

Again, the incident of Abu 'l-Faḍl's repentance is put by Shaykh Farīd at the time when the former was in the Deccan and not when he was in the capital, as Blochmann seems to have understood, or more correctly, misunderstood it. This shows, as also the fact, that he has not mentioned the manuscript used by him, that Blochmann did not see the Dhakhīrah himself but has quoted it on some other authority.

As has been stated earlier, Shaykh Farīd completed his book when he was fairly advanced in years.¹ His ideas were, therefore, mature, and there is no doubt that his views on various problems and in respect of personalities are quite definite. He had served the Empire in different capacities and under several important officers, and had been posted in various provinces. He had participated in battles and had been present at functions presided over by the Emperor himself. He is fairly independent in his views and does not hesitate in criticizing and sometimes even in condemning the vices of the great men about whom he writes. A few instances may be mentioned.

Mirzā 'Abd al-Rahīm Khān Khānān :

تند مزاج هم بود صدای کوثره البته از خانه او مسوم عالم
می شد و راستی غضب نتوانست محافظت خود کرد..... طالب
دنیا بود و این لفظ بار گیر بوده که در لباس دوستی دشمنی

Nawāb Murtaḍā Khān :

اولاً اگر در وقت تناول چند پیاله شراب را..... می خوردند، دوم
در حق رعایا رحم دل نبودند..... سوم شدید بعداوت بودند

¹ It is difficult to find out the year of Shaykh Farīd's death, but it can be stated that he was past sixty in 1061 A. H. when he was giving final touches to his book.

had mentioned it. It has been stated that Jahāngīr on paying a surprise visit to the house of Shaykh Abu 'l-Faḍl found there 40 scribes engaged in copying the *Qur'an*. He reported the matter to Akbar telling him that Abu 'l-Faḍl was guilty of duplicity: he was a staunch Muslim himself but preached Hinduism to others. Akbar got infuriated at this report and sent Abu 'l-Faḍl to the Deccan. After referring to this incident Blochmann says: "A similar, but less credible story, is told by the author of the *Dhakhīrat al-Khawānīn*. He says that Abu 'l-Faḍl repented of his apostacy from Islam, and used at night to visit *inognito* the houses of *darveshes* and, giving them gold *mohurs* requested them 'to pray for the stability of Abu 'l-Faḍl's faith, sighing at the same time and striking his knees and exclaiming, 'What shall I do?' And just as writers on the history of literature have tried to save Fayzi from apostacy and consequent damnation, by representing that before his death he had praised the Prophet, so have other authors succeeded in finding for Abu 'l-Faḍl a place in paradise."¹ A careful study of Shaykh Farīd's version will, however, show that he does not take the responsibility of giving currency to the story of Jahāngīr's surprise visit and its consequences. He begins the story by saying :

آورده اند کہ شاہزادہ سلطان سلیم بحال شیخ توجہ نداشتند
روزے درون خانہ شیخ در آمدہ چہل نفر کاتب را با الجزای قرآن
وتفاسیر گرفنہ بتظر حضرت گزرائیدند حضرت فرمودند کہ ما را
بردین ہنود ترغیب کردہ خود بمذہب اہل اسلام ثابت قدم ماند
در قرب و حالت شیخ فقورے روئی داد ایشان را بدکن فرستادند

¹ Page xl.

در سال ششم جلوس موافق ماه محرم ۱۰۲۰ هـ آنچه به لوازم تقدیر
پرتو ظهور افکند به حضرت جنت مکانی خواستگاری نواب نورجهان
بیگم صبیبه اعتمادالدوله است

After describing how after the death of her first husband, Nūr Jahān was sent back to the Court and put on the personal staff of Salīmah Begum, he refers to Jahān-gir's marriage in these words :

چون قلم تقدیر برین رفته بود که از ملکه جهان و بانوی زمان گردد
روزے در جشن او روز منظور نظر کیمیا اثر شده او را در سالک حرم
محترم داخل ساختند و تعلق تمام بهم رسید روز بروز پایه عزت
ایشان ارتفاع یافت و اعتلا پذیرفت نخست به نور محل ملقب
ساختند پس از چند گاه خطاب نور جهان بیگم مرحمت فرمودند

It is not difficult to add more instances to indicate the importance and value of Shaykh Farīd's versions of some very important problems of Mughul history.

Shaykh Farīd's biographical notices are often characterized by personal touches, which make them not only more interesting but in some cases very useful for purposes of research.

