

Indus, in the "big and beautiful" city of Janānī (not to be traced now) and in Schwān.⁴⁶

The modern savant, Mawlānā Sulaymān Nadvī argues that the religion of the Sūmras was Ismā'ilism, on the basis of the Druze epistle cited above. The Sūmras could not have belonged to the Druze dissident sect of the Ismā'ilis, because in that case the Druze writer would not have appealed to *Shaykh* Sūmar Rājibāl to accept Druzism. It appears that the Sūmras belonged, like their brethren in Multān and Manṣūrah, to the official Ismā'ili Da'wa organised at that time on behalf of the Fāṭimid Caliphs of Egypt, Imāms Zāhir and Mustanṣir. The early Ismā'ili Qarmaṭian dissident movement had never gained a hold in Sind, although as noted above, the Sunni historians, when referring to Ismā'ilis of the official Da'wa, often erroneously call them Qarmaṭians. The Nizārī orientation of Ismā'ilism is a later development and about its influence in Northern India we shall add a few lines later. The Druze epistle appeals to *Shaykh* Rājibāl to bring the younger Dā'ūd, a descendant of the last Ismā'ili ruler of Multān, Abu'l-Futūh, and his folk back among the "believers in Tawhīd", i.e., Ismā'ilis. A recent writer Moulvī 'Ubayd Allāh Shā'iq Sūmra, in a Sindhi book written in 1929 entitled *Dawlat-i-'Alawiyya* (or *Sūmrān ji Hukūmat*), has compiled a list of Sūmra rulers from genealogical tables with fanciful Arabic titles given to these rulers and fantastic stories related about them. They may not be of any historical worth, but one thing seems clear, that the Sūmra family tradition regarded themselves as «'Alids», and as such more likely to accept Ismā'ilism.⁴⁷

*Tuhfat al-Kirām*⁴⁸ gives a list of rulers of the Sūmra dynasty along with the number of years they ruled. It is reproduced below :

(46) Ibn Baṭūṭa: *ibid*; cf. S. Nadvī: *op. cit.*, pp. 359-361. Daudpota (notes to *Ta'rikhi Ma'ṣūmī*, p. 289) on the authority of *Ta'rikhi Mubārakshāhī* (p. 43) calculates Janānī to be three miles from Schwān along the Indus towards the sea, near to Thatta.

(47) From unpublished notes of Dr. Daudpota. See also his note in his edition of *Mir Ma'ṣūm*, p. 289

(48) Extract in Elliot and Dawson, *Hist. of India*, p. 343; cf. S. Nadvī, *op. cit.*; Daudpota (*op. cit.* pp. 289-290) gives comparative lists of Sūmra rulers as given in three sources: *Ta'rikhi Ma'ṣūmī*, *Tuhfat al-Kirām* and *Dawlat-i-'Alawiyya*. The one of *Tuhfat*, however, seems to be the more complete and as such has been made the basis of our discussion. Even this list has not been followed scrupulously in the text, necessitated by a maze of conflicting and complicating accounts.

1. Sūmra	... Ruled for a long time (?)
2. Bhūngar b. Sūmra I	... " " 15 years
3. Dūda I b. Bhūngar	... " " 24 "
4. Sanghār	... " " 15 "
5. Hafif (<i>Khafif</i>)	... " " 33 "
6. 'Umar (or Unar)	... " " 40 "
7. Dūda II	... " " 14 "
8. Pātho	... " " 33 "
9. Ghanrā I	... " " 16 "
10. Muḥammad Tor	... " " 15 "
11. Ghanrā II	... " " some "
12. Dūda III	... " " 14 "
13. Tā'i	... " " 15 "
14. Chīnsar	... " " 18 "
15. Bhūngar II	... " " 15 "
16. <i>Khafif</i> II	... " " 18 "
17. Dūda IV	... " " 25 "
18. 'Umar Sūmra	... " " 35 "
19. Bhūngar III	... " " 10 "
20. Hamīr (Amīr) Last King	... " " some "
	<hr/>
	Total 355 years expressly mentioned
	plus 6 " of nos. 11 and 20
	<hr/>
	Total 361 years given in <i>Tuhfat</i>
	plus 3 " of the first ruler
	calculated below
	<hr/>
	Total 364 years

