

# ASIATIC PAPERS

## PART II

PAPERS READ BEFORE THE  
BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE  
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

BY

JIVANJI JAMSHEDJI MODI, B.A., Ph.D., C.I.E.,

Fellow of the University of Bombay (1887), Dipl. Litteris et Artibus  
(Sweden, 1889), Shams-ul-Ulma (Government of India,  
1893), Officier de 1<sup>e</sup> Instruction Publique  
(France, 1902), Ph. D. (Honoris  
Causa. Heidelberg, 1912).

SAI Heidelberg



45087881,2

BOMBAY :  
THE TIMES PRESS  
1917

*A Persian Inscription of the Mogal times on a stone  
found in the District Judge's Court at Thana.*

(Read on 18th March 1915.)

I

**INTRODUCTION.**

My attention was drawn to the inscription, which forms the subject of this paper, by Mr. Kashaorao Appa Padhey, Pleader, High Court, more than two years ago, at the close of a meeting of the Anthropological Society which we attended. He showed me the stone in the archæological collection of our Society. I then requested our then librarian, Mr. Mogre, to send the stone to me for decipherment. After a short cursory attempt to decipher the inscription at my place, I wrote to the librarian to give me some particulars, as to where the stone was found, and how it came to the collection of our society. He wrote to me on 7th December 1912, as follows: "Mr. Edwardes visited Thana in June 1906. There, he was shown some inscriptions deposited in the Collector's office and in the office of the Thana Municipality. Some of them were lately excavated from the Pokharni tank of that place and others were secured at different times; 22 of these were selected by Mr. Edwardes for the Prince of Wales Museum and were ordered by him to be sent here. One more was added to these by the Mamlatdar of that place and all these 23 were received here on or about 16th June 1906. I regret, our files supply no more particulars about them. My nephew, Mr. Kashaorao Appa Padhey of Thana, might be able to throw some further light on this subject."

I then wrote to Mr. Padhey to inquire about the matter. In reply to my inquiry, he gave me the following particulars about the discovery of the stones, one of which forms the subject of this paper, in his letter, dated 19th December 1912: "The two stone inscriptions in Persian were found by me in the rear compound of the District Judge's Court at Thana. Flower-pots were placed on the back side of these slabs. My curiosity was aroused by the appearance of these slabs. I asked a Court peon to remove the flower-pots. I got

them deciphered by an Arabic scholar, Mr. Munshi Fazl-i Ali of Thanana. The translation of the Persian inscriptions was submitted to the late lamented Mr. A. M. T. Jackson under whose advice the stones were despatched to Bombay. The result of the deciphering is : ' Shah Jahan, the Great Mogal Emperor placed one Rajput named Mândhâtâ मानधाता in charge of Asherigad (Asheri Fort) with 5,000 horse.' This Asheri Fort is in Berar, and is considered as an impregnable and commanding fort. Another fort of that name is near Palgar (20 miles off the Railway Station). • It would be interesting to note that the great Mogal Emperor should have considered this fort in the remotest corner of the Konkan as an important one. I have failed to ascertain as to how the stones were brought to Thanana. I have discovered other stones of still remoter dates (such as one bearing Savat 1140), about 22 pieces of architectural friezes and marble-idols from Thanana, and an inscription of king Nagardev being of 13th century."

Then, recently, I wrote to Mr. Edwardes to inquire, if he could give me any further particulars, collected by him on his above visit to Thanana. He wrote to me in reply on 11th March 1915 :

" I really forget the details of the stone from Thanana. But I do remember going over there one day and looking at a collection of stone relics, of which this particular stone with the Persian inscription was one. And I remember giving orders for them to be sent in to Bombay to be ultimately placed in the Museum. It is, I think, correct that Mr. Kesharao Appa Padhey noticed the stone and it was probably on his information that I went over to Thanana. But I remember no other details now."

It appears from all this correspondence, that Mr. Padhey first discovered the stone under a flower-pot in the District Judge's Court at Thanana in about 1906. He communicated the discovery to the late Mr. Jackson, who was at one time the Collector of Thanana. Mr. Jackson communicated that discovery to Mr. Edwardes, who was then the Honorary Secretary of our Society. Mr. Edwardes went to Thanana in June 1906 and saw the stone there. He then got the stone in question, together with some other stones and archæological relics, removed to the rooms of our Society with a view that they all may be subsequently placed in the Prince of Wales Museum.