It seems that most of the European writers on the history of the subcontinent did not know of this work, and perhaps this is the reason why we do not find its manuscripts in any of the well-known collections and libraries of the West. Blochmann, however, refers to the Dhakhīrah in his introduction to the English translation of *Ā'in i Akbarī* (page xl) ; but it is certain that he himself had not seen the book, and seems to have relied on some other authority who

Next we find Shaykh Farīd on the staff of Sarandāz Khān Qalmāq, who was a three-thousander, and held the charge of Dalmau with the *fawjdārī* of seventy-two *parganahs* of Lucknow. He spent large sums on the stipends of the 'ulamā and gifts to the *darwīshes*, with the result that he could not pay the full dues of his soldiers. The latter complained to the Emperor who "recalled the writer of this compilation from the *Maqta'*-ship of Bīr and appointed him his (Qalmāq's) *Wakl i Mutlaq al-Inān*, so that he (Farīd) might bring prosperity to his *sarkār*. Under the orders of His Majesty a salary of one thousand rupees a month, with no deductions, and two rupees as daily allowance for food, were fixed for him ; he was given unrestricted powers and full responsibility of his *sarkār*." Shaykh Farīd succeeded in improving the conditions to such an extent that by the time that he had to leave the place in order to join the campaign against Jagat Singh, the dues of Qalmāq's soldiers were paid. Despite Farīd's services Sarandāz Khān treated him unkindly. Farīd complains that "although the writer of this compilation had ruined his chances of happiness in the next world for his (Qalmāq's) sake, he caused harm to this slave on account of the complaints of his former servants."² Thus, it is obvious that Shaykh Farīd was present at the Battle of Mau (1642 A. C.) in the campaign against the rebel chief, Jagat Singh.³

¹ See F. 60 b.

² See F. 61 a.

³ See F. 59 b, 61 a.

by no means favourable to the Mughuls. After Shāh Jahān's departure from the south, Shahji Bhonsla violated the treaty according to which he had surrendered to the Mughuls. With the help of the Ādilshāhī forces he had captured the strong fort of Daulatabad.¹ Fath Khān, the son of the famous Malik 'Anbar, was upset by this triumph of Shahji and appealed to Mahābat Khān, who was encamping at Burhanpūr,² to help him against the enemy. Mahābat promptly decided to march towards Daulatābād. But he was soon informed that Fath Khān had betrayed him and joined hands with the Bijapuris. However, he ordered his son, Khān Zamān, to besiege Daulatābād and started preparations for a large-scale war in the Deccan.³ These precautionary measures on his part proved to be of immense advantage. Ultimately Mahābat captured Daulatābād in June, 1633. Several persons composed chronograms of this great event; Farīd wrote several⁴ :

- (۱) قلعه مفتوح شد
 (۲) دولت آباد فتح نمودند
 (۳) دیو گیر فتح شد
 (۴) مروپایے نظام الملک شکستہ

¹ Lahuri, I, 497.

² Farīd was present at Burhanpur when the people received Mahābat Khān. He says :

جمیعے کہ ان روز بہ نظر آمدہ تا حال مشاہدہ نہ رفتہ

³ Farīd gives interesting details in this connection; he was the Amin and Bakhshī at Bīr and was one of those officers who were ordered to store provisions. He could collect provisions worth four lakhs of rupees at Bīr. See F. 35a.

⁴ These phrases yield 1040. See F. 35 a.

in trouble for some time, here he was treated with consideration by Mirzā Husaynī.¹ Of all the leading nobles under whom Farīd had an opportunity of working none seems to have impressed him more deeply than Khān Jahān. This is indicated by a conversation which Farīd had with Mahābat Khān on the merits Khān Jahān. Evidently Mahābat could not appreciate Farīd's laudatory remarks about Khān Jahān's virtues, particularly his generosity. However, Farīd insisted on expressing his gratitude as well as his admiration for Khān Jahān.²

The other distinguished officer under whom Shaykh Farīd worked for a long period was the well-known General Mahābat Khān. Perhaps it would be safe to assert that Farīd began to work under him in 1040 A. H. In any case he was present on the occasion when Shāh Jahān honoured Mahābat Khān by personally bidding him farewell in the *Bagh Dehrah* (1632 A. C.). Mahābat Khān's appointment had been made earlier at the time when the distressed Emperor, at the death of his beloved wife, Mumtāz Maḥal, decided to leave the Deccan for the north. Khan Zamān, son of Mahābat Khān, was ordered to officiate his father till his arrival. Mahābat Khān's victories over the Deccanis constitute a brilliant chapter of Mughul warfare in the south.

