

# Deconstruction Of Rāḥat Al-Qulūb: A Critical Dissection Of Authenticity And Reliability

Dr. Muḥammad Tanveer Jamal\*<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Lecturer, Department of Humanities, COMSATS University Islamabad (CUI), Abbottabad Campus, Pakistan.

---

## Abstract

Bābā Farīd (Shaykh Farīd al-dīn Mas‘ūd Ganj-i Shakar) stands as one of the prominent Ṣūfī figures within South Asia. He is affiliated with the Chishtīyyah silsilah, which holds a significant place as one of the earliest Ṣūfī orders in the Indo-Pāk subcontinent. The primary objective of this study is a meticulous examination of the authenticity of Rāḥat al-Qulūb, seeking to underscore its significance while also identifying instances of fabrications and legends that might be present. The study holds immense value within the realm of Sufism scholarship, particularly in relation to Rāḥat al-Qulūb, as it critically analyzes the works of both Muḥammad Ḥabīb's Chishtī Mystics Records of the Sultanate Period and Akhlāq Hussain Delhwī's Āaina Malfūzāt: Fawā'id al-Sālikīn, Asrār al-Awliyā', Rāḥat al-Qulūb. The differing viewpoints of these two historians concerning the credibility of Rāḥat al-Qulūb have led to a distinct division within scholarly discourse. This article aims to introduce a new perspective, utilizing axiological, analytical, and descriptive research methods to establish that both historians' assessments may not be entirely accurate. The study delves into the complex landscape of Rāḥat al-Qulūb with the intention of shedding light on its true nature and significance while navigating the arguments presented by Ḥabīb and Delhwī.

**Keywords:** Bābā Farīd, Rāḥat al-Qulūb, Chishtī Ṣūfīs, authenticity of malfūzāt, fabrication.

## Introduction

The early Chishtī Ṣūfīs of South Asia were characterized by their focus on rigorous contemplation, ethical integrity, and humanitarian values. Their approach was apolitical, and they generally avoided forming close ties with rulers. Instead of engaging in extensive literary pursuits, they prioritized deep meditation and spiritual practice. However, they did introduce certain literary innovations within the Indo-Pāk subcontinent, including the creation of Ṣūfī hagiographies, malfūzāt (sayings and teachings of the Shaykhs), dīwāns (collections of poetry), and Ishārāt (symbolic writings). Numerous malfūzāt and dīwāns are attributed to these early Shaykhs; however, the authenticity of many of them is debatable. Moreover, there are three books entitled Risālah Bandagī, Ganj al-Asrār, and Risālah Wujūdīyyah attributed to Bābā Farīd (d. 1256), but

their validity is too controversial. Additionally, the Shaykh compiled a scrupulous commentary on ‘Awārif al-Ma‘ārif, but it is now extinct. It is also a fact that some other eminent Chishtī Ṣūfīs, including Khwājah Ḥamīd al-dīn Nāgaūrī (d. 1274) and Khwājah Bandah Nawāz Gēsū Darāz (d. 1422), produced plenty of books. Moreover, modern researchers have explored more than thirty books of Khwājah Qūṭab al-dīn Mawdūd Chishtī (d. 1132), which will sooner or later attract the attention of scholarship to explore the intellectual prowess of early Chishtī Ṣūfīs.

The main objective of the study is to reevaluate Rāḥat al-Qulūb. In this regard, it is indispensable to critically dissect Prof. Muḥammad Ḥabīb's Chishtī Mystics Records of the Sultanate Period, which claims Rāḥat al-Qulūb as a created malfūzāt. Later, this claim was followed by other eminent modern historians like K. A. Nizami,<sup>2</sup> Bruce B. Lawrence<sup>3</sup> and Carl W. Ernst.<sup>4</sup> Paradoxically, Āaina Malfūzāt: Fawā'id al-Sālikīn, Asrār al-Awliyā', Rāḥat al-Qulūb written by Akhlāq Hussain Delhwī presents a totally different narrative about Rāḥat al-Qulūb. However, it seems that errors and misunderstandings have been found in both intellectuals' works.

Massive literature discussing Bābā Farīd's life, teachings, and his malfūzāt is available. The Life and Times of Shaikh Farīd-U'D-Din Ganj-I-Shakar (1955), written by Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, is a seminal dedicated biography of Bābā Farīd, which encompasses most of the aspects of the Shaykh's life. Additionally, Anna Suvorova's Muslim Saints of South Asia: The Eleven to Fifteen Centuries (1999) is another imperative, enlightening, and explanatory work about Shaykh Farīd al-dīn. She succinctly discusses the genuineness of sources regarding the biography of Bābā Farīd and identifies legends incorporated by different hagiographers. Furthermore, she meticulously discusses the authorship of Ashloke Shaykh Farīd of Gūrū Granth but does not discuss Rāḥat al-Qulūb. Mīyān Naeem Anwar Chishti's Āaina-i-Ma'rifat Tadhkira Ahwāl wa Malfūzāt Shaykh al-Shayūkh al-'Ālam Haḍrat Bābā Farīd Mas'ūd Ganj Shakar (2011) is another important and inclusive biography of Bābā Farīd and his descendants and khulafā'. The author profusely refers to Rāḥat al-Qulūb and Asrār al-Awliyā' but does not critically deconstruct their authenticity. The process of compilation of hagiographical sources regarding Bābā Farīd started in the fourteenth century, and it continues to date. However, none of these works are exclusive and methodical studies that highlight which part of Rāḥat al-Qulūb is original, and which is fabricated.

### **Deconstruction of Rāḥat al-Qulūb**

Rāḥat al-Qulūb is a malfūzāt attributed to Bābā Farīd, collected by his most distinguished khalīfah Shaykh Nizām al-dīn Awliyā'. The available manuscripts of the malfūzāt have twenty-four majālis. The time span of its compilation is mentioned as Rajab 15, 655 A.H. to Rabi' al-Awwal

<sup>2</sup>Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, *The Life and Times of Shaikh Farīd-U'D-Din Ganj-I-Shakar* (Aligarh: Aligarh Muslim University, 1955), 118-20:

<sup>3</sup>Bruce B. Lawrence, *Notes from a Distant Flute: The Extant Literature of pre-Mughal Indian Sufism* (Tehran: Imperial Iranian Academy of Philosophy, 1978), 35-36: see also Carl W. Ernst, and Bruce B. Lawrence, *Sufi Martyrs of Love: The Chishtī Order in South Asia and Beyond* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2002), 228.

<sup>4</sup>Carl W. Ernst, *Eternal Garden: Mysticism, History, and Politics at a South Asian Sufi Center* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992), 77-78.

2, 656 (July 21, 1257 - March 9, 1258), which is axiomatically not justifiable. The renowned Indian Muslim historian Professor Muḥammad Ḥabīb postulates that Bābā Farīd did not produce any malfūzāt and that Rāḥat al-Qulūb is an invented malfūzāt. Moreover, he avows Fawā'id al-Fūād and Khayr al-Majālis as the genuine and original malfūzāt. Muḥammad Ḥabīb further averred that Shaykh Niẓām al-dīn Awliyā' himself asserted in Fawā'id al-Fūād that “I have not written any book”.<sup>5</sup>

Paradoxically, reliable contemporary compendiums explicitly substantiated the composing and surviving of Bābā Farīd's malfūzāt. For instance, Shaykh Niẓām al-dīn Awliyā' stated in Fawā'id al-Fūād that he collected the malfūzāt of his Shaykh. He further maintains that Bābā Farīd called him before discussing any discourse. Furthermore, if he was not available, the Shaykh repeated his addresses in his presence.<sup>6</sup> Muḥammad Ḥabīb maintains about that source “what happened with Khwājah Niẓām al-dīn Awliyā's personal memoranda it is difficult to say”.<sup>7</sup> Additionally, Khwājah Niẓām al-dīn Awliyā' maintains that Bābā Farīd carefully and thoroughly examined these written discourses and substantiated them. He further maintains that when he brought six pieces of paper of this manuscript and submitted them to his Shaykh, he thoroughly dissected and endorsed them with appreciation.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, Amīr Khūrd frequently mentions that he was well aware about a copy of malfūzāt compiled by Shaykh Niẓām al-dīn Awliyā' himself.<sup>9</sup> Likewise, Shaykh Niẓām al-dīn Awliyā' also discusses that particular copy of the malfūzāt in one of his assemblies of Fawā'id al-Fūād which occurred on April 17, 1309 CE Nevertheless, he either deliberately did not mention its title or it may not have been conferred any title yet.