This is the story of the journey of the stone from the Thanana Judge's Court to our rooms, but we know nothing as to how it came to the Thanana Court from the hill of Mahavli or Mâhuli, to which, as we will see later on, it originally belonged.

We do not know, what has become of the translation, referred to by Mr. Padhey as given to the late Mr. Jackson. However, if the translation, led the gentleman who translated it or Mr. Padhey to the conclusion, as said in Mr. Padhey's letter, that the inscription only takes a note of king Shah Jahan appointing Mândhâta in charge of Asherigad, (Asirgad), that is not sufficient. The main object of the inscription is to record the fact of a son of Mândhâta being appointed in command of the Mahratta forts—Mahâvli, Pâlâsghad and one other fort, perhaps Bhandarghad. Of the three groups of the Thana forts—the coast group, the inland group and the Sahyâdri group—these forts belong to the second inland group of 24 forts. They form parts of the Mâhuli fortifications in the Shâhâpur taluka or sub-division.<sup>1</sup> They are situated on the Mâhuli hill.<sup>2</sup>

After I announced my paper, I learnt from our librarian, Mr. Gothasker, that a photo of the stone was taken by Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar of the Archæological Department of Bombay, at the request of Prof. Shaikh Abdul Kadir Surfraz of the Deccan College at Poona. I wrote a few days ago to both these gentlemen. I heard only yesterday from Mr. Bhandarkar that he was in Sind on tour and so could not help me now. Professor Surfraz wrote to me in his letter, dated 8th March 1915, that he had no photographs, but a paper-impression, taken for him sometime ago by Mr. Bhandarkar. I produce here that paper-impression and beg to thank Professor Surfraz for it. I learn from his letter that he had got the impression taken some years ago by Mr. Bhandarkar with a view to decipher the inscription and to read a paper, but that, owing to press of work and being away from a good library, he could not do so.

The object of this paper is two-fold :

1. To give a decipherment of the inscription, which is bi-lingual or an inscription in two languages,—one, a small one, in Hindi in Nagari characters, beginning on the top of the slab and then running down on its right hand margin, and the other in Persian.

2. To trace the historical events referred to in it and to give some historical and geographical particulars about the persons and places referred to in it.

<sup>1</sup> The Bombay Gazetteer, Thana. Places of Interest, Vol. XIV, p. 98.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. S. M. Bharucha, the present Collector of Thana, in his letter, dated 10th March 1915, in reply to my inquiries, says that the Mahuli hill is "5 miles from Asangaon Railway Station on the G. I. P. Ry., and the ascent after leaving the road is about 2 miles. There is no made road but only a cart-track."

As to the first object, I do not presume that my decipherment is altogether correct. There are a few difficulties in deciphering it quite correctly. One can see, both from the stone and the impression which I produce that the slab is a little broken. It has lost a slip in a somewhat vertical line. So, words and letters here and there are lost. This is the principal cause of the difficulty for an altogether correct decipherment. Another cause is the difficulty of deciphering the *nukteh*s (نکته) or points occurring on Persian letters. It is difficult to determine whether a particular part of the slab bears a *nukteh*, or only a scar as the result of the wear and tear or a careless handling of the stone. However, in spite of these petty obstacles, there is no great difficulty in deciphering the inscription, as far as the sense of the whole inscription is concerned. One may decipher a word or letter, here and there, in a way, different from the one which I beg to submit, but I think, that that will not make much difference in the matter of the general signification or the meaning of the inscription. I beg to thank Professor Khodayâr Sheheryâr, Mr. G. K. Nariman and Mr. M. P. Kharegat for kindly helping me to decipher a word here and there.

As to the second object of the paper, *viz.*, the narrative of the historical events and the description of the geographical places referred to in the inscription, I am indebted to books referring to the historical works of the time of Jehangir—works like Elliot's History of India, especially Vol. VI, and the Gazetteer volumes. As to the Persian text itself which refers to Shah Jahan's rebellion, I am indebted to an old manuscript copy of the *Târikh-i-Jahângiri* (تاریخ جهانگیری) in the Moola Feroze Library.

I will first give my reading of the inscription and then the translation.

## II

### THE TEXT AND THE TRANSLATION OF THE INSCRIPTION.

#### THE HINDI INSCRIPTION.

माहाराजा मानधाता गोरं का बेटा राजा मनोहरदासजीका अमलमै भंडारदरंग व महावली व पालासगढ़ की गमारति का सर्व काम तैयार हुवा.