Farīd was an eye-witness to Mahābat Khan's exploits. At the time of his arrival the situation in the south was

¹ F. 50 b.

² F. 36 b.

In 1610 A. C. Shaykh Farīd was present in the army of Khān Jahān Lūdī¹ when the latter was commissioned to lead a campaign against the Deccan. He seems to have remained under Khān Jahān for a considerable time and speaks of him as his great benefactor.² Farīd was certainly in a position to watch the Khān's career and activities with interest and care. This is why we find in his account of that nobleman, particularly in connection with his revolt, a number of incidents which are not found in other works. In 1024 A. H. he mentions himself as the *Dīwān* of Nūran Maḥal, a wife of Jahāngīr.³ It is difficult to say if Farīd was removed from the service of Khān Jahān or was given this latter job in addition to his own duties. Nevertheless, he again refers to himself as *Bakhshī i Kul* of the *Sarkār* of Khān Jahān in 1628 A.C. ; the Khān often entrusted him with important duties.⁴ Early in the reign of Shāh Jahān, Khān Jahān raised the standard of revolt ; but Farīd remained loyal to the Government. He says that he returned to Bhakkar and was naturally

¹ He was the son of Dawlat Khān Lūdī. He soon established his reputation as a soldier in the reign of Akbar. Jahāngīr gave him the rank of 3000 *zāt* and 1500 *sawār* in the second year of his reign. Three years later he became a five-thousander and in 1610 was entrusted with the command of the Deccan campaign. See 'Abd al-Ḥamīd Lahurī, *Pādshāhnāmāh* (Calcutta edition), I, 272. It may be added that he was first introduced to Khān Jahān by Muḥammad Shafī Sabzwārī. See F. 45 b.

² Farīd calls himself as پروردہ خان جہان See F. 36 b.

³ See F. 40 a.

⁴ See for instance F. 37 b.

connected story of his activities as far as his official career is concerned. Nevertheless, some stray references at various places in the *Dhakhīrah*, if put together, will give an idea of the position which he held at different stages of his life. He says that he first took service under the Mughuls as *Wakīl* of Abu 'l-Fath Dakhanī.¹ This must have been before 1015 A. H. for in that year we find him as *fawjdār* of Lucknow.² Abu 'l-Fath died during the Mughul campaign against Udeypur. The Emperor awarded rank to his sons and relatives and also conferred a *mansah* of 65 *ṣawar* on Farīd. The latter was not satisfied with this and "returned to my native place".³

Two years later Farīd refers to himself as *Amīn* in the *Ṣūbah* of Berar.⁴ He seems to have held this post for about eight years as he himself writes :⁵

مسود این مجموعه شیخ فرید دیوان و بخشى و اسیرن و واقعه نویسی
آنجا بود مدت هشت سال.

¹ Abu 'l-Fath was a descendant of Sayyid Muhammad of Jaunpur, the leader of the Mahdawīs. Abu 'l-Fath's father, Mīr Ilāhdād was known for his piety and devotion. Abu 'l-Fath joined service of the Mughul Government under Akbar and rose to the rank of 5000 *zāt* and *sawār*. For some time he held the *Ṣūbahdārī* of Allahabad and Farīd was under him in these days (f. 46 a). He died at Pul Kandal in Rajputana during the expedition against the Rana of Udeypur in the time of Jahāngīr. (See F. 46 a.)

² F. 22 a. ³ F. 46 a. ⁴ F. 16 a. ⁵ F. 47 b.

hūnt he would have this “*Şzft*” executed. Someone reported this to Shaykh Junayd who simply remarked : “We need not worry on that account. The Mirzā would not return safe from his hunting trip, and if he did, he would not survive even for one night.” It so happened, continues Farīd, that the Mirzā returned late in the night ; he told his men that he would hang Shaykh Junayd the next morning. But when he was sleeping, a thief entered his house and killed him. Shaykh Junayd attended the funeral of the Mirzā and prayed for his soul.¹

Farīd has related another interesting incident of which he is an eye-witness. Mirzā Fathpurī’s son, Mirzā ‘Abd-allāh, was as cruel a man as his father. He is stated to have gone to Ajmer in order to be enrolled as a disciple of Shaykh Ḥusayn Chishtī, the *sajjādah-nashīn* of the *dargāh* of Khwājah Mu‘in-al-Din. Shaykh Ḥusayn asked Mirza ‘Abd-allāh as to how many persons he had killed. The Mirzā replied : “Not more than three thousand in my whole life, and of these I have killed with my own hand only two hundred.” Shaykh Ḥusayn refused to enrol him as a disciple.²

Shaykh Farīd’s service career under the Mughul Government was long and variegated, extending over a period of nearly half a century. It is a pity we do not possess enough details to build up a complete and

¹ F. 49 a.

