he had composed 381 large folio pages of Parts I. and II. in his native tongue. Perhaps those pages were the work of an amanuensis, while the letter of 1706 was his own composition.

The Italian *précis* at Venice.

The maker of this Italian *précis* goes on to abstract from the 'Storia' whatever refers to Manucci's life and travels. He gives the month of leaving Venice as November, thus coinciding substantially with the deduced date of October, arrived at by me independently (see the note on Viscount Bellomont, following Part I., p. 47, of the text). Manucci's age at departure is given as nineteen, whereas it is fourteen in the Berlin text (Phillipps 1945). The abstract ends abruptly with: 'He set out with the prince (Dārā) for the war against Aurangzeb.' The writer makes the incorrect statement that part of the 'Storia' is written in *Spanish;* he should have said *Portuguese.*

Eusebius of Bourges, Capuchin.

I have failed in obtaining much trace of Father F. Eusebius, of Bourges, Capuchin, while in India, and nothing at all about him after his return to Europe. Manucci, in Part IV., fol. 193, speaking of 1704, says that a short time before that year Eusebius had arrived at Madras from Sūrat, on his way to France. He went on to Pondicherry, where the Jesuits spread reports that he had been excommunicated, and thus every door was shut in his face. I do not know what became of him; but we learn from Zanetti that he made over the books to the then ambassador of the Venetian Senate at Paris, Lorenzo Tiepolo (son of Francesco, son of Marco), a man of distinguished ancestry, whose family tree is given in vol. viii. of Count Pompeo Litta's 'Celebri famiglie Italiane' (Milano, n.d., ? 1835). There is a biography of him on p. 162 of vol. xxii. of Gerolamo Baciardo's 'Nuova Enciclopedia Italiana' (Torino, 1887), and in 'Il campodoglio Venete' of Girolamo Alessandro Capellan, vol. iv. (of which the manuscript is in the library of San Marco). In the same library, Class VII., Codex DCCCCI., is the manuscript of Tiepolo's 'Relazione della sua ambasciate a Luigi XIV. di Francia.' In the State Archives at I Frari his despatches from Paris are preserved. The first is dated April 4, 1704, and the last April 27, 1708. In none of these sources could I find any mention of Manucci's work, of its arrival in Paris, or its transmission to Venice. The Abbé Morelli, librarian from 1778, says on p. 46 of his 'Della pubblica Libreria di San Marco' (Venice, 1774), that Tiepolo

Lorenzo Tiepolo (1673-1742).

obtained the Codex in France in 1722, but I do not know what authority he has for this statement. The year seems much too late; but 1712 might be correct.

Zanetti's Catalogue (1741).

Tiepolo, who is described as a man of vast erudition, became procurator of St. Mark, and in 1736 was appointed librarian. He died in 1742, at the age of sixty-nine. Under Tiepolo's auspices as librarian, Antonio Maria Zanetti, the younger, drew up a catalogue of the San Marco collection, which appeared under the title of 'Latina et Italica D. Marci Bibleotheca Codicum manuscriptorum per titulos digesta' [&ca], folio, Venice, 1741. On p. 235 we have the following account of the Manucci manuscript:

'Codex XLIV., in folio, paper, ff. 778, of the eighteenth century. "Historical Memoirs of the Mogul Empire," by Niccolo Manuzzi, Veneziano, divided into four parts, written partly in Italian, partly in Portuguese, and partly in French. From the beginning of the fifteenth to about the eighteenth century.'

Zanetti's description of Codex XLIV.

From the first three parts of this work, carried to France by Monsieur Deslandes in 1700, Father Catrou derived his 'Histoire de l'Empire Mogul,' published at Paris in 1705, two volumes, octavo, and at the Hague, 1708, in 12mo.; translated into Italian in 1731, and printed at Venice. This celebrated literary man, although he had compiled various notices of that kingdom from other authors, nevertheless renders due justice to the labours of our Manuzzi, and he admits him to be the support and foundation of all his statements, wisely dwelling on the character of that author, who was not a simple traveller or merchant (people who are forced either to hurry hither and thither, or to confine themselves solely to cities near the sea), but in truth a medical man, whose profession had detained him at the court for a period of forty or more years, whereby was thrown open to him access to particular information, concealed from every other European, and the means of transcribing the original chronicles themselves. The said Father observes,[1] furthermore, that in the mode of Manuzzi's narration, in spite of the text being in various and

[1] Preface of 1705, p. 5.

obscure languages, there is found a certain ardour of imagination fitted to sustain the historian who works on such materials; to which may be added that at the same time we discover in all these writings a certain air of unstudied simplicity and honest frankness, which still can be detected even when heightened and embellished by a chastened style [*i.e.* Catrou's].

This production of Father Catrou, although much honoured by Manuzzi, had not the fortune to please him when it reached him in India; on the contrary, he was deeply offended that Catrou had inserted the accounts of other people, and had omitted from his book certain statements which Manuzzi considered important. Therefore the author decided to send his own original manuscript to Europe through a Capuchin Father, who gave a pledge that he would hand it over to the first official of the Venetian Republic that he encountered. This monk did as promised, and on reaching Paris delivered it to the Cavaliere Lorenzo Tiepolo, then Venetian ambassador at that court, at present procurator of San Marco, and its illustrious, most meritorious librarian. The gift of Manuzzi was addressed to the Senate with a Latin letter, and these were speedily sent on to Venice by the ambassador. In addition to the above-entered four parts of the 'Historical Memoirs,' there was also a fifth, which went on with the same subject. There was also another volume, with pictures of the gods, priests, and other matters connected with the idolaters who dwell in that country. These pictures are often referred to in the course of the work, and serve to explain the religious beliefs and rites of the ancient inhabitants of Hindustan. But what is more precious for its beauty and its magnificence is a volume containing the portraits of the Mogul emperors, of their families, and other illustrious personages among those idolaters. These are painted with incredible labour, and present the most lovely colouring, heightened by much gilding; and although they do not display all the requisites of correct drawing, or of light and shade, yet the figures are not wanting in naturalness, and, if one may infer it from the diversity of idea and from certain details of the faces, the portraits must be very like their

originals. Father Catrou, who had seen the pictures, would have liked to reproduce them in his history, but he feared to add to the expense of a first edition. We have felt ourselves constrained to give, at the least, a selection of three, and we have chosen the portraits of our Manuzzi, of Tamerlane, and of Orangzeb; the first as being that of the author of the work, the second as that of the first of the emperors, the third as being that of the ruler under whom the writer lived and dwelt in India.

The portrait, then, of Manuzzi is in the highest degree like him, as is asseverated by more than one person who had personal knowledge of him. He is clothed in Mogul attire, and in the act of feeling the pulse of an Indian patient, giving in this way a sign of his profession.

Tamerlane, or Timur-lenk, a name much spoken of in many histories, was the first among the Tartars who conquered and ruled over Hindustan. He is represented out hunting, in which he greatly delighted, in the act of slaying a lion with an arquebuss. The hunting of these wild beasts the Moguls carry out by throwing down in the path a sheep bound with cords. On seeing it, the wild beast rushes at once to devour it; meanwhile they watch, and can easily kill it. The attire of Tamerlane is noticeable, still more his armour, which consists in a corslet of mail richly adorned with gems. Perhaps this costume was peculiar to the Tartars before that of Hindustan began to prevail among them. The posture of this prince, who is kneeling, is asserted by some as intended to indicate that from birth he was weak in the legs, because the second half of his name—that is, *lenk*—means in the Tartar language 'The Lame.'

Orangzeb, eleventh emperor, who died in 1707, after a very long reign, left behind him a resounding memory as the man who to gain the summit felled and slew—partly by deceit, partly by force—all his three brothers, and as one who for many a day held his own father a prisoner. Before he became emperor he was of a certain sect of the Mahomedans who style themselves *faqirs*, and maintained throughout his life an assumed exterior of religion. Thus the artist succeds in taking

him to the very life in the act of reading the Quran, in an attitude full of piety and composure, to which there is not wanting any sanctimonious detail.

In many aspects, then, this manuscript of Manuzzi is of value, and the gathering together of all these different books is worthy of high praise. Certainly the public has benefited by a considerable portion of them in the compilation of Father Catrou. All the same, without advertence to the absence of any extracts from the last two parts, it seems that still other chapters from the Memoirs of our author are called for as additions to Catrou's publication. One chapter ought certainly to be on the natural history of Hindustan, which could be gathered so easily from many dispersed passages to be found in Manuzzi's story, and in his notes on his medical practice, where plants, animals, and other rare products are spoken of, not omitting the marvellous properties of the elephant. Another chapter should be on the private habits of the Indians and the Tartars, which could be deduced from particular instances. But let this suffice for a general notice of this Codex, thus deviating no further from our original scheme.

Engravings in Zanetti.

Zanetti's volume includes three fine copper-plate engravings: 1. Orangzeb, XI. (Blochet, 'Inventaire,' No. 13); the emperor is on a white horse, reading, and there are twenty-five other figures round him on foot. 2. Tamur-lang, I. (Blochet, No. 3). A jungle scene, Taimur on one knee, shooting: thirty-one other figures. 3. Portrait of Niccolao Manuzzi, author of the 'History of the Mogul' (Blochet, No. 2). A stout, white-faced, entirely shaven man in Indian costume looking to the left and holding the pulse of a very dark man.

Further description of Codex XLIV. (Venice).

Cardinal Placido Zurla is inaccurate in stating that the Manucci manuscript 'was unfortunately mislaid in the late political troubles,' meaning the days of Napoleon's invasion, his remark, as we shall see presently, applying only to the volume of portraits. Codex XLIV. (Zanetti) is still in its place at Venice, and I proceed to give further details, such as I was able to glean from an inspection of it in May, 1902.

Codex XLIV. is a large folio of 778 pages, the paper used being of several different sizes; it is bound in calf, and stamped on one side with a lozenge-shaped shield bearing the figure of a winged lion holding in its paw a book, with the letters P E / T / M M (in other words, it bears the arms of the republic); it is lettered on the back, 'Manuzzi, Istoria de' Mogoli.' Loose within it are the two leaves of the Latin letter already quoted, the signature to which appears to be in the hand of a scribe; also four leaves, two written on in Italian, apparently not in the same writing as the Latin letter, but signed on the third line of the second page 'Nicolao Manuci.' A fascimile of this signature is inserted beneath our reproduction of the second portrait of the author. The first two pages (in Italian), 'Notice to the Reader,' are not numbered, and at the end bear the signature 'Nicolao Manuci,' which we have reproduced at the foot of the younger of the two portraits.

The small cramped handwriting of the earlier part might be the same as that of the second letter. The MS. Phillipps 1945, at Berlin, is, on the contrary, in a fair copyist's hand. The first handwriting of Codex XLIV. continues up to p. 366 (in Italian). On pp. 367-406 the hand resembles that of the Berlin MS.; on p. 407 the first hand recommences. Pp. 416-616 are on a smaller (foolscap) paper, and here the third part apparently ends.

The subjects of this third part are as follows—it begins on p. 149: p. 170 (year 1664), p. 212 (year 1666), p. 304, titles of princesses and concubines; p. 305, men's titles; p. 307, palace slaves; p. 320, names of generals; p. 322, *Manṣabs;* p. 337, provinces; p. 340, names of peoples. On some unnumbered leaves following p. 366 he explains that 'for want of writers of Italian, I am obliged to continue my work in French.' From p. 368 he goes on in French up to p. 406. On p. 407 Portuguese begins, 'On Elephants,' down to p. 415. P. 416 is blank. On p. 417 he begins (still in Portuguese) about Adūnī; p. 419, the royal seal and hand imprint; pp. 421 to 423, blank; pp. 424-427, the Dakhin kings; p. 450, principal Hindu temples;

p. 451, temples destroyed by Aurangzeb; p. 455, Joao P. de Faria in Madras; p. 465, St. Thome in 1695; p. 474, Damaõ in 1681; p. 479, Manuel Macedo at St. Thome; p. 501, one quarter blank; p. 502, blank; p. 503, begins 'serviço' (? a misplaced leaf); p. 511, year 1663; p. 565, year 1678; p. 582, Bassein in 1666; p. 606, year 1694. Page 616 ends with the words: 'Lagrima de sangue emover o modo taõ improprio e taõ diverço do que antigam^te^ obravaõn.'

Then on an intermediate size of paper begins in French 'Suite . . . Quatriesme Partie, Préface,' with a new paging, and in a handwriting something like that of the Berlin MS. The history breaks off on p. 122; then pp. 123 and 124 are blank. On p. 125 the author commences to speak of the bad conduct of the Portuguese, and this subject goes on as far as p. 145, attestations from various authorities beginning on p. 140. Between pp. 140 and 141 are bound in four 4to. pages of minute handwriting, apparently the copy of a certificate from the Bishop and Vicar-General of St. Thome, dated January 23, 1705. Pp. 148 to 152 are blank.