Some external evidence supports the survival of Rāḥat al-Qulūb. For example, i) Rukn al-dīn Dabīr Kāshānī frequently mentioned Rāḥat al-Qulūb in Shamāil al-Atqiyā-o-Dalāil al-Atqiyā<sup>10</sup>— malfūzāt of Khwājah Burhān al-dīn Gharīb (d.1337), an eminent khalīfah of Khwājah Niẓām al-dīn Awliyā' and a brother of Qāḍī Muntajab al-dīn. Qāḍī Muntajab al-dīn was an eminent spiritual successor of Bābā Farīd — an original and important malfūzāt.<sup>11</sup> ii), A scrupulous dissection of Muḥammad Majīr Wajīh's Mufatāh al-Janān reveals that the author profusely provides extracts of Rāḥat al-Qulūb. Wajīh, therefore, was an eminent disciple and devotee of Khwājah Naṣīr al-dīn

<sup>5</sup>Amīr Hassan Sijzī 'Alā' Delhwī, *Fawā'id al-Fūād* (Delhi: Hassani Publishers, 1282 AH/ 1865-66 A.D.), 29: See also Muhammad Habib, *Politics and Society During the Early Medieval Period*, ed. K.A Nizami (Aligarh: People's Publishing House, 1974), 402: See also Nizāmī, *The Life and Times of Shaikh Farīd-U'D-Din Ganj-I-Shakar*, 118.

<sup>6</sup>Sijzī, *Fawā'id al-Fūād*, 20-21.

<sup>7</sup>Ḥabīb, *Politics and Society During the Early Medieval Period*, 417.

<sup>8</sup>Sijzī, *Fawā'id al-Fūād*, 20.

<sup>9</sup>Sayed Muhammad bin Mubārak 'Alawī Kirmānī alias Amīr Khūrd, *Siyar al-Awliyā'*, ed. Chiranjī Lāl (Delhi: Muhib-i Hindi Press, 1302 AH/1885AD), 449-50 & 499.

<sup>10</sup>Rukn al-dīn Dabīr Kāshānī, *Shamāil al-Atqiyā o-Dalail al Atqiyā* (Hyderabad: Ashraf Press, n.d), 6.

<sup>11</sup>Carl W. Ernst, “The Interpretation of the Classical Sufi Tradition,” (Summer, 1994), 5.

Maḥmūd Chirāg-i Delhī.<sup>12</sup> Additionally, Sarūr-al Ṣadūr was compiled almost one hundred years after the death of Khwājah Ḥamīd al-dīn Nāgaurī but still deemed the most authentic malfūzāt.<sup>13</sup>

Ḥabīb makes some mistakes regarding the evolution of Rāḥat al-Qulūb. He rightly objected to the wrong time span of the compilation mentioned in the available manuscripts of Rāḥat al-Qulūb. However, he himself erroneously mentioned it as 1247-48 CE., which is 1257-58 CE., and the Hijra calendar as Rajab 15, 655 A.H. to Rabi' al-Awwal 1, 655 A.H.<sup>14</sup> which is Rajab 15, 655 A.H. to Rabi' al-Awwal 2, 656 A.H. respectively. Shaykh Nizām al-dīn Awliyā' visited Bābā Farīd for the first time in 1257 A.D. and the third or last time in 1264 A.D., so he compiled Rāḥat al-Qulūb on his last visit. It is obvious that no Shaykh would like to confer some special tasks to any of his disciples on his first visit. The time period of the assemblies of Rāḥat al-Qulūb is not mentioned by Khwājah Nizām al-dīn Awliyā', and they were added after its compilation. In some other authentic malfūzāt like Khayr al-Majālis, the time period of the assemblies is not mentioned. Ḥabīb's other major objection is the traveling journeys of Bābā Farīd to different eminent Islamic centers.<sup>15</sup> However, the earlier reliable sources and the availability of chillah places corroborate these travelling itineraries of Bābā Farīd to Baghdād,<sup>16</sup> Bukhāra, Kirmān<sup>17</sup> and Jerusalem. The ḥujrah (a small apartment) of Bābā Farīd is still intact in Palestine, known as Indian Hospice (Sarāh-i Hindī). In contrast, Muḥammad Ḥabīb maintains that a meeting of Bābā Farīd with Shihāb al-dīn Suhrwardī is impossible,<sup>18</sup> Nizām al-dīn Yamenī in Laṭāif-i Asharafī, which is an original and genuine malfūzāt<sup>19</sup> has corroborated that meeting.<sup>20</sup>



<sup>12</sup>Muhammad bin Muhammad Majīr al-dīn Wajīh, *Mufatāh al-Janān*. (Iran Pakistan Institute of Persian Studies, 1975), ff. 15, 34, 36, 39, 128, 191, 194, 203, 418, 436, 440, 493, 494, 497, 592, 594, 617-18, 640, 642, 646-48. The author had mentioned the name of *Rāḥat al-Qulūb* single time at page number 138.

<sup>13</sup>K.A. Nizami, *Some Aspects of Religion and Politics in India During the Thirteenth Century* (Aligarh: Department of History Muslim University Aligarh, 1961), 270.

<sup>14</sup>Ḥabīb, *Politics and Society During the Early Medieval Period*, ed. Nizāmī, 418-19.

<sup>15</sup>*Ibid.*, 419.

<sup>16</sup>Nizām al-Dīn Yamenī, *Lataif-i Asharafī*, trans. Shams Bareilvi (Faizabad: Jam' al-Ashraf Publishers, n.d), 597-98: See also Mirza La'al Baig La'alī Badakhshī, *Samarāt al-Qudūs min Shajrat al-Ans*, ed. Jawadi, 212: see also Muḥammad Qāsim Farishta, *Tārīkh-i Farishta*. Vol. 4, trans. Abdul Hye Khawaja (Lahore: Meezan Publishers, n.d), 752.

<sup>17</sup>Amīr Khusraū, *Afḍal al-Fawā'id* (Delhi: Rizvi Publishers, 1304 AH/1887 AD), 135-36: see also Farishta, *Tārīkh-i Farishta*. Vol. 4, trans. Khwājah, 752-53.

<sup>18</sup>Ḥabīb, *Politics and Society During the Early Medieval Period*, ed. Nizāmī, 419

<sup>19</sup>Lawrence, *Sufi Martyr of Love*, 229.

<sup>20</sup>Yamenī, *Lataif-i-Asharafī*. Vol. 1, trans. Bareilvi, 597-98.

Fig.1. Hujrah Bābā Farīd at Jerusalem      Fig.1.1 Hujrah Bābā Farīd at Jerusalem

Another objection of Ḥabīb regarding the legitimacy of Rāḥat al-Qulūb is that it is a miracle centered malfūzāt,<sup>21</sup> which is, in fact, not a rational observation. While discussing the presence of supernatural or mystical narratives, it is a fact that such types of miracles have been found in Fawā'id al-Fūād, Khayr al-Majālis, Siyar al-Awliyā, and in Jawām'al-Kalm. Furthermore, Laṭā'if-i Asharāfī describes more supernatural stories than Rāḥat al-Qulūb. Similarly, another objection is the non-availability of the numerous sources mentioned in Rāḥat al-Qulūb.<sup>22</sup> However, abundant sources mentioned in other authentic Chishtī malfūzāt including Shamāil al-Atqiyā<sup>23</sup> and malfūzāt-i Shāh Mīnā Chishtī are also not available. Likewise, Shāh Mīnā refers to Rāḥat al-Qulūb in his assemblies.<sup>24</sup> Historically, many books pertaining even to the Prophet Muḥammad (PBUH) (d. 632 CE) have also perished, including books of 'Urwah bin Zubair bin 'Awwām (d.713),<sup>25</sup> Abbān bin Uthmān bin 'Affān (d.723), Sīrat Ibne Ishāq of Muḥammad bin Ishāq (d.768), and much more.