² F. 49 a.

“The sacred tomb of Haḍrat Qutb al-Aqṣāb Makhdūm Shaykh Bahā al-Dīn Zikriyā had very little space around it and inside the dome there was no room left because of the graves of the *Sajjādahs*. He (Qulīj Khān) widened the dome and purchasing the houses lying in the vicinity of the tomb extended the courtyard and made it into a well designed (گنبد مرتفع عربض) place. The compiler of this collection, Shaykh Farīd Bhakkari, had always wished that this honour of the repairs of the *Rawḍah*, which is so near the native town of this *faqīr* should have fallen to his lot because he is so closely connected with that great *Khānwādah* through faith and devotion. But he could not get that privilege.”¹

Shaykh Junayd of Pattan (Gujrat), a *Khalifah* and disciple of the well-known Gujrati Shaykh, Shāh Wajīh al Dīn (d. 998 A. H.), was another *Sūfī* to whom Farīd was deeply attached (اعتقادی کامل بآنحضرت بوده). He has also related an incident of Shaykh Junayd’s friendly attitude even towards his enemies. Mirzā Fathpurī, son of Mirzā Shāhrukh, was unhappy with Shaykh Junayd and used to say that he spoiled the beliefs of Muslims who became enrolled as his disciples. Once when going on a hunting excursion the proud nobleman said that on returning from the

¹ See F. 62b.

disciple of Mīr ‘Abd-allāh *Mishkīn raqm.*¹ He relates an interesting incident of his *pīr*. The son of a Turānī chief, Qāḍī ‘Imād, had built a big mansion near the house of Mīr ‘Abd-allāh. The latter sent words to ‘Imād through Farīd that the privacy of his house was violated on account of the height of his mansion and he should, therefore, make some changes in the building. The *qāḍī* did not only refuse to accede to the Mīr’s request but started behaving in an undesirable manner. Although the Mīr did not change his ways and continued to show a neighbourly regard to the *qāḍī*, the latter’s highhandedness soon became unbearable. The Mīr then sent a message to ‘Imād, once again through Farīd, saying: “After a year neither I shall be living in my house nor you in your splendid mansion.” The *qāḍī* did not take the hint, but it so happened, adds Farīd, that Mīr ‘Abd-allāh died within six months; soon after this the *qāḍī* also followed him to the grave.²

Of other noted *Ṣūfī Shaykhs* also our author speaks with reverence and exhibits a keen interest in referring to the ‘*urs* gatherings and *fātiḥah*, etc. at different places. He had a great faith in the Suhrāwardīyah *Shaykhs* of Multan, particularly *Shaykh Bahā al-Dīn Zikriyā*

Referring to the extension and repairs of the *Shaykh’s* tomb by Nawāb Qulīj Khān Tūrānī he says rather feelingly that he wished he should have had that honour He writes :

¹ F. 54 b.

² F. 54 b.

the book. Referring to Muḥammad Khān Niyāzi, a courtier of Jahāngīr, he writes:

ایام بہار است و گل و لالہ و نسریں
از خاک ہر آیند تو در خاک چرائی
چو ابر بہاراں شوم وزار بگریم
ہر خاک تو چندانکہ تو از خاک ہرائی

On another occasion he sent a *tadmīn* to Nawāb Rashīd Khān, grandson of Pīr Rūshānāī. As the Nawāb had fallen from the horse, Farīd selected a *rubā'ī* of *Anwarī* who had composed it when Sultān Sanjar Saljūqī had met with a similar accident and written a *tadmīn* on it:

رفتم ہر رخس تا بہ تیغت بکشم
گفتا بشنو دو حرف از صوت خوشم
نے گاو زمینم کہ پشت منست
لے چرخ چہارم کہ خورشید کشم

Farīd was also fond of writing chronograms, some of which may be read in the *Dhakhīrah*. On Maḥābat Khān's death in 1044 A. H. he composed two chronograms of the incident: ¹ رخ مرد سپہ سالار رفتہ and ² خیر ایرج. Twenty years earlier the Imperial forces commanded by Mirzi İraj, son of Khān Khānān, secured a big victory in the Battle of Khirkī. Shaykh Farīd composed the chronogram ³ besides these, some other chronograms by him are also mentioned in the book.