Next, with p. 153, comes the large folio paper once more, the writing being that of a copyist, and the language French; mention is made of 1703; and the French text ends with one line on the top of p. 164. On p. 165 there begins in Portuguese an account of Cardinal C. M. de Tournon's stay at Pondicherry. On p. 175 is a date, July 11, 1704. On p. 177 is Manucci's 'Manifesto' to the Friars and Patriarch at Pondicherry, which ends on p. 182, being followed by the Archbishop's letter from Goa, dated September 1, 1704.

On p. 184 the handwriting changes, and the historical narrative is resumed without any heading; on p. 186 is the date, September 9, 1704. On p. 200 we return to more talk about the Portuguese misdeeds, which ends on p. 216. Page 217 is a half-sheet only, apparently intended as the conclusion of Part IV.; and there Manucci promises, if he lives, to go on with a Fifth Part, and the passage is dated Madras, January 5, 1705-1706. At the end is a signature, in a hand differing from the text, 'Nicolas Manuci.' At p. 218 we return to foolscap paper, and the narrative turns again to Aurangzeb. On p. 223

is a date, November 4, 1704, and on p. 226 we have a letter to the author from the Archbishop of Goa, dated January 22, 1705. On p. 230 is the Manifesto; on p. 231 a letter from the Bishop of Mailapur (St. Thome). On p. 234, after the fourth line, is scrawled: 'The end of the Fourth Part of Nicolas Manucci, Venetian.'

Then follow four leaves (not numbered) about Aurangzeb and Shāh 'Ālam; a sheet (also not numbered) with seventeen lines of writing on the upper half of it; one leaf fully written on one side, and with nine and a half lines on the other; two leaves in a different handwriting from the preceding, having three written pages and ten and a quarter lines on the fourth side, referring to Dāūd Khān and Thomas Pitt. Lastly, there are two large folded sheets, giving the order of battle of Shāh 'Ālam's and of 'Aẓam Shāh's armies respectively. If these plans of battle accompanied the volume originally from India, and were not sent subsequently with the Fifth Part, then Codex XLIV. could not have left India until after June, 1707, the battle in question having been fought on the eighteenth of that month.

Codex XLIV. used as text for Part IV.

For Part IV. of my translation I have used the text contained in Codex XLIV. (Zanetti), from the new paging beginning in French 'Suite de l'Histoire du Mogor,' going on to p. 235, and the remaining unnumbered leaves above referred to. I saw this and the other Codices on my visit to Venice in 1902, and, thanks to the good offices of Professor Dr. G. Cóggiola, sub-librarian, who, on this and many other occasions, has been most graciously helpful, I obtained a copy of Part IV., which was made for me by Signor Gilberto Moni.

V. VENICE CODEX XLV. (ZANETTI).

Zanetti's description

This volume is thus described in Zanetti's Catalogue, p. 237: 'Codex XLV., in small folio, on paper, 740 folios, of the eighteenth century. An Italian version of Manuzzi's 'Historical Memoirs of the Moguls,' made by Count Stefano Nivibus Cardeira, Portuguese, the Public Professor of Civil Law in the University of Padua.'

The volume begins with the Third Part (the pages are not

numbered); after that another portion begins 'Delli elefanti,' of which the pages are numbered 1 to 260. Next is the Fourth Part, with Preface, on folios 1 to 197. Lastly is the Fifth Part, with a title-page: 'Parte Quinta | della Storia del Mogol | di | Nicolo Manuci Veneziano | Transportato | dell' Idioma Portoghesi all' Italiano | dal | Co. Diego Cardeira | Portoghese | ,' followed by an Italian letter of February 20, 1712, sending the Fifth Part of the translation, the signature is that of Agostino Gadaldini, then Secretary to the Venetian Senate, as Dr. Cóggiola informs me. The writer speaks of having made over Part V. to Senhor Cardeira's sons for translation, and states that folios 2 to 90 (of the original) were part in Portuguese and part in French, to which must be added 'eleven detached leaves in one or the other tongue.' Next comes a leaf, written on both sides, and not numbered (probably displaced in binding). Then another title-page: 'Tome Quinto | composito per l'autore | Signor | Manucci di | Nazione Veneziano in questa | Fortezza di S. Giorgio | di Madrastapattam. | On the reverse is the book-plate of the librarian, a winged lion with a sword and book, the year (? of appointment) MDCCXXII., and his name Hieronymo Veniero, Procurator of St. Mark.[1] There is still another title-page: 'Quinta Parte | del raconto della Storia del Mogol | In questo presente anno | 1705 | nel mese di Genaro | di | Nicolo Manucci Veneziano.' | On p. 201, 'Account of Persecutions suffered by the Capuchins' is said to be from the French, and translated by Count Andrea Cardeira. On p. 321 is the death of Aurangzeb, February 24, 1707; on p. 329 Prince Akbar's last letter to his father, with four lines of verse in the middle. On p. 339 we are told that Aurangzeb's final illness began on February 7, 1707. 'Āẓam Shāh's coin inscription is given on p. 341, under the date of March 15, 1707. The work ends on p. 345.

Codex XLV. used as text of Part V.

The only complete and consecutive text of Part V. now extant being the Italian version given in this Codex XLV.,

[1] According to Jacopo Morelli, 'Della pubblica Libreria di San Marco in Venezia' (Venice, 1774, pp. 96, 8vo.), p. 92, Girolamo Veniero was librarian from 1716 to 1736.

I have used it in preparing my translation. There are some repetitions of matter already contained in Codex XLIV., and these I have omitted from Part V., giving merely a reference to the page in that manuscript. I saw the Codex XLV. when at Venice in 1902, and Part V. was copied for me by Signor Carlo Alberto Corti.

How the Venice Codices were traced.

It remains to say a word or two of how I got upon the track of these Venice Codices XLIV. and XLV. (Zanetti). For a time I believed I was the first student of Indian history to unearth them, and that the notice in Zanetti's catalogue of 1741 had gone entirely unnoticed. Misled by the 'Nouvelle Biographie Générale,' I had started in search of a Lisbon edition of Manucci's work, and to that end asked my friend, Mr. J. Batalha-Reis, M.V.O., Consul-General in London, to procure me information from the great libraries of Lisbon. This attempt was infructuous, for I was on the wrong scent; but Mr. Batalha-Reis's attention had been roused, and since, as befits one of his nationality, he is a diligent student of, and deeply versed in, geographical literature, he soon afterwards directed me to a passage he had just seen in the work of Cardinal Placido Zurla (1769-1834): 'Di Marco Polo | e degli altri | Viaggiotori Veneziani | . . .,' 2 vols., folio, Venezia, 1818. In vol. ii., in a chapter headed 'Of Some Learned Travellers,' he says (p. 293, para. 67): 'But more than all is worthy of mention the crown of this chapter, Nicolo Manuzzi, who, resorting to the Mogul (country) towards the end of the seventeenth century, exercised medicine there for over forty years, and by the help of that (p. 294) profession was able to frequent the court, and to inform himself of the history, politics, physical condition, and religion of the country, and inserted most entrancing information about it in his "Historical Memoirs of the Mogul Empire," divided into three books, and written partly in Italian, partly in Portuguese, and partly in French. They begin with the fifteenth and come down to the eighteenth century. These very manuscripts were sent by Manuzzi himself from the Mogol country to the Venetian Senate, and they formed one of the ornaments of the Marciana

Cardinal Placido Zurla.

until in the recent political disturbances they were unfortunately mislaid. Some specimens may be seen in Anton Maria Zanetti's "Latina et Italica D. Marci Bibliotheca," where he reproduces three of the many pictures of that veritably magnificent and priceless codex; and he shows how Father Catrou made use of Manuzzi for his "History of the Mogols."'

Letter from Librarian of San Marco.

Guided by the above passage in Zurla, I discovered and made extracts from Zanetti. Before going to Venice it was necessary to find out if the manuscript had ever been recovered. The questions I drew up were most kindly communicated by Dr. C. H. Hagberg Wright, of the London Library, to the librarian of San Marco. This inquiry produced a full and most interesting reply from the then librarian, Dr. Salomone Morpurgo,[1] under date of March 29, 1899, the opening sentences referring to the volume of portraits which will be dealt with in a succeeding section. The following is a translation of this letter:

'The volume described by you certainly belongs to the Marciana, for it bears our old *ex-libris*, otherwise the lion and sword with the motto *Custos vel ultor*. With equal certainty it once formed part of Codex XLIV., described by Zanetti at p. 235 and following. The said Codex is to this day in the Marciana; but it was in 1797 bereft of this, its most precious part' [quotes Zanetti]. 'A marginal note on our examplar of Zanetti announces that "the book of portraits was made over in 1797 to the Signor Brunet, the French commissary," and it was never subsequently restored. Zurla is inexact enough in his expression when he says the Manuzzi manuscript "was unfortunately mislaid in the late political troubles," for, instead of that, it was *taken by force;* but not the whole of it, as he (Zurla) seems to say. You can compare with the originals at Paris the three plates reproduced by Zanetti. Thus, then, the text of the 'Memoirs,' Codex XLIV., remains in the Marciana, also the other volume mentioned by Zanetti, pictures of gods, priests, etc[a]; this is now placed in Classe VI., It. 136. In addition thereto we possess in manuscript (Classe VI., It. 345) descriptions of the portraits in the volume now at Paris, and

[1] Now chief librarian of the National Library at Florence.

I send the opening paragraph and the titles referring to each figure. Codex XLV. is still in its proper place on the shelves.'

After that letter I was satisfied that my journey would not be fruitless; but it was not till May, 1902, that I was able to visit Venice, inspect the manuscripts, and arrange to have them copied.

Bernouilli knew of Codex XLIV.

As I have already said, I was convinced for a time that I was the first discoverer of this Venice Codex since Zanetti's and Foscarini's time. But I had not reckoned with the Teutonic genius for research: an eighteenth-century German professor had been before me. There are some rather interesting particulars in J. Bernouilli's note, and as it does not seem to be printed in the more commonly accessible French edition of the 'Récherches sur l'Inde,' I insert it from the German edition, 'Beschreibung von Hindustan,' Band II., Theil II. (1788), pp. 192, 193:

'Two or three years ago my youngest brother' [Jacques B., born 1759, drowned 1789], 'who is at present an ordinary member of the Russian Imperial Academy of Science at St. Petersburg, stayed some time in Venice. I requested him to inspect this manuscript of Manuzzi, and more especially to give me an idea of the Fourth and Fifth Parts; and I also wanted him to look out for a copyist to transcribe those two parts, or to extract from them all that was valuable. He answered me on February 15, 1786, thus:

'"I went to the library, and unfortunately found the work about as badly divided as it could be in respect of the languages used. The first three books, just those you do not want, are all in Italian, excepting some 100 pages or so in French. The Fourth Part has 122 pages of history, some 20 on the Jesuits and the Inquisition, another 20 of history in French, followed by 20 pages in Portuguese. The Fifth Part has 130 pages of history in Portuguese, and 50 in French on the Jesuit and Capuchin disputes. You must see how difficult it is to find one copyist for all that at any reasonable price, for French is little known here, and Portuguese still less, or even not at all. The latter especially is not of a very easily-read handwriting for anyone not knowing the language, etc[a]."

'At length a capable copyist was found, but at too high a rate, and while negotiations over this were pending my brother was compelled to continue his journey to St. Petersburg. He certainly confided the matter to a German friend in Venice; however, this gentleman died soon afterwards, and since then I gave up the project for the time being, although the Abbate Morelli, custodian of the library' [Jacopo Morelli, 1745-1819, custodian from 1778], 'assured me through another friend in Venice he would willingly produce the manuscript in question, if a diligent copyist could be found as to whose moral character he could entertain no doubts.'

Bernouilli winds up by expressing the hope that these hints will induce some one to follow up the trace and select the most valuable parts of this 'apparently-for-the-greater-part-important manuscript.' The Abbate Morelli's demand for a 'moral' copyist is somewhat diverting.

VI. THE OTHER MANUCCI CODICES AT VENICE.

Codex CXXXVI.

Codex CXXXVI., in Class VI., bears the same book-plate as Codex XLV. (Zanetti), the name of the same librarian, Geronimo Veniero, and the same year, MDCCXXII. It is a volume of pictures, all in colours. They represent gods and goddesses, devotees, marriage and funeral ceremonies, Hindū and Mahomedan festivals. There are also plans of the battle between Shāh 'Ālam and A'ẓam Shāh, similar to those bound up in Codex XLIV. There are short descriptions of the pictures, some in French and some in Italian.

Subjects of paintings in same.