We have it from the author of *Tuhfat al-Kirām*, and other sources, that the Sūmra dynasty ended shortly after 752 H., when the Sulṭān of Delhi, Muḥammad Shāh Tughlaq invaded the Kingdom of the last Sūmra ruler Hamīr (or Amīr). Counting back 364 years it would mean that the Sūmra's rule began in 388 H. But we have already seen above that the Sūmras came to power in 443 H. by defeating 'Abd ar-Rashīd b. Mas'ūd b. Maḥmūd of Ghazna. Hence there is a discrepancy of 55 years, and this discrepancy is quite evident by the fact that very long reigns are attributed to *Khafif* (no. 5), Unar (no. 6), Pātho (no. 8)

and Unar Sūmra (no. 18). However this much appears certain that the Sūmras ruled Sind from 443 H. till after 752 H. — that is, for over 309 years.

The first in our list, Sūmra, as we have seen above, is the same person as *Shaykh Sūmar Rājibal* (or Rājā Pāl) of the Druze epistle. Mir Ma'šūm⁴⁹ tells us that with the help of his tribe he declared himself independant of Ghaznawids in 443 H. and King of Sind, at a place called Tharī (Thatta District). He married the daughter of a rich and powerful Arab landlord called Sa'd, and got a son by her, named *Bhūngar*, who succeeded him as the next ruler of Sind in 446 H. Muḥammad Yūsuf⁵⁰ adds that this *Bhūngar* ruled for fifteen years and died in 461 H.

Bhūngar's son and successor, Dūda I, conquered all territory from Naṣrpūr (near Bahmanābād - Maṣūrah) to the eastern most boundries of Sind. On his death his son *Sanghār* became king, but, being an infant, his elder sister Tārī ruled on his behalf.⁵¹ Maulavī Abū Zafar, in his *Ta'rikh Sindh*,⁵² thinks that this Tārī is the same as Tā'ī — no. 13 of our list above, and that her name has been erroneously inserted in the list. This is improbable, because *Sanghār* and Tā'ī in the list are removed from each other by eight other rulers. If, on the other hand, Maulavī Abū Zafar's conjecture is correct, then 15 years of Tā'ī's rule are taken off, thus reducing the discrepancy mentioned above considerably. *Sanghār* also was as bold a ruler as his father. He extended his kingdom in the west to include Makrān,⁵³ — Nānaknā'ī, according to *Tuḥfat*, Halā Kandī, according to Mir Ma'šūm.

The author of *Tuḥfat* further mentions that *Sanghār* had no son, and therefore his wife Himū, who had occupied the fort of Adak, put her two brothers in possession of Tor and Tharī, and they ruled together.⁵⁴ If we take the next rulers on our list — *Khafīf* (no. 5) and Unar (no. 6) as the two brothers-in-law of *Sanghār*, their long reigns of 33 and 40 years could be considered simultaneous, thus reducing the above-mentioned discrepancy still further. They were contemporary to *Shihāb ad-dīn Mu'izz ad-dīn Muḥammad Ghori*, who annexed Multān

(49) *Ta'rikh-i-Sind* in Elliot, *Hist.*, I, 215.

(50) Author of *Muntakhab at-Tawārikh* quoted in *Tuḥfat al-Kirām* by 'Alī Sher Qānī in Elliot, *Hist.*, I, 344.

(51) *Tuḥfat* (Bombay ed.), III, 35.

(52) Published at A'zamgarh, India 1947 (in Urdu), p. 291.

(53) *Tuḥfat*, *ibid.*

(54) *Ibid.*

and *Uchch* in 571 H. and had violated the territory of Sind in 578 H. In the section on Multān above we have cited a note from Juzjānī (d. 650 H.) to the effect that Sulṭān Muḥammad Ghori "delivered Multān from the hands of the Qarmaṭians" in 571 H. It is quite likely that one of the Sūmra brothers *Khafif* or *Unar* might have been in possession of Multān at that time.