Farīd was a staunch Sunni Muslim, highly devoted to the well-known *ṣūfī* Shaykhs. He was enrolled as a

¹ F. 55 a.

² F. 37 a.

³ F. 40 a.

“To yourself” was the audacious reply of Ma'rūf Anjū was not prepared for a bombshell like this. He was deeply stung by this remark and left the party. Farīd adds that after this incident he was never heard to have indulged in such jokes.¹

In the *Dhakhīrah* we meet with a few references to Farīd's early education and some of his teachers. He mentions, for instance, Mullā Muṣṭafā Jawnpurī as one of his teachers and says that he had a learned discussion with the well-known Mullā Muahammad Thattawī, which lasted for seven days. When Farīd asked his teacher about Thattawī's scholarship, he replied that the Mullā was a great scholar, almost peerless in the whole of Hindustan, but he was weak in *fiqh*.² Another teacher to whom he refers was Mīr Abu 'l-Qāsim *Namkīn*; he writes³:

تعلیم نظم و خط راقم این مسود از آن مرحوم (میر ابوالقاسم) کرد .

It is difficult to form an exact idea of the educational and literary attainments of Farīd, but there can be no doubt that besides being wellversed in Persian he knew Arabic, Pushtu and Hindi Sindhi, of course, was his mother tongue. It is to be noted that Farīd has used a large number of Hindi words and expressions in the book.

Shaykh Farīd was capable of writing poetry; he has quoted his own couplets at two different places in

¹ F. 46 b.

² F. 46a.

³ F. 19b. For Abu'l-Qasim's relations with Shaykh Ma'ruf, see note.

Nawāb Murtaḍā Khān set apart four thousand *bīghās* of land for the people who needed assistance and help, and left it to the option of Shaykh Ma'rūf to make a selection of the deserving cases. This indicated the extent of confidence which Nawāb Murtaḍā had in Shaykh Ma'rūf.¹ The above incidents which have been picked up from Farīd's references to his father leave no doubt as to the high position which he and his brother had been able to attain in the court circles soon after the establishment of Muḡhul sway over Sind. Besides being a man of influence and status, Shaykh Ma'rūf was known for his moral courage and noble character. His son calls him *mazhar i jalāl i aḥdiyāt* (manifestation of the dignity of God) and relates a story indicating how courageous he was in expressing his true feelings. Once when Mīr Anjū held the charge of Bhakkar, Shaykh Ma'rūf, Shaykh 'Abd al-Raḥmān Mīr 'Adl, Qāḍī Abū Sa'id and Qāḍī Muḡammad Ḥusayn happened to be present at the Mīr's house. Out of mere joke Mīr Anjū remarked: "It is a fundamental principle of *Naḥw* that two contradictions cannot be together; here I see four contradictions. If all of you are killed, the *Sarkār* of Bhakkar would be purged of treason, revolt and disorders" All remained silent except Shaykh Ma'rūf who retorted preemptorily: "What about the fifth, their leader? If he is also disposed of the region of Bhakkar will become much cleaner." Anjū enquired whom he was referring to as the leader of the gang?

¹ F. 14 b.

Bhakkār in 1004 A. H. He soon made himself unpopular by his cruel treatment of the leading residents of the place. They lodged a complaint at the Court of the Emperor, who got so annoyed that immediate orders were issued to Abu'l-Qāsim to proceed to the capital. He was greatly perturbed at this and consulted Ma'rūf. The latter advised him to placate the complainants by giving them money. Qāsim acted on this advice and ultimately escaped the Imperial wrath.¹ Another reference has been made by Farīd to Qādī Maḥmūd's taking shelter with Shaykh Ma'ruf. In 1020 A. H., he writes, Mirzā Rustam Beg Ṣafawī was put in charge of Thatta. He soon started treating the people rather harshly and many of them went into exile. Among those who left Thatta was a leading scholar named Qādī Maḥmūd. He went to Bhakkār and stayed with Ma'ruf. Soon after this Jahāngīr recalled Rustam Ṣafawī.² Of the contacts of Farīd's family an idea may be formed by an incident related by him in the account of Nawāb Murtaḍa Khān Shaykh Farīd Bukhārī (d. 1021 A. H.). The latter, one of the topmost nobles of Jahāngīr's Court, held a *jāgīr* in the *Sarkār* of Bhakkār. His manager, Lakhmidas Krori Sehwanī, was harsh on the *imāms* and had stopped their *madad i ma'āsh*. Shaykh Farīd and his father interceded on behalf of those who had suffered at the hands of Lakhmidas.