From a transcript of these descriptions (French text) made for me through Dr. Cóggiola, I give the following list of the subjects: (1*a*) A representation of Banjāras, or grain-carriers; (1) Brahma; (2) Vishnu; (3) Brahman and his wife, followers of No. 2 (Vishnu); (4) a second picture of Vishnu; (5) Brahman (follower of Vishnu No. 4) and his wife; (6) a third picture of Vishnu; (7) Brahman and his wife, followers of the third Vishnu, No. 6; (8) Rudra (Shivā); (9) priest of Rudra and his wife; (10) Pillaiyaur, son of Rudra; (11) another picture of Rudra; (12) priest of Rudra with his wife; (13) ceremony at

the November festival of the goddess 'Culouly' (? Kālī alias Kangālī); (14) first ceremony at a Hindū marriage; (15) second ceremony at a marriage; (16) third ceremony at a marriage; (17) fourth ceremony at a marriage; (18) fifth and last ceremony at a marriage; (19) first ceremony at a Lingāyat funeral; (20) second ceremony at such funeral; (21) third ceremony at the said funeral; (22) funeral of a *grucs* (? *gurū*), or learned doctor of the Hindū religion; (23) burning of a Brahman widow; (24) an eclipse of the moon as pictured by the Hindūs; (24*bis*) ritual at eclipse of the sun and moon; (25) burning of the dead; (26) bathing of the widow after her husband's death; (27) picture of the woman (see Part II., f. 70) who dragged her lover into the pyre; (28) lamentations of a Hindū widow on hearing of her husband's death; (29) sacrifices at the dedication of a Lingāyat temple; (30) representations of a *faqīr's* life; (31) Brahmans branding a man dedicated to their service; (32) ritual against the small-pox; (33) elevation and plan of the temple at Canjivaron [Kānchipuram or Conjeeveram, 'Madras Manual of Ad.,' iii. 210]; (34) elevation and plan of two other temples at Kānchipuram; (35) plans and view of Lankā town, the fairy city of the Hindūs; (36) representation of the great temple at Tirupatī [see Part III., f. 201 of text]; (37) Brahmans sacrificing a goat to fire; (38) rejoicings of the Brahmans after sacrificing the goat; (39) flower pavilion erected at temples on great festivals; (40) Brahmans blessing water; (41) triumphal car used in processions to bear their idols; (42) a Hindū festival to Lakshmi and Paramal; (43) Hindū devotee with iron chain; (44) Hindū devotee with wooden yoke; (45) Hindū devotee with an iron chain through his lip; (46) a dead Hindū half buried, and a woman begging alms for him; (47) a Hindū asking for alms; (47*bis*) another Hindū mendicant; (48) a Hindū penitent worshipping the sun; (49) another Hindū penitent worshipping the sun; (50) a Hindū penitent in a fixed position; (51) the same, another position; (52) another ascetic in a constrained posture; (53) another of these penitents; (54) another instance; (55) penitents adoring the Lingam; (56) a Hindū penitent with a brazier on his head; (57) Hindū strollers attached to temples asking alms and

dancing; (57*bis*) the same again; (58) a Brahman begging; (59) a Hindū on his way to consult a Brahman; (60) a Hindū selling Gangotri water; (61) a Hindū begging by singing and beating a drum; (62) Mahomedan annual mourning for the death of Ḥasan and Ḥusain; (63) the idol of 'Manarou Lamy' [? *Mantrālammah*, see 'Madras Manual of Ad.," iii. 530] with worshippers; (64) penitent in a constrained posture; (65) penitent standing and leaning on a rope attached to a tree; (66) a naked penitent with long hair and prodigious nails.

Thus, with double numbers, there are sixty-nine plates in all. Most of them are crowded with figures in action, and are not merely drawings of the gods, goddesses, devotees, and penitents alone.

Codex CCCXLV., descriptions of portraits.

Codex CCCXLV., in Class VI., an octavo volume, is the last of the four Manucci manuscripts now in the San Marco library at Venice, and contains Italian descriptions of the pictures in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. With the pictures at Paris are bound up similar descriptions in French.

Notices of Manucci and Codex XLIV.

The 'Marciana Codex of Manucci' is quoted as one of the sources of the notice on him in 'Studii biografici e bibliografici sulla storia della geographia in Italia,' by P. Amat di S. Filippo (second edition, Roma, 1882), vol. i., p. 440, along with Zurla, of whom I have spoken, Legrenzi and Foscarini. Of these last I shall speak when I come to the story of Manucci's life. Some slight errors I have noted in the above work are: *Caton* for *Catrou*, *1707* for *1705*, *8vo* for *4o and 12o*, *1737* for *1731* (Venice translation). Deslandes did not translate the work into French, but conveyed it to France; for *trasporto in francese*, read *in Francia*. Nor were Parts IV. and V. sent home in 1705, but Part IV. in 1706 and Part V. still later.

VII. THE VOLUME OF PORTRAITS IN THE BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE, PARIS.

Volume of portraits sent with Parts I., II., and III

Manucci, in his Latin letter, mentions that, along with the three volumes of his History sent to Europe through M. Deslandes, he also forwarded a volume of portraits. Catrou (Preface of 1705, p. 4) speaks as if he had control over this

volume also, being only deterred by fear of expense from reproducing some of its contents. He may have inspected the volume, but as he did not make it over to the Jesuits' College along with the three volumes of text, we may doubt if he had more than a passing connection with it. I have not been able to discover any trace of the date or the channel of transfer to Venice. That the volume did reach the St. Mark Library at that place we have ample proof. Zanetti catalogued it there in 1741, and reproduced three of the pictures, and, as the present librarian writes, their copy of that catalogue bears the marginal note that the volume of pictures was made over to the French in 1797.

This volume traced.

In 1898 I came across some articles in the *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, January to June, 1897, p. 281, by Monsieur E. Blochet, on 'Miniatures des MSS. Mussulmanes'; and for one of his reproductions, a portrait of Dāwar Bakhsh, alias Bulāqī, grandson of Jahāngīr, he gave as his authority 'Voyage de Manucci.' In March, 1899, being then in Paris, my friend Mr. H. Beveridge kindly made an examination for me, from which there could be no doubt that it was the identical volume that Zurla in 1818 declared had been mislaid, but, to speak more exactly, that had been carried off by the French in 1797 as part of their Italian booty.

Inspection of volume.

I have since seen the book myself. It forms part of the collection in the Cabinet des Estampes at the Bibliothèque Nationale, and it is classed as O.D., No. 45 (réserve). It is now bound in red morocco, impressed with gold imperial eagles at the corners. Evidently it was rebound at Paris after 1797; but the embossed lozenge-shaped stamp of the San Marco Library, cut out of the old calf binding, is inserted in the centre of the new covers. The lining is of pale blue satin with gold edging. It is labelled outside 'Histoire de l'Inde depuis Tamerlank jusqu'à Orangzeb, par Manucci,' and bears the year 1712. Inside is the *ex-libris* of San Marco, bearing the same name (Geronimo Veniero) and the same year (1722) as that in Codex XLIV. (Zanetti) at Venice. Opposite each picture is a description of it in French. Of these an Italian version is found at Venice in Codex Class VI., No. cccxlv.;

they are evidently the composition of Manucci. Most of the portraits are very characteristic; those of Aurangzeb and Shivā Jī may be specially noted. Those of Shāh 'Ālam and the other sons of Aurangzeb, as those of persons known to Manucci, ought to be authentic. The two pictures devoted, one to the kings of Gulkhandah and the other to the kings of Bījāpur, strike me as very life-like, and probably also authentic.

Manucci's account of portraits.

As an introduction to his descriptions, Manucci says: 'Before I left the Mogul dominions' [that is, before 1686], 'to satisfy my curiosity I caused portraits to be painted of all the kings and princes from Taimur-i-lang to Aurangzeb, including the sons and grandsons of the last named, together with the portraits of the rulers over Bījāpur and Gulkhandah, of some of the chief Hindū princes, and of other famous generals. The artist was a friend of mine, Mīr Muḥammad, an official in the household of the prince, Shāh 'Ālam, and all were copied from originals in the royal palace. So far as I know, no one has yet imparted such portraits to the public; or if any ingenious person has so done, this collection of mine has nothing in common with such, mine being the veritable, which the others cannot be. Meanwhile, to get them I have spared no expense, and have given many presents; and the whole was carried out under great difficulties, it being incumbent on me to observe profound secrecy as to my having the copies. I do not bring forward any portraits of queens and princesses, for it is impossible to see them, thanks to their being always concealed. If anyone has produced such portraits, they should not be accepted, being only likenesses of concubines and dancing-girls, etc., which have been drawn according to the artist's fancy. It should be remarked that all portraits showing a nimbus and an umbrella over the head are those of persons of the blood royal.'

Hand-list, by E. Blochet.

In the *Revue des Bibliothèques* for 1898 (vol. viii.), 1899 (vol. ix.), and 1900 (vol. x.), Monsieur Blochet published an 'Inventaire et Description des Miniatures des MSS. Orientaux dans la Bibliothèque Nationale à Paris,' subsequently reproduced in a separate volume (pp. 278, 8vo.; Paris: E. Bouillon, 1900). On pp. 225-229 is a list of the fifty-six paintings in

volume O.D., No. 45 (réserve); but this I need not insert, as black and white reproductions of the whole series are incorporated in the present issue of Manucci. The excellent negatives from which they are taken were done by Monsieur P. Sauvanaud, of the Rue Jacob, Paris, who was recommended to me by Monsieur Blochet. The original paintings are, as M. Blochet justly says, 'd'une splendide exécution'; they lose vastly in effect when stripped of their colouring, at once gorgeous and exquisitely delicate, and I regret that the great expense has made it impossible to attempt their reproduction by some colour process. Apart from their artistic excellence, these pictures have the additional value of forming a collection which has never been disturbed since it was made, while the date of execution and the name of the artist are accurately known. Thus the portraits of men then alive may be accepted as likenesses, so far as the skill of the painter permitted.

Previous reproductions of a few pictures.

Of previous reproductions of these portraits, I have already referred to the three fine copperplate engravings in Zanetti's catalogue of 1741, and Monsieur Blochet's process block of Dāwar Bakhsh, alias Bulāqī (grandson of Jahāngīr), in the *Gazette des Beaux Arts* (1897). In June, 1903, I accidentally took up some lithographs, displayed by Miss Manning at one of her National Indian Association meetings, and to my surprise one of these, a portrait of Aurangzeb, professed to be from 'una miniatura persiana estratta dal MS. di Manucci.' Miss Manning told me she had destroyed the book but kept the illustrations, and she subsequently sent me thirty-three lithographs in all, and of these, a portrait of Akbar was also referred to an original in Manucci's collection. After a good deal of trouble the book was found at Rome. It turns out to be 'Storia delle Indie Orientali,' by Giovanni Flechia, preceded by a 'Geographical Description of India,' by F. C. Marmocchi (2 vols., 4to., Torino, 1862). The geography (262 pages) is good, but the history is a mere compilation from Elphinstone and other easily accessible authorities.

Flechia and Marmocchi's 'Storia.'

There are forty-seven full-page lithographic illustrations, mostly taken from W. Daniell's 'Oriental Annuals,' and a few,

the most spirited, from originals by Evremont de Bérard (flourished *c.* 1852-1861). There are five portraits of emperors: (1) Taimur, (2) Akbar, (3) Shāhjahān, (4) Aurangzeb, (5) Bahādur Shāh II., all given in gold and colours, very creditably done, that of Shāhjahān being especially good. Of these, the second, third and fourth profess to be taken from Manucci's volume, but no further indication of its *locale* is given. The one of Shāhjahān could hardly be from the Manucci collection, as there is no such portrait of that monarch contained in it.

VIII. MANUCCI'S BIOGRAPHY.

Printed accounts defective

Although, as Foscarini says, Manucci's life, 'che fu piena d'accidenti curiosi,' can be easily put together from the 'Storia,' the accounts of him in the usual biographical dictionaries are singularly meagre and erroneous. Neither in the old nor the new edition of the 'Biographie Universelle' (Michaud) does his name appear either under Manouchi or Manucci. In the 'Nouvelle Biographie Générale' (Didot), xxxiii. (1860), we certainly have an entry. But, unfortunately, it is one crowded with demonstrable errors. There is no evidence that Manucci died about 1710; on the contrary, his continued existence in 1712 can be proved. That he returned to Europe in 1691 or any other year; that he retired to Portugal; that he published a work which had become very scarce, are all untenable propositions. The entry in Sir Thomas Phillipps's catalogue is of a manuscript, not of a printed book; it is, therefore, hardly to be wondered at if the dictionary contributor (F. D.) had never been able to find a copy. His authority, the 'Mercure Galant' for 1691, I have not been able to consult, as it is not in the British Museum; what his 'documents particuliers' were, we, of course, cannot know now.

Manucci not traced at Venice.

By the inquiries I instituted at Venice, I was unable to find any trace there of Manucci. I was told that the name was not Patrician. The only other Manuccis that I have come across do not, I fear, shed much lustre on the name; both occur in Casanova de Seingalt's 'Mémoires'; one was the spy who

denounced Casanova as a heretic, and secured his committal to *I Piombi;* the other was a friend met at Barcelona, whose plans Jacopo Casanova inadvertently betrayed.[1] As Manucci nowhere tells us his father's Christian name or the parish of his birth, to search for his birth or baptism was a hopeless task. Nor did the police reports yield any notice of such a boy's disappearance. Further search under the right year and month (November, 1653) has not produced anything, nor any mention of Viscount Bellomont's stay at Venice and departure from it by sea. Thus the only means of reconstituting Manucci's life-story and its chronology is a search through the 'Storia.' This reconstruction I now attempt.

