THE REVOLT OF THE AGHA KHAN MAHALLATI AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NIZARI IMAMATE IN INDIA.

A dissertation offered as part of the B.A. Degree in Oriental Studies in the Department of Near Eastern Studies, Victoria University of Manchester.

MISS NADIA EBOO

1979

THE REVOLT OF THE ĀGHĀ KHĀN MAHALLĀTI AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NIZĀRI IMĀMATE IN INDIA.

A dissertation offered as part of the B.A. Degree in Oriental Studies in the Department of Near Eastern Studies, Victoria University of Manchester.

MISS NADIA EBOO

1979

"The Ismailis of the world are those who have made a final determination to live and act in accordance with the Truth, under adverse or favourable circumstances, in hardships or in pleasures, in despair, or in joy, doing everything to help one another, making the utmost effort, and patiently bearing every form of exile (or molestation?) to which they are subjected."[1]

1. Ivanov,W; Kalami Pir, Islamic Research Association,(Bombay,1935,) p.39

Note: The transliteration of names attempts to comply consistently with the commonly used British transliteration of the Arabic script. e.g. Faḍl Allāh Rukn al-Dīn; Āghā Khān; Khōja.

CONTENTS.

Chapter One.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND : NIZĀRĪ ISMĀ'ĪLĪS IN IRAN FROM THE 13TH CENTURY UP UNTIL 1817.

"The Nizārī venture had begun as an all out assault upon the insolent power that was sweeping away the barely won hopes of the Shī'a."[1]

This reference to the Seljuk period shows the beginning of the Nizārī Ismā'īlī movement. During this period they increased in number, power and especially in strength. All of this was due to the guidance of Ḥasan-i Sabbāḥ (1090-1124), a famous Ismā'īlī dā'ī (missionary) , and his new doctrine of Ismā'īlī belief, and also due to his further development of the old Ismā'īlī doctrine. His successors carried on his work and soon the Ismā'īlīs became a menace and a threat to those in control and to the orthodox Sunnī Muslims as a whole. From their strongholds in Alamūt, Rūdbār, Ḥamasār, etc., they caused a great deal of trouble to both the Seljuk Sultans and the 'Abbāsid Caliphs.

The historian of the Mongol period, Juwainī[2] suggested that the Ismā'īlī Imām Jalāl al-Dīn* had some sort of understanding with the Mongols in Central Asia and probably developed a policy of cooperation with them, but relations seem to have been completely severed by the time of Güyük's accession to the throne in 1246. Complaints by the Sunnī Muslims about the behaviour of the Ismā'īlīs and about their threatening attitude, had been brought to the notice of the Great Khān, Möngkē (1251-8), in Mongolia and in 1256 Hulēgu Khān, an Il-Khān, moved from Mongolia towards Persia. The aims of this campaign were threefold;

---

* See List of Imāms.

1. Hodgson, M; The Order of the Assassins, (The Hague,1955), p.264.
2. Boyle, J.A.; "The Ismā'īlīs and the Mongol Invasion", in Ismā'īlī Contributions to Islamic Culture, (Tehran,1977), p.8.

to subdue the Ismā'īlīs, to conquer Central Asia and finally to conquer Persia.

So in 1256 came the complete defeat of the Nizārī Ismā'īlīs, the surrender of their 27th Imām, Rukn al-Dīn Khūrshāh,* and the total destruction of their strongholds, particularly that of Alamūt. Hūlāgū had received strict orders from the Great Khān that all Ismā'īlīs, including children should be killed and 80,000 are said to have been massacred.[1] "It was the end of their political power."[2]

Despite this disaster the Ismā'īlī community did not die out. Many did manage to escape and according to Ismā'īlī tradition Rukn al-Dīn Khūrshāh, anticipating the catastrophe had already sent his son and heir designate, Shams al-Dīn,* to a safe place. Thus he was succeeded by him after his death. However, according to Ivanow,[3] there is no direct indication of the locality in which the Imāms were said to have been living. Only through indirect sources is it possible to conclude that they moved to Āẕarbāījān, where they lived in seclusion for some time.

The information about the history of the Ismā'īlīs during the next couple of centuries is scanty and fragments vary from one source to another. The Imāms inĀẕarbāījān had to live in concealment and obscurity, and were forced to practice taqīya (prudential dissimilation of belief). Only in this way were they able to continue the Ismā'īlī tradition and da'wa (missionary work) without fear of persecution. The Ismā'īlī heritage entered into the general current of Persian mystical and esoteric thought. In order to survive in such a hostile environment, the Imām became one of a host of Ṣūfī pīrs, leaders, and their followers as with Ṣūfī followers

---

* See List of Imāms.

1. Hodgson; Order, p.270.
2. Hollister, J.N; Shi'a of India, (London, 1953), p.319.
3. Ivanow, "Tombs of some Persian Ismaili Imams," J.B.B.R.A.S. (1938)pp 145-6.

were called murīds. This adoption obviously was facilitated by the similarity between the two esoteric traditions.[1] If within the Ismā'īlīs the Imām is insān-i Kāmil (The Perfect Man), so too is the quṭb in Ṣūfism. The reason for the fusion of Ismā'īlī into Ṣūfī was in order to perpetuate anonymity, and was adopted after the fall of Alamūt.

However, the Ismā'īlīs never allowed themselves to be submerged totally into the general esoteric medley. Their form of Shī'ite Ṣūfism remained quite distinctive. They read Ṣūfī literature but commented on it according to their own doctrines, thus retaining their own identity. Nor did they allow their own traditions to be forgotten and oral tradition was maintained, preserving all the stories of their Imāms. They were only Ṣūfīs externally. This pretence of religion and attitude was used successfully for several centuries.

It is to be noted that Kūdbār and Kūhistān harboured large Ismā'īlī populations for a long time and in the first part of the 14th century, the land was still so thoroughly controlled by the Ismā'īlīs that Sunnī missionaries had difficulty in remedying the situation.[2] However, this position had obviously changed by the 15th century, when the Ismā'īlīs were only to be found thereabouts in small pockets.

Due to being in a state of taqīya, many of their Imāms had been forced to adopt a second name. Sometimes they added a prefix or a suffix to their names. Some even had a private name by which they were known among the Ismā'īlīs and a different name known only to outsiders.

---

1. Ivanow, W; Bibliographical Survey of Ismaili Literature, (Teheran, 1963), p.52.
2. Von Hammer, J; History of the Assassins, Extracts from a booklet by Jalālī of Qā'in, English translation pp.205 and 209 (London, 1840).

This has been mainly responsible for the lack of information about the Imāms in that time. Lists of Imāms in addition to that of Ismā'īlī tradition are also given in the Kalami Pir[1], and in The Origins of the Khojas,[2] and finally in the Ismailiticia.[3] All of these differ slightly as to the dates, names and even in the number of the Imāms. The most reliable of them is that of Ismā'īlī tradition which, according to some studies undertaken by Professor Ivanow on Persian Ismā'īlī tombs, seems to be fairly accurate.

How long the Ismā'īlīs remained in Āẕarbāljān is not known, but it appears that by the middle of the 15th century they were settled in the arid and hilly area of the districts of Farāhān and Maḥallāt[4], situated between Qūm and Sulṭānābād. Under the Tīmūrids some obscure ties[5] do connect the Ismā'īlīs with Āẕarbāljān, but it is believed that the purge of the Ismā'īlīs by Tamerlane (1335-1400) forced them to move to a less populated, inhabited area. This new locality was thinly populated, and partly occupied by predatory nomad tribes, thus making it extremely suitable for those wishing to avoid publicity.

Ivanow has been able to discover the tomb of Mustanṣir bi Allāh II* in Anjūdān, about 25 miles from Sulṭānābād, with the date 885 A.H./1480 A.D. inscribed on it. According to him, the modern Ismā'īlī expansion can be traced back to the "Anjūdān revival", of the late 15th century, just prior to the establishment of the twelver Shī'ism as the offical religion in Iran by the Ṣafavī ruler Ismā'īl in 1500. It was at this time when one of the Ismā'īlī Imāms presumably took advantage of the Shī'ite triumph to revive and extend his own form of Shī'ism. During this period the Nizārīs of Iran

---

* See List of Imāms.

1. Ivanow; Kalami Pir, p.44.
2. Mujtaba, 'Alī; The Origins of the Khojas, (Bonn, 1936), p.54.
3. Ivanow; Ismailiticia Memoirs of the Asiatic Society, (Calcutta, 1922), pp. 68/9.
4. Ivanow; "Tombs" p.52.
5. Ivanow; "Tombs", p.52 note ...

became reunited once again with the Syrian Ismā'īlīs, a break having occurred two generations after Rukn al-Dīn Khūrshāh*[1]. They also united with the ones in the Upper Oxus who had been isolated from them since the Fātimid times. A number of dā'īs were sent out to Nizārī Ismā'īlīs in India, who were by now the largest Nizārī community.[2] Most of these people, converted from Hinduism to Ismā'īlism still retained some of their customs; however, they were extremely pious and loyal to their Imāms in Iran.

Further tombs were discovered by Ivanow, such as the mausoleum of Shāh Gharīb in Anjūdān. According to Ismā'īlī tradition this is the tomb of Imām Gharīb Mīrzā. There was a certain amount of confusion concerning the identity of this person, as the tomb had Mustanṣir bi Allāh b. 'Abd al-Salām* written on it. But Ivanow has suggested that Shāh Gharīb Mustanṣir bi Allāh b. 'Abd al-Salām are one and the same person as there exists no information about a so-called Mustanṣir bi Allāh III. Another tomb found in Anjūdān is that of Dhū al-Fiqār 'Alī* But some discrepancy about the date of his death seems to exist, for Ivanow places it at 1567, supported by extracts from the dīwān of Imām Qulī Dizbādī, a contemporary of this Imām, who used the takhallus Khākī.[3]

The mausoleum of the Imām, Nizār* was found at Kahāk, a little further east of Anjūdān. Long ago the Iṣfahān-Sulṭānābād road touched Kahāk, hence it was not as isolated as it is now. An exceptional feature of this mausoleum is that a number of its graves carry Khōjki Sindhi characters, probably graves belonging to Indian pilgrims who had come to visit their Imām.[4]

---

* See List of Imāms.