¹ F. 19b.

² F. 11 a.

Mirzā Jānī Beg as the tutor of his son, Ghāzi Beg.¹ Subsequently he joined State service and acted as *Diwān* and *Wakīl* of some eminent nobles including the historian, Nizām al-Dīn, the author of the *Ṭabaqāt i Akbarī*. Shaykh Ma'sūm is stated to have travelled to Gujrat where his friend, Muḥammad Ishāq, was posted. The latter introduced Ma'sūm to Nizām al-Dīn, and managed to secure for him a *manṣab*. Subsequently Ma'sūm was enrolled among the Imperial *Manṣabdārs*, obviously through the intercession of Nizām al-Dīn. It is, therefore, no wonder that he, along with Muḥammad Ishāq, assisted the great author of the *Ṭabaqāt* in its compilation.²

Shaykh Farīd's father, Shaykh Ma'rūf, is first mentioned in connection with the siege of Bhakkar by the Mughul forces in 978 A. H. The siege lasted for several years and the besieged were reduced to great hardships. "We were inside the besieged fort," says Farīd's father, "a loaf of bread could not even be obtained in return for life. The people ate the dogs, the cats, the mice and the crows."³ After the capture of Bhakkar by the Mughuls, Shaykh Ma'ruf was appointed *Ṣadr* and seems to have enjoyed the confidence of the Imperial Government. Farīd mentions an incident which shows that his father was a man of sound judgment. Mīr Abu 'l-Qāsim was appointed *jaḡīrdār* of

¹ Q'ani, Mir 'Ali Sher, *Tuḥfat al-Kirām* (Karachi, 1959), p. 395.

² For these details, see F. 20 b.

³ F. 17a.

Shaykh Farīd Bhakkari¹ was born, as his name shows, at Bhakkar and belonged to a respected family of that place.² He does not mention the date of his birth but it would be reasonable to put it in the last decade of the tenth century *Hijrah*. Farīd's family was connected with that of the well-known ruler of Thatta, Mirza 'Isā Beg.³ Another important person whom he mentions as one of his near relatives is Sayyid Abu'l-Faḥ Bhakkari.⁴ Shaykh Farīd's uncle, Muḥammad Ishāq, was considered to be a scholar of some reputation. He was a classmate of the famous Sindhi historian, Shaykh Ma'sum, and was among his closest friends. At one time he was employed by

(Continued from page 5)

among the people. These can, however, be picked up from his account without difficulty and cannot be considered to have marred the authenticity of his book. The actual words of Shah Nawaz are :

اگرچہ دریں وقت کتاب موسوم بہ ذخیرہ الخوانین تصنیف شیخ معروف (فرید) بھکاری متضمن احوال امراء بہ نظر رسید و اکثر مطالب آن ضمیمہ این نسخہ گردید لیکن چون بنائے آن بر اخبار سماعی مخالف تحقیق اہل فن بود و ماخذ این نسخہ کتب معتبرہ ثقات است و رجحانے بد یہی و مزیتے ظاہر بران متعلق ثابت است۔

Ma'athir al-Umarā, Calcutta edition, Vol. I, p. 8).

¹ Our only source of information for the life and work of Shaykh Farīd is the *Dhakhirah*. No contemporary or later writer has said anything about him. Even the author of the *Ma'athir al-Umarā*, who is so greatly indebted to Farīd has not said much about him. An attempt has, therefore, been made to build up the story of his life on the basis of references which he makes to his own contacts and activities in this work.

² He refers to Bhakkar as *وطن آبا و اجداد احقر*. See F. 19 a.

³ See F. 40a. 'Isā Beg's tomb, near Thatta, is one of the well-known monuments of this region.

⁴ F. 38a.

himself said, utilized it as a source book.¹ Kiwal Rām wrote after Shāh Nawāz and could not have dispensed with either of his predecessors. But I venture to go a step further and feel tempted to assert that both these writers must have taken inspiration from Shaykh Farīd Bhakkarī's scheme of preparing a biographical dictionary of the statesmen, nobles and officers of the Mughul Government.