In the early part of his book, and up to about the year 1678, there is an almost constant defect of two years in Manucci's dates. From external evidence we know that the eclipse of the sun he saw at Zulfah, in Armenia, took place on August 12, 1654; that he landed in India in January, 1656; that the Battle of Samūgarh, near Āgrah, was fought on June 8, 1658.[2] Calculating from these points as fixed data, we find that Manucci left Venice in November, 1653 (not 1651). He says he was then fourteen, and thus must have been born some time in 1639. He ran away from home, and hid on board a vessel bound for Smyrna; here he encountered Viscount Bellomont (Henry Bard), then on his way to Persia and India. Bellomont had pity on the lad, and took him into his service. From Smyrna they went through Asia Minor to the Persian court at Qazwīn (August, 1654). Thence they moved to Iṣfahān, where they remained a year (September, 1654 to September, 1655), finally reaching Gombroon (Bandar 'Abbās) viâ Shīrāz and Lār. A passage was obtained on the H.E.I. Company's *Seahorse*, in which they reached Sūrat, on the west coast of India, in January, 1656. Leaving that place in April, they travelled by Burhānpur, Hāndiyah, Sironj, Narwar, Gwāliyār and Dholpur to Āgrah; thence they started for the Mogul court at Dihlī. On

From birth to 1656.

[1] See C. Whibley's article in *Macmillan's Magazine* for February, 1903, p. 273.

[2] This mistake of two years in Manucci explains the appearance of 1656 instead of 1658 in Catrou, p. 195, who made here a most uncritical use of his text. He could easily have corrected the error from Bernier.

June 20, 1656, when near Hodal, a place between Mathurā and Dihlī, Bellomont suddenly expired.

1656-1666. Manucci went on to Dihlī, and, through the dispute arising over the late ambassador's affairs, obtained an introduction to Prince Dārā Shukoh, eldest son of the emperor Shāhjahān. Manucci was enlisted as an artilleryman in Dārā's service on rupees 80 a month. In 1658, when the princes Aurangzeb and Murād Bakhsh moved against Āgrah, Dāra Shukoh marched south to oppose them, Manucci being in his army. A countermarch to Samūgarh followed, and there battle was delivered. Manucci was in the field, and after Dārā's defeat fled with the rest to Āgrah. Subsequently he succeeded in attaching himself in disguise to Aurangzeb's army, and was in it when Murād Bakhsh was seized. From Dihlī Manucci managed to get away and join Dārā Shukoh at Lāhor. With that prince he marched to Multān and Bhakkar. He was placed at the head of the artillery in the latter fortress, under the command of the eunuch Basant, and the garrison stood a siege, only surrendering after the capture of their prince. Evacuating Bhakkar, the garrison returned to Lāhor, and there Manucci escaped with his bare life from an attack in which Basant was killed. Returning with the other European artillerymen to Dihlī, Manucci refused further service, as he disliked Aurangzeb. After he had witnessed that monarch's departure from Dihlī for Kashmīr (December 8, 1662), Manucci made an expedition eastwards, and, taking boat at Patnah, travelled to Rājmahal and Dhākkah, thence through the Sundarbans to Hūglī, returning to Āgrah by way of Qāsimbāzār. At Āgrah and Dihlī he gradually adopted medicine as a profession, but, obtaining an introduction to Rajah Jai Singh, of Amber, through his second son, Kīrat Singh, he was offered by that prince the post of captain of artillery on 10 rupees a day. Jai Singh was appointed Governor of the Dakhin between March and September, 1664. Manucci marched with him for that country, being deputed on the way to negotiate with some petty rajahs north of Bombay. After seven months he rejoined at Aurangābād, where the rajah had united his forces with those of Shāh 'Ālam. He saw Shivā Jī in the rajah's camp in June

or July, 1665. In Jai Singh's further move southwards against Bījāpur Manucci also took part.

Apparently tiring of his position, Manucci resigned (II. 1666-1677.
108, 109), and made his way viâ Kaliyānī to Bassain, twenty-eight miles north of Bombay; he was there during the Lent of 1667, and narrowly escaped the Inquisition (III. 230). He reached Goa in May, 1667, and after a stay of fifteen months (May 1667 to August 1668) he left it disguised as a Carmelite, and returned to Āgrah and Dihlī (II. 130). At the latter place he attached himself to Kīrat Singh, obtaining from him a horse and rupees 5 a day. After a year's time Kīrat Singh was ordered to Kābul, and Manucci resolved to move to Lāhor (end of 1670 or early in 1671), and start practice there as a physician. He practised as such for about six or seven years, and, having realized a small competence, decided on removing into territory governed by Europeans. This must have been in 1676, as he was at Damān, on the west coast, in that year (II. 137, III. 198), and during 1677 (III. 264, 265) he made his home at Bandora, on Salsette Island, nine miles north of Bombay fort.

Having lost his money in a bad speculation, Manucci was 1678-1682.
obliged to try his fortunes once more at the Mogul court. He returned to Dihlī, where, through a court chamberlain, he was called in to attend one of Shāh 'Ālam's wives, and, having cured her of a gathering in the ear, the lady interested herself in his affairs and procured his appointment by that prince as one of his physicians. This must have been subsequent to January 30, 1678, the date on which Shāh 'Ālam returned to Dihlī from Kābul. On September 28, 1678, Shāh 'Ālam was made governor of the Dakhin, and Manucci went there in his train. He says once that he was at Āgrah in 1679, and possibly the occasion was on this march to the Dakhin. On September 6, 1679, Shāh 'Ālam's thirty-seventh birthday, they were at Aurangābād; but not long before this (December 18, 1678) Jaswant Singh of Jodhpur had died in Kābul, and Aurangzeb, after failing to seize one of the rajah's infant sons, resolved on the conquest of the Jodhpur state. Shāh 'Ālam was recalled to take part in the campaign, and the prince (Manucci with him)

passed the rains of 1680 at Ujjain (II. 204). In January, 1681, they joined the main army at Ajmer, having seen a comet on their way (December 24, 1680). Prince Akbar had just fled (January 13, 1681), and had raised the standard of revolt. On the 26th Shāh 'Ālam was sent in pursuit, and remained on this duty until the end of March (1681). Some sort of peace was patched up with the other Rājputs, Akbar escaped to the Mahrattahs in the south, and, in consequence, on September 15, 1681, Aurangzeb began his first march towards the Dakhin, a country from which he was destined never to return.

1682-1684. Finding his position an irksome one, and having some money in the hands of the Theatine Fathers at Goa, Manucci, apparently in 1682 or early in 1683, resolved to get away under the pretext of two months' leave of absence. On reaching Sūrat he obtained a boat from François Martin,[1] of the French Company, which took him to Damān, and thence to Goa. The then governor of Goa, the Conde de Alvor, had taken charge on September 11, 1681, and at the time of our hero's arrival found himself closely threatened by an army under Sambhā Jī, son of Shivā Jī, the Mahrattah. About August, 1683, having unwisely offered battle at Ponda on the mainland, the viceroy was badly defeated. Negotiations were opened, and Manucci was sent to interview Sambhā Jī. Nothing resulted, and Santo Estevaoñ, one of the Goa islands, was captured by Sambhā Jī during the night of November 25, 1683. Once more Manucci visited the Mahrattah chief, and also went to see Shāh 'Ālam, who was approaching in a threatening manner. He also took part in a second embassy to Shāh 'Ālam. For all these services the governor conferred on him a patent of knighthood in the Portuguese Order of St. Iago, this patent being dated January 29, 1684.

1684-1686. On the second visit Shāh 'Ālam detained Manucci as an absconder from his service. Flight was attempted, but the poor man was brought back much against his will. A difficult march through the Ghāts was then made, and the prince

[1] F. Martin was at Sūrat from 1680 to 1686 (see J. Sottas, 'Histoire,' 1904, p. 104, and Michaud, 'Biographie Universelle,' new edition of 1860, vol. xxvii., p. 121, article by Pierre Margry).

rejoined his father at Aḥmadnagar. Shortly afterwards Shāh 'Ālam was sent against the King of Gulkhandah. When the camp was at Mālkher, Manucci managed to enter into communication with the general on the opposite side, and he was helped to escape to Gulkhandah. When Shāh 'Ālam occupied Gulkhandah (1686) Manucci fled further afield to the European settlements at Narsāpur and Masulipatam, on the east coast. Soldiers brought him back to Gulkhandah, but he was successful in evading delivery to the agents of Shāh 'Ālam, who had left that place. Once more, with the aid of an Augustinian friar, he managed after two months to get away, and took refuge at the English settlement of Madras or Fort St. George. This was in the second half of 1686.

1686, his marriage.

Paying a visit to François Martin at Pondicherry, eighty-six miles south of Madras, Manucci was dissuaded from returning to Europe, and was advised to marry. He was introduced to a Catholic widow, the daughter of Christopher Hartley and Aguida Pereyra. Her first husband, Thomas Clarke, had died on October 6, 1683. Manucci married her on October 28, 1686, and a son was born to them, but the child died in infancy. He resumed his practice as a physician, and much commends a cordial of which he had the secret, while his 'stones,' an imitation of the Goa stones of the Jesuits, had a great vogue.[1]

1686-1700.

Almost immediately on his arrival at Madras Manucci's services were requisitioned by Governor William Gyfford (July 1681 to July 1687). Gyfford wrote to the 'Great Mogull' on February 17, 168⅘, and March 20, 168⅘, sending both letters by Manucci's messengers. Before the answer arrived from the court Gyfford had been superseded by Elihu Yale (July 1687 to October 23, 1692), and on September 16, 1687, the new governor ousted Manucci and made over the negotiation entirely to Khwājah Ibnūs, alias Joan de Marke, an Armenian merchant at Gulkhandah, with whom the correspondence lasted until July, 1688. During Yale's (1687-1692) and Higginson's (1692-1698) governorships Manucci would

[1] C. Lockyer, 'Account of Trade in India,' 1711, p. 268, and see 'Hobson Jobson,' p. 379, s.v. 'Goa Stones.'

appear to have remained out of favour. On the contrary, Thomas Pitt, governor from 1698 to 1709, seems to have liked and trusted Manucci—at any rate, he employed him a good deal.

1700-1703. In 1700 Sir William Norris and Consul John Pitt, who had come out in the interests of the newly-founded rival English company, made overtures to Manucci to join the first-named as interpreter. Manucci declined on the score of age and blindness, but really out of a desire not to offend Governor Pitt.[1]

In O.C., No. 6737 (Masulipatam general letter of September 19, 1699), we have an intimation that a letter was awaited from 'Sen^r Manuchii,' which was delayed by his absence at Pondicherry, the French settlement, on some business he was transacting for them (the French).

A translation of Manucci's answer to John Pitt is to be found at the India Office (O.C., vol. lxvi., Part I., No. 6790), and, as Sir Henry Yule does not give it, I insert it in full.

'MOST ILLUSTRIOUS SR. MR. PITT,

'I have received the honour of 3 letters, which you have done me the Favour of writing to me, and am infinitely obliged to you, for all the Goodness you show therein; and (as I should be alwayes gladd to serve your Honr.) I would doe it with all my heart, but finding my Selfe Old and Infirme, I am not in a Condition to undertake what You desire of me; If I enjoyed my former health and Strength, it would be a great honour to me, to find soe favourable an opportunity of Serving, his Majesty, his Excellency, and the Noble Company, but my Infirmity and Blindness will not permit me.

'I desire your Honour will assure your selfe, that noe other reason should hinder me from accepting the soe Honourable Offers that you make me with soe much Goodness.

[1] Yule, 'Diary of W. Hedges,' ii., pp. cclxviii, cclxix; iii., p. xlv, where see—
(*a*) J. Pitt, Italian letter to N. M. of July 28, 1699 (O.S.) (India Office, O.C., 6685).
(*b*) Sir W. Norris to Sir Nicholas Waite, from Masulipatam, January 19, ⅓⅓⅓ (O.C., 6836).
(*c*) J. Peachey to J. Pitt, from Fort St. George, February 19, ⅓⅓⅓ (O.C., 6919).

'I have not answered your two former Letters, not having mett with a secure oppertunity; in fine, I offer you my whole heart, and upon all occasions You shall find me punctually ready, as your most humble Servant. God keep your illustrious person.

'Madrastapatan, $\frac{1}{11}$ December, 1699.

'Most Illustrious Sr.,

'Your most humble

'NICOLAS MANUCH.

'To the most illustrious Signor Mr. Pitt, President of the Noble Royall Company of England for the Coast of Cormandell, Metchlapatan.'

The kingdom of Gulkhandah having finally fallen in 1687, the Moguls proceeded to invest Jinjī, eighty-two miles south-west of Madras, but were unable to reduce it until 1698. From the date of its fall they became very active, and began to interfere throughout the Karnātik. Their deputy-governor, Dā,ūd Khān, Pannī, obeying orders from court, made himself especially disagreeable. In 1702 he invested Madras for many weeks, when Manucci and a Brahmin were sent as joint envoys from Governor Pitt to the besieger (Part IV., 87, 93, 97, 244; V., 224). The story of these negotiations, from the official point of view, will be found in J. Talboys Wheeler's 'Madras in the Olden Time,' chapter xvi., pp. 195-221. In February and March, 1703, Manucci paid a visit to that Nawāb at his house in Kaḍapah, 137 miles north-west of Madras.