The author of *Tuḥfat al-Kirām* again gives us further information. Dūda II assumed the leadership of Sūmras, and from his fortress of Wāhka marched against the brothers of Himū and killed them.⁵⁵ The remnants of the ruling Sūmra tribe (now being defeated at Multān, *Uchch* and elsewhere in Sind by the advance of Muḥammad Ghori) gathered at Daybul, where they elected Dūda II as their next ruler.⁵⁶ Thus the Sūmra capital changes from Thari to Daybul. But Muḥammad Ghori occupied Daybul in 578 H. and swept through Sind. The Sūmra rulers Dūda II and his successor Pātho (Bhutto, probably, of the present times) seem to have existed as powerless princelings somewhere in Sind. Under the next ruler, *Ghanrā I*,⁵⁷ the Sūmra rule was confined to Thatta (about sixty miles from the modern Karachi).

We have it from *Farishta*⁵⁸ that during the reign of the slave king *Shams ad-dīn Altamish* (607-633 H.), *Jalāl ad-dīn Muḥammad Khwārazmshāh*, fleeing from *Chingiz Khān*, came to Lahore, where he was repulsed by the forces of *Shams ad-dīn Aybak*. So he rushed forth to Sind and occupied Thatta where the Sūmras were ruling. The name of the Sūmra King is given as *Jalsī*, but could be our *Ghanrā I* mentioned above. He could also be the same as *Malik Sinān ad-Dīn Chanisar*, *Wāli-i-Sind wa Daybul*,⁵⁹ who fled from Daybul in 621 H., Four years later (in 625 H.) he surrendered to *Nizām al-Mulk al-Junaydī* and accompanied him to the court of *Iltumish* at Delhi.⁶⁰

Khwārazmshāh destroyed and plundered Thatta, and the Sūmras were again forced to move on. Under their next leader *Muḥammad Tor* they retreated into the desert and arrived at a place by the Indus River where they settled down. They named it "Muḥammad Tor"

(55) *Ibid.*

(56) *Ibid.*

(57) *Khīrā* in *Ta'rikh-i-Ma'fūmī*, p. 61.

(58) *Farishta: Ta'rikh*, (Nawal Kishore ed.), II, 314.

(59) According to *Tabaqāt-i-Nāsirī*, ed. Raverty, p. 123.

(60) *Daudpota: A Dark Period in the History of Sind*, paper read at the Pakistan Historical Conference, Peshawar 1953.

after their leader, and it was alternately called "Mahātam Tor".⁶¹ It was situated in the Drik district which is now called *Chachgām*.⁶² Here Muḥammad Tor managed to save the remnants of the Sūmra tribe and their Ismā'ili tradition.

After the death of the slave king of Delhi *Shams ad-din Aybak* there was a civil war leading to the accession of *Sulṭāna Raḍiyya* in 634 H. to the throne of Delhi. The Ismā'ilis took advantage of this unrest in Delhi to stage a revolt there — particularly because much of the persecution against them in the past emanated from there. Under the leadership of one *Nūr Turk*, Ismā'ilis, primarily from Sind and Gujarāt but also from the banks of Ganges and Jamna, gathered in Delhi and attacked the *Jāmi' Masjid* to make it headquarters of their revolt, but were subsequently defeated by the ruling authorities.⁶³ We are confronted with the question: Was this *Nūr Turk* the same as *Muḥammad Tor*? We can make this conjecture because the Sūmras were the only influential Ismā'ili community in Sind and the Sindi Ismā'ilis had formed the main bulk of the people who revolted at Delhi under *Nūr Turk*. Moreover, it is the Sūmras alone who could have summoned their neighbours, the Gujarāti Ismā'ilis, to their help, for the Sūmras had suffered considerably in the past at the hands of the Delhi rulers. The contemporary names, *Muḥammad Tor* (of the Sūmras) and *Nūr Turk* (of Delhi) could, therefore, be identified into one personality.