#### *Translation.*

During the administration of Raja Manohardas, the son of Mahârajâ Mândhâtâ Gor, all the works of the buildings of Bhandâr-darang<sup>1</sup> and Mahâvli and Palâsghad were finished.

<sup>1</sup> Doubtful reading.

## THE PERSIAN INSCRIPTION.

(1)<sup>1</sup> چون در سنه یکهزار سي و دو هجري شاه جهان ( ) ل و  
متاع معم خادمان محل بر قلعه آسير حواله راجه گوپالداس کور

(2) نموده خود بدولت عازم به سمت پورب شدند در هنگام  
( ) راجه متازالیه از سلطان پرویز قریب دو سال در آسير

(3) جنگ نمود بعد چند روز شاه جهان از آنجا عبور نموده باز به  
دکهن تشریف ارزاني فرمودند آن زمان راجه گوپالداس  
بملازمت

(4) فايض گشته به خطاب راجه مانند هاتا و بمتصب پنجه زاري از  
روي عنايت پادشاهانه مرحمت شدند چنانچه راجه مانند هاتا

(5) با پسرکلان باسم کنور بلرام در جنگ تهیه بکار آمدند بعد از آن  
در سنه یکهزار سي و شش حضرت شاه جهان بر تخت دهلي زیر  
بخش

(6) گردیدند و در سنه یکهزار شصت دو راجه منوهر داس پسر  
راجه مانند (هاتا) به قلعه داري قلعه آسير معین گشته تا شش  
سال

(7) خدمت قلعه داري قلعه مسطور بصدق عقیده بجا آوردند و  
در سنه یکهزار (شصت) و هشت شاه اورنگ بادشاه بر تخت  
سلطنت

(8) زیب افزا شدند و در سنه یکهزار هفتاد پنج نقش درست  
اعتقاد (ي و) ثابت قدمي قلعه داري آسير از راجه منوهر داس

<sup>1</sup> These figures on the right hand side indicate the number of the lines of the Inscription.

<sup>2</sup> These brackets denote gaps, due to the breakage on the slab. At the close of the meeting, where the paper was read, Prof. Isfahani suggested that the missing part may be تمام مال, which, with the remaining letter ل, may read تمام مال, i.e., all property.

One cannot say with certainty if the first word is تمام, but it seems pretty certain that

the next word is مال. The words مال و متاع are generally spoken together.

(9) در خاطر مبارک مقدس معلی پسند آورده بشدست قلعه  
داری مهاولی و غیره مرحمت فرمودند چنانچه در عمل قلعه  
داری راجه مذکور کار

(10) شکست ریخت دیوارها و انبار خانه ها قلعه مهاولی و پلاس  
گدهم و زینه<sup>2</sup> پایه و غیره قلعه بند اردرنگ آراست شدند پنجم  
رمضان سنه ۱۱

*Translation.*

When, in the year 1032 Hijri, Shâh Jahân, entrusting..... his property and<sup>4</sup> his servants of the palace in the charge of Raja Gopaldass Gor in the fort of Asir, himself set<sup>5</sup> out with good fortune on a journey in the direction of Purab,<sup>6</sup> then (lit. at the time)<sup>7</sup> .....the abovenamed<sup>8</sup> Raja fought with Sultan Parviz for nearly two years in Asir. After some days, Shâh Jahân crossing over from that place went back to Dakhan. At that time, Raja Gopaldass having served well<sup>9</sup> with attendance<sup>10</sup>, was presented by way of Royal favour with the title of Rajâ Mândhâta and with the *mansab* (*i.e.*, post) of 5,000. So, Raja Mândhâta with his elder son named Kunvar<sup>11</sup> Balrâm, prepared<sup>12</sup> for war. After that, in the year 1036, Hazrat (*i.e.*, His Majesty) Shâh Jahân sat on the throne<sup>13</sup> of Delhi. And in the year 1062, Raja Manohardas, the son of Raja Mândhâta, being appointed on the fort-commandership of the fort of Asir, performed faithfully<sup>14</sup> for six years, the service of the fort-commandership of the above fort. And in the year

<sup>1</sup> Prof. Isfahani suggests شکست ریخت in the sense of "repairs."

<sup>2</sup> As suggested by Prof. Isfahani at the meeting when the paper was read.

<sup>3</sup> *Vide* the note in the text above. The reading of the missing words seems correct. If so, the words here would be "all goods (and)."

<sup>4</sup> Lit. with.

<sup>5</sup> عازم شدن to set out.

<sup>6</sup> Prof. Isfahani suggests that it may be a Hindi word for the East, पूर्ब and we know from history that Shâh Jahân did go to Orissa and Bengal which are situated on the East of Khandesh.