1703-1706, ecclesiastical disputes.

With 1703 begins the active stage of the dispute between the Capuchins and Jesuits, arising chiefly out of the so-called Malabar Rites or Accommodation Strife,[1] about the supposed concessions of Jesuit missionaries to heathendom. Into this and other ecclesiastical matters Manucci threw himself with great energy. In 1700 he had been the host of some priests who were on their way to China (IV., 231, 232), and at the end of 1701 he wrote to Dā'ūd Khān about persecutions in

[1] 'Accommodation' in the French sense, as in Molière's 'Il y a avec le ciel des accommodements.'

Tānjor, being thanked in two letters by the Père Pierre Martin, Jesuit, of that mission (second letter, dated February 6, 1702). With the arrival of Cardinal de Tournon, papal legate, at Pondicherry in November, 1703, ecclesiastical questions took precedence of all others in our author's mind. He devotes many pages to these questions, and in Père Norbert's 'Mémoires Utiles et Nécessaires,' Luques (Lucca), 1742, p. 187, under the date of January 10, 1707, we find 'Nicolo Manucci' as one of the four witnesses who attest that a certain request had been presented on September 28, 1706, by Père Michel Angelo, Capuchin, to the Bishop of St. Thome, an ex-Jesuit.

1706-1717, to his death.

In 1706 Manucci lost his wife, and at some date between that event and 1712 he moved his home to Pondicherry. In the latter year he proposed to make a journey to the Mogul court at Lāhor on the request of Shāh 'Ālam, who had become emperor five years before. The Madras Council wished to make use of his mediation to clear up certain long-pending difficulties with the Mogul, and secure fresh privileges for their honourable masters. The death of Shāh 'Ālam put an end to Manucci's plans. But as a reward for previous services during Dā'ūd Khān's attack, the governor and Council on January 14, 1712, conceded to him in perpetuity his leasehold house and garden at Madras, situated outside the north-west corner of the then Black Town.

The previous history of this renewal presents one or two points of interest. An order of March 22, 170$\frac{3}{4}$, directed a renewal for twenty-one years on the levy of a fine of sixty *pagodas*, with the rider: 'It being the generall opinion of all that the aforesaid Nicolo Manuch is very poor, and in consideration of his readiness to serve the Company on all occasions, 'tis agreed that upon his payment of the sixty *pagodas* before-mentioned, it be returned to him as a gratuity for his good services' ('Factory Records,' Fort St. George, vol. xiii., fol. 37).

Unfortunately, before the lease was drawn up and executed a Padre at Negapatam sent to the governor (Thomas Pitt) a 'letter full of strange invectives against Sen^{r} Manuch,' which, when produced before the Council, led them to suspect he

'was not true to the Company's interest.' The lease was stopped and inquiry ordered. It was found that 'the Padre was an infamous and scandalous fellow.' Manucci had detected him in attempts at debaucheries in his family, while the Padres at Madras and other Portuguese of good reputation gave the Padre a very ill character. It was determined on December 18, 1704, to grant the lease on the terms originally sanctioned ('Factory Records,' Fort St. George, vol. xiii., fol. 203).

Then follows the lease, dated December 20, 1704. It recites that the first grant for thirty years was made to Thomas Clarke, gent[n], in the year 1671. It consisted of a garden or parcel of ground without the town. Manucci petitioned as heir of Thomas Clarke (having married his widow). The terms were a fine of sixty *pagodas* (remitted as above stated), and a yearly acknowledgment of one *pagoda*.

This house and garden lay to the north of Madras, and just north of it again was a piece of ground known as the Elephant Garden (entry of May 7, 1706). The plot was 657 feet from north to south, and from east to west (at the north end) 353 feet and (at the south end) 482 feet. The boundaries were: North, the garden of Foree Moortepan; south, the Black Town wall; east, Mantangaura's garden and some Pariah houses; west, the highway from Tom Clarke's gate to the Company's old garden. The term granted was for twenty-one years from March 25, 1703, at a yearly rent of one *pagoda* (see Madras Consultations, January 15, 1704, Range 239, vol. lxxxiii., pp. 19-22, and 69[1]).

The perpetual grant of January 14, 1712, was made under the following circumstances: On November 1, 1711, Mr. Charles Boon, a free merchant, appeared before the Madras Council (Edward Harrison, president) with a petition from Señor Nichola Manuch, 'formerly inhabitant of this place but now in Pondicherry.' The petition recites the lease of

[1] I am indebted to the Rev. F. Penny for the information that, up to the beginning of the eighteenth century, the north-west gate of Fort St. George, now called the Choultry Gate, was known as 'Tom Clarke's Gate.' For the Company's garden, marked simply 'Garden,' see the map of 1733, reproduced in Mrs. Penny's 'Fort St. George.' All these houses must have been swept away in 1746, when the French took the place, and formed a *glacis* round the fort.

ground near Tom Clarke's gate, in which by mistake a piece of ground for which he (Nichola Manuch) held a bill of sale was wrongly included, and he prays for a rectification. On November 6, 1711, H. Davenport, B. Binyon, and W. Warre reported. The terms of the report are not entered, but apparently it was adverse to the application.

But on January 14, 1712, the president revived the matter in council. He informed the Board that a special order had come to Pondicherry calling for Manucci's attendance at Shāh 'Ālam's court [then at Lāhor]. Manucci was about to set out for Arkāṭ to see the *dīwān*, who had orders to supply all his necessities and forward him to Dihlī. The president reverts to the refusal on November 6, 1711, to admit a higher title than that of leaseholder; and now for the following reasons: (1) As the land is of very small value; (2) as 'the said Manuch during his residence here was very serviceable to the Company's affairs by his perfect knowledge of the Persian language and the customs among the Moors, having been often employ'd between Governor Pitt and Nabob Doud Caun; (3) but yet more in consideration that he may be very usefull in our present circumstances by assisting those that go to court with the Present from Bengal; (4) and likewise representing our quarrel with Surup Sing with advantage on our side'; he proposes a new resolution in supersession of the former one. It is to the effect that in consideration of the good service done by Señor Nichola Manuch, they confirm to him and his heirs for ever that piece of ground which Thomas Drinkwater bought of Charles and Ann Ryly on September 26, 1674, since sold to Thomas Clarke on April 19, 1675, and by the said Thomas Clarke to Nicholas Manuch.

While on the subject of Manucci's houses, it seems to be tolerably clear that he had a second house or country retreat at Big Mount or St. Thomas's Mount, eight miles from Fort St. George. This property is mentioned distinctly in Part V., folios 101, 102, and elsewhere. It must be the place where Manucci entertained Dā,ūd Khān. The late Mr. A. T. Pringle objected that in those disturbed times Europeans would not have lived so far away from Madras; and for the same reason

doubted Manucci's story about a theft of fruit from the governor's garden at the same place on December 15, 1705 (Part V., folio 55). But the entry of December 1, 1705, ordering the destruction of the Mount House and the building of another there for invalids, shows that Manucci was quite right, and (for once) Mr. Pringle was wrong. There was a governor's house at St. Thomas's Mount in 1705 (Public Consultations, Fort St. George, vol. xxxv., pp. 269, 270).

The first mention of obtaining a *farmān* through Ẕu,lfiqār Khān, the new governor of the Dakhin, is in a letter from Fort St. George of December 16, 1711 (List of Old Records, No. 807); and under date December 1, 1711, the Sūrat Council speak of 'their' embassy (*idem*, No. 794). The Madras Council anticipated difficulties, owing to their having employed Ẕiyā-ud-dīn Khān as their go-between, to the displeasure of Ẕu,lfiqār Khān, whose new office of viceroy made him all-powerful in the Dakhin. However, the emperor Shāh 'Ālam died at Lāhor on February 27, and the report thereof reached Madras in April, 1712; thus, no doubt, Manucci did not start for the court, while the English for the time abandoned their project of an embassy. It was not until some years afterwards that John Surman was sent to Dihlī from Calcutta.

I have failed to trace Manucci farther at Madras or Pondicherry, and the only date for his death is a vague intimation in the work 'Della Litteratura Veneziana . . .' (4to., Venice, 1854), by the Doge Marco Nicolò Foscarini (b. February, 1695, d. March, 1763; Librarian of San Marco from 1742 to 1762), which was originally published in one volume, folio, at Padua in 1752. On p. 441 of the 4th edition (1854) it is said that Manucci died in India in 1717 as an octogenarian, 'as he [Foscarini] had heard.' Father Doyle of San Thome informs me that there are no records there previous to 1784, when Tippū's cavalry plundered and burnt everything. I have not been able to search the Pondicherry archives, and some entry may be found there. As would seem, Manucci left an estate of 30,000 *pagodas* (about £10,000), judging by the entry taken from Padre Saverini Capuchin's accounts, as printed in the 'Madras Catholic Directory' for 1867, p. 153.

Although 1742, the date of Saverini's appointment as superior (Penny, 'Church in Madras,' p. 240), is rather late for administration to the estate of a man dying in 1717, it is almost impossible of belief that there could have been in that part of the world, in the first half of the eighteenth century, any other 'Mr. Nicholas Manook' than Nicolao Manucci, the author of the 'Storia do Mogor.' The only possible argument against this identification is the fact that twice Manucci made himself out a poor man. Once was when the fine on the renewal of his lease was remitted by the Madras Council; the other instance was the non-payment in 1706 of a death-bed bequest by his wife of two hundred *pagodas* to the Bishop of San Thome. Father Michael Angelo, the Madras chaplain, urged him to pay it. Manucci said he had no money; the Father suggested borrowing, and to that Manucci replied that his debts were already too heavy for him to wish to add to them (V., f. 279).

A search at the India Office in the copies of the Madras Records up to 1719, which are there preserved, has produced nothing bearing upon the question of our author's death or his estate. The reason of this is probably the fact, communicated to me by the Rev. Frank Penny, that for many years the estates of Roman Catholics were left in the hands of the priests for administration, and were not dealt with by the English officials.

IX. SUMMARY OF PLAN AND CONTENTS OF THE 'STORIA.'

Original plan of 'Storia.'

Manucci started his work on a fixed plan, to which he adhered tolerably closely in the first three parts, though already in the second half of Part III. he becomes discursive. But in Parts IV. and V. it is hardly possible to discover any plan, their contents being so exceedingly heterogeneous—current historical events alternating with personal adventures, stories of long-past years, or even mere fables. In Parts IV. and V. the ecclesiastical element also bulks very largely, the author taking a strongly adverse position to the Jesuits and their missionary methods.

Par I.

Part I. consists of two sections—first, a personal narrative of the author's journey from Venice to Dihlī, divided into twenty

chapters (pp. 1-55); secondly, a short chronicle of the Mogul kings, beginning with Taimur-i-lang, and ending with Aurangzeb's succession and the death of his three brothers: Taimur-i-lang, pp. 57-61; Mirān Shāh, pp. 61-63; Abū Sa'īd, pp. 63, 64; 'Umar Shekh, p. 64; Sultān Maḥmūd, pp. 64-66; Bābar, pp. 66-69 (list of thirty-one previous kings of Dihlī); Humāyūn, pp. 69-75; Akbar, pp. 75-98; Excursus on the Chinese in India, pp. 98-100, and on the Baniyās, pp. 100-103; Jahāngīr, pp. 103-120; Shāhjahān, pp. 120-280. Under Shāhjahān are set forth the author's personal adventures up to and including the War of Succession (1658-1659).

In Part II., pp. 1-255, is given the reign of Aurangzeb, 1658-1700, interspersed with the author's personal history, his journeys and adventures, during the same period. Part II.

Part III. is principally a treatise on the Mogul court, with its system of government and statistics of its revenues. Some of the subjects treated are: The royal household, p. 2; names of queens, p. 3; of concubines, p. 4; of harem matrons, p. 4; of chief dancers, p. 5; of women slaves, p. 5; habits of the harem, p. 6; mode of addressing the emperor, p. 11; names of eunuchs, p. 13; of physicians, p. 16; of slaves, p. 17; of swords, p. 17; of shields, p. 18; of horses, p. 18; of elephants, p. 18; of cannon, p. 21; of the nobles, p. 22. Then follows the system of pay and rank, the mode of government and its abuses, p. 29, with a digression on Sir William Norris's (1700) and the Dutch (1688) embassies; the author's work as physician, p. 43; a list of provinces and their revenues, p. 49; descriptions of the provinces, p. 53; the Hindū states, p. 59; routes and distances, p. 67; Mahomedans, p. 72; treatise on the Hindū religion and ceremonial, p. 90; on elephants and other animals, p. 144; Governor Gyfford and the Mogul court, p. 154; origin of Madras, p. 155; empire of Nar Singh, p. 166; the Jesuit Roberto de' Nobili, p. 171; the pearl fishery, p. 171; various stories of Goa, Pondicherry, and San Thome, p. 175; stories of witchcraft and magic, p. 247 to end. Part III.