1. Ivanow; "A forgotten branch of the Ismailis", J.R.A.S., (1938) pp. 57-59.
2. Hollister; Shī'a, pp. 334-5.
3. Dīwān of Khākī Khorāsānī, ed. Ivanow (Bombay, 1933) scattered information throughout this Edition.
4. Ivanow, "Tombs", p.56.

After this, for at least one hundred and forty years, there is no record of any tombs of the Imāms in this area. This coincides roughly with the rise of the Ṣafavīs and the Ismā'īlī revival. During this period Ismā'īlī tradition states that the Imām and members of his family moved from Anjūdān, when Imām Sayyid 'Alī * was appointed as Governor of Kirmān by the Ṣafavī ruler, Ṣafī I (1629-1642), with whom he was on good terms. Also under Shāh 'Abbās II (1642-1666) the Ismā'īlī Imāms were highly respected and Ḥasan 'Alī* kept the position as Governor of Kirmān. Also, large numbers of Ismā'īlīs at this time joined the Persian army.

Imām Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī* seems to have accompanied Nādir Shāh (1736-1747) to India in 1738 while he was still quite young[1] under Karīm Khān Zand (1750-1779); having been recognised for his valour and wisdom, he was appointed first as Governor of Kiyāb and later even as Governor of Kirmān. In 1779 the rule of the Zand dynasty came to an end, but he kept his ruling position in Kirmān due to his immense popularity and influence among the local people. He was known for his kindness and generosity due to the vast sums which he received in tribute from the Nizārīs in India. However, he still was unable to prevent parts of Kirmān from being lost to the Ghilzai Afghans.

In 1790 his position in Kirmān was threatened by Luṭf 'Alī Khān (1789-94), the last ruler of the Zand dynasty, but the threat was eventually averted when the latter was put to death in 1794 by the first Qājār ruler Āghā Muḥammad Shāh. (1779-1797).[2]
The Imām had denied Luṭf 'Alī admittance to his city, a fact which strengthened his favour in the eyes of the Qājār Shāh. Luṭf 'Alī thus tried, in vain, to conquer the city of Kirmān, but was soon forced to give up and leave.

---

* See List of Imāms.

1. Chunara, A.J; Noorum Mubin- A glorious history of Ismaili Imams, (In Gujarati) (Bombay 1951) p.3
2. Sykes, P.M; A History of Persia, (London, 1915) No.1. II, p.380.

Eventually Abū al-Hasan ʻAlī retired from his position in Kirmān in order to seek rest in Mahallāt. He was buried in the mausoleum of the famous Sūfī Mushtāq ʻAlī[1] in Kirmān, where an anonymous grave is attributed to him.

After his death he was succeeded by his son Khalīl Allāh ʻAlī,* also known by the designation Sayyid Kahākī because his established residence was by then in Kahāk. His position as head of the Ismāʻīlīs was tacitly recognised by the new Qājār ruler Fatḥ ʻAlī Shāh (1779-1834). Khalīl Allāh ʻAlī was greatly revered by all his followers and many from India used to make pilgrimages to see him bringing him rich tribute and receiving his benedictions.[2]

Information about Khalīl Allāh ʻAlī is supplied by M. Rousseau, French Consul in Aleppo under the first Empire.[3] He learnt that Khalīl Allāh was detested by the Ithnāʻasharī scholars or ʻUlamā', possibly due to his claims to the Imāmate, but he was protected by Fatḥ ʻAlī Shāh because of the revenue brought to Iran by Indian Ismāʻīlī pilgrims. Rumours spread that it was because he was a convert to the Ismāʻīlī cause. Yet more likely was Fatḥ ʻAlī Shāh's general tendency to seek the favour of holy men, whether orthodox or heterodox.[4]

Despite royal protection, he was killed by one of the Ithnā ʻAsharī scholars.[5] In 1815 he had moved to Yazd in order to have a convenient centre for communication with India and was killed there, but later buried at Najaf as was then the growing tradition.

His death worried Fatḥ ʻAlī Shāh, in case he was suspected of complicity and, "Knowing the deadly vengeance of the sect",[6] in order to

---

* See List of Imāms.
1. Ivanow, "Tombs", PP. 60/61.
2. Some words given in Praise of Khalīl Allāh. Ivanow , Kalami Pir, p.45.
3. Rousseau M; "Memoires sur les Ismailis et les Nosairies de Syria", Annales des voyages de la Geographie et de l'histoire, vol.XIV, (Paris, 1811), pp. 297-8.
4. Algar, H; Chapter III in Religion and State in Iran 1785-1906. The Role of the Ulama in the Qajar Period, ([illegible] Los Angeles, 19[illegible]).
5. [illegible]; A [illegible] p. [illegible]
6. [illegible]

avoid suspicion he severely punished those guilty and richly rewarded Khalīl Allāh 'Alī's son Ḥasan 'Alī Shāh*, by giving him the districts of Qūm and Maḥallāt as a form of recompense. Also, he recognised him openly and publicly as the head of the Ismā'īlī sect by bestowing on him the title of Āghā Khān.

It is perhaps more likely that all the compensation and attention given to Ḥasan 'Alī Shāh was because Fath 'Alī Shāh was concerned with maintaining his links with the Imāmate for reasons of material benefit.[1]

The reason, however, that any compensation had to be given to Ḥasan 'Alī Shāh was that the fortunes of the family were somewhat low at the time of his father's death,[2] who on moving to Yazd had left his wife and son to live on the proceeds of the family holdings in the Maḥallāt area. Disputes among the local Ismā'īlīs and the local population had left them unprovided for. Their situation steadily grew more insecure and it is said that they were surrounded by the hostilities of "both relatives and strangers."[3]

On the death of Khalīl Allāh 'Alī his wife, a vigorous woman, went to court to seek justice and her pleadings were successful. Fath 'Alī Shāh ordered Ẓill al-Sulṭān, Governor of Qūm, to cease interfering with the family lands and to restore to them a number of misappropriated villages. Some crown lands in the region were also added to the Imāms' holdings. Finally, as a conclusive sign of honour, Fath 'Alī Shāh gave one of his daughters, Sarv-i Jahān Khānum, in marriage to the Āghā Khān, alloting also 23,000 tumāns for the wedding expenses.

Thus the wordly fortunes of the Imāmate were fully restored and the new Imām appears therefore to have led a tranquil life in the Maḥallāt area until the death of his royal patron in 1834.[4]

---

* See List of Imāms.

1. Algar, H. "The revolt of Āghā Khān Maḥallātī and the Transference of the Ismā'īlī Imāmate to India," S.I. [illegible] ([illegible]), p.61.
2. Ḥasan 'Alī Shāh, 'Ibrat-i Afzā, (Bombay, [illegible]).
3. 'Ibrat-i Afzā, pp [illegible].
4. Algar, "Revolt," p.[illegible].

CHAPTER TWO.

THE REVOLT OF ĀGHĀ KHĀN MAḤALLĀTĪ

Under the patronage of Fatḥ ʿAlī Shāh, the Āghā Khān was able to live peacefully, with no one to trouble him. So during this time, he was able to secure his position and power by gathering together a large number of armed followers with great military potential. Also, he amassed large funds from the tribute being paid to him by his ever-increasing followers in India.

After the death of Fatḥ ʿAlī Shāh in 1834, his successor Muḥammad Shāh (1834-1848) gave the Āghā Khān the Governorship of Kirmān. This was a politically-motivated manoeuvre, for this area was at that time in a state of chaos. First of all, it was exposed to continual raids by the Afghans and Baluchis. Secondly, during the interim period after the death of Fatḥ ʿAlī Shāh and the accession of Muḥammad Shāh to the throne, the two sons of Ḥasan ʿAlī Mīrzā Shujāʿal-Salṭāna, a claimant to the throne,[1] had seized the province.[2]

Thus the Qājār ruler felt that he could make use of the Āghā Khān, whose family had always favoured the Qājār Government, by sending him and his troops to pacify this area. He also acknowledged that the Āghā Khān had a special attachment to the province of Kirmān as being the place once governed by his grandfather and forefathers. According to his autobiography, the Āghā Khān undertook this task without any advance payment from the treasury, saying that he would be content with whatever reward the monarch and his ministers should think fit.[3]

---

1. Algar, "Revolt", p.63.
2. Busse, H; History of Persia under Qājār rule, (New York, 1972), p.231.
3. ʿIbrat -i Afzā, p.9.

He forced the two sons of Shujā' al-Sulṭanī to abandon the city, but they fled to the nearby citadel at Bam. The Āghā Khān was occupied with organising the affairs of Kirmān, so he sent his brother Sardār Abū 'l-Ḥasan Khān, together with a number of 'Aṭā Allāhīs, (nomads of the Ismā'īlī faith,) to lay siege to the citadel at Bam and soon the two brothers were again forced to flee.