<sup>7</sup> A word or two missing.

<sup>8</sup> Mushâr ilaihi (Steingass, p 96, col. 2, p. 1242, col. I.)

<sup>9</sup> Lit. having become abundant or affluent.

<sup>10</sup> Or service.

<sup>11</sup> Or prince.

<sup>12</sup> تهیه preparation.

<sup>13</sup> Lit. became the glory-giver on the throne.

<sup>14</sup> Lit. with the truth of faithfulness.

1068, Shah Aurang Bâdshah came to the throne<sup>1</sup>. And in the year 1075, (His Majesty), liking (lit. bringing into his liking in his auspicious, holy and high-mind) the faithful trustworthiness, (and) firmness of the commandership of the fort of Asir by Raja Manohardas, appointed him on (lit. favoured him with) the service of the commandership of Mahâvli, etc. So, in the rule of the commandership of the above-named Raja, the work of rebuilding the walls and storehouses of the fort of Mahâvli and Palâsghadha and of the steps of the stairs, etc., of the fort of Bhandâr-darang<sup>2</sup> was done. The fifth of Ramzan year eleven.

The pith of what the inscription says is this : Shâh Jahân, when he rebelled against his father Jahangir, had placed one Raja Gopaldass Gor in the command of the fort of Asir, which was a very strong fort in Khandesh. He placed his superfluous things and his domestics there, and went to fight against his brother Sultan Parvez whom his father had sent to suppress his rebellion. Gopaldass held the fort well against Sultan Parvez for nearly two years. So, Shâh Jahân rewarded him with the title of Mândhâta and a *mansab* of 5,000. This Raja was latterly helped by his son Prince Balram or Bâlârâm. Then Shâh Jahân came to the throne in 1036 Hijri. The inscription takes no note of the intervening events, the principal of which was, that Shâh Jahân had apologized and was forgiven. In 1062 Hijri “(i.e., 26 years after Shâh Jahân’s accession to the throne),” Raja Manohardas, the son of the above Raja Gopaldass, was appointed in command of the fort of Asir. He ruled well for six years, i.e., up to 1068, when Shâh Jahân’s son, Aurangzeb, came to the throne. In 1075, Aurangzeb in recognition of the good services of Raja Manohardas as commander of the fort of Asir appointed him on the command of the fort of Mahâvli in the 11th year of his (Aurangzeb’s) reign.

The principal object of the inscription was to commemorate this event in the 11th year of the reign of Aurangzeb (Hijri 1079) in the time of Raja Manohardas. But, in taking note of that event, it has referred to a few preceding events from Hijri 1032, i.e., to the events of about 47 years, to show the meritorious services of Raja Manohardas and his father Gopaldass in connection with the fort of Asir, in recognition of which the command of Mahâvli was given to him. In point of importance, Mahâvli stands much lower than the famous Asirghad, but, perhaps, Aurangzeb thought it advisable to put an important fort of Thana, that was newly acquired, under the command of an experienced officer, who had done his work well at Asir.

<sup>1</sup> Lit. became glory-enhancer of the throne of the kingdom.

<sup>2</sup> The last part of the word is doubtful. It seems to be a rendering of Hindi अ'डर ६२'ग।



The inscription says nothing, as to how the fort of Mahâvli came into the hands of Aurangzeb. But we will see, later on, that the historians of the reign of this Mogal Emperor tell us, that Aurangzeb had to fight with the Mahrathas under Shivaji. Shivaji, being hard pressed, surrendered himself to Aurangzeb. One of the terms of the surrender was, that he was to give up the forts of Thana to the Mogal Emperor. Mahâvli was one of such hostile forts. It was in the time of his Governorship as the Commander of Mahâvli and Palâsghad that the fortifications of Mahâvli, Palâsghad and one other fort on the same hill were put in good order. The inscription says that this was done in the 11th year of Aurangzeb's reign.

### III

#### EVENTS OF THREE REIGNS.

##### A LIST OF THE EVENTS.

The inscription refers to some events of the reigns of three Mogul Emperors—Jahangir, Shâh Jahân and Aurangzeb.

**An Account of Shâh Jahân's Rebellion.** It takes a note of the events of about 44 years—from 1032 to 1075 Hijri. In order to have a clear grasp of the historical events noted therein, one must know something of the reign of Jahangir, especially of his relations with his son, Shâh Jahân, who had rebelled against him.