Part IV. begins by continuing the account of current events in the Mogul camp (1701), with earlier reminiscences introduced here and there, pp. 1-33; Sir William Norris's embassy, Part IV.

p. 34; Jesuit missions, pp. 36-49; Tānjor persecutions, pp. 49-60, 62-76; quarrels of Capuchins and Jesuits, pp. 60-62; more about the Tānjor persecutions, pp. 76-80; Mogul attacks on Tranquebar, Cuddalūr, and Pondicherry, pp. 80-86; Dā,ūd Khān and Madras, pp. 87-105; Aurangzeb's doings, pp. 105-120; Father Ephraim and the Goa Inquisition in 1649, pp. 124-146; a visit to Dā,ūd Khān at Kaḍapah, pp. 147-151; events of 1702-1704, pp. 152-162; Cardinal de Tournon and the Jesuits, pp. 164-197; various events, pp. 197-218; Christian quarrels, pp. 225-230; other events (ends on p. 244).

Part V. In Part V. the relation of events is carried on into 1705 and 1706, pp. 1-237; two Manifestoes by the Capuchins against the Bishop of San Thome and the Jesuits occupy pp. 238-417; then we return to events from 1707 to February, 1709, p. 418 (ending on p. 459). Stories about various earlier years are interspersed—viz. of 1659, 1665, 1690, 1699, and so forth.

X. MANUCCI, THE AUTHOR AND THE MAN.

Language used. A work written by an Italian not in his mother-tongue, but in Portuguese, has always presented an interesting problem. We find now, on consulting the Codex at Venice, that about one-third of the whole work was drawn up originally in Italian. I have not used this text much, so I am not able to say fully in what it differs from the final copy of Parts I. to III., prepared in French and in Portuguese for transmission to Europe. But from what I have seen of it, the Italian text is much inferior in arrangement to the Berlin MS.; its only use is to furnish a various reading here and there, and, perhaps, a few extra details worth preserving. The explanation for the choice of language, perhaps not a very sufficient one, as given by Manucci in two or three places, is that he was forced to change the language according to the nationality of the amanuensis available at the time. For instance, what he says (in Italian) on folio 364 of Codex XLIV. (Zanetti) is: 'Owing to the want of an Italian copyist, I have been obliged to continue my work in French, and even in Portuguese. The latter is far from correct, there not being any

scribes here who are careful to seek always for the meaning of words; I leave the matter to the goodwill of the learned.' From this point he drops Italian for French, and shortly after changes into Portuguese.

Characteristics of language and style.

The French, as it seems to me, is handled with less freedom and force than the Portuguese. The latter would probably be deemed a patois, but I am not in a position myself to judge it, or compare it with more highly-elaborated compositions in that language. As used by Manucci, it has the merits of being simple, direct, and graphic; and it forms an excellent vehicle for his narrative. As a *raconteur* Manucci takes high rank, knowing all the secrets of how to tell a story, precision of place and date, abundance of appropriate and convincing detail. Passages that may be singled out from much that is nearly as good are the death of the eunuch Basant, the author's first surgical case at Lāhor, the onset of the Rājput chivalry headed by their red-eyed, opium-maddened bards chanting their battle-songs, the Nathan-like apologue told to Bishop Gaspar Affonço of San Thome, and the scene at the bleeding of Shāh 'Ālam's wife. Many others might be adduced. His style, though simple and non-literary, is extremely vivacious. He had what Catrou calls 'je ne sçai quel feu d'imagination' in his mode of narration; he never fails in interesting and carrying his readers along with him, and reproduces something of the stir of life in Indian cities, and their vividly contrasted splendour and squalor. In an occasional grossness of expression, opposed to our present canons of taste, he is following only the usage of his age and country. On the other hand, he is seldom guilty of pruriency or lubricity.

Place as an historian.

As an historian Manucci presents us with a somewhat mingled yarn. His supposed extracts from the Mogul official chronicles are for the reigns preceding that of Shāhjahān a tissue of absurdities. These fables were, no doubt, current among the people, but they are distortions of the facts, as such folks' talk always is. What is told about Jahāngīr, whether true or not, is at any rate characteristic, and might be true. With the reign of Shāhjahān things alter, and certainly for the later years of that reign and for the fifty years of Aurangzeb Manucci is a

writer whose statements cannot be ignored. I will not assert that what he says must always be believed. He was at times misinformed; he was prejudiced; he wrote in the decline of life, thirty to forty years after many of the events had happened. I do not think he was intentionally unveracious; he is, indeed, quite honest and specific, as a rule, about the sources of his information. No doubt he had a penchant for the personal side of history—in fact, he has been called a 'backstairs gossip,' —but I do not think this condemns him as unworthy of credit. Oriental history, as tricked out by venal and fulsome pens, tells us little or nothing of the real character of the actors in it, or of the inner causes of events; and a writer like Manucci supplies us with the necessary corrective of lifelike, if at times sordid, detail. Merely because they reveal undignified or discreditable actions, I do not hold that his stories should be rejected, while I think they are always true to the spirit of the time and country, and therefore antecedently probable. Governor Pitt's remark that the work was a 'history of Tom Thumb' is absurd, and the less worthy of respect that he had not seen any part of what he was condemning.[1]

One of the principal objects I have had in writing the notes which I have added to the text has been to show that, with rare exceptions, Manucci's statements, where they can be verified, are historically accurate, and a fair inference is that, where there is no such corroboration, he may equally be accepted as trustworthy.

Manucci not a plagiarist.

In my opinion Manucci has not copied from others, with the partial exception of F. Bernier. Evidently he possessed Bernier's book, and I think that where the two deal with the same events, Manucci took the order of his subjects from Bernier. Even then the topics are used chiefly as suggesting to him his own reminiscences. Another fact which distinguishes Manucci from Bernier is that in the contest for the crown they were on opposite sides, Manucci with Dārā and Bernier with Aurangzeb; and we thus obtain the story of the defeated faction, which is frequently suppressed by the victor's eulogists.

[1] Governor Pitt to Mr. Wooley, Secretary at the India House, October 19, 1701, in Yule's 'Diary of Sir W. Hedges,' ii., cclxviii, note 3.

In one instance Manucci may be convicted of actually copying Bernier. But after 1667, when the French physician left India, no suggestion can be made of any debt due to him by our author. Bernier was, of course, a trained physician and a man of superior education. But Manucci was an equally acute observer, and had an advantage in his very much longer experience of the country. In one or two cases, for instance, that of the siege of Bhakkar, p. 93, Bernier was probably indebted to Manucci himself for his information. If before 1667 Bernier (p. 55, ed. Constable) had the political prescience to see that the Mogul military power was rotten at the core, and could easily be overthrown by a small but well-commanded European brigade, we must not refuse some credit to Manucci for having, thirty years later, equally foretold the course of history. On folio 66 of Part III. (written in 1700) he says: 'I assert from what I have seen and tested, all that is required to sweep it away and occupy the whole Empire is a corps of thirty thousand European soldiers led by competent commanders, who would thereby acquire the glory of great conquerors.'

His views generally.

Manucci seems to have had strong likes and dislikes. The chief objects of his dislike are the emperor Aurangzeb, the Portuguese, and the Jesuits. Can anyone assert that in any of these cases he had nothing to justify him? His romantic attachment to Dārā Shukoh, his first master, possibly made him unfair to Aurangzeb. But, I ask, can a man who attacks and kills two brothers, imprisons an aged father, and thus 'wades through slaughter to a throne,' be held up as a model of all the virtues? Were the Portuguese, in those days of their decay, not open to the censures passed upon them by Manucci? Were the methods of the Jesuits as missionaries, and their defiance of the Pope, deserving of no reprobation? In all other cases Manucci is usually tolerant, but does occasionally break forth into bitter and bigoted remarks on both Hinduism and Mahomedanism. He also takes a very low view of the Indian character, Hindū and Mahomedan, a view, though far from being the whole truth, which has impressed itself strongly on the majority of Europeans. Strangely enough, he

entirely disapproves of and ridicules astrology; yet he is always ready to swallow anything in the nature of witchcraft or soothsaying. Another of his peculiarities is his readiness to attribute poisoning as the cause of any great man's sudden death. He is constantly making such accusations against Aurangzeb. Possibly there are some grains of truth hidden in this wholesale denunciation; and Manucci's readiness to see poison everywhere may be attributed, perhaps, to his Italian origin, and his knowledge of what had been the case in his own country.

Period of composition.

Parts I., II., III. were written in 1699 and 1700, Part IV. between 1701 and 1705, Part V. between 1706 and 1709. On p. 21 of Part II. the then date is given as March 9, 1699; when he was writing Part III., p. 241, it was December, 1700. He began the work at the instigation of François Martin and Boureau-Deslandes, with whom he was intimate; and the intention evidently was to send it to Europe for presentation to Louis XIV., in the hope that he would direct its publication.

Mention by other European travellers.

I can find no reference to Manucci in Tavernier; and Mr. W. Foster informs me that there is no mention of him in the travels of Jean de Thevenot, who in 1666-67 travelled through Gujarāt and Gulkhandah, visiting Sūrat and Machhlipatnam. Manucci mentions Tavernier once in passing in rather disparaging terms; but it does not seem that the two men ever met.[1] He speaks of 'Monsu Tavirnier's' presence at Dihlī in 1665 (Part V., f. 75), and his recourse to a French doctor (not named, perhaps François de la Palisse),[2] to help him in the sale of his jewels to Aurangzeb, who was far from being so liberal a buyer as Shāhjahān. Tavernier holds out a promise to get the doctor a new wife in France, whereupon the man tries to poison his Portuguese consort. In 1666 her sister, the renegade wife

[1] Of Tavernier's six voyages, only two — the fifth and sixth — fall within Manucci's time (see C. Joret, 'J. B. Tavernier, Baron d'Aubonne,' 1886, pp. 143-160). The fifth voyage began in February, 1657, and ended in 1663; he was in Iṣfahān, 1662. In the sixth voyage Tavernier was at Iṣfahān in 1664, and at Sūrat in May of that year (pp. 161-208). Manucci was then at Dihlī.

[2] Tavernier (edition of 1692, iii. 94) says this surgeon, also known as Saint Jacques, was at the Mogul court in 1666, and married a Portuguese wife. It was through him that the French ambassadors in that year obtained access to Ja'far Khān, the wazīr.

of 'Alī Mardān Khan, rescues her, and removes her to Lāhor, but afterwards poisons her there herself.

There was, however, another traveller, a fellow-townsman, who encountered Manucci, and is mentioned by him. The year must have been 1679. This man, Angelo Legrenzi, published a book, 'Il Pellegrino nell' Asia . . . ,' 240 pp., 12mo., Venetia, 1705. Manucci mentions him (Part V., f. 185) in these terms: 'When I was at the court of Shāh 'Ālam in Aurangābād, there arrived a Venetian physician called Angello Legrenzi. He had come from Aleppo, having quitted the service of the Most Serene Republic, and at the age of thirty-five had set out to seek his fortune afresh. He was possessed with various ideas, and concealed in his mind many thoughts. He came to see me, and presented to me a recommendatory letter from Father Ivo, Capuchin, of Sūrat.[1] I received him most courteously, offering him the use of my house, also to his companion, one Signor Protasio, a noble German. I was greatly pleased at his coming, seeing myself thus quit of several patients who came bothering me every day. Forthwith I appointed him my coadjutor, to secure him more respect, and introduced him into the presence of the head physician, Muḥammad Muqīm, with a view to his getting an appointment from the prince and an adequate salary, and thus not being hindered from practising. The worthy "patrician," seeing I treated him so well, was highly pleased, but he would not follow my advice. He displayed great eagerness to enter the prince's service and get a salary.

N. M.'s account of A. Legrenzi.

'To show his ability and that he was not a surgeon but a physician, he wrote a small tract dealing with the four principal kinds of fever, their causes, and the remedies for dispelling them. Seeing that he had no faith in my word, still less in that of other friends, I again took him to the Ḥakīm, to whom he presented the book and explained its contents. Muḥammad Muqīm was content to let him talk, and by his face seemed to approve of what he was saying. To all appearance Legrenzi

[1] This is evidently the Père Yves who left France in 1644 with Tavernier and Père Raphael du Mans. Tavernier says the Father died at Sūrat, and he built him a tomb there.

was satisfied, believing that he had done a good stroke by presenting the work, and that he would be thereby thought more of at the court.

'However, knowing the contrary, I told him he might be very thankful if he met with any success. When dismissing him, the Ḥakīm said he might renew his visits. I continued to help him with a horse and servants, who every day accompanied him, since the Ḥakīm lived half a league from my house. This going and coming went on for a year without the Ḥakīm ever sending him a single patient, although he still spoke to him, but my "patrician" had no idea what that meant.