Yet the Afghan and Baluchi raiders who had conquered the citadels at Bam and Narmāshīr were more difficult to overcome and they held these two places even after the Āghā Khān arrived to join his brother. However, after a year of prolonged sieges, both Bam and Narmāshīr were taken by the Āghā Khān, and a long account of his victory was sent to Muḥammad Shāh in Tehrān, together with the tax arrears of the province. According to his own account, the Āghā Khān then sat back in expectation of royal favour.[1]

This was the beginning of the Āghā Khān's change in attitude towards the Qājār Government and his intention to stand independently and revolt against them. There are several reasons for this change in attitude. First of all, when the Āghā Khān set out to subdue Kirmān, he did so without advance payment from the Treasury, as was customary at that time, but it was on the strength of a promise made to him by the Grand Vazir (Ṣadr-i a'ẓam) Ḥājjī Mīrzā Āghāsī, that at some late stage, he might recoup himself from the revenues of that province.[2] However, the Grand Vazir, offended because one of his protéges, of low birth, who had asked to marry one of the Āghā Khān's daughters, and had been refused, went back on his promise, demanding a refund of all of the revenue from the province. This built up a feeling of emnity between the two men.[3]

---

1. 'Ibrat-i Afzā, pp.17-19.
2. Kumasia, N; The Aga Khan and his Ancestors, (Bombay, 1939), pp.23-24.
3. Picklay, A.S; History of the Ismailis, (Bombay, 1940), p.70.

So when the news reached him that he was going to be removed from the Governorship at Kirmān and replaced by Fīrūz Mīrzā, a brother of Muḥammad Shāh,[1] he fortified the citadel at Bam (1839) and summoned his two brothers, Sardār Abū al- Ḥasan Khān and Muḥammad Bāqir Khān, to join him there. They abandoned their campaigns against the Baluchis and hastened to meet him. The siege that began, lasted fourteen months, during which the troops of the Āghā Khān were progressively depleted and his brother Muḥammad Bāqir Khān was taken prisoner.

The Āghā Khān presents all of his encounters with the government forces as characterized with the utmost restraint, having as his only object, self-defence against relentless opponents.[2] On the other hand, Qājār chroniclers such as Riḍā Qulī Khān Hidāyat designate his actions simply as acts of revolt with little treatment as to his motives.[3] The reason for this viewpoint may have been prompted by the fact of the Āghā Khān's initial refusal to accept money from the Treasury to cover the expenses of the subjugation of Kirmān, thus showing to them his desire for independent action. Also, the account of the Āghā Khān is sparing in detail when it describes the hostilities between the Āghā Khān and the Government, although some grievances are mentioned[4]. Yet to the Qājār historian Aḥmad ʿAlī Khān Vazīrī, there could have been no other reason for the Āghā Khān to shut himself up in the citadel at Bam after his dismissal from the Governorship, other than to plot his revolt.[5]

When any further resistance at Bam became impossible, the Āghā Khān sent an appeal to Farīdūn Mīrzā, (Farmān Farmā II), Governor of Fārs and a younger brother of Muḥammad Shāh, to intervene on his behalf and to arrange a safe passage for him to the capital in order that he could plead his case

---

1. Aḥmad ʿAlī Khān Vazīr; Tārīkh-i Kirmān, (Tehran, 1920), pp.384-6.
2. Algar, "Revolt", p.64.
3. Riḍā Qulī Khān Hidāyat; Rauḍat al-Ṣafā-yi Nāṣirī, (Tehran, 1920), vol.X, pp.52-5.
4. ʿIbrat -i Afzā, pp.22-34.
5. Tārīkh -i Kirmān, p.385.

directly to the Shāh. The Governor of Fārs then sent Muḥammad Ṣādiq Khān, his consul, as a mediator to Bam, who with the agreement of the besieging forces, entered the citadel, swearing that no harm would come to the Āghā Khān on his departure from the citadel.

However, he was seized on leaving the citadel and all of his possessions plundered.[1] Ensuing ~~that was~~ eight months of captivity in Kirmān, although the rigour of this confinement was eased in order for him to receive tribute from Badakhshān, a large Ismā'īlī centre, and also from India, thus making up for the losses he suffered at Bam.

During this time the Qājār ruler Muḥamad Shāh had been involved in a campaign against Herāt, which had to be given up due to British pressure there. On his return, the Āghā Khān was permitted to proceed to Tehran. He was then received by the ruler and pardoned on the condition that he would return to Maḥallāt.[2] This was much to the chagrin of Ḥājjī Mīrzā Āghāsī, who had been behind all the intrigue against the Āghā Khān during the absence of Muḥammad Shāh.[3]

This was the end of the first stage of the Āghā Khān's uprising. He remained in Maḥallāt for about two years until 1841. Even though previous Imāms had lived in the vicinity of Maḥallāt, in Anjūdān and Kahāk, none had actually resided in Maḥallāt itself. So these two years were spent establishing a fitting residence for the Imām.[4] However, it was soon clear that he did not intend to stay in Maḥallāt permanently and rumours arose that he was amassing men and equipment in order to renew his revolt. These preparations were denied by the Āghā Khān, who claimed that they were just malicious rumours on the part of such people as did not like him.

---

1. 'Ibrat-i Afzā, pp 23-4.
2. Algār, "Revolt", p.66. Note 2.
3. Dumasia; Aga Khan, pp. 25-7.
4. Houtum-Schindler, A; Eastern Persian Irak (London, 1896,), p.92. (The building erected by the Āghā Khān was later used as a residence by Qājār Governors.)

However, those rumours were probably well founded, as he was known to have collected five hundred head of horse and to have hired, for a generous reward, a large number of mercenaries.[1]

In 1840, Muḥammad Shāh came to Dalījān, sixteen miles from Maḥallāt, ostensibly for recreation but in reality to check up on the situation and to investigate the rumours. The Āghā Khān offered the excuse for his absence that he was on a hunting expedition, but more probably, it was to give him the time to conceal his forces. Then he sent a message to the Shāh, with a request to leave Iran and to proceed towards Mecca with a band of followers. As soon as this was granted he set off from Maḥallāt in 1841.

Again his intentions of revolt are stressed.[2] In his own account he is somewhat reticent in setting forth the cirumstances of his departure. It is suggested that the Government wished to destroy his party on its way to the Hijāz.[3] However, the profit that the government would have gained by attacking a group of pilgrims who were about to leave the country, is not indicated. It is clear that he was accompanied by a military force of greater magnitude than that of a mere escort. The rigour displayed by the Āghā Khān seemed more in keeping with rebellious rather than defensive intentions.[4]

Also, it appears that the Āghā Khān was equipped with forged letters of appointment to the Governorship of Kirmān, and other documents likely to be of use along the way. On passing near to Yazd, a letter was sent to the Governor, Bahman Mīrzā, Bahā' al-Dawla, explaining the Āghā Khān's intention of going to Arabia, but that he had then received order to go to Kirmān and resume his Governorship there. Bahman Mīrzā accepted the documents as genuine,

---

1. Muḥammad Ḥasan Khān I'timād al-Salṭana, Tārīkh-i Muntaẓam-i Nāṣirī, (Tehran, ? 1807), Vol.III, p.173.
2. Tārīkh-i Kirmān, p.388.
3. 'Ibrat-i Afzā, p.27.
4. Algar, "Revolt", p.65.

offering the Āghā Khān lodging in his city. This was refused on the pretext of his being occupied attending to a group of pilgrims.

It is to be noted that none of these events are mentioned in the 'Ibrat-i Afzā, where it is asserted that the Governors along the routes had orders to deny him provisions.[1]

By the following day Bahman Mīrzā was aware of the false nature of the documents, so he followed the Āghā Khān. A battle ensued which, despite the inferiority of his troops, the Āghā Khān won. Several other minor encounters were also won by him, but it was decided that in order to have a firm base in Kirmān, he had to sieze Shahr-i Bābak in Fārs. This city contained a large number of Ismā'īlīs, thus augmenting his forces. Also the non-Ismā'īlī population, with memories of the generosity of Abū al- Ḥasan Shāh, the grandfather of the Āghā Khān, were favourably inclined towards him and his cause.

The citadel at Shahr-i Bābak was in the hands of Kuhandil Khān, the brother of Dūst Muḥammed, ruler of Afghanistan, and other Khāns from Qandahar, who had taken refuge in Iran, after the British invasion of Afghanistan, and had brought the city under their control. But they were extremely unpopular and the Āghā Khān's arrival coincided with an attempt by the former governor, Ḥājjī Muḥammad 'Alī, to dislodge them. So the Āghā Khān joined in, until a few days later these Khāns made a profession of their friendship to the Ismā'īlīs.[2]

From Shahr-i Bābak, the Āghā Khān sent his brother, Muḥammad Bāqir Khān to secure provisions from Sīrjān, in the region of Kirmān, whilst he moved to the village of Rūmnī, near Shahr-i Bābak. A few days later he received the message that his brother had been encircled in the fortress of Zaydābād at Sīrjān by a large force under the command of the Governor(neqterbeq) of Kirman,

1. 'Ibrat-i Afzā, p.27.
2. Ibrat-i Afzā, p.31.

Faḍl ʿAlī Khān. So the Āgha Khān set out immediately to rescue his brother and succeeded in freeing him and the majority of his followers. All of this had taken almost a year to accomplish.

The Ismāʿīlīs then moved towards Fārs, stopping at Rūdbār to gather fresh troops from the surrounding area, and to accumulate supplies. It was at this point that the Āghā Khān's armoury was particularly strengthened by the arrival of two cannons, probably of British provenance. The finances of the Āghā Khān were being continually replenished, for, despite the fact that he was a fugitive and hunted by government troops, pilgrims were still seeking him out to offer tribute to him. However these pilgrims soon depleted the provisions, forcing the Āghā Khān to keep on the move.[1]

In 1842, he set out once more towards Kirmān, sending his brother Sardār Abū al-Ḥasan Khān towards Dashtāb and then joining him at the outskirts of the town. Isfandiyār Khān, a brother of Faḍl ʿAlī Khān, advanced against the Ismāʿīlīs, and during the battle heavy casualties were inflicted upon his army by the cannons and soon the government troops were routed and Isfandiyār killed. A number of Isfandiyār's soldiers changed to the side of the Ismāʿīlīs, but reinforcements from Fārs were on their way. In order to prevent these reinforcements from joining up with the remnants of the defeated forces, the Āghā Khān moved to the citadel at Bazanjān, leaving Muḥammad Bāqir Khān at Dashtāb.