Ḥabīb makes a surprising objection regarding the availability of a quatrain which is extant in both Rāḥat al-Qulūb and in Fawā'id al-Fūād. He maintains that Rāḥat al-Qulūb reveals that the quatrain was sent by Khwājah Nizām al-dīn Awliyā' to his Shaykh from Hānsī, while Fawā'id al-Fūād indicates that it was dispatched from Delhi.<sup>26</sup> However, both malfūzāt do not mention a location.<sup>27</sup> Muḥammad Ḥabīb further argues that Rāḥat al-Qulūb wrongly demonstrates that Khwājah Nizām al-dīn Awliyā', during his stay at Ajōdhan, did not live in the Jamā't Khānah of Bābā Farīd.<sup>28</sup> The fact is that he stayed at the khānqāh of his Shaykh. Ḥabīb perhaps tries to deploy the routine of Amīr Ḥassan Sijzī and Ḥamīd Qalandar, who were not permanent dwellers of the hospice of their Shaykh. That is why they started each assembly with a sentence "I obtained the benefit of kissing his (Khwājah Nizām al-dīn Awliyā') feet". However, it seems that they borrowed this sentence from Rāḥat al-Qulūb. In fact, there is not any assembly of Rāḥat al-Qulūb which substantiates that Khwājah Nizām al-dīn Awliyā' was living outside of the khānqāh of Bābā Farīd. He taught six out thirty portions of Holy Qurān, six chapters of 'Awārif al- Ma'ārif, and complete book of Abū Shakūr Sālamī's Kitāb al-Tamhīd to Shaykh Nizām al-dīn Awliyā'.<sup>29</sup> Besides special attention to the education of his spiritual successors, Bābā Farīd scrupulously examined their esoteric training as well. In this regard, he assigned Khwājah Nizām al-dīn Awliyā' a zāwīyah (an apartment assigned only to the khulāfā of the Shaykh for rigorous meditation) in Jamā't Khānah in which the

<sup>21</sup>Habīb, *Politics and Society During the Early Medieval Period*, ed. Nizāmī, 420.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid.,

<sup>23</sup>Ernst, *Eternal Garden*, 76.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., 102-03.

<sup>25</sup>Imād al-Dīn Ismail bin 'Umar Ibne Kathīr, *Tārīkh-i Ibne Kathīr (Al-Bīdaya wa al-Nihaya)* Vol. 5, trans. Muhammad Asghar Mughal (Karachi: Dar al-Ishat, n.d), 106.

<sup>26</sup>Habīb, *Politics and Society During the Early Medieval Period*, ed. Nizāmī, 418.

<sup>27</sup>Sijzī, *Fawā'id al-Fūād*, 113: see also Nizām al-Dīn Awliyā', *Rāḥat al-Qulūb* (Delhi: Matba' Muḥtaba, 1891), 60-61.

<sup>28</sup>Habīb, *Politics and Society During the Early Medieval Period*, ed. Nizāmī, 418.

<sup>29</sup>Amīr Khūrd, *Siyar al-Awliyā'*, 106-07.

young disciple kept himself busy in grueling rīyādat (meditation) and stayed in this apartment during his visit to his Shaykh.

Muḥammad Ḥabīb further claims that Qāḍī Ḥamīd al-dīn Nāgaūrī and Khwājah Badr al-dīn Ghaznavī were present in the second and some other succeeding assemblies of Rāḥat al-Qulūb while both died several years prior to the arrival of Shaykh Nizām al-dīn Awliyā' at Ajōdhan.<sup>30</sup> It is true that Qāḍī Ḥamīd al-dīn Nāgaūrī died in 1245 CE.<sup>31</sup> However, it appears to be a writing error. It might have referred to Khwājah Ḥamīd al-dīn Nāgaūrī (d. 1274 CE), a celebrated khalīfah of Khwājah Mu'īn al-dīn Ḥassan, who died almost a decade after the death of Bābā Farīd. Moreover, external evidence shows that he had a cordial relation with Bābā Farīd as his letters written to Bābā Farīd are still intact.<sup>32</sup> There is a possibility that he visited Bābā Farīd at Ajōdhan. The possibility of a writing mistake has also been observed in some existing manuscripts of Fawā'id al-Fūād as well as some of its translations (Fawā'id al-Fūād Urdu translation by Khwājah Ḥassan Nizāmī). This includes Shaykh Najam al-dīn Kubrā—pioneer of Kubravīyyah Ṣūfī silsilah of Central Asia— being granted a certificate of succession to Shaykh Shihāb al-dīn Suhrwardī, when it was in fact Shihāb al-dīn Turpushatī. Again, going to external evidence, regarding the presence of Khwājah Badr al-dīn Ghaznavī, it is interesting to mention that Amīr Khūrd describes several meetings of Shaykh Nizām al-dīn Awliyā' and Khwājah Badr al-dīn Ghaznavī. Both even visited Bābā Farīd at the same time.<sup>33</sup>

Another reservation of Muḥammad Ḥabīb directly pertains to the time of the compilation of Rāḥat al-Qulūb. Rāḥat al-Qulūb also mentions the death of Shēr Khān, who died in 1264, Shaykh Bahā al-dīn Zakariyā Multānī, who died in 1263 and Shaykh Sayf al-dīn Bakharzī, who died in 1259-60.<sup>34</sup> Furthermore, Ḥabīb continues that Bābā Farīd mentions the Mongol's siege of Yemen. Additionally, a traveler told the Shaykh about another destruction of Damascus by the Mongol. The destruction was so thorough that only twenty houses survived in Damascus. Ḥabīb further claims that in fact, the Mongols neither invaded nor captured Damascus before 1258. Another chronological objection highlighted by Muḥammad Ḥabīb is that Khwājah Jalāl al-dīn of Tabrīz (d. 1244) informed Bābā Farīd about his meeting with a disciple of Khwājah Ḥassan Baṣrī (d. 728). Lastly, Bābā Farīd himself visited a disciple of Junaid of Baghdād (d. 910), as well as a disciple of Dhūl Nūn Miṣrī (d. 859).<sup>35</sup>

As mentioned above, Muḥammad Ḥabīb falsely mentioned 1247 CE as the actual date of the compilation of malfūzāt which is described as 1257-58 CE. Again, it is stated that the time period of the assemblies, which created many chronological problems, was added after the

---

<sup>30</sup>Habīb, *Politics and Society During the Early Medieval Period*, ed. Nizāmī, 418-19.

<sup>31</sup>Amīr Khūrd, *Siyar al-Awliyā'*, 57.

<sup>32</sup>Abdul Haq Muhadīth Delhwī, *Akḥbār al-Akhyār fī Asrār al-Abrār*, ed. 'Alīm Ashraf Khān (Tehrān: Anjuman Āsar wa Mufākkar Farhangī, 1383 A.H/ 1963), 58.

<sup>33</sup>Amīr Khūrd, *Siyar al-Awliyā'*, 472, 499, 505.

<sup>34</sup>Habīb, *Politics and Society During the Early Medieval Period*, ed. Nizāmī, 419.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid.

compilation of Rāḥat al-Qulūb. Rāḥat al-Qulūb provides matching information to that of Fawā'id al-Fūād regarding Shēr Khān with an addition to his death.<sup>36</sup> While discussing Mongol destruction, the information provided by the malfūzāt seems factual. However, spatial errors are witnesses in cases of Damascus<sup>37</sup> and Yemen. There is almost no historical as well as hagiographical source which can be deemed free from such types of chronological as well as spatial errors. Additionally, Ḥabīb and the contemporary Mongol sources provide matching information to Rāḥat al-Qulūb; for example, in Herāt only fifteen people survived while in Samarqand, Bukhāra, Merv, Tirmiz and Khwārazm only a few beggars were left alive. In Nīshāpur, every living creature was slaughtered including cats and dogs.<sup>38</sup> Similarly, the available manuscripts of Rāḥat al-Qulūb mention a meeting of Khwājah Jalāl al-dīn of Tabrīz with a grandson of Ḥassan al-Baṣṣī, rather than his disciple.<sup>39</sup> It is a common practice that the descendants of a great personality proudly called themselves their sons and grandsons, despite a vast chronological gap. For instance, popular educationalist and colonial Muslim political leader Sir Sayed Aḥmad Khān (d. 1898), called himself as a grandson of Holy Prophet (PBUH).<sup>40</sup> Similarly, the word disciple or devotee is also commonly used as follower of the path of that particular Shaykh.