'Finally, to disenchant him, Muḥammad Muqīm one day directed his servant, who acted as interpreter—an Armenian called Giuseppe (Joseph)—to sit down close to him. My "patrician" was aggrieved thereby, and on reaching home told me. I knew not what else to say except that he must have patience. The following day he went back and wasted his time, seated there for over three hours. At last the Ḥakīm asked if he knew what God was. At this question Legrenzi was stunned and said nothing, perceiving that such a demand was equivalent to dismissal; thus was his joy turned into sorrow. Therefore he went back by the road he had come, lamenting his strange fortune, and resuming his old place which he had quitted, where he was well received. Signor Protasio remained with me, as he had no money to meet his journey; a year afterwards he started, I helping him as well as I could, and I never heard of him again.'

It is a mere surmise, but it seems to me very possible that Manucci had seen Legrenzi's book of 1705 before he wrote the above passage taken from Part V., and that it is his retort courteous for Legrenzi's somewhat uncivil depreciation. Or as an Italian writer, P. Amat di S. Filippo ('Studii sulla Storia della Geografia . . .' I., 440) says: 'This judgment [of Legrenzi on Manucci] is, however, not devoid of prejudice, both being followers of Esculapius'; and again, speaking of the 'Storia,' he says, 'From these [the Memoirs] it can be seen (at least as regards education) that the finding of Legrenzi ought not to be accepted blindly.'

Let us turn now to Legrenzi's story in 'Il Pellegrino,' Libro Terzo, 192-310 (India), Of the city of Aurangābād, 220-227. On p. 223 the passage begins thus: 'Besides these paid artillerymen the prince entertains several medical men, or rather surgeons, for they practise not only physic but surgery; I do not say in cases of importance—on the contrary, only in more humble operations, such as letting of blood, cupping, blistering and such-like. Among these gentlemen I had the luck to find a fellow-countryman, named Nicolò Manucci, a person with great credit among the nobles, with the handsomest salary I have heard as given in this country—that is, three hundred rupees a month. Such a happy encounter consoled me much, being aware of how rare it is to find Italians there, much less a Venetian. It is impossible to describe how often we embraced, how lively were our demonstrations of affection, how long our talks and interrogations. For he had been away from home nearly thirty years, and was extremely anxious to learn about his connections, even when not known to me, about the condition of Venice city, and other particulars. Legrenzi's account of N. M.

'Our civilities over and the many inquiries ended, he began in a few days to converse seriously with me to find out my plans, and openly asked me if I wanted to enter the prince's service, where he assured me that I should meet with more than ordinary fortune, he meanwhile offering himself for recommendations and good offices with Shāh 'Ālam. I gave him cordial thanks for his kind feelings in my favour, but answered him that I absolutely refused to engage myself outside my native land, having come to India to see the country and its chief sights, intending thereafter to return home to my relations and connections.

'Not satisfied with this answer, my friend invited me to reflect on future contingencies at the death of the king; for the prince, as eldest son, would ascend the throne, thereby opening to me the way to benefits not less great than glorious. To sum up, all this made no impression on me, and I answered that I absolutely refused to fetter my liberty, above all with princes, who possess neither sense nor good faith.

'At these remarks my friend was more upset than before,

desirous as he was, by whatever means he could, to induce me to rest beside him and supply him with a little light in medicine, devoid as he was of letters, and even any knowledge of the arts. I consoled him, however, on that head by saying that I would remain with him for some months, then take my departure at the decline of the season. Then arose rumours of the prince's departure for Dihlī before the end of the rains. I had intended, on leaving Sūrat, to proceed to Gulkhandah, and thence to Goa. But it seemed to me preferable to give up that project, and to embrace the opportunity of staying on and following the route of my friend, so as to see that royal city with all else that might offer itself.'

On p. 230 he says that it was on July 25, 1679, that Shāh 'Ālam started for the north, which is possibly correct, though the year 1680 is more probable. But the journey is said to have been to Āgrah in thirty-four days, and after a stay of four days, on to Dihlī in six days. There, as he says, Manucci was greeted by a throng of friends; and after a stay of two months Legrenzi returned to Sūrat. Then follows an account of Āgrah, of Dihlī, and other chapters, till the subject of India ends on p. 310. Now, I am convinced that all this journey is fictitious; it bears internal evidence, I think, that the man was never either at Āgrah or Dihlī, and what he knew of them was mere hearsay. Nor did Shāh 'Ālam, when recalled from the Dakhin for the Rājputānah campaign, go anywhere near Āgrah or Dihlī. As to the two versions of what happened at Aurangābād, either or both must be embroidered; and, as just shown, Legrenzi is not above a little fiction when necessary. There is a notice of Legrenzi and his book in 'Studii Biografici e Bibliografici sulla Storia della Geografia in India,' by S. Amat de S. Filippo (Roma, 1882), p. 445.

Personal character.

In Manucci we have obviously a man chiefly self-educated, and not the 'learned traveller' of Cardinal Zurla. There are two portraits of him: the extraordinary attitude—one leg almost in air—of the younger one denotes, I suppose, a lively and mercurial temperament; the older one, in profile, reveals a very long and inquisitive nose. In any case, he must have been full of mother-wit, shrewd, and remarkably observant.

He boasts himself of his ready tongue, and I infer that a good deal of his success turned on his power of talk, which seldom left him at a loss in any awkward dilemma. This quality made him, I assume, what is called good company, a cheerful companion; perhaps, as professed story-tellers in their old age usually do, becoming slightly a bore, and, like Dogberry, bestowing on his hearers somewhat too abundantly of his 'tediousness.' Though for a time a soldier, I gather that he had more prudence than valour, being thoroughly impressed with the importance of living to fight another day. He describes the great historic battle of Samūgaṛh in June, 1658, as a mere spectator, and we do not hear that he fired there a single shot in his beloved master's cause. Again, outside Lāhor in 1659, when his commander, the eunuch Basant, was slain, we do not find Manucci playing a very heroic part.

The same continued.

From his various disputes about money, and his strong dislikes, I infer that he was rather vengeful, and he was certainly pertinacious in pushing a claim. In conduct he seems to have been moral and sober; indeed, in the former respect he paints himself as a very Joseph or St. Anthony, triumphant over all temptations. Even when, as old men use, he follows Falstaff and Master Shallow in letting us know that he, too, has 'heard the chimes at midnight,' he does not seem to have got farther than peeping into the closed litter of a dancing-girl. He was a devout Catholic, and resisted successfully all attempts to make him turn Mahomedan. In his old age he was much preoccupied with ecclesiastical disputes, and had become, I should say, rather bigoted in his faith. I have spoken already of his disliking the Portuguese; the English, among whom he lived for twenty years, he evidently respected, but did not love; his whole affection goes out towards the French, whose praises he sings more than once.

N. M.'s medical knowledge.

His medical knowledge must have been limited; but it was evidently sufficient to secure him some professional reputation, perhaps due to the fact that 'among the blind the one-eyed man is king.' His practice evidently consisted chiefly in bleeding, purging, and the actual cautery. He is very proud of the last remedy as a cure for cholera; he refers to it more than once,

and, as can be seen in the 'Lettres Édifiantes,' he strongly recommended it to Father Martin of the Madura Mission. He also says he introduced the use of the enema, which was unknown to native practice. In selling imitations of the Goa stones he was following an example already set by the Jesuit Fathers; and another source of income was some preparation he calls a 'cordial,' probably intended as an aphrodisiac. But, knowing what we do of the healing art in Italy and France in the seventeenth century, he does not seem to have been so very much behind his European contemporaries.

XI. CONCLUSION.

Having now stated the reasons which have for many years made the question of Manucci and his history a curious literary problem, and having thrown upon it and upon him all the light that ten years of research have produced, I take my leave of him. I know that this book, and still more its translator and editor, are open to adverse criticism; but of one thing I am convinced, that no fair-minded reader ought to say that Manucci is, for many pages together, so dull as to be uninteresting and unreadable.

Here I may state the reasons which have led me to prepare an English translation instead of bringing out the original text. It is obvious, in the first place, that a work in three languages —Italian, French, and Portuguese—would be somewhat of an anomaly. If this be conceded, as I think it must be, it follows that one of the three languages would have to be preferred, and into it the other portions must be translated. Even if Italian, as the author's mother-tongue, be chosen, two-thirds of the book would still be a translation, and we should be as far as ever from a reproduction of the original text. On the other hand, Italian is not so generally known as French or English. But the main reason determining my choice was that the work is one whose interest lies more in its matter than its form. It is not a literary classic, and what it has to tell us can be just as well reproduced in English as in any other language. Then, through an English edition, we address a much larger audience

in England and America; and the needs of Indians interested in the history of their country, now an increasing class, are also served much more effectually.

In the course of my task I have received abundant and generous help from many persons, whose names I have endeavoured to record, either in this Introduction, or as occasion arose in the course of the book. I have not willingly overlooked any kindness shown me, but in such an extensive and long-sustained effort, ramifying in so many directions, it may well be that I have omitted some names; and if this be so, I crave those persons' pardon, and so bid all farewell with many thanks.

APPENDIX TO INTRODUCTION.

NOTE ON BOUREAU-DESLANDES.

NEXT to François Martin himself, Boureau-Deslandes stands out as the most capable person employed by Colbert's French Company in India in the fifty years of its existence. Yet his name has not hitherto found its way into any biographical dictionary, a fact hardly to be wondered at, perhaps, when we find that it was not until 1860—when the late Mr. Pierre Margry interested himself in the subject—that any adequate, or even tolerably correct, life of F. Martin himself found a place in the 'Biographie Universelle.' I have therefore made some research into the official career and the family history of Martin's son-in-law and colleague, the results of which I here present.

André Boureau-Deslandes, the scion of an ancient and honourable family, was born at Tours probably between 1740 and 1750. I have not been able to procure a copy of his birth or baptismal register, and thus cannot give any more exact date. His early life is not traced, and we first hear of him in India between 1667 and 1672, in the service of the French East India Company, which had been founded in 1665 under the auspices of Louis XIV.'s Minister, Colbert. There being no colonial archives of the *État Civil* (births, deaths, and marriages) earlier than 1690, no exact date can be given, but before April 26, 1686, at latest, Deslandes had been married at Sūrat to Marie

Françoise, the daughter of François Martin, then chief of the French factory at that place. In 1694 there were six children issue of the marriage, three sons and three daughters.

The eldest child, a girl, was living at Pondicherry with her grandparents, and the proud grandfather writes in October, 1692: 'La fille que nous avons avec nous, qui est l'aînée, est un petit bijou, une distinction au-dessus de son aage.' In 1693, when the siege by the Dutch began, Madame Martin moved with her granddaughter to San Thome. On the capitulation of Pondicherry they were allowed to rejoin François Martin, and they proceeded with him to Batavia, thence to Hūglī, where they joined Deslandes and his wife. The second and third children were sons, and the fourth a daughter (born in 1692).

Their second child and eldest son was André François Boureau-Deslandes, born at Hūglī on May 19, 1689, and baptized on May 24 in the church of Notre Dame du Rosaire by the Prior Julian de Gratia, Augustinian, the absent godfather and godmother, F. Martin and Margaret Colinet, being represented by Jean François Cuperly and Gabriel Pellé. This son may be identical with the François Boureau, Lord of Chevalrie and Lieutenant of Militia, whose daughter by his wife, Marie Thérèse Jaham, was baptized at Martinique on March 10, 1709. In any case, we know that A. F. B. Deslandes was appointed a Commissary of Marine on April 30, 1716, and Commissary-General on May 6, 1736. At the latter date he was serving at Brest, but on January 1, 1738, was transferred to Rochefort. He retired upon pension on December 1, 1746, and died in 1757. He became a well-known light lance in literature, and published many works of a sceptical turn. The best-remembered thing about him is his forming the subject of an epigram by Voltaire:

Écrivez français, bourreau !'

Let us turn now to the official career of the elder Boureau-Deslandes. The exact date on which he entered the French Company's service is not known, but it must have been early in its history. Obviously the MS. petition of 1703, applying for letters of nobility, must be in error in assigning 1676 as the year of his arrival in India. We hear of a Boureau at Calicut in 1669, probably our Boureau-Deslandes; and Caron, the first director in India (drowned 1674), is said to have sent him before 1672 to Bālāsor, on the Bengal coast, whence he reached the Hūglī, and then founded (so it is said) Chandarnagar on that river. In January, 1674, there were both a Boureau and a Boureau-Deslandes in the French council at Sūrat. It is

asserted (Weber, 171) that in 1676 Deslandes fortified Chandarnagar, but this may be doubted.

We then hear of him as having been sent from Sūrat in 1679 in charge of two ships, with orders to re-establish on the Malabar coast the trade which had been broken off by the war. He was instructed to negotiate with the local princes and with the viceroys and governors under the Portuguese crown.

Next we find him on duty in Siam, where he proceeded on board the *Vautour*. He acquired the confidence of the King of Siam, who desired him to remain to conduct the company's trade. The *Vautour*, therefore, left Siam without him on December 1, 1680. On December 26, 1682, he reported from Siam to Baron, the director at Sūrat. The ambassadors subsequently despatched from France by Louis XIV. were instructed to ask confirmation of the treaties Deslandes had obtained. In 1685 he left Siam on an English vessel. He was bound for Sūrat, and carried with him commissions to be executed for the King of Siam, amounting to over 200,000 livres. He arrived at Sūrat at some date prior to October 15, 1685.