According to the Āghā Khān, the commander of the citadel at Bazanjān, ʿAbd Allāh Khān, plotted with the commander of the reinforcement troops to lure him into a trap.[2] He suggested that the Āghā Khān should move to Mashīz to await the elaboration of a settlement fitting for him and then that the Āghā Khān would be reinstated as Governor of Kirmān.

---

1. ʿIbrat-i Afzā, pp 32-5.
2. ʿIbrat-i Afzā, pp 36-43.

On the other hand, Riḍā Qulī Khān stated that the Āghā Khān's move to Mashīz was part of an aggressive advance on Kirmān,[1] also stating that letters were found to have been sent to the prominent men of the city, inviting them to overthrow Faḍl 'Alī Khān and to prepare to receive the Āghā Khān as Governor.

In any event, Faḍl 'Alī Khān mounted a campaign to drive the Ismā'īlīs out of Kirmān for ever. The Āghā Khān fled to Bam, then to Narmāshīr, where a battle took place in which the Āghā Khān was totally outnumbered. At that time he was deserted by many of the mercenaries, he had recruited and many others also fled. His brother Sardār Abū al-Ḥasan Khān became separated from him during the skirmishes but rejoined him later on. Although the Āgha Khān escaped from Faḍl 'Alī Khān, his defeat was final. Thus he made plans to embark for India. However, the routes to the coast were blocked, so he had to escape overland. With only a third of his force remaining, he crossed the Dasht-i Lūt to Qā'in, then moved eastward towards Afghanistan, which was under British dominion, and finally he crossed over the border at Lāsh.[2]

This was the end of the Iranian period of the Nizārī Ismā'īlī Imāmate.

It is interesting however to note some of the reasons for this revolt. The Qājār period had seen rebellions of princes and governors against the central Government at one time or another but perhaps this one had its own importance, not only in the political scenery of Qājār Iran in the 19th Century, but more so in the context of creating a significant basis for the Ismā'īlī community, which centred around the person of their Imām, within the British Empire and through them the rest of Europe. However, it is not mentioned with any real emphasis in Iranian history books, if it is mentioned at all.

---

1. Rauḍat al-Ṣafā-yi Nāṣirī, vol. X, p.260.
2. 'Ibrat-i Afzā, pp.48-54.

Those who followed the Āghā Khān did so out of a religious allegiance or, for non- Ismā'īlīs in Kirmān, due to the unpopularity of the Qājār rule in the area. Faḍl 'Alī Khān greatly feared a positive response by the people of Kirmān towards the Āghā Khān.[1] Apart from those living in the cities, sporadic Baluchi aid was given, possibly due to the traditional hostility of nomads towards a central power.

The revolt was not the fruit of a renewed da'wa, nor was it an attempt at winning power for the Imāmate, despite the fact that social discontent and messianic longing did exist in Qājār Iran, whence the rise of the Bābīs at this same time, also in southern Iran. However, there is no evidence that the Āghā Khān attempted to use that potential through a renewal of Ismā'īlī propaganda.[2] Nonetheless, religious motives can be detected and Watson says that the Imām's claims were totally spiritual and not temporal.[3]

In the post-Alamūt period the Ismā'īlīs had adopted the external appearance of the Ṣūfīs, as mentioned earlier. An almost simultaneous development occurred in the Ithnā'asharī sect, producing the mystic Shāh Ni'mat Allāh Valī (d.1431).[4] It was to this Ithnā 'asharī-orientated Ṣūfī order to which the Ismā'īlī Imāms became affiliated. The relevance of this to the Āghā Khān's revolt is that Muḥammad Shāh had very firm Ṣūfī loyalties and cultivated the company of certain dervishes. Prominent among these were Ḥājjī Mīrzā Aghāsī and another person called Ḥājjī Zain al-'Ābidīn, both members of the Ni'mat Allāh order. When the time came for the people to choose between these two as to which of them would be the leader of the Ni'mat Allāh order, the Āghā Khān supported Ḥājjī Zain al-'Ābidīn, a long-standing friend of his.

---

1. Rauḍat al-Safā-yi Nāṣirī, vol.X, p.260.
2. Watson, R; History of Persia from the beginning of the nineteeth century to the year 1850, (London, 1866,) p.332.
3. See Henri Corbin; Sayyed Haydar Āmolī (XIV Siècle): Theologie Shī'ite du Soufisme, Mélanges d'orientalisme offerts à Henri Massé, (Tehran, 1963) p.75
4. Algar, Religion and State in Iran, pp.37-8.

The successful Ḥājjī Mīza Aghāsī was incensed by this action, and as he already had cause to dislike the Āghā Khān, this just added fuel to the fire. According to 'Ibrat-i Afzā, it was he who tried to prevent the Āghā Khān's peaceful exit from Iran.[1]

These court rivalries contributed to the revolt, but are not sufficient to explain the Āghā Khān's attempt to establish an autonomous rulership in South Eastern Iran. Thus it is necessary to examine some other evidence, that relating to British interest in Eastern and South Eastern Iran in the mid nineteenth century.

1. 'Ibrat-i Afzā, pp.16 and 26.

CHAPTER THREE.

THE ĀGHĀ KHĀN'S RELATIONS WITH THE BRITISH.

Events in South Eastern Iran, Afghanistan, Baluchistan and Sind were all interrelated with British strategical thinking throughout the Qājār period. British concern was primarily for the security of imperial rule in India, yet it came to express itself increasingly in expansionist ventures against the lands to the North West, where largely hypothetical threats were constantly thought to be on the point of realisation.

Iran was believed to be a threat to imperial interests, not only friendly to Russia, but allying herself with other enemies of the British such as Dōst Muḥammad Khān of Kābul and his brothers in Qandahār headed by Kuhandil Khān.[1] The aim of the British was to prevent Russian interference in their internal problems and its penetration into the areas at the border of India, thus being able to threaten the very existence of the British Empire. Thus the Iranian campaign to assert sovereignty over Herāt was adduced as one pressing reason for the British to launch an attack on Afghanistan in 1838. One of the military aims of their invasion was to raise the siege of Herāt, if diplomatic pressure would fail to force the Iranian army to withdraw.[2] Secondly, to replace the dethroned ruler Shāh Shujā' in Kābul instead of Dōst Muḥammad.[3]

It may, therefore, have been no coincidence that the first stage of the Āghā Khān's revolt came at a time when Iranian troops were advancing on Herāt in despite of British diplomatic negotiations. This diversion of Iranian attention must have been very welcomed by the British.

---

1. Dispatch of Ellis from Tehran, (24th December 1835),in Correspondence relating to Persia and Afghanistan,(London,1839), p.5.
2. Havelock,H; Narrative of the war in Afghanistan,(London,1840), p.30.
3. Algar, "Revolt ", p.75.

His revolt also supplied the British minister in Tehran, Sir John McNeill, with an additional argument for dissuading the Iranian Government from an attack on Herāt: " Some of the provinces of the Kingdom, for instance Kerman, Mazanderan etc., require to be brought into proper order."[1] In a despatch to Lord Palmerston, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, McNeill mentioned the Āghā Khān's enterprise with obvious approval as a counterpoise to Muḥammad Shāh's movement eastwards: " In the meantime the Āghā Khān continues to hold out in the fortress at Bam near Kerman and has made some successful services against the beseiging forces."[2]

It seems likely that the Āghā Khān's revolt, though in part determined by his involvement in court rivalries, was also designated to serve British interests in checking Iranian assertion of authority over Herāt, a stepping stone to Kābul, then Qandahār, then India, thus giving Russia an advanced post from which to intrigue amongst the border states of British India.[3] Thus it is probable that direct aid was given to the Āghā Khān, particularly during the second stage of his revolt, hence the cannons which he received.

With the Āghā Khān's arrival in Afghanistan, it is no longer necessary to speculate the extent of his association with the British. His services to them are openly recorded in his autobiography and after crossing the Afghan border he made straight for Qandahār which was under British occupation. From Girishk he sent notice of his impending arrival to Muḥammad Taymūr, the British-appointed governor of Qandahār and also to Major Rawlinson.[4] His entry to Qandahār took place in December 1842. From then on, " he made the enemies of the British his own and the British cause his own cause."[5]

---

1. letter to Ḥājjī Mīrzā Āghāsī, (May 1837), in Correspondence relating to Persia and Afghanistan, pp.36-7.
2. Dispatch (28th September 1837), Correspondence relating to Persia and Afghanistan, pp.36-7.
3. Kelly, J.B; Britain and the Persian Gulf, 1795-1880, (Oxford, 1968), p.292.
4. 'Ibrat-i Afzā , pp.54-55.
5. Smasiar, Aga Khan p.27.

he made himself available to the British. With his help the British camp was saved and Haydarābād fell to Major Outram of the British army.