All the information we have about the successors of *Muḥammad Tor* in our Persian sources consists of nothing but a fairy tale — irrelevant stories of individual romances, devoid of any chronology or historical context. One thing is certain that the Sūmras managed somehow to keep up their small state at "*Muḥammad Tor*", although it was time and again ravaged by the Delhi Sulṭāns and the invading *Moghuls*. The next ruler, *Ghanrā II*, who may be identified as *Chanīsar II*, was dethroned by his step-brother *Dūda III*. He however sought help from 'Alā ad-dīn *Khilji* (695-715 A.H.) and brought disaster to the Sūmra dynasty. *Dūda* resisted valiantly and "his deeds in this unequal war of attrition", states *Daudpota*,⁶⁴ "are still sung in ballads and inspire the Sindhis with legitimate pride." In 734 H.

(61) *Farishta: Ta'rikh*, II, p. 314.

(62) S. Nadvi: *op. cit.*, p. 366.

(63) *Juzjāni: Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri* (Calcutta ed. 1864), pp. 116 and 189; see above for the same note in the section on Multān.

(64) *Op. cit.*

54
 PIR SAIFUDDIN
 NUR
 Vani
 634
 1132
 1130

Ibn Baṭūṭa found in Sind a king by the name of Wūnar. He could be the same as 'Umar (Unar) Sūmra (no. 18) of our list.⁶⁵ The date 734 H. is just before the closing years of the Sūmra dynasty. Ibn Baṭūṭa says that Sulṭān Muḥammad b. Tughlaq had appointed a Hindu governor in Sind by the name of Malik Ratan. However, one of Sulṭān's officers Qaysar Rūmī, being jealous of Ratan, conspired with our Sūmra ruler Wūnar to get him killed. After the deed, Wūnar, in fright of the Sulṭān, ran away to his tribesmen and soon died of a drunken orgy.⁶⁶

The famous Muḥammad b. Tughlaq ruled in Delhi from 724 to 752 H. In the last year of his reign he proceeded against the Sūmra Kingdom, which was again ruled now from Thatta. In the service of Muḥammad b. Tughlaq there was a Moghul by the name of Taghī. He was sent to Gujarāt, but there he revolted and became independant. When the Sulṭān proceeded against him, he took refuge in the Sūmra capital of Thatta. Hence the Sulṭān had to invade the town. A long battle was fought near Thatta between Sūmras and Mughals on one side and the forces of Sulṭān Muḥammad b. Tughlaq on the other, but it remained indecisive, for the Sulṭān fell ill and died, and his army, after electing Fīrūzshāh as the next Sulṭān, decided to withdraw from Thatta on 21 Muḥarram, 752 H.

However, when Fīrūzshāh returned to Thatta in 762 H., ten years later, he found Jām Unar — first ruler of the Sunnī dynasty of Sama. It seems that the Sunnī Samas had defeated and driven out the Ismā'īlī Sūmras sometime between 752 H. and 762 H.; and from that time onwards we do not hear of the Sūmras.⁶⁷ At present in Sind there exists a famous and influential family of Soomro, who could probably be the descendants of the ancient Sūmras.

(65) S. Nadvi: *op. cit.*, p. 374.

(66) Ibn Baṭūṭa : *Travel.*, I, 105-8.

(67) About the rise of Banū Sama, see the article by Riazul-Islam entitled *The Rise of Sammas in Sind in Islamic Culture* (1948). He maintains that Wūnar was a Sūmra as mentioned by Ibn Baṭūṭa, but Daudpota (*op. cit.*) thinks that he was the same as Jām Unar, the first Sama ruler. According to him, Wūnar, though a Sama, was the combined chief of both Sūmras and Samas acting as regent on behalf of Hamīr the minor son of the penultimate Sūmra ruler Armīl who was assassinated.

Riazul-Islam maintains that the policy of Delhi after 752 H. was to support the last Sūmras as a counterpoise against the rising Sammas who, when they came to power, necessitated another invasion from Delhi in 762 H. by Fīrūzshāh (*op. cit.*, pp. 365-368).