François Martin had been transferred from Pondicherry to Sūrat, where he arrived on August 22, 1681, and upon Baron's death (June 10, 1683) succeeded to the conduct of affairs. It was about this time (1685-86) that Deslandes married F. Martin's elder daughter. On April 20, 1686, we find Deslandes still at Sūrat, and we are told that he was preparing for a move to Pondicherry as Second in Council, with the object of being employed on the Choromandel coast and Bengal. F. Martin and his family reached Pondicherry on May 20, 1686, and Deslandes either accompanied them or soon followed them. Before he left Sūrat he was sent with le Sieur Roques as a deputation to the Mahomedan Governor of Sūrat to remonstrate at his continual exactions.

On June 15, 1686, Deslandes formed one of a deputation from Pondicherry to Fort St. George (Madras); and an English trader's letter from Mergui (in Tenasserim), dated December 30, 1686, would lead us to believe that he was at Pondicherry at that date. We know he was still there on September 24, 1687. It must, then, have been in the end of 1687 that he revisited Siam at the request of the king; but although the king wished to retain him, he did not remain long, for the French Company required his services to found a trading station in Bengal. On the return journey he and the French ambassador to Siam were off Madras on January 14, 1688, but

excused themselves from landing on the plea that business required them to hasten to Pondicherry. We have notices of his presence at Pondicherry on February 2 and 17, 1688.

He now became Director-General of Commerce in Bengal, and left Pondicherry in April, 1688, to take up his new duties. In October, 1689, he was called upon by Martin to send a ship-load of food from Bengal to relieve the distress then prevailing in Pondicherry. He remained in Bengal until 1701, as is proved by a whole series of letters.

In 1690 Deslandes had a dispute with the Portuguese Augustinian friars at Hūglī, who had sent their Christians to force their way into the French compound (*loge*). In consequence, Deslandes retired a few miles off to Chandarnagar, and there built another *loge*. This seems the real date for the foundation of the French settlement at Chandarnagar; until this time they had apparently, like the other Europeans, lived in or close to Hūglī town.

The date of the founding of Chandarnagar is somewhat obscure, but some light is thrown upon it by the English records. In a general letter from Hūglī, dated October 13, 1686, para. 8, we hear that the French had sent orders to settle factories all over Bengal; to which Fort St. George, September 1, 1688, para. 44, adds the fact that they are endeavouring to procure the Mogul's *farmān*. Again, in January, 1689, para. 16, it is said that, 'French trade is increasing by new settlements in . . . Bengal, though no factory had been built, nor any certain terms agreed on.' On January 16, 1692, the Calcutta Council write (para. 17) that 'the French had almost finished a large factory at Chandarnagar.' From Ḍhākkah, under date May 26, 1690, we hear of a struggle between the Dutch and French, apparently about Chandarnagar. The French had bought a piece of ground 'for which they have a prime writing'; but the Dutch refused to let them build. After taking the dispute before the nawāb (the *nāẓim*) and the *dīwān*, it was referred to the king. Finally, by the Fort St. George general letter of November 20, 1691 (O.C. 5777) we are told that: 'The Mounseers have been long idle and quiet at Pullicherry . . . tho' their Chief in Bengall is building severall large Factoryes, bigg enough for a mighty trade, but 'tis doubted too large for their Stock.'

From F. Martin's letter of January 22, 1691, we learn that Deslandes then spoke of returning to France. He complained of having been passed over in promotion. Other notices of him at Hūglī (for thus he dates his letters) are found in his letters of December 15, 1691, and January 20 and 29, 1693

(? 1694). In the last of these he states that he has just heard of the fall of Pondicherry, and that F. Martin was a prisoner. There are other letters from him to the directors of September 27, 1693, and January 25, 1694.

Pondicherry had surrendered to the Dutch on September 6, 1693 (N.S.) and F. Martin, his family, and the garrison were transported to Batavia. On arrival there he was allowed at his earnest request to return to India, and on February 15, 1694, rejoined his son-in-law Deslandes at the French factory on the Hūglī. There he remained until the restoration of Pondicherry to the French under the Peace of Ryswick (1697). We find several letters in that period signed either by F. Martin alone or jointly with Boureau-Deslandes, viz.: December 28, 1694; July 10 and 25, November 21, 1696; January 15 and 16, October 19, and December 30, 1697. On January 5, 169$\frac{8}{7}$, Martin passed Calcutta in a ship taking him back to Pondicherry (India Office, 'Factory Records,' Calcutta, p. 3). There are passing mentions of Deslandes in the Calcutta records of December 6 and 14, 1690, and June 30, 1698. In February, 1700, he wrote to the governor at Calcutta condoling on the loss of the *East India Merchant*, and sent two sloops to assist in the work of salvage. Boureau-Deslandes remained in charge of Chandarnagar, as is shown by the letters of January 4, February 8, and December 12, 1700, and the list of the company's servants at Hūglī, dated January 10, 1700.

From the letter of January 9, 1701, signed by B. Deslandes, Dulivier, and Pelé, we learn that a month before that date Deslandes had decided to act on the permission he had received to retire on the ground of family cares and poor health. Some *farmāns* that had long been desired had just been obtained, and he believed that affairs could now go on without him. He meant to sail by the *Phelypeaux*, and gave over charge to Dulivier (Pelé and Renault, members of council). On January 10 he embarked for Pondicherry, which he reached on February 3. Manucci, Part IV., fol. 54, also speaks of his being at Pondicherry in February, 1701. He left for France on February 23, and reached that country on August 28, 1701.[1]

In April, 1703, Boureau-Deslandes received from Louis XIV. letters of nobility for himself and his posterity in reward for his services in India. On November 28 of the same year he

[1] The statement of Dr. Jules Sottas, 'Histoire de la Compagnie Royale des Indes, 1664-1719,' Paris, 1905, p. 105, note, that Deslandes died off St. Helena of scurvy is due, as that author informs me, to an oversight. It was the commander of the vessel, Captain Le Quentiac, who died.

was nominated Commissary at St. Domingo by the king, also Director-General in America by the Royal Company established for supplying negroes to the Spanish colonies. He died in the West Indies on February 13, 1706.

A treatise by Boureau-Deslandes—'Relations de la France avec le Royaume de Siam'—has been published by Pierre Margry in 'Relations et Mémoires' (Paris: Challamel Ainé, 1867), No. V., pp. 149-184; No. IV., pp. 115-148, in the same volume being a paper by François Martin on 'L'Inde et les Nations Européennes,' dated February 15, 1700.

One point connected with the history of François Martin may be commented on here. Monsieur Weber, in his 'La Compagnie Française des Indes' (1904), pp. 181, 182, states that on the capitulation of Pondicherry in September, 1693, F. Martin 'était revenu en France où le roi l'avait traité avec honneur.' This is evidently an error, probably due to a confusion between *François* Martin, the Director-General, and *Jean Baptiste* Martin, the Second in Council at Pondicherry in 1693.

It is clear from the tenth article of capitulation that François Martin begged to be allowed to remain in India. But this request was refused. His wife and granddaughter with their servants and baggage were recalled from San Thome, where in July, 1693, they had been sent for safety, and they embarked with Martin for Batavia. The Dutch ships from Pondicherry passed Fort St. David on their way to Negapatam on September 15, 1693 (O.S.), and the English write 'we hear Monsieur Martin is in the "Admirall."'

From a resolution of the governor-general and Council at Batavia, dated November 5, 1693, it appears that the French captives had recently arrived there on the *Beurs* and the *Maas*. Among them were Director François Martin and his family, consisting of his wife and the daughter of the French director in Bengal, 'Monsieur de Lande,' by their (the Martins') daughter, one French servant, one Armenian, two slave men, and two slave girls. These were accorded quarters in the governor-general's house, and the Martins were to eat at his table.

On November 9, the governor-general reported that F. Martin earnestly prayed to be spared the long journey to Europe on account of the advanced years of himself and his wife, and begged permission to proceed to Bengal. The matter was deliberated on.

Next day (the tenth) a petition from F. Martin was produced before the Council. It recites the fact that Laurens Pit, governor on the Choromandel coast and commanding the troops

at the taking of Pondicherry, had referred the question of Martin's destination to the decision of the Batavia Council. During the negotiations he had asked to be allowed to depart either to Masulipatam or to Bengal, where the French Company had factories. This petition was refused, and in order not to break off negotiations, he withdrew his demand, on being given hope that at Batavia the article would be reconsidered. He appeals to the precedent of San Thome (1674), when Baron, director-general of the French Company, had been allowed to withdraw to Sūrat by land or water with forty-five to fifty persons. He pleads his own great age and the infirmity of his wife, who was not likely to survive a journey to Europe, and prays for terms similar to those accorded to Monsieur Baron.

After deliberating the Council resolved, on perusal of the conditions allowed to Monsieur Baron, to grant François Martin's request on account of his age, and he was permitted to embark with his family for Bengal viâ Malacca on the flûte *Walenburg*. We have already referred to his correspondence from Hūglī, between 1694 and 1698. He sailed thence for Pondicherry on board the *Gaillard* in January, and arrived on March 8, 1699. On March 21, 1699, the English governor and Council at Fort St. George wrote to the French director-general and Council at Pondicherry, 'congratulating him on his restoration and being in quiet possession of that place once lost in war.'

AUTHORITIES.

ARCHIVES DU MINISTÈRE DES COLONIES, PARIS:

C^{2}63, Correspondance Générale, 1676-1691, fols. 8, 62, 63, 67, 80, 82, 90, 138, 141, 173, 174*b*, 203-217.

C^{2}64, Correspondance Générale, 1692-1698, fols. 102-104, 112-113, 114, 120*b*, 142-145, 145-148, 166*b*, 243, 245-246, 247-250, 252-255, 256-261, 268-278.

C^{2}65, Correspondance Générale, 1699-1700, fols. 49-66, 111-113, 114-122, 138-139, 170-173, 173*b*-178*b*, 179-186.

C^{2}66, Correspondance Générale, 1701-1702, fols. 10*b*-11, 15, 15-35.

ARCHIVES NATIONALES, PARIS:

Série T^{a}, 1169, 'Mémoires de François Martin, 1664-1694,' 631 fols.' foolscap.

BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE, PARIS:

MS. No. 6,231, 'Mémoires sur la Compagnie des Indes de 1662 à 1720, fols. 15, 18.

MS. Français 31,286, 'Nouveau d'Hozier,' 61; 'Dossier Boureau,' fol. 4.

MS. Français 30,351, 'Correspondance d'Hozier,' No. 122, fols. 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244.

MS. Français 27,462, 'Pièces Originales,' No. 978.

INDIA OFFICE RECORDS, LONDON:

Factory Records, Fort St. George, No. 4, 1686.
Factory Records, Fort St. George, No. 21, January, 168⅞.
Original Correspondence, No. 5,549, December 30, 1686.
Factory Records, Fort St. George, No. 31, August 29, 1693 (from Fort St. David).
Factory Records, Fort St. George, No. 22, August 31, 1693 (O.S.), September 5, 1693 (O.S.).
Original Correspondence, 5,886, No. 21, July 29, 1693.
Original Correspondence, 5,881, No. 25, September 28, 1693.
Factory Records, Calcutta, No. 9, December 6 and 14, 1690.
Factory Records, Calcutta, No. 3, June 30, 1698.
Factory Records, Calcutta, No. 3, January 5, 1699.
Factory Records, Calcutta, No. 10, February, 1700.

FORT ST. GEORGE (MADRAS) RECORDS:

'Letters from Fort St. George,' vol. ix., pp. 30, 31, March 21, 1699.

DUTCH ARCHIVES (MS.) AT THE HAGUE:

Kolonial Archief, Deel No. 1412, blz. 1037-1044, 'Articles of Capitulation of Pondicherry.'
Kolonial Archief, Deel No. 1412, blz. 1057, 'Expenditure on French Prisoners,' Batavia, December 2, 1693.
'Extracten uit de Generals Résolutien van Gouverneur-Général en Rade,' Batavia, November 5, 9, and 10, 1693.

PIERRE MARGRY:

'Relations et Mémoires inédits pour servir à l'histoire de la France dans les pays d'outre mer, tirés des Archives du Ministère des Colonies,' Paris, Challamel Ainé, 1867, containing the following papers:
'L'Inde et les Nations Européennes,' par F. Martin, dated February 15, 1700, No. 4, pp. 115-148.
'Rélations de la France avec le Royaume de Siam,' par Deslandes-Boureau, fondateur de la ville de Chandernagore, No. 5, pp. 149-184.

HENRY WEBER, DOCTEUR EN DROIT:

'La Compagnie des Indes, 1604-1875' (Paris, 1904, pp. 715), pp. 171, 174, 181, 182, 208, 209, 210, 225.

DR. JULES SOTTAS:

'Histoire de la Compagnie Royale des Indes Orientales, 1664-1719' (Paris, 1905, pp. 496), pp. 105, 136, 137, 138, 154, 392, 393, 413-415.