The conquest of Sind was followed during the next 30 years by the subjugation of certain parts of Baluchistan. Here again the Āghā Khān exerted himself on behalf of the British, both diplomatically and militarily. During his stay in Sind the Āghā Khān is said to have received £2,000 annually from Sir Charles Napier, the political agent in India who further rewarded him with the title of "Highness".[1]

He sent envoys, on behalf of the British, to Baluchi Chieftains in 1843, advising them to submit, but these were ignored. So he sent his brother Muḥammad Bāqir Khān, together with a number of his followers, to assist Major Outram to defeat and capture Mīr Shīr Khān, a Baluchi chieftain. During this time the Āghā Khān busied himself with receiving tribute from Ismā'īlī pilgrims who were still on the trail of their wandering Imām. However, this was interrupted by a surprise attack by Baluchi raiders who plundered the treasury and forced the Āghā Khān to flee to the nearest British camp.[2]

The British were not too keen to interfere by pressing the Baluchi raiders for the return of the treasury. They informed the Āghā Khān that he should have taken greater care to protect it.[3] Despite this and other minor causes of distrust between himself and the British, his forces continued to be available to the British.

Whilst his brothers were concerning themselves with affairs in Baluchistan, though they were struck with one defeat after another, the Āghā Khān proceeded via Kuch, Kathiawer, Junagarh, Surat and Damar, to Bombay, visiting Ismā'īlī communities en route. Bombay was to become the new seat

---

1. Dmasia, Aga Khan, p.80, 82.
2. Napier, Conquest of Scinde, p.224.
3. 'Ibrat-i Afzā, p.63.

Major Rawlinson granted the Āghā Khān a daily allowance of one hundred rupees for the length of his stay in Qandahār and he suggested that the Āghā Khān should make contact with Sir William Macnaghten in Kābul concerning his further movements. In the Āghā Khān's letter to Sir William Macnaghten he suggested that he should conquer and govern Herāt on behalf of the British, and their puppet Shāh Shujā'. This proposal was accepted but never carried out due to the uprising of Muḥammad Akbar Khān and the annihilation of the British garrison in Kābul. The same was the fate of the garrison in Qandahār. In the fighting which took place, the Āghā Khān put his force at the disposal of the British[1]. Thus at the time of the British evacuation from Qandahār, he had no alternative but to move with them into Sind. During their time in Afghanistan he had been of great service to them and was highly thought of for his invaluable assistance and advice.[2]

It had been part of the "forward policy" of the British Government in India to annex Sind. So pressure was being applied to Naṣīr Khān, the Khān of Kalat, to permit the annexation of Karachi to British India.[3] The Āghā Khān wrote to him to advise him to surrender Karachi and to inform him that he could expect to receive more from the British Government than from the annual revenue of Karachi.[4]

This advice went unheeded by the Khān of Kalat, who prepared to fight against the British outside Haydarābād. The Āghā Khān, feeling it his "Muslim duty",[5] offered his assistance to the Khān but when this was refused

---

1. 'Ibrat-i Afzā, p.56.
2. Kaye, J; History of war in Aghanistan, (London, 1851), Vol.III, p.133.
3. Napier, W; The conquest of Scinde, (London, 1857), pp. 42, 44 & 71.
4. 'Ibrat-i Afzā, p.59.
5. 'Ibrat-i Afzā, p.60.

of the Ismā'īlī Imāmate.

It was not long after his arrival there in December 1845, that the Iranian Government demanded his extradition from India. This was done with reference to article ten of the Anglo-Iranian Treaty of 1814 called the "Definitive Treaty".[1] This provided for the delivery of fugitives between the territories of contracting parties. More specifically, protest was made against the Āghā Khān's subversive correspondence with the Chieftains of Iranian Baluchistan and against the expedition of his brothers to Bampūr which had been mounted from British controlled territory. In reply to this extradition order, Muḥammad Shāh was asked by the British to forego his application of the relevant article of the Treaty " in the spirit of friendship," in view of the services of the Āghā Khān to the British crown. It was promised that instead of his place of residence being in Bombay, which was too close to South Eastern Iran for Iranian comfort, it would be transferred to Calcutta.[2]

The British found themselves in a dilemma. On the one hand they could not desert the Āghā Khān after all his services to them, but they also had to be careful to preserve their amicable relations with the Shāh and they could not allow anyone to jeopardise that position. His departure to Calcutta was delayed while efforts were made to secure his return to Iran, not as a fugitive who had been extradited, but reinstated in favour and influence to his previous status. In 1847 the British Minister in Tehran, Sheil, made an appeal to this effect, on behalf of the Governor General in India. Ḥājjī Mīrzā Āghāsī, the Grandvazir, consented to the Āghā Khān's return but stipulated that he should return by way of Bushire and not set foot in Kirmān or Baluchistan.

---

1. "Definitive Treaty", article X, Indian Papers-Treaties(8 March,1839), p.6.
2. Fereydūn Ādamīyat, Amīr Kabīr va Īrān,(Tehran,1955), p.269.

According to Hamid Algar, it was evident that the Āghā Khān was still hoping to seize control of South Eastern Iran,[1] for he found this condition unacceptable and temporarily abandoned his attempts to return.[2] In April 1847 after repeated to and froing between the British and Iranian representatives, the Āghā Khān was obliged to leave Bombay for Calcutta despite his ill-health.

His forced stay in Calcutta lasted for about eighteen months. Throughout this period he still anxiously awaited an end to his exile and a return to Iran. These hopes were increased by the death of Muḥammad Shāh in 1848. Praying that under the new ruler Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh (1848-1996) his past history might be overlooked, he set out for Bombay at the end of 1848. From there renewed efforts were made on his behalf to secure his return.[3] There were still many obstacles for him as the new Grandvazir, Amīr Kabīr, proved to be even less accommodating than his predecessor and replied to British overtures that the Āghā Khān could return to Iran only if he was to be handed over to the authorities at the border as a fugitive.[4]

The Āghā Khān did not despair and tried to cultivate the friendship of Mīrzā Ḥusayn Khān, the new Iranian consul in Bombay, by introducing him to the pleasures of the racetrack.[5]

Amīr Kabīr fell from power in 1852 and the Āghā Khān now made his final attempt to return, being personally acquainted with Mīrzā Āghā Khān Nūrī the new Grandvazir, expecting from him a more ready response than from his predeccessor.

---

1. Algar, "Revolt ", p.80.
2. Amīr Kabīr va Irān, pp.269-70.
3. 'Ibrat-i Afzā, p.77.
4. Amīr Kabīr va Irān, pp.270-71.
5. 'Ibrat-i Afzā, p.78.

For this reason the Āghā Khān is said to have sent Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh the gift of an elephant,[1] being desperate to improve his relationship with the Qājār ruler.

Some of his family lands were then restored to the control of the Āghā Khān's agents and it appears as though Mīrzā Āghā Khān Nūrī might have arranged for the Āghā Khān's return on the manner that the Āghā Khān was hoping for.[2] However, his stay in power was of short duration and after that, the Āghā Khān did not approach any subsequent ministers with his request. He probably realised that his life would only be truly safe under British protection.

By 1867, the Āghā Khān had clearly decided to remain permanently in India in the proximity of the large Ismā'īlī community and under the protective shadow of Imperial patronage.

1. 'Ibrat-i Afzā, p.81.
2. 'Ibrat-i Afzā, p.81.

NIZARI ISMA'ILIS IN INDIA PRIOR TO THE 19TH CENTURY.

There were four distinct periods to the Ismā'īlī movement in India prior to the 19th century, the first being that of the establishment of Ismā'īlī political hegemony in Multān and Sind during the ninth and tenth centuries. During these centuries Arab rule was weakening and being replaced by local dynasties of various origin. This change in circumstance coincided with the Ismā'īlī rise to power. This period is sketchily documented and is sometimes referred to as, "the dark period in the history of Sind."[1]

However, on the evidence of Qāḍī Nu'mān, the Chief Qāḍī of the Fāṭimid Caliph al-Mu'izz,* (952-975) the first dā'ī (missionary) was sent to Sind from Egypt in 883.[2] Also, Rashīd al-Dīn's account of Fāṭimid missionaries, mentions that by the time of Caliph al-Mu'izz quite a large following of Ismā'īlīs were to be found in Multān, Gujarāt amd Punjāb, and that the Ismā'īlī da'wa was already widespread.[3] Al- Muqaddasī the geographer, during his visit to Multān in 985, wrote, "the people of Multān are Shī'a, in Multān the Khuṭba is read in the name of the Fāṭimid Caliph of Egypt and the place is administered by his orders. Gifts are regularly sent from here to Egypt." [4]

In the time of al-Mu'izz, Multān was a vassal state to the Fāṭimids, thus becoming an Ismā'īlī stronghold.[5] It is to be noted that this area held a congenial atmosphere for the spread of Ismā'īlī da'wa.

---

* See List of Imāms.

1. Khān, A, Z; "Isma'ilism in Multan and Sind", Journal of Historical Society, (Pakistan, 1973,), vol.23, p.36 note 2.
2. Lewis, B; "Ismā'īlī Notes " B.S.O.A.S (1948,) vol.XII p.600.
3. Levy, R; Excerpts from Rashīd al Dīn; "Ismā'īlī doctrines in the Jāmi' al- Tawārīkh, "J.R.A.S." (1930) pp. 516,518,522.
4. see Ahsan al- Taqāsīm fī ma'rifat al-Aqālīm (Leiden ed.,) p.481.
5. Stern, S, M; "Ismā'īlī propaganda and the Fāṭimid rule in Sind," (Volume xxiii) I. . (1949) pp.298-307.

First of all it was on the periphery of the 'Abbāsid Caliphate, thus forming a fugitive place for rebels. More important was the fact that the majority of the inhabitants were Buddhists, Brahmins believing in ḥulūl and tanāsukh, (incarnation and transmigration,), both of these being cardinal principles of the Ismā 'īlī doctrine.[1] Also, early Muslim rule prevented the conversions of these Buddhists and Brahmins due to a fear of losing the revenue obtained from them. So the non-Muslims at the time of the arrival of these missionaries were suffering from a feeling of social injustice and thus were ready to listen to new teachings and missionaries offering them a better life. The Ismā'īlī movement symbolised for them equality and justice.[2] The Shī'ites aimed all their measures at distinguishing their new and just rule from that of the unjust Umayyad rulers.