As noted above the Sūmras were Ismā'ilis. But the question remains about the exact shade and sub-division of Ismā'ilism which the Sūmras had accepted. We already noted above that they could neither have been of the Qarmaṭian nor Druze brands of Ismā'ilism. The early Sūmra rulers definitely belonged to the official Fāṭimid Ismā'īlī Da'wa. But the Fāṭimid Da'wa itself, after the death of Imām Mustanṣir at Cairo in 487 H., had been divided into two sections. The one was the Musta'lian Da'wa which had the Yaman, and later the Gujarāt coast of India, as its headquarters; and the other was the Nizārī Ismā'īlī Da'wa which had its headquarters at Alamūt in Persia under the leadership of the celebrated Ḥasan b. Ṣabbāḥ and espousing the cause of Imām Nizār b. Mustanṣir and his descendants. The question now arises as to which of the two Da'was did the later Sūmras, from say Sanghār (no. 4 of our list) onwards belong to — in other words, were they under the influence of the Da'wa of the Yaman or the Ismā'ilis of Persia ?

The Musta'lian Da'wa of the Yaman controlled their local converts in Gujarāt from 460 H. upto 944 H., when it shifted its headquarters to Gujarāt itself. During this time the Yamanites exercised a thorough Arab influence. We find in their Da'wa in Gujarāt people with Arabic names, and literature written mainly in Arabic. The local Hindu tradition was abandoned and the process of Arabicising had gone very deep. But in the case of Sūmras, except for their hereditary Arab names (some of them) we find a considerable Hindu cultural influence. This goes to prove that the Musta'lian Yamanī Da'wa had hardly any influence over them. Their relations with the Musta'lians is therefore improbable, particularly in absence of any evidence to the contrary.

Now let us examine the Nizārī Ismā'īlī tradition of Persia. In the time of Imām Nizār and his son Imām Hādī and the Dā'ī Ḥasan b. Ṣabbāḥ, a *dā'ī* was sent from Persia to Gujarāt. His name was Sat Gur Nūr and his tomb is still shown at Navsārī. Another *dā'ī* called Pir Shams Sabzwārī was also sent to India. He appears as a figure resembling the Indian Jogis. Many legends of a Ṣūfic type are woven around the character of Pir Shams, which shows a clear affinity between the tales of Persian mysticism and the Hindu mythology. It is asserted in modern Ismā'īlī writings that he was sent to Multān where he got a considerable following. He is also supposed to have converted to Nizārīan Ismā'ilism much of the population of Badakhshān, Kashmir and Northern India. ⊙ If his activity was during the period of Sūmra rule we would have easily connected the Sūmras with Nizārī Ismā'ilism.

But Pīr Shams was sent to India during the time of Imām Qāsim Shāh (710-771), almost at the close of Sūmra dynasty. Hence it is difficult to say that the Sūmras were Nizārī Ismā'īlis. It is likely that being near Persia they might have been under Nizārī influence, but there is no historical evidence to support such a contention.

What kind of Ismā'īlis were the Sūmras then? To my mind, after the Nizārīd-Musta'lian split among the Ismā'īlis in 487 H. the Sūmras drifted away from both the rival Da'was; separating from these Da'was, made themselves quite independent. They just kept up the Fāṭimid Ismā'īlī tradition of their forefathers without paying any allegiance to any Da'wa outside. They had a sort of Ismā'īlism of their own, which kept them neutral from the Sunnī Islām brought by the Turkish conquerors and their Hindu environment. However, whatever kind of Ismā'īlī tradition they kept up, helped in the later Nizārīd mission in Northern India particularly under Pīr Ṣadrudīn, who died near Uchch in 876/1471.

Thus ends the first chapter regarding the beginning of Ismā'īlism in India. Its logical sequel is a discussion on the Musta'lian Da'wa in Western India, particularly Gujarāt, and the Nizārīd mission in Northern India.