Muḥammad Ḥabīb further claims that Rāḥat al-Qulūb has manufactured certain Chishtī Ṣūfīs' compilations which do not exist in reality. These include Khwājah Abū Yūsuf Chishtī's Sharah al-Asrār, Khwājah Quṭab al-dīn Mawdūd Chishtī's Sharah al-Awliyā, Khwājah 'Uthmān Harwanī's Qūt al-qulūb, Khwājah Mu'in al-dīn Ḥassan's Āūrād and Khwājah Quṭab al-dīn Bakhtiyār Kākī's Āūrād.<sup>41</sup> Likewise, many books of Khwājah Quṭab al-dīn Mawdūd are available including Ḥujjat al-Sālikīn<sup>42</sup> Minhāj al-'Ārifīn, Khulāṣa al-Sharī'a,<sup>43</sup> thirty-one of his books are mentioned by Sayid Aḥmad Chishtī Mawdūdī.<sup>44</sup> Likewise, Malfūzāt-i Shāh Mīnā mentions Āūrād-i Naṣrīyyah as well

---

<sup>36</sup>Sijzī, *Fawā'id al-Fūād*, 99: see also Awliyā', *Rāḥat al-Qulūb*, 16-17.

<sup>37</sup>Syria was captured by the Mongols in 1260, did severe massacred in Aleppo and no resistance was occurred in Damascus. However, the Mongol ruled Syria only few months. Reuven Amitai, "Mongol Raids into Palestine (A.D. 1260 AND 130)", *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, 2 (1987), 236-38.

<sup>38</sup>Muhammad Habib "Introduction" in *Some Aspects of Religion and Politics in India During The Thirteenth Century* (Aligarh: Department of History Muslim University Aligarh, 1961), iii-iv: see also Alā al-dīn Juwaynī, *The Tārīkh-i Jahān Gushā*, Part.1, ed. Mirzā Muḥammad Qazwīnī (Leyden: E. J. Brill, 1912), 148-49.

<sup>39</sup>Awliya, *Rāḥat al-Qulūb*, 24: See also Nizām al-dīn Awliya, *Rāḥat al-Qulūb*, (Tehrān: Kitābkhāna Majlis-i Shura-i Islāmī, n.d), 52.

<sup>40</sup>Sayed Ross Mas'ūd, *Kaṭū-e Sir Sayyid* (letter 8, August, 20, 1869) (Badaun: Nizāmī Press, 1924), 49.

<sup>41</sup>Ḥabīb, *Politics and Society During the Early Medieval Period*, ed. Nizāmī, 420.

<sup>42</sup>Muḥammad Ākram Barāsawī, *Jawāhir-i Mawdūdī* (Islamabad: Kutābkhānah Ganj Bakhsh Iran Pakistan Institute of Persian Studies, n.d), not paginated.

<sup>43</sup>Muḥammad Ākram Barāsawī, *Iqtibās al-Ānwār* (compl. 1720) (Lāhore: Matba' Islāmīyyah, n.d), 118: see also Muḥammad Zakariyyā Kandhalwī, *Tārīkh-i Mashā'ikh-i Chisht* (compl. 1917) (Karachi: Makabah al-Shaykh, n.d), 159.

<sup>44</sup>The books including *Sharah al-Asrār*, *Khulāṣa al-Shariah*, *Minhāj al-Ābidīn*, *Minhāj al-'Ārifīn*, *Fateḥ Allahum Mawdūdī*, *Sa'adīyah Mawdūdīyyah*, *Minhāj al-Wāsilīn*, *Tuḥfat al-Sālikīn*, *Minhāj al-Murīdīn*, *Tuḥfat al-Wa'azīn*, *Minhāj al-Taṣawwūf*, *Tuḥfat al-Ṣābirīn*, *Tafsīr Shāfiyyah Mawdūdīyyah*, *Tafsīr bi Naṣr Sultān Mawdūdī*, *Tafsīr-e Akbarī*, *Falsafah-e Akbarī*, *Fiqh Nūrīyyah Mawdūdīyyah*, *Ṭabb-e Akbarī*, *Mawdūd al-Khazā'in*, *Kinz al-Mawdūd*, *Marqāt al-Naṭaq*, *Khaṭabah Chishtī*, *Mawdūd al-Mawdūd*, *Qutab al-Khaṭab Chishtī*, *Mawdūd al-Naṣrī*, *Faqah al-Mawdūd*, *Nafahāt al-Jin*, *Bazar al-Ash'ār*, *Nājīyah Mawdūdīyyah*, *Qasaid-e Mawdūdīyyah* and *Baḥar al-Faṭan* (Sayid Aḥmad Chishtī Mawdūdī, *Zindgī Nāmah* (Chāp wā Nasar Mashhad, 1944), 126-29.

as some *aūrād* of Khwājah Naṣīr al-dīn Maḥmūd.<sup>45</sup> *Āūrād-i Naṣīriyyah* mentions *Āūrād* of Khwājah Mu‘īn al-dīn Ḥassan and Khwājah Quṭab al-dīn Bakhtiyār.

Further, it seems that the available manuscripts of *Rāḥat al-Qulūb* are not thoroughly in their original form. Some internal and external evidence challenge its authenticity; one such evidence is its compilation period. Main causes of the existing errors are the anonymity of *Rāḥat al-Qulūb* to the Chishtīyah devotees as compared to *Fawā'id al-Fūād*. Khwājah Niẓām al-dīn Awliyā' did not share its copy with anyone. There was hardly any facility available in Ajōdhan to scribe some other copies of the *malfūzāt*. On the other hand, *Fawā'id al-Fūād* was compiled in Delhi by a prominent poet, intellectual and an official Amīr Ḥassan Sijzī who was well acquainted with contemporary scholarship, disciples of the Shaykh, as well as the ruling elite. This is why *Fawā'id al-Fūād* became quite popular among the intellectuals and common people even during its completion. Amīr Khusrau (d. 1325), contemporary of Amīr Ḥassan Sijzī and a celebrated poet, offered Sijzī all his literary works in the replacement of *Fawā'id al-Fūād*.<sup>46</sup> Paradoxically, only a few disciples of Bābā Farīd knew about *Rāḥat al-Qulūb*. Due to the unavailability of printing press, which was launched in India much later, lesser-known scripts either vanished or lost their smaller or larger parts and were replete with writing errors and legends. The same occurred with the *malfūzāt* of Bābā Farīd and the *malfūzāt* compiled by his grandsons. Moreover, further discussing the writing errors, it is pertinent to mention that Bābā Farīd's personal manuscript of 'Awārif al-Ma'ārif' was also full of language errors and the great Shaykh not only pointed out these mistakes to his disciples but also corrected them.

Beside the wrong compilation period, some additional or fabricated information has been found in *Rāḥat al-Qulūb*. This information has been incorporated in the original text after its compilation, and the procedure of addition carried on until the nineteenth century CE. Some scribes provided additional information in annotations which unfortunately, later, became part of the *malfūzāt*. For instance, numerous poetic verses of 'Urafi Shīrāzī are incorporated in *Ma'dan al-Ma'anī*—*malfūzāt* of renowned Ṣūfī Shaykh Sharf al-dīn Yahyā Munerī (d. 1381)—while the former poet was born two hundred years after the death of the Shaykh.<sup>47</sup> Similarly, chronological errors have also been found in almost all other contemporary *malfūzāt* and hagiographical compendium.