The Ismā'īlī rule in Multān lasted for about half a century. Then came the second phase of their movement, that of internal dissension and loss of their political power.

The eleventh century brought a violent reaction by the orthodox Muslims to their movement. In 1026 Sulṭān Maḥmūd of Ghazna (998-1030), a staunch Sunnī Muslim, annexed the town of Multān, took prisoner and uprooted the family of Abū al-Fatḥ Dā' ūd, the local ruler, installing in his place a Sunnī leader, and massacred many Ismā'īlīs. The persecution of the Ismā'īlīs by Sulṭān Maḥmūd is attested to by the theologian al-Baghdādī (d.1037), who says that the Ismā'īlīs of Multān were massacred in thousands by Sulṭān Maḥmūd.[4]

The community's failure against Sulṭān Maḥmūd is partly explained by its internal strife and dissension at the time of the Ghaznavid invasion. The Fāṭimid Caliph, al-Ḥākim* (996-1020) had claimed that he was God incarnate, as are all Ismā'īlī Imāms, but that he was the "Final incarnation".[5] This claim

---

* See List of Imāms.

1. Khan; "Isma'ilism in Multan", p.37.
2. Hollister; Shī'a of India, p.209.
3. Nāzim, Muhammad; The Life and Times of Sultān Maḥmūd of Ghazna (Cambridge, 19 pp 96-99.
4. Lewis; "Ismā'īlī notes"

engendered serious controversy among the Ismā'īlīs. Al-Ḥākim's death in 1020 caused further confusion and people were in two minds as to whether they should believe in his claim or whether to follow his son al-Ẓāhir* (1020-1036). This controversial problem was extremely acute, especially during the years 1024-25.

The Ghaznavid invasion shattered the community completely. They brought with them much wealth and replaced the ruling members with Sunnī leaders, whom they left to run the areas on their own. Some weaker members of the Ismā'īlī community were attracted to the more affluent and secure Sunnīs and converted to the orthodox Sunnī way of life.

However, the Khuṭba continued to be read in al-Ḥākim's name in private. A few people began to believe that in fact al-Ḥākim was not the "Final incarnation," and that his son al-Ẓāhir was the next Caliph and Imām. These people were led by 'Abd Allāh, the grandson of the previous ruler of Multān, Abū al-Fatḥ Dā'ūd. They were considered by other Ismā'īlīs as rebels and people of contradiction.

Al-Ẓāhir seems to have embarked on a rigorous campaign to win new converts. Thus the Ismā'īlī Imāms in Cairo succeeded in re-establishing their control over Ismā'īlīs in India. Those who still believed in al-Ḥākim's claim became known as the Druses and they were eventually compelled to retreat to the safer areas of the mountains in Lebanon,[1] where the sect still survives today. However, they did continue to seek support for their beliefs and to try to rally Ismā'īlīs of distant regions to their beliefs.

Under the Fāṭimid Caliph al-Mustanṣir* (1036-1094) the Ismā'īlīs were once again more successful. Around 1050 there was a weakening in the Ghaznavid dynasty and Sind became independent under the Sūmra family, of local Hindu origin.[2]

---

* See List of Imāms.

1. Ivanow, W; A guide to Ismaili literature, (London, 1933), p 45.
2. Hamdani, A; The beginnings of Isma'ili Da'wa in Northern India, (Cairo, 1956) p.8.

However, these rulers had converted to Islam from the time of the Arab conquest.[1] They had intermarried with Arab settlers and yet despite being Muslim had retained some of their Hindu customs.

The Sunnīs had acquired great influence and power due to their intermarriage with local Arab landowners. Sūmra family tradition had always regarded itself as pro-'Alī, and thus they were obviously more inclined towards the adoption of the Ismā'īlī da'wa.

The Caliph al-Mustanṣir, in order to continue the campaign of his father, al-Ẓāhir, sent a da'ī to India; in fact he was a pīr, the "door" (bāb) to the Imām. He was Nūr al-Dīn, more commonly known as pīr Satgur Nūr (TrueTeacher Light). He is said to have arrived in 1093, although there are discrepancies about his dates.[2] He initiated a new system of belief known as Sat-panth or Sirāṭ al mustaqīm which was a synthesis between Islam and Hinduism.[3] He moved the Headquarters of the Ismā'īlīs from Sind to Gujarāt. Also, he combined the Ismā'īlī beliefs with the Vedantic notions. For the majority of people were still Hindu in their beliefs, and in order to show to the indigenous population that the Ismā'īlī beliefs were akin to the Hindu beliefs, he had to adopt some Hindu customs and alter some Ismā'īlī practices to suit them. He concentrated on converting the low-caste Hindus, especially those who were socially backward and who were obviously looking for some kind of guide. He mixed with them and associated himself with them. According to Ismā'īlī tradition, he performed miracles for them and impressed them by his knowledge and his great wisdom.

This was the third phase of the Ismā'īlī movement, in which once again the community began to flourish.

However, once again they were doomed to dissension and on the death of Caliph al-Mustanṣir another split occured with the Ismā'īlīs which again caused

---

1. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's travels, (Cairo, 1869), Vol.III, pp.4-6.
2. Selections from The Great Ismā'īlī heroes, compiled by Shia Imamee Ismaila Association for United Kingdom, (London).
3. Ivanow W; "Satpanth", in Collectanea, (Holland, 1948), Vol.I, p.1.

and internal conflict. This was due to the difficult decision at the time of the Caliph's death as to who should succeed him. His eldest son Nizār* was chosen initially. However, later his father revoked his choice in preference for his other son Musta'lī. Some Ismā'īlīs followed Nizār claiming that the choice of an Imām can never be revoked. Nizār's son al- Hādī (d.1135*) was said to have been smuggled out of Egypt, during the conflict, and then taken to Iran, which there became the home of the Nizārī branch of the Ismā'īlīs. For the next few years missionaries from both sects worked hard, but eventually despite this effort the Musta'lī da'wa died out in Multān. Those following Musta'lī came to form the later Bohra community of Ismā'īlīs.

In Sind where the Sūmra Ismā'īlīs were ruling, they did not adher to either of these rivalling da'was but formed their own sort of independent da'wa based on Fāṭimid tradition.[1]

In 1175 another invasion took place in India, almost as disastrous for the Ismā'īlīs as that of the Ghaznavid invasion. This was the Ghūrid invasion. The ruler at that time was a staunch Sunnī, Muḥammad of Ghūr[2] who sent his Turkish slave troops into India. He appointed Sunnī Governors in all the areas he conquered. In Multān and Sind another eclipse was caused to Ismā'īlī da'wa. Due to their own internal conflicts there, no military cooperation was possible amongst them; thus they were not able to withstand the Ghūrid invasion.

In 1162 Ḥasan 'alā dhikrihi al-Salām*, the twenty-third Imām, had given a new lease of life to the Nizārī Ismā'īlīs by declaring the qiyāmat,[3] (resurrection), in which he claimed that there was no need for the religious restrictions of the sharī'a (Islamic law,) and that the Imām was the main source of authority and law. This was supposed to give the Ismā'īlīs their own identity. However, it had not penetrated sufficiently into India at the

---

* See List of Imāms.

1. Haidāni, The Beginnings of, p.16.
2. Ikram, S.M. Muslim Civilization in India, (New York, 1964), p.6.
3. Hodgson, [illegible] in Cambridge History of Iran, (1968), p.[illegible].

time of the Ghūrid invasion for it to form a binding effect on the Ismā'īlīs there.

The Ismā'īlīs never fully recovered from the setback of the invasion, for in 1256 the Mongols invaded Iran sacking Nizārī strongholds and massacring their inhabitants. They were forced to go underground into a state of satr (veiling). As a result of this, the da'wa in India was considerably weakened. Ṣūfīs were undermining Ismā'īlī influence, and in Multān and Sind, some people were turning to orthodox Islam. The lack of missionaries allowed the weaker men to go astray and fall into licentious living.[1]

Due to various changes in the course of the river Indus, the once fertile area of Sind, now became a desert and the Sūmras soon lost their wealth, which had come mainly from the irrigated land. These people too were beginning to lose faith in their da'wa and were being infiltrated by the Ṣūfīs on the one hand and the Hindus on the other.

The Nizārīs in India adopted Ṣūfī practices and were extremely influenced by their ideas and their philosophy. They ceased to appear as Ismā'īlīs but became identified with either the Ṣūfī orthodox Muslim or Hindu population.

Imām Qāsim Shāh, realising this lapse in faith, sent the pīr, Shams Sabzawārī[2] (1241-1356), to India to revive the Nizārī da'wa, there. He became the official founder of pīrs in India, or the ḥujja (the supernatural witness of the Imām's identity, and the only speaker on his behalf.). The ḥujja was the post-Alamūt equivalent to pīr. He introduced a verse form called ginānṣ which had a Hinduistic style with the use of traditional rules of the Sanskrit poets.[3] The atmosphere of these ginānṣ were Hindu, using Hindu terminology and mythological references. They were

---

1. Tārīkh-i Sind, Dawūdpotah notes (Poona, 1938), p.61.
2. Hollister, Shī'a of India, p.324.
3. Manow ; Collectanea , p.41.

in the form of short or long poems in lyrical scales of folk tunes which were very popular among the masses.[1] These ginans came to be written in several different Indian languages, most of them being ascribed to various pirs. They contain moral and religious instruction, legendary histories of the pirs and the description of their miracles.