There is no doubt that Abu'l-Faḍl has given lists of the grandees of the Empire in his *A'in*, but he records their names and titles only, because, to quote his own words, "it does not become the encomiast of His Majesty to praise others, and I should act against my sense of truthfulness, were I but to mention that which is praiseworthy, and to pass in silence over that which cannot be approved of."² The *Dhakhīrat al-Khawānīn* is, therefore, a pioneer work in the field of biographical literature on Mughul nobility; but its importance lies, far more than this, in its intrinsic value as a source book. It is rather strange that Shāh Nawāz who utilized it as a source book tries to belittle its importance by declaring it to be unauthentic, because its author depended on hearsay evidence. A careful examination of the two works will show that Shāh Nawāz has sometimes simply reproduced Shaykh Farīd's version.³

¹ Volume I, p. 8. ² *A'in*, English translation, vol. I, p. 321.

³ Shāh Nawāz has tried to vitiate the authenticity of Farīd's work. It is difficult to accept his criticism. Farīd has not only based his statements on authentic works but has taken care to ascertain facts before recording them. No doubt he has occasionally mentioned stories which had found currency

al-Dīn Nizām al-Fadlī, the *Tadhkirat al-Awliyā* of Shaykh Farīd al-Dīn ‘Attār and the *Nafahāt al-Uns* of Jāmī are well-known works. In this subcontinent also a number of biographical dictionaries, mostly on saints and scholars, were written. Of the numerous works written on the lives of the ‘*Ulamā*’ and *Ṣūfīs* of the subcontinent, the *Siyar al-Awliyā* of Amīr Khurd, the *Akhbār al Akhyār* of Shaykh ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq and the *Thamarāt al-Quds* of Lal Beg, the *Ma’athir al-Kirām* of Āzād, the *Ma’ārij al-Wilāyat* of Shaykh Ghulām Mu‘īn al-Dīn the *Khazinat al-Aṣfiyah* of Ghulām Sarwar, to name only a few, have served as useful sources of historical information. It may be added, however, that comparatively few books have been written on the lives of the statesmen, officers and nobles of the State. In fact, no such work is known to have existed before the time of our author. Shaykh Farīd is, therefore, justified in referring to this fact in his introductory remarks.¹ He writes that the historians had produced volumes on the lives and works of the kings but nobody had cared to write an account of the nobles ; for this reason he undertook to compile this work.

The two other well-known biographical dictionaries of Mughul officers and nobles, the *Ma’athir al-Umarā* of Shāh Nawāz Khān and the *Tadhkirat al-Umarā* of Kiwal Rām were both compiled more than a hundred years after the *Dhakhīrah*. Shāh Nawāz, as he has

¹ F. I

be traced, like so many other disciplines, to the devotion of the Muslims to their Prophet and their anxiety to preserve the details of his life. Alongside of their study and development of the twin sciences of *ḥadīth* and *sīrah* of the Prophet the Muslim scholars collected material on the lives and character of his *Companions* (*ṣaḥābah*) and other reporters of his sayings and activities. The growth and development of this discipline, technically known as the *asmā' al-rijāl*, gave to us a number of voluminous works containing the lives of persons who were quoted as authorities on *ḥadīth* or *sīrah* narrations. The discipline pertaining to the wars and battles of the Prophet came to be known as *maghāzī*. In course of time *sīrah* and *maghāzī* of the Prophet created a taste for history in general, so did the *asmā' al-rijāl* become the foundation of works on biographies. It may be of some interest to mention that Muslim writers have produced most exhaustive and excellent biographical dictionaries based on high class research and can today be regarded as classics. The earliest of these important works was Ibn Sa'd's *ṭabaqāt*. It covers besides the lives of the Prophet and his *Companions* an account of the *Tābi'īn* also. Some of these works are of a general character, like the *Wafayāt* of Ibn *Khallikān*, while others are devoted to the celebrated figures of particular sections, such as *Yāqūt's Mu'jam al-Udabā* or *Qiftī's Tārīkh al-Hukamā*. The traditions laid down by the early Muslim writers of biographical dictionaries were followed by the Persian authors both in *Khurāsān* and *Hind-Pakistān*. The *Āthār al-Wuzarā* of *Hājji Sayf*

suggest that the author might have thought of filling them later, and then he had no opportunity to do it. Another striking feature is that there are quite a few erasures and alterations, though not very substantial. In any case, the manuscript is quite old and must have been scribed soon after its compilation in 1061 A.H. It belonged to the Library of Chānd Bībī¹ as is indicated by her seal on the title page and the following endorsement on the top of the first page :