Some other confusing incidents mentioned in *Rāḥat al-Qulūb* are like Khwājah Quṭab al-dīn Bakhtiyār Kākī living in the company of Khwājah Quṭab al-dīn Mawdūd Chishtī for a decade.<sup>48</sup> It seems that either it is a legend, or he may be referring to Khwājah Aḥmad Mawdūd, a son and

<sup>45</sup>Mīr Muhy al-dīn, *Malfūzāt-i Shāh Mīnā* (compl. 1011 A.H), trans. Lutfullah (Lahore: Institute of Islamic Culture, 1994), 54, 183, 184.

<sup>46</sup>Gautam Chakravarty, "Reading *Fawā'id al-Fūād*: Text, Testimony and History," *Journal of Subcontinent Researchers University of Sistan and Baluchistan*, 2, no.4 (2010): 56. See also: M. Sharaf Alam, "Ḥassan Sijzī and Shaikh Sharaf ud Dīn Ahmad Manerī (A Comparative Study of Their Mystic Thoughts & Persian Prose)," *Journal of Subcontinent Researchers University of Sistan and Baluchistan*, 2, no.4 (2010): 8.

<sup>47</sup>Some verses of 'Urafi Shīrāzī have been seen in the numerous manuscripts of *Ma'dan al-Ma'anī*. However, there are some oldest manuscripts of that *malfūzāt* are available in which these verses are not found.

<sup>48</sup>Awliyā', *Rāḥat al-Qulūb*, 8.



khalīfah of Khwājah Quṭab al-dīn Mawdūd Chishtī or some other khalīfah of Quṭab al-dīn Mawdūd as the Shaykh had more than one thousand khulāfā.<sup>49</sup> Similarly, as mentioned earlier Bābā Farīd visited the majority of eminent Islamic learning centers where he met with numerous ascetics and intellectual Ṣūfīs; among them was Shaykh Abū Yūsuf Chishtī.<sup>50</sup> He was not Abū Yūsuf, the preceptor of Shaykh Quṭab al-dīn Mawdūd Chishtī, but a contemporary of Bābā Farīd. There is a possibility that more than one saint of similar name belongs to same era and location. A similar point is highlighted by Shaykh ‘Abdul Haq Muhadith as he maintains that in Hindūstān there were three popular Ḍiyā al-dīn figures, including eminent historian Ḍiyā al-dīn Baranī, a Chishtī intellectual Ṣūfī Ḍiyā al-dīn Bakhshī and a theologian of Delhi Ḍiyā al-dīn Sanaī, all contemporaries of Khwājah Nizām al-dīn Awliyā.<sup>51</sup>

A negotiation of Khwājah ‘Usmān Harwanī with Munkar Nakīr (angels) is another strange incident mentioned in Rāḥat al-Qulūb.<sup>52</sup> However, a similar type of incident is also attributed to Shaykh ‘Abdul Qādir Jīlānī (d. 1165).<sup>53</sup> Additionally, Jamālī mentions that Khwājah ‘Uthmān Harwanī remained for four hours in a furious fire along with a fire worshiper’s child and remained protected.<sup>54</sup> One reason of inclusion of these miracles is that the medieval period is considered as the apogee of Ṣūfīsm. Paradoxically, socio-political and economic decline, ruthless destruction and execution—Mongol’s execution—of Muslims and their civilization also occurred during the same era. This is why the Muslim masses, even the kings, became great devotees of their contemporary eminent Ṣūfīs, owing to the hope of protection for their states due to their divine power and prayers. It is also a fact that the Ṣūfīs played an imperative role in protecting the Muslim masses against the tyranny of the Mongols, as the Mongols were converted to Islam by these Ṣūfīs. During that time, the Ṣūfīs’ hagiographical compendia were escalated. This compendium is mostly miracle-centered, providing common Muslims with a sense of solace and complacency. Another reason for such miracle-dominated compilations is the profound asceticism of the early and medieval Ṣūfīs, with the miracles primarily pertaining to ascetic practices.

It is important to mention that Akhlāq Hussain Delhwī has also acknowledged that the available manuscripts of Rāḥat al-Qulūb are not in their original form, severely affected by the passage of time and a combination of scattered pages. However, he believes that only a few minor mistakes have been added to the malfūzāt, which are common in many other eminent works by Muslim intellectuals of India.<sup>55</sup> It is worth noting that Delhwī presents a thematic and linguistic comparison of Rāḥat al-Qulūb and Fawā’id al-Fūād, maintaining that the former malfūzāt has excelled over the latter. Moreover, he declares Rāḥat al-Qulūb as one of the major sources of Fawā’id al-Fūād.

<sup>49</sup>Kandhalwī, *Tārīkh-i Mashā’ikh-i Chisht*, 160.

<sup>50</sup>Awliyā’, *Rāḥat al-Qulūb*, 22.

<sup>51</sup>Delhwī, *Akhbār al-Akhyār fī Asrār al-Abrār*, ed. Khān, 204.

<sup>52</sup>Awliya, *Rāḥat al-Qulūb*, 23.

<sup>53</sup>Barāsawī, *Iqtibās al-Ānwār*, 87-88.

<sup>54</sup>Hāmid bin Faḍalullah Jamālī, *Siyar al-‘Arifīn* (Delhi: Rizvi Publishers, n.d), 8-9.

<sup>55</sup>Akhlāq Hussain Delhwī, *Āina Malfūzāt: Fawā’id al-Sālikīn, Asrār al-Awliyā’*, *Rāḥat al-Qulūb* (Delhi: Kutab Khana Anjuman-i Tariqi-i Urdu, 1983), 243-70.

Furthermore, he highlights the matching information and anecdotes between the both sources.<sup>56</sup> Additionally, he mentions the locations of some old manuscripts of *Rāḥat al-Qulūb*. Moreover, he discusses certain other unusual incidents described in *Rāḥat al-Qulūb* which were overlooked by Muḥammad Ḥabīb. He makes rational interpretations of these incidents and declares them to be genuine. Thus, *Āaina Malfūzāt: Fawā'id al-Sālikīn, Asrār al-Awliyā'*, *Rāḥat al-Qulūb* like Chishti Mystics Records of the Sultanate Period represents a commendable intellectual effort and contribution to academia.

While evaluating *Rāḥat al-Qulūb* and its chronological, thematic and textual problems, Delhwī highlights some significant points, including errors found in certain eminent historical and hagiographical books of medieval India. However, he too makes some errors in the process. For instance, he claims that Amīr Khūrd maintains that Khwājah Nizām al-dīn Awliyā' died at age of eighty years, while Ḥabīb incorrectly mentions that Amīr Khūrd the former Shaykh's death at the age of eighty-nine. Delhwī cites page 124 of *Siyar al-Awliyā'* as a reference, yet this page does not mention the date of death or the age of the former Shaykh. It appears that Delhwī has not thoroughly examined page 154 of the same book, which indeed states the Shaykh's age as eighty-nine years<sup>57</sup> and supports Ḥabīb's assertion.<sup>58</sup> Similarly, while incorrectly referring to Amīr Khūrd, he maintains that Amīr Khūrd does not mention the year of birth of Khwājah Nizām al-dīn Awliyā' and Muḥammad Bulāq falsely attributes Amīr Khūrd and cites 636 A.H. as year of the Shaykh's birth.<sup>59</sup> Here, Amīr Khūrd's *Siyar al-Awliyā'* explicitly contradicts Delhwī's claims and validates Muḥammad Bulāq's narrative.<sup>60</sup>

Delhwī further contends that Ghulām Aḥmad Biryān's Urdu translation of *Siyar al-Awliyā'* misleads Ḥabīb and numerous other historians. He highlights that Biryān inserted the date of birth of Khwājah Nizām al-dīn Awliyā' as 636 A.H. in his translation, although it is not present in the original text of *Siyar al-Awliyā'*'s Chiranjī Lāl edition.<sup>61</sup> However, Delhwī's claim is in fact contrary to reality. As mentioned earlier, *Siyar al-Awliyā'* (Chiranjī Lāl edition) explicitly states 636 A.H. as the year of birth of the Shaykh. It is also perplexing why the author has devoted a lengthy discussion to the birth and death of Khwājah Nizām al-dīn (spanning six pages) within the evaluation of *Rāḥat al-Qulūb*.