Pir Shams Sabzawari introduced these ginans to propagate Isma'ili tenets. He did manage to stabilise many of the weaker members and to convert a few Hindus, particularly in the Punjab, but his efforts were isolated and rather weak. His work was mainly in Multan and his shrine is to be located there.[2]

However, it was during the time of the pir Sadr al-Din that many were converted. Pir Sadr al-Din is one of the most renowned pirs, and he is said to have taken his training under pir Shams Sabzawari. There is some discrepancy as to his date of birth and death. Ivanow puts it at 1380,[3] whereas Isma'ili tradition puts it at 1369.

His importance was based on his reorganisation of the existing community. He converted many Hindus, particularly those of the Lohana caste, who were extremely oppressed by the high caste people, and so were looking for some way out. Pir Sadr al-Din realising this, wrote a famous book called the Dasa Awtar (the ten incarnations) in which the prophets and imams of Isma'ili theology are identified with Hindu Gods, thus helping these Hindu converts to conform to the Isma'ili doctrine and philosophy and to enable them to associate themselves with the Isma'ilis.

Pir Sadr al-Din tried to establish a community not only led by religious ties but by social ones too. He instituted the use of jama'at-Khanas (assembly and prayer halls,)[4] where the community could

1. "Short History of Ismaili Pirs"; selections from, The Great Ismaili Heroes, compiled by Shia Imamee Ismailia Association for the United Kingdom(London,):
2. Encyclopaedia of Islam (New Edition) under Khodia(forthcoming).
3. Ivanow,W; "The sect of Imam Shah in Gujrat," J.B.B.R.A.S. VII (1936)pp. 39-
4. Mujtaba'Ali; The Origins of the Khojas and their life today,(Bonn,1939), p.

gather to pray as well as to meet one another. It was during his time that the word Khōja, taken from the Persian Khwāja (master,) was used for the first time in reference to the Nizārī Ismā'īlīs and it was by this name that they were known hereafter.

However, during his lifetime, the status of the ḥujja in India was increased vis à vis the Imām. First of all, the post of the ḥujja became hereditary, thus elevating the status of the whole family of the ḥujja in question. Secondly, people soon came to regard the ḥujja with more significance and as performing more the function of the Imām than the function expected of a ḥujja . This began to undermine the control of the absent Imām.

Furthermore, many difficulties arose on the question of the right of succession. There was a great deal of competition within the family of the ḥujja, for the post brought with it much influence and a high status.

A case in point is that of Tāj al-Dīn, the brother of Kabīr al- Dīn who was the successor of Ṣadr al-Dīn. On the death of Kabīr al-Dīn, Tāj al-Dīn was appointed as the next ḥujja . However, the sons of Kabīr al-Dīn opposed this, and they, despite quarrelling among themselves, accused Tāj al-Dīn of embezzling the titles for the Imām. He is said to have either died of shock or committed suicide after this.[1]

After this, a split occured within the Khōjas. It is said that pīr Imām Shāh (1430 or 1486), the son of Kabīr al-Dīn, or Nūr al Dīn, his son , were responsible for this. The difficulty arose over the question of dassondh (10% zakāt, religious tax,) and its remittance to the Imām.[2] Some scholars say that the conflict happened in the time of Nūr al-Dīn,[3] and not in that of his father. Nūr al-Dīn is said to have repudiated the

1. Encyclopaedia of Islam, (New edition,) Khōdja (forthcoming).
2. Hollister; Shī'a of India, pp.368-9.
3. Encyclopaedia of Islam, (New edition), Imām Shāh V, p.474.

recognition of the Imām in Persia and to have claimed the Imāmate for himself, founding a separate sect called Imām Shāhīs or Satpanthīs.[1] It is to be noted that these dissenters lived in Gujarāt, having followed Imām Shāh in his move from Sind to Gujarāt, and they adopted his name for their sect.

Despite the efforts of the various ḥujjas, the Ismā'īlī da'wa continued to suffer set-backs. There was a decreasing popularity in the movement. One of the reasons was the popularity of Imām Shāh in Gujarāt. The Khōjas were restricted to Sind, more particularly the South Eastern borders, and they were often subjected to punitive proselytizing expeditions from Gujarāt, whose Sulṭān Maḥmūd Baggarha tried to teach them "true Islam" and sent a number of Orthodox scholars to Sind to instruct them in the real faith.[2] His attempts further weakened the Khōja movement. In 1594 they transferred their headquarters to Gujarāt.

Meanwhile, shaken by all the troubles involving the ḥujjas and their families, the Imāms in Iran decided not to allow the people to rely so greatly on the ḥujjas, and to make a firm guideline for the ḥujjas to adhere to. Thus a guide book was introduced, the Pandīyat-i jawānmardī ("the counsels of manliness",) attributed to the Imām Mustanṣir bi Allāh II*.

Only one pīr, mentioned in some of the Lists, was active in India after the introduction of the book, and that was pīr Dādū. He is said to have been sent to India with the mission of stopping the conversion of Khōjas to Sunnism around 1580. It was he who moved the community to Gujarāt.[3]

---

1. Ivanow; "The Sect of Imam Shah ", pp.394-3
2. Khan, "Isma'ilism in Multan ", p.56.
3. Encyclopaedia of Islam, (New Edition) Khōdja (forthcoming).

* See List of Imāms.

Hereafter, all references to the existence of the community, mentioned in the annals lack any detail. Various indirect references to the success of the community come from references made to the tribute offered to the Imāms in Iran and the pilgrimages made to the Imāms. The traditional literature of the ginans has survived up to the present day, with their mixture of Islamic, Hindu and popular Tantric elements. However, although these supply us with some kind of historical guide to the events up until the 19th century, no further research has been made on this period based on reliable sources.

THE IMAMATE IN INDIA

Now that the Āghā Khān had finally accepted the impossibility of his return to Iran, he decided to settle permanently in Bombay. With a taste for oriental splendour, he estab ished an imposing residence called "Aga Hall" on Malabar Hill, overlooking the sea. From this magnificent residence, with a separate library, staff quarters, and which was set in a parkland with a high wall surrounding it, the Āghā Khān was able to conduct the affairs of his Khōja followers. "Aga Hall" became the centre of the community's affairs.

He installed his family in equally costly houses around him.[1] The Āgā Khān had three wives, three sons and three daughters. The two sons of his first marriage died, so he married again, but his second wife died and finally he married once again. From Iran he is said to have brought 1,000 or more relatives and retainers, all of whom came into exile with him.[2] Thus the need to build a large complex for these homeless followers was foremost in his mind. It is to be noted that the Bombay of the 19th century was obviously much smaller than that of today and the homes of the Āghā Khān's family covered a great deal of some of the more densely-populated and prosperous areas of contemporary Bombay.[3] Similar complexes were established in Poona and Bangalore, and the Āghā Khān alternated between these residences.

The Imām took his religious duties very seriously, visiting the Jamā'at Khāna on holy days, leading the prayers, and presiding over the distribution and drinking of holy water mixed with the holy dust of Kerbalā. He conferred titles on his followers such as mukhi (a cleric, leader of the prayers in the Imām's absence) and Kamarias (Treasurers, and collectors of the dassondh,), thus establishing a form of religious hierarchy with the Imām

1. Frischauer, Willi, The Aga Khans, (London, 1970), p.41.
2. The Memoirs of the Aga Khan, (London, 1954) p.8.
3. Ibid.

at the top, then the mukhi and Kamaria. Also titles such as vazīr and the European title of count, and then aitmadi (counsellor). This was more in the form of a secular bureaucracy. However, during the Āghā Khān's time it was not so rigidly defined or ordered. His successors followed this practice, expanding it and securing the system.

It was a united community of small traders, with some very rich members. They organised their own birth, marriage and death ceremonies which up until this time had been conducted by the appropriate mulla and now were performed by the mukhi. They were a closely knit group, and with the money obtained from the dassondh, of which the appropriate amount per annum was £10,000, the Āghā Khān was able to increase education and religious instruction among the community. He was very keen that his followers should attain a good education in both eastern and western fields. His family travelled extensively, and his son and heir Āghā 'Alī Shāh, a highly intelligent man, was taught both oriental and western languages.

To the Khōjas in India, the establishment of the Imāmate in their country, for the first time, was the answer to their prayers. For the weaker members of the community, it was a reaffirmation of their doubts. The community began to flourish and the belief in the Imām was strengthened even more than before. The feeling of belonging to a community not only in a religious sense but also socially and economically was increased. If one needed any financial aid one would come to the community. Marriage was only permitted within the community, further strengthening the bonds. The people felt protected by the Imām and his presence and continual teaching revived the Spirit of belief which in some had lain dormant.

However, this peaceful existence was interupted by certain problems within the community. The first being that of a group of some 300 families

who had refused to pay the dassondh. This was considered to be an outrageous offence against the Khōja community, the members of which were always very insistent in pressing their contribution on the Imām in the hope of some reward in the Hereafter. These recalcitrant Khojas were excommunicated from the community. They repented and applied for readmission promising to pay, but the same thing reoccured so they were expelled for ever.[1]

Meanwhile, a British court confirmed that the Āghā Khān was entitled to dassondh and to manage the caste's affairs on his own. This was, "either as a decree or as a precedent of a certain "Declaration of Rights," pronounced by Sir Erskine Perry in the sittings of the late Supreme Court, after the third term of the year 1851." [2] The outcome of this caused a great deal of bitterness amongst those families who felt that the Āga Khān had no right to excommunicate them. In the Jamā'at Khāna of Mahim, the rival factions caused a riot in which four Khojas died. Nineteen men were tried for murder, sentenced and then hanged. These violent interludes cast shadows over the Imām's establishment.