این کتاب از کتاب خانه چندا بی بی المصططب به ماه لقا
 بائی بنت سیده بی بی المصططب به راج کنور بائی متوطن بلده فرخنده
 بنیاد حیدرآباد در عهد ریاست نواب بنده گن عالی میرزا نظام علی خان
 بهادر وزیر اعظم خاندان محمد شاه بادشاه دهلی تیموریه ' اختتام خواندن
 این کتاب در ۱۲۱۶ هجری شد بدست خود بنا بر یادگار ترقیم یافت

The scribe, whoever he may be, was a well-educated person, for he does not commit mistakes which are ordinarily found in manuscripts written by men of poor education. He writes in a semi-*shikast* style and with an exceedingly fine pen. But for a person acquainted with the style of the seventeenth century prose writers of Persian and the history of the period which is covered by the book it is not difficult to read the manuscript and decipher even those passages which are not very clear.

The *Dhakhīrat al-Khawānīn* is a biographical dictionary of the Mughul nobility as its name indicates. The origin of *sawāniḥ-nigārī* (biography) in Islam can

¹ She was a mistress of Mīr Nizām 'Alī Khān Āsaf Jāh II. She was a poetess and patronized scholars. For an account of her literary activities, see *Majmū'ah i Naghz* of Abū al-Qāsim Qudrat-allāh, India Office, No. 2949.

INTRODUCTION

THE *Dhakhīrat al-Khawānīn* of Shaykh Farīd Bhakkārī is an extremely rare but highly useful work on Mughul history. It was compiled in 1060-61 A. H. as the author himself says in his account of Mīr Sayyid Ṣābir.¹ There are only two manuscripts of this valuable work known to exist: one is in the library of the Pakistan Historical Society and the other in that of the Anjuman Taraqqi Urdu, Karachi.² Both these manuscripts have been utilized for the present edition. The printed text, however, is based on the manuscript belonging to the Pakistan Historical Society, while the other one is referred to as MS B.

The manuscript belonging to the Pakistan Historical Society contains 67 folios, each folio being 12½" by 7½". There are 27 lines to a page with a written space of 10½" by 5½". The name of the scribe and the date of the manuscript are not mentioned anywhere. But it can be safely concluded from the type of the paper and the condition of the manuscript that it is pretty old. In fact one would have been tempted to consider it to be an autograph copy or at least a copy based on it, if there had not been a few lacunae in the earlier portion of the manuscript. On the other hand, the lacunae also

¹ See F. 59 b.

² This manuscript was examined by Dr. Abdullah Chaghatai. See his article in *Islamic Culture* (Hyderabad, Deccan), July 1953.

A. H.			A. C.
1048	5 May, 1638
1049	24 April, 1639
1050	14 April, 1640
1051	2 April, 1641
1052	22 March, 1642
1053	12 March, 1643
1054	29 February, 1644
1055	17 February, 1645
1056	7 February, 1646
1057	27 January, 1647
1058	17 January, 1648
1059	5 January, 1649
1060	25 December, 1649
1061	15 December, 1650
1062	4 December, 1651
1063	22 November, 1652
1064	12 November, 1653

A. H.			A. C.
1020	6 March, 1611
1021	23 February, 1612
1022	11 February, 1613
1023	1 February, 1614
1024	31 January, 1615
1025	10 January, 1616
1026	30 December, 1616
1027	19 December, 1617
1028	9 December, 1618
1029	28 November, 1619
1030	16 November, 1620
1031	16 November, 1621
1032	26 October, 1622
1033	15 October, 1623
1034	4 October, 1624
1035	23 September, 1625
1036	12 September, 1626
1037	2 September, 1627
1038	21 August, 1628
1039	11 August, 1629
1040	31 July, 1630
1041	20 July, 1631
1042	9 July, 1632
1043	28 June, 1633
1044	17 June, 1634
1045	7 June, 1635
1046	26 May, 1636
1047	16 May, 1637

(ii)

A. H.			A. C.
992	4 January, 1584
993	24 December, 1584
994	13 December, 1585
995	2 December, 1586
996	22 November 1587
997	10 November, 1588
998	31 October, 1589
999	20 October, 1590
1000	9 October, 1591
1001	28 September, 1592
1002	17 September, 1593
1003	6 September, 1594
1004	27 August, 1595
1005	15 August, 1596
1006	4 August, 1597
1007	25 July, 1598
1008	14 July, 1599
1009	3 July, 1600
1010	22 June, 1601
1011	11 June, 1602
1012	1 June, 1603
1013	20 May, 1604
1014	9 May, 1605
1015	29 April, 1606
1016	18 April, 1607
1017	7 April, 1608
1018	27 March, 1609
1019	16 March, 1610