### **Prowess of *Rāḥat al-Qulūb***

The available manuscripts of *Rāḥat al-Qulūb* demonstrate profound probity, wisdom, and a great knowledge of Bābā Farīd regarding Islamic Shariah, Ṣūfīsm, and asceticism. The *malfūzāt* also engage in intellectual discussions about *darwaishī* (spirituality), the *wazaif* (spiritual practices) of

---

<sup>56</sup>Ibid., 238-50.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid., 222-30.

<sup>58</sup>Amīr Khūrd, *Siyar al-Awliyā'*, 154.

<sup>59</sup>Delhwī, *Āaina Malfūzāt*, 228-29.

<sup>60</sup>Amīr Khūrd, *Siyar al-Awliyā'*, 154.

<sup>61</sup>Delhwī, *Āaina Malfūzāt*, 230-31.

each month—Darūr-i Nizāmī also places strong emphasis on the wazaif and aūrād (daily litany of prayers)—Samā’ (devotional music), wajad (ecstasy), nafs (the self), dhikr (remembrance), tariqa (the spiritual path), abnegation of the world, the significance of the robe, solitude, meditation, reasoning, the prowess of knowledge, ethics, and the just and equal treatment of all human beings.

Rāḥat al-Qulūb refers to numerous compilations of Ṣūfīs and theologians, including Imām Muḥammad ash-Shaybānī’s (d. 805) Jām’ al-Kabīr, Shaqīq Balkhī’s (d. 810) Dalīl al-Shāfi (although Dalīl al-Shāfi is scarcely available, however, Ādāb al-‘ibādāt, a short treatise of Shaqīq Balkhī that primarily focuses on renunciation of the world and worldly desires, and is one of the earliest Sufi sources on asceticism, is intact), Zāhīr al-dīn Ābū Bakr’s Fatawa-i Zāhīrī (referred to in Malfūzāt Shāh Mīnā Chishtī), Abū Yazīd Bisṭāmī’s (d. 874) Sālk al-Salūk<sup>62</sup> (the book is unavailable and hagiographical sources are silent about the work), and Shaykh Junaid Baghdādī’s (d. 911) ‘Umdah—It seems there are writing errors; the Shaykh may be referring to Irādah (Tashīḥ al-Irādah), a book of Junaid Baghdādī reported by ‘Alī bin ‘Uthmān al-Hujwerī (d. 1076) in his masterpiece entitled Kashf al-Maḥjūb.<sup>63</sup> The mentioned book is also not available, and some other books of Junaid, such as Kitāb al-Amthāl al-Qurān, Sharḥ Shaṭḥiyāt Abī Yazīd Bisṭāmī, al-Munājāt, and Kitāb Rasā’ail, are also not extant. Despite this, there are still thirty books of the great Shaykh that are extant.<sup>64</sup> Shaykh Abū Bakr Shiblī’s (d. 946) Tuhfat al-‘Ārifīn, while no book, including Tuhfat al-‘Ārifīn, is extant. However, contemporaneous Ṣūfī intellectuals of Shiblī, such as al-Kalābāzī (d. 990s), mention that he produced books.<sup>65</sup>

Now, we only have exegesis of numerous Quranic verses as mentioned by ‘Abdul Rahmān al-Sulamī in his Ḥaḡā’iq al-tafsīr and Ziyādāt ḡaḡā’iq al-tafsīr, and Dīwān available among the Shaykh’s compendia. Abū Tālib al-Makkī’s (d. 996) Qūt al-Qulūb, Imām Ghazālī’s (d. 1111) Iḡyā al-‘ulūm al-dīn, Abū Layyas Samārqandī’s Baḡiyat Khatam al-Mujtahadīn, Khwājah Abū Yūsuf Chishtī’s (d. 1067) Sharaḡ al-Asrār, Shaykh Shihāb al-dīn Suhrawardī’s (d. 1234) magnum opus ‘Āwārīf al-Ma’ārif, Khwājah Quṭab al-dīn Mawdūd Chishtī’s Sharaḡ al-Awliyā (which is available with the title of Sharaḡ al-Asrār), Shaykh Ḥamīd al-dīn Nāḡaurī’s Rāḡat al-Ārwāh and Tawārīkh,<sup>66</sup> Radī al-dīn Ḥassan Saghnaī’s Mashāraq al-Ānwār, Tafsīr-i Zāhid of Abū Naṣr Aḡmad bin Ḥassan, Zamakhsharī’s (d. 1143-44) Tafsīr-i-Kashshāf, and Imām Sha’bī’s al-Kafaya are also available sources. One reason for the demonstration of so many books is the extensive traveling journeys of the Shaykh to Islamic centers where he acquired these works. However, Rāḡat al-Qulūb does not

<sup>62</sup>Another book entitled *Sālk al-Salūk* is a masterpiece of Ḍiyā al-dīn Bakhshī (1350 CE), prominent *khalīfah* of Shaykh Farīd al-dīn a grandson of Khwājah Ḥamīd al-dīn Nāḡaurī. (Delhwī, *Akḡbār al-Akḡyār*, ed. Khān, 204).

<sup>63</sup>‘Alī bin ‘Uthmān al-Hujwerī, *Kashf al-Maḡjūb*, trans. Reynold A. Nicholson (Lahore: Islamic Book Foundation, 1976), 338.

<sup>64</sup>Ali Hassan Abdel Kader, *The Life, Personality and Writings of al-Junayd* (London: Luzac & Company, 1962), 53-61.

<sup>65</sup>Arthur John Arberry, *The Doctrine of the Ṣūfīs (Kitāb al-Ta’arruf li Madḡhab ahl al-Taṣawwuf* of Abū Bakr al-Kalābāzī), trans. Arthur John Arberry (London: Cambridge University Press, 1935), 13.

<sup>66</sup>Khwājah Ḥamīd al-dīn Nāḡaurī compiled plenty of books. Delhwī, *Akḡbār al-Akḡyār*, ed. Khān, 58: See also ‘Abdul Raḡmān Chishtī, *Mirāt al-Asrār*, vol. 1 (Majlis-i Shura-I Islami, n.d), 261.

mention the authors of some other works such as *Khulāsāt al-Haqaiq*, *Āsar al-Mashāikh*, *Sharah al-Mashāikh*, *Āsār al-‘Ārifīn*, *Āsrār al-Tab’aīn*, *Fatawa-i Kubrā*, and *Jawām’ al-Haqāyāt* (Sadīd al-dīn Muḥammad ‘Awfī (d. 1242), a prominent Persian poet and historian, compiled *Jawām’ al-Haqāyāt*). It seems *Jawām’ al-Haqāyāt* was deemed a prominent hagiographical work in Medieval times, and the book was reported in *Fawā’id al-Fuād*. Shaykh Niẓām al-dīn stated that Shaykh Najīb al-dīn Mutawakkil (d. 1261) — brother and khalīfah of Bābā Farīd — had a great desire to get a copy of this book but failed owing to a lack of money.<sup>67</sup> Furthermore, many sources reported by Sadīd al-dīn Muḥammad ‘Awfī in his another masterpiece entitled *Lubāb al-Ālbāb* are now extinct.<sup>68</sup> Additionally, as mentioned earlier, the majority of these sources has also been mentioned in the *Malfūzāt Shāh Mīnā Chishtī*.