However, the Āghā Khān turned his attention back to his community life and to his hobby, that of breeding and racing horses, which became a tradition carried on by his sons. His stables housed the world's finest Arab blood and the Stud in the Nejd produced superb animals. No expenses were spared to improve bloodstock, leading trainers and jockeys, mostly English were engaged. Bombay racecourse was one of the few public places where the Āghā Khān showed himself. Despite his contentedness, one feels that the loss of his homeland and his vast possessions in Iran must have weighed heavily on his heart.[3]

---

1. Frischauer, The Aga Khans, p.50.
2. Bombay High Court Reports, (April 1866.) "The Khoja Case", p.116.
3. Picklay, A.S; History of the Ismailis, (Bombay, 1940), p.80.

His tranquility was shortened, for some Khōjas[1] linked to the previous families claimed that the Khōja community was not of Shī'a origin but Sunnī origin and that pīr Ṣadr al-Dīn, who converted the Hindus to Ismā'īlīs, was a Sunnī and not a Shī'a. Due to this, the Āghā Khān was to have no jurisdiction over them, no rights to the dassondh, nor the right of excommunicating any member, nor any right to any property, which they claimed was for sole benefit of the Khōja sect and that no person not being a member "in particular no person professing Shia opinions in matters of religion and religious discipline " was entitled to it. High principles and large amounts were at stake, and the whole existence of the Shī'a Imāmī Ismā'īlīs was on trial.

The community was still widespread over India at that time and in certain Sunnī areas it was difficult to ascertain who was Shī'a Khōja and who was Sunnī Khōja. In order to sort out all this confusion the Imām ordered all his followers everywhere to reveal themselves as Shī'a Imāmī Ismā'īlīs and believers in him as their Imām. He was able to do this due to his protection by the British and their attitude of acceptance of different religious beliefs. This was officially the end of taqīya for the Shī'a Imāmī Ismā'īlīs. The Imām asked them all to sign their names on a document, and the overwhelming majority signed, and declared their unswerving support for the Imām. However it was this small group, mentioned above, who called themselves "The Khōja Reform Party," who refused to sign and took their case to the Bombay High Court in 1866. This case became more widely known as the "Khoja case, or Aga Khan case" [2] The Chief Justice of the case was Sir Joseph Arnold.

---

1. Bombay High Court Reports, p.114. The 5th clause of the prayer made by the plaintiffs.
2. Picklay, History, p.91.

Many side issues were brought up and many historical assumptions paraded. The main issue however was to discover the true identity of pīr Ṣadr-al-Dīn, who for the Āghā Khān was an Ismā'īlī pīr sent to India to convert Hindus, and who for the Khōja Reform Party was a Sunnī missionary.

The best advocates available were briefed on both sides. However, after a twenty-five day trial, Sir Joseph Arnold had to settle down to study all the evidence put forward and to sift out all the important facts. He finally gave judgement that the Khōja community," is a sect of people whose ancestors were Hindu in original, which was converted to, and has throughout abided in, the faith of the Shia Imamee Ismailis, which has always been and is still bound by ties of spiritual allegiance to the hereditary Imams of Ismailis."[1]

As a result of this judgement, the rights of the Āghā Khān as the spiritual head of the Shī'a Imāmī Ismā'īlī were firmly and legally established. The Khōja Reform Party did try however to appeal against this judgement, but they were unsuccessful.

After this case, the Āghā Khān, now an old man, retired to private life. It was here that, in acknowledgement of his exceptional status and loyal services rendered to the British crown,[2] that this Persian aristocrat was visited by the Duke of Edinburgh and King Edward VII, as Prince of Wales in 1875, an honour which had been accorded to no person other than ruling princes.

During these years he left most of the religious and administrative duties to his son Āghā 'Alī Shāh who, on his death in 1881, became the second Āghā Khān. The resting place of this warrior, statesman, sportsman and even more important spiritual leader, is at Mazgaon in Bombay, now called Ḥasanābād after him. His followers erected a mausoleum there out of respect, and it is visited continually by many thousands of Ismā'īlīs.

1. Bombay High Court Reports, [illegible].

So during the last years of his life he had been able to realise his vision about an independent, and amongst the Islamic community, accepted community named the Shī'a Imāmī Ismā'īlīs. Even though the Khōjas in India had had a totally different background and upbringing from those in Iran, and had been living under different conditions, both religiously and socially, the Āghā Khān, through his skill and understanding, had managed to bring these two groups together, making them merge into one another. A new era had begun for the Shī'a Imāmī Ismā'īlī Imāmate in which the two largest groups of the Nizārī Ismā'īlīs had come together. The community now became an active thriving community based in Bombay, with a strong sense of unity running through it.

GENEALOGY OF ISMĀ'ĪLĪ IMĀMS.

	NAMES OF IMĀMS.	YEAR OF DEATH. A.H./A.D.
1.	'Alī	40/660
2.	Ḥusayn	61/680
3.	Zayn al-'Abidīn	94/712*
4.	Muḥammad al-Bāqir	118/736*
5.	Ja'far al-Ṣādiq	148/765
6.	Ismā'īl	158/774*
7.	Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl	193/808*
8.	Wafi Aḥmad ('Abd Allāh)	212/827
9.	Taqī Muḥammad (Aḥmad b. 'Abd Allāh)	229/843
10.	Raḍī al-Dīn 'Abd Allāh (Ḥusayn)	289/901
11.	al-Mahdī ('Ubayd Allāh)	322/933
12.	al-Qā'im	334/935
13.	al-Manṣūr	341/952
14.	al-Mu'izz (Ma'd)	365/975
15.	al-'Azīz (Nizār)	386/996
16.	al-Ḥākim bi' Amr Allāh (Manṣūr)	411/1020
17.	al-Ẓāhir ('Alī)	427/1035
18.	al-Mustanṣir bi Allāh (Ma'd) I	487/1094
19.	Nizār	488/1095
20.	Hādī ('Alī)	530/1135*
21.	Muhtadi (Muḥammad)	552/1157
22.	Qāhir	557/1161
23.	'Alā dhikrihi al-Salām (Ḥasan)	561/1166
24.	A'lā Muḥammad	607/1210
25.	Jalāl al-Dīn (Ḥasan)	618/1221
26.	'Alā' al-Dīn (Muḥammad)	653/1255
27.	Rukn al-Dīn Khūrshāh	654-1256
28.	Shams al-Dīn (Muḥammad)	710-1310

NAMES OF IMAMS.		YEAR OF DEATH. A.H./A.D.
29.	Qāsim Shāh	771/1369*
30.	Islām Shāh	827/1423
31.	Muḥammad b. Islām Shāh	868/1463
32.	Mustanṣir bi Allāh ('Alī) II	880/1475
33.	'Abd al-Salām (Maḥmūd)	899/1493
34.	Gharīb Mīrzā	902/1496
35.	Abū al-Dharr 'Alī; also Nūr al-Dīn	915/1509
36.	Murād Mīrzā	920/1514
37.	Dhū al- Fiqār 'Alī	922/1516
38.	Nūr al-Dīn 'Alī	957/1550
39.	Khalīl Allāh 'Alī	993/1585
40.	Nizār	1038/1628

ABBREVIATIONS.

B.S.O.A.S.	Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies.
I.C.	Islamic Culture.
J.B.B.R.A.S.	Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
J.R.A.S.	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.
S.I.	Studia Islamica.

Ivanow,W; A guide to Ismaili Culture,(London,1933,)

(Editor) Diwān of Khākī Khorāsānī (Bombay, 1933,)

Ismailitica Memoirs of the Asiatic Society,(Calcutta,1922,)

Kalami Pir, Islamic Research Association,(Bombay, 1935,)

"Satpanth," in Collectanea (Holland,1948,) Vol.I

"The Sect of Imam Shah in Gujrat," J.B.B.R.A.S.,XII,(1936,)

Kay, J; History of the war in Afghanistan,(London,1851,)Vol.III

Kelly,J.B; Britain and the Persian Gulf 1795-1880,(Oxford, 1968,)

Khan,A.Z; "Isma'ilism in Multan and Sind," Journal of History Society (Pakistan,1973,) Vol.23.

Levy,R; "Ism'ili doctrines in the Jamī'al-Tawarīkh," J.R.A.S.(1930)

LEWIS,B; "Ismā'īlī Notes," in B.S.O.A.S. (1948) XII

Muqaddasī Aḥsān al-Taqāsīm fī ma'rifat al-Aqālīm (Leiden Edition)

Napier,W; The conquest of Scinde, (London, 1857,)

Nāẓim, Muḥammad; The Life and Times of Sulṭān Maḥmūd of Ghazna, (Cambridge,1931,)

Parliamentary Papers - Correspondence relating to Persia and Afghanistan (India Office Library)
Dispatch of Ellis from Tehran (24 December,1835,)
letter to Ḥājjī Mīrza Āghāsī (May 1837,)
Dispatch (28th September 1834)
Indian Papers - Treaties
"Definitive Treaty," article X (8 March,1809,)

Picklay,A.S; History of the Ismailis, (Bombay,1940,)

Rousseau,M;"Memoirs sur les Ismaelis et les Nosairies de Syrie," Annales des voyages de la Géographe et de l'histoire, vol XIV (Paris,1811,)

Shah, Hasan 'Alī 'Ibrat-i Afzā , (Bombay, 1861,)

Shia Imamee Ismailia Association for the United Kingdom; " A short History of Ismaili Pirs " selections from, The Great Ismaili Heroes,(London,N.D.

Stern, S.M; "Ismā'īlī Propaganda and the Fātimid Rule in Sind," in I.C. (1949)

Sykes, P.M; A History of Persia, (London,1915,) Vol.II.

The Memoirs of the Aga Khan, (London,1954,)

Van Hammer, J; History of the Assassins, (London 1840,)

V[illegible], Aḥmad 'Alī Khān; [illegible]

[illegible]