Another paramount attribute of *Rāḥat al-Qulūb* is that it indirectly shares plenty of information with other contemporary *malfūzāt* and *tadhkirāt*. By "indirectly," I mean that the authors did not have direct access to *Rāḥat al-Qulūb*, but Shaykh Niẓām al-dīn Awliyā’ shared information that he himself compiled in *Rāḥat al-Qulūb*. The sources that gleaned information from this compilation include *Fawā’id al-Fuād*, *Darūr-i Niẓāmī*, *Afḍal al-Fuād*, and *Siyar al-Awliyā’*. Here are some examples of the shared information:

a) The types of alms (*zakaṭ*) are mentioned in *Fawā’id al-Fuād* and *Durr-i-Niẓāmī*. b) The four principles for *darwaishī* and the story of Muḥammad Shāh's brother's illness are in *Siyar al-Awliyā*. c) Jealousy and abhorrence of the popular warrior and governor of Multān named Shēr Khān are mentioned in *Fawā’id al-Fuād*. d) Bābā Farīd's demonstration of a miracle in the presence of Shaykh Aḥwad al-dīn Kirmānī is in *Afḍal al-Fuād*. e) Khwājah Ḥamīd al-dīn Nāgaurī's letters to Bābā Farīd are described in *Fawā’id al-Fuād*. f) A devotee visited Bābā Farīd from Jerusalem, Sultān Naṣīr al-dīn Maḥmūd (r. 1246-66) and submitted a cash amount as well as an agricultural land as a gift to Bābā Farīd in *Siyar al-Awliyā*. g) It is mentioned in *Rāḥat al-Qulūb* that the *āḥādīth* of *Mashāraq al-Anwār* are authentic and genuine,<sup>69</sup> Khwājah Niẓām al-dīn Awliyā’ also extolled *Mashāraq al-Anwār* and mentioned similar viewpoints about the *āḥādīth* of the book.<sup>70</sup> These are just a few examples of the interconnected information found across these sources.

Similarly, there are further incidents and information available in *Rāḥat al-Qulūb* that do not match with the principles and teachings of Bābā Farīd as preserved in other contemporary and early contemporary sources. Interestingly, both Muḥammad Ḥabīb and Akhlāq Hussain Delhwī do not highlight this information. For example, *Rāḥat al-Qulūb* presents an incident in which thieves lost their eyesight upon entering a *darwaish*'s house, and through his prayer, they regained their eyesight.<sup>71</sup> A similar incident is mentioned regarding Ḥaḍrat Qursam Bībī, the mother of Bābā

<sup>67</sup>Sijzī, *Fawā’id al-Fuād*, 18.

<sup>68</sup>Nizami, *Some Aspects of Religion and Politics in India*, 373.

<sup>69</sup>Awliya, *Rāḥat al-Qulūb*, 32.

<sup>70</sup>Sijzī, *Fawā’id al-Fuād*, 69-70.

<sup>71</sup>Awliya, *Rāḥat al-Qulūb*, 52.

Farīd. This type of incident seems inconsistent with the overall discourse of Bābā Farīd as found in other sources.

Similarly, Shaykh Bahā' al-dīn Zakarīyyā died in 1262 CE, and Bābā Farīd mentioned his passing to his disciples in the twentieth assembly, while Shaykh Jamāl al-dīn Hānswī, who had passed away two years prior to the death of Shaykh Bahā' al-dīn Zakarīyyā, was present in the twenty-first and twenty-third assemblies.<sup>72</sup>

It is worth noting that Sālk al-Salūk is a masterpiece by Ḍiyā al-dīn Bakhshī (d. 1350 CE) rather than by Abū Yazīd Bisṭāmī (d. 874). Bakhshī also compiled other very popular works, such as Ṭūḍī Nāmāh, 'Asharah Mubasharah, and Qaliyāt wa Jaziyāt.<sup>73</sup> Similarly, the "Sharah" (exegesis or commentary) of Khwājah Mu'īn al-dīn Ḥassan is not mentioned in other hagiographical sources.<sup>74</sup>

Furthermore, Rāḥat al-Qulūb reveals that Bābā Farīd made a commitment to himself not to drink cold water. However, on the other hand, the verses of Shaykh Farīd in Ashloke Shaykh Farīd of Adī Granth seem to explicitly mention the opposite:

رکھی سکھی کھا کے ، ٹھنڈا پانی پی  
فریدا ویکھ پرائی چوپڑی ، نہ ٹرساویں جی  
Eat bare dry bread and drink cold water!

Farīd, seeing the buttered bread of others do not tantalize (thy) soul!<sup>75</sup>

It is also a fact that, apart from the aforementioned single difference, there are numerous similarities and parallels manifested between Rāḥat al-Qulūb and Ashloke Shaykh Farīd. Muḥammad Ḥabīb rightfully claims that Bābā Farīd granted a certificate of succession to Khwājah Nizām al-dīn Awliyā' during his third and final visit. However, in Rāḥat al-Qulūb, the information presented in the first assembly indicates that Nizām al-dīn Awliyā' received khalāfat (spiritual succession) during his first visit. Nonetheless, accurate information regarding khalāfat is provided in the twenty-second assembly. It's worth mentioning that Amīr Khūrd also provides different dates regarding the robe of succession of Khwājah Nizām al-dīn Awliyā'.

Similarly, Ḥabīb rightly pointed out that it was Shaikh 'Arif rather than Shihāb al-dīn Ghaznavī who received a gift for Bābā Farīd.<sup>76</sup> This correction is necessary as the incident contradicts the anecdote available in Fawā'id al-Fūād. To further explore and examine the oldest manuscripts of the said malfūzāt, conducting critical analysis and comparisons is the only rational solution to distinguish between the legends and the genuine text of the malfūzāt.

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., 57-63.

<sup>73</sup>Delhwī, *Akḥbār al-Akhyār*, ed. Khān, 204.

<sup>74</sup>Awliya, *Rāḥat al-Qulūb*, 62.

<sup>75</sup>Maqbool Elahi, *Couplets of Bābā Farīd* (Lahore: Majlis Shah Hussain, 1967), *shalok*, 32, p. 23. See also *The Adī Granth*, trans. Ernest Trumpp (London: Waterloo Place, 1877), *Shalok*, 29, p. 687

<sup>76</sup>Ḥabīb, *Politics and Society During the Early Medieval Period*, 420.

It is evident that many other eminent sources have also lost their original or complete forms. For instance, the available manuscripts of Fawā'id al-Fūād are not the same as the manuscript used by Ḥāmid bin Faḍalullah Jamālī. Similarly, some anecdotes and information described by Shaykh Shāh Mīnā with reference to Fawā'id al-Fūād are now extinct.<sup>77</sup> Additionally, Sayyed Muḥammad al-Hussainī never authenticated Khayr al-Majālis, as he pointed out that Shaykh Naṣīr al-dīn Maḥmūd stated: "I have said something different from what he (Ḥāmid Qalandar) has written."<sup>78</sup>

Numerous mistakes have also been found in the earliest two Ṣūfī biographical works of Muslim-South Asia, including Amīr Khūrd Kirmānī's *Siyar al-Awliyā* and Jamālī's *Siyar al-Ārifīn*, regarding the biography of Bābā Farīd. These mistakes include: i) Amīr Khūrd stated that Bābā Farīd passed away on Muharram 5, 664 A.H.,<sup>79</sup> However, paradoxically, he also mentions that Bābā Farīd granted khalāfat nāmah to Khwājah Nizām al-dīn Awliyā' on Ramḍān 13, 669 A.H.

ii) Amīr Khūrd mentioned that Bābā Farīd's ancestors lost their empire of Kābul during the Mongol invasions and that his grandfather, Qādī Shu'aīb, moved to Punjab.<sup>80</sup> However, historical records show that Changīz Khān attacked Central Asia and Kābul in 1218 A.D., while Bābā Farīd's family had left Kābul nearly seven decades before the Mongol attack. iii) The date of initiation (bay'at) of Khwājah Quṭab al-dīn Bakhtiyār Kākī is mentioned as 1128 CE by mistake,<sup>81</sup> In fact, the great Shaykh was not born until 1128 CE.

iv) Ḥāmid bin Faḍalullah Jamālī wrongly mentioned Bābā Farīd's father as Maḥmūd of Ghazna's nephew.<sup>82</sup> In reality, Maḥmūd (r. 998-1030) was the descendant of the last Persian ruler, Yazd Gird,<sup>83</sup> while Bābā Farīd belongs to the Quraish tribe and its clan Banū 'Adī, a clan of the Second righteous caliph 'Umar bin Khattāb (r. 634-44). v) Jamālī wrongly mentions the elder brother of Bābā Farīd, named 'Azū al-dīn Maḥmūd, as 'Azu al-dīn Muḥammad. vi) 'Alī bin 'Uthmān, popularly known as Dātā Ganj Bakhsh, passed away in the same year that Khwājah Mu'īn al-dīn Ḥassan arrived in Lahore.<sup>84</sup> However, Dātā Ganj Bakhsh died even before the birth of the former Shaykh. These discrepancies emphasize the importance of critically analyzing and cross-referencing historical sources to arrive at a more accurate understanding of events and biographical details.

<sup>77</sup>Muhy al-dīn, *Malḥūzāt-i Shāh Mīnā*, trans. Lutfullah, 66-67.

<sup>78</sup>Sayed Muhammad Akbar Hussainī, *Jawām 'al Kalim*, trans. Muin al-din Dardai (Karachi: Nafees Academy, 1980), 244.

<sup>79</sup>Amīr Khūrd, *Siyar al-Awliyā'*, 89-91.

<sup>80</sup>Ibid., 60

<sup>81</sup>Ibid., 48.

<sup>82</sup>Jamālī, *Siyar al-Ārifīn*, 31-32.

<sup>83</sup>Genealogy presented by Minhāj as Sirāj Jawzjānī in in *Tabaqāt-i-Nāsirī* of Sultān Maḥmūd is Maḥmūd b. Subuktigīn b. Jūq b. Qara Bahkam b. Qara Arslān b. Qara Mallat b. Qara Nu'man b. Fīrūz b. Yazd-Gird. Minhāj al-Dīn Jawzjānī, *Tabaqāt-i-Nāsirī*, ed. Cap. W. Nassau Lees, Maulvi Khadim Hossain and Abd al-Hay. (Calcutta: College Press, 1864), 6. While genealogy of Sultān Maḥmūd presented by Muhammad Qāsim Hindu Shāhī Farishta: Maḥmūd b. Subuktigīn b. Juqakan b. Qara al-Hakam b. Qarzl Arslan b. Qara Nu'man b. Fīrūz b. Yazd Gird. Abu al-Qāsim Muhammad Qāsim Hindu Shah Farishta, *Tārīkh-i-Farishta*. Vol. 1, trans. Abdul Hayy Khawaja (Lahore: Al-Mizan Publishers, 2009), 51

<sup>84</sup>Jamālī, *Siyar al-Ārifīn*, 12.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, it is evident that *Rāḥat al-Qulūb* is a collection of *malfūzāt* (sayings and teachings) of Bābā Farīd, compiled by Khwājah Nizām al-dīn Awliyā'. However, over time, errors and legends were added, leading to distortions in its original content. The question arises: why were so many sources lost, and why are many not in their original form?

Altāf Hussain Hālī provides insight into this question, pointing out that one of the reasons is the destruction of Islamic libraries and book repositories in South Asia during the War of Independence in 1857. This event led to the loss of a significant portion of the Islamic literary heritage of the region.<sup>85</sup> Similarly, as mentioned earlier, the Mongols' destruction of libraries during their invasions played a role in the loss of important compilations across various fields of knowledge. These historical events, coupled with other factors such as time, inadequate preservation methods, and the challenges of manuscript transmission, have contributed to the loss and distortion of many valuable sources. Despite these challenges, scholars and researchers continue to work diligently to analyze and reconstruct these sources to gain a clearer understanding of the past and its intellectual contributions.

Many Chishtī Ṣūfīs' *malfūzāt* and books are extinct now, such as the *malfūzāt* of Bābā Farīd entitled *Asrār al-Mutahayarīn*. The early sources mention this *malfūzāt*; however, its compiler's name is not mentioned. Shaykh 'Alī Bihārī, a distinguished disciple of Bābā Farīd, compiled a book entitled *Rahadī*, which is extinct now. Similarly, the *Taṣrīf Badarī* authored by Khwājah Badr al-dīn Ishāq, a distinguished khalīfah of Bābā Farīd, is extinct. Additionally, the *Dīwān* (poetry compilation) of Khwājah Badr al-dīn Ghaznavī is not intact.

Similarly, numerous *malfūzāt* of Khwājah Nizām al-dīn Awliyā' are extinct now, including: i) *Ānwār al-Majālis* collected by Imām Muḥammad, a grandson of Bābā Farīd. ii) *Tuhfat al-Ābrār Karāmāt al-Akhyār* compiled by Shaykh 'Azīz al-dīn Ṣūfī, another grandson of Bābā Farīd. iii) *Khulāsāt al-Lataif* written by Shaykh 'Alī Jāndār (who also compiled *Darūr-i Nizāmī*, another important *malfūzāt* of Shaykh, which is fortunately available). iv) *Sirāj al-'Arīfīn*, another *malfūzāt* of Shaykh, however, like *Asrār al-Mutahayarīn*, the scribe's name is missing.

*Ṣalāt-i Kabīr*, 'Ināyat Nāmah of Diyā al-dīn Baranī, and *Tadhkirāt al-Awliyā'* compiled by Shaykh Āin al-dīn Baidarī are also not available. It is also surprising that some other available popular Chishtī Ṣūfī sources of Medieval India have also lost smaller or larger parts of their text. These sources include *Siyar al-Awliyā'*, *Fawā'id al-Fūād*, *Baḥar al-Ma'anī*, *Sirāj al-Hidāyah*, *Lataif-i-Asharafī*, and others.

Akhlāq Hussain Delhwī attempts to compare *Rāḥat al-Qulūb* solely with *Fawā'id al-Fūād*. If he were to consult other hagiographical compendia, he could easily address the objections raised by Ḥabīb regarding the asceticism of Bābā Farīd. Moreover, in his evaluation of *Rāḥat al-Qulūb*, he

---

<sup>85</sup>Altāf Hussain Hālī, *Ḥayāt-i-Jāvīd*, Vol. 2 (Mīrpūr: Arsalan Books, 2000), 13.

dedicates a lengthy discussion to the mystical power of a jōgī and his encounter and contest with Bābā Farīd. It would be beneficial if Delhwī consulted Khusrau's Nuh Sipihr (Nine Skies), in which Amīr Khusrau compiled a comprehensive section on the prowess of jōgīs.

Shaykh Nizām al-dīn Awliyā's affirmation regarding the compilation of Bābā Farīd's malfūzāt and its endorsement by his Shaykh, along with the reports from Shamāil al-Atqiyā and Dalāil al-Atqiyā, as well as Mufatāh al-Janān, suffices to establish the existence and survival of Rāḥat al-Qulūb. Additionally, the substantial matching information between Rāḥat al-Qulūb, Siyar al-Awliyā, Fawā'id al-Fūād, and Khayr al-Majālis underscores its significance. Mistakes in the evaluation of Rāḥat al-Qulūb have been made by both Ḥabīb and Delhwī. While one discredited it as an invented malfūzāt, the other deemed it an original source.

Undoubtedly, legends have been incorporated into Rāḥat al-Qulūb. One contributing factor was its anonymity, coupled with the lack of facilities in Ajōdhan, where it wasn't copied by other disciples of Shaykh Farīd. Khwājah Nizām al-dīn Awliyā's decision not to provide copies of the malfūzāt to prominent khulāfā or disciples further explains its scarcity. Consequently, earlier Sajjādah Nashīns of Bābā Farīd also remained silent about this malfūzāt. Lastly, the inclusion of footnotes into these malfūzāt introduced additional challenges regarding their authenticity.

Certainly, numerous fabrications and legends have permeated the available manuscripts of Rāḥat al-Qulūb. Similarly, as previously mentioned, even the most reliable and authentic Chishtī malfūzāt, such as Fawā'id al-Fūād, have suffered from the loss of certain portions of their content. Shaykh Naṣīr al-dīn Maḥmūd himself raised objections against the authenticity of Khayr al-Majālis. It's worth noting that early Ṣūfī hagiographical compilations from Muslim India, including Siyar al-Awliyā' and Siyar al-'Ārifīn, are not exempt from chronological and textual errors.

A proposed solution is to present an accurate version of Rāḥat al-Qulūb, and through this, initiate the search for its oldest manuscripts. A critical analysis that encompasses both thematic and linguistic aspects should be undertaken to uncover the true essence of the text.