The lives of kings Jahangir and Shâh Jahân of the Mogul dynasty of India present, in one respect, a parallel, as it were, to the lives of king Gushtâsp and his son Aspandyâr of the Kiânian dynasty of Persia. The parallel illustrates the moral maxim, "You will reap as you will sow." King Gushtâsp of Iran, in his youthful days, was a disobedient son, giving some trouble to his father Lohrasp. He asked for the throne of Persia in his father's life-time. In his turn, when he came to the throne, his son Aspandyâr behaved in the same way and asked for the throne in his father's life-time. In India, Jahangir had turned out a disobedient son to his father Akbar. So, he, in his turn, had two disobedient sons, Khusru and Khurram, latterly known as Shâh Jahân. Shâh Jahân again had a disobedient son in Aurangzeb, who kept his old father in custody.

**Khusru's Rebellion.** Khusru rose in rebellion against his father Jahangir in the very first year of his reign. Jahangir marched against him and took him prisoner. Khusru was the cause of much grief to his father, both directly and indirectly.

At one time, a seditious person, Kutb by name, acted the part of the Pseudo-Smerdis of the Achemnian times of king Darius of Persia

and "declared himself to be Khusrû, and said that, having escaped from prison, he had come there (into the territory of Ujjainiya which lies near Patna); and that those who joined and helped him should share in his success."<sup>1</sup> His rebellion was suppressed after some fight and he was put to death. Jahangir then tried to forget and forgive his son Khusrû, but his leniency had no great effect upon his son.

Jahangir's other son Khurram was, at one time, his great favourite.

Prince Khurram or Shah Jahan, at one time, a favourite son of Jahangir.

Jahangir thus speaks of the favours he bestowed upon him on Thursday, the 20th Mehr, in the 12th year of his reign (11th Shawwal 1026 Hijri): "After he had paid me his respects, I called him in the window where I was sitting, and with the impulse of excessive paternal affection and love, I immediately rose up and took him in my arms. The more he expressed his reverence and respect for me, the more my tenderness increased towards him. I ordered him to sit by me . . . . Formerly at the conquest of the Rânâ (Rânâ Amar Sing), a *mansab* of 20,000 and the command of 10,000 horse had been conferred on Prince Khurram, and when he was sent to the Dakhin, he was honoured with the title of a Shâh. Now, in consideration of his present service, his *mansab* was promoted to a *mansab* of 30,000 and the command of 20,000 horse. I also conferred on him the title of Shâh Jahân. It was also ordered, that henceforth a chair should be placed for him in the Court next to my throne, an honour which was particularly conferred on him, and had never before been known in my family."<sup>2</sup>

Latterly (in 1029 Hijri, 1620 A.D.), when there arose a rebellion in the Deccan he sent Khurram (Shah Jahan) to suppress it. On Jumad-I awwal, 1031 Hijri (March 1622), news reached Jahangir that Khurram (Shah Jahan), upon whom he had bestowed many favours as said above, had himself risen in rebellion. Jahangir sent Raja Roz-afzun, one of his oldest servants to Khurram, who was then at Mandu, to inquire into the cause of the rebellion. Jahangir got displeased with this rebellious son. He thus speaks of the way in which he expressed his displeasure: "When Khurram's son was ill, I made a vow that, if God would spare his life, I would never shoot an animal again with my own hand. For all my love of shooting, I kept my vow for five years to the present time; but now that I was offended with Khurram, I resolved to go out shooting again."<sup>3</sup>

Jahangir then spoke of his son as *siyâh bakht*, i.e., dark-fortuned. He issued an order that thenceforth he should be called *bi dault*, i.e.,

<sup>1</sup> Elliot's History of India, Vol. VI., p. 321.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, pp. 351

<sup>3</sup> Ibid, p. 384.

without fortune or wretch. These words carry a sense opposed to that of his original name Khurram (خرم) which means "auspicious, pleasant, delightful."

Jahangir's displeasure.

We read the following passage in the Memoirs of Jahangir, expressive of his displeasure towards this rebellious son :—

"I directed that henceforward he should be called 'Wretch,' and whenever the word 'Wretch' occurs in this *Ikbâl-nâma*, it is he who is intended. I can safely assert that the kindness and instruction which I have bestowed upon him, no King has ever yet bestowed upon a son. The favours which my respected father showed to my brothers, I have shown ever to his servants. I exalted his titles, made him lord of a standard and drum, as may be recorded in this *Ikbâl-nâma*, and the fact cannot be concealed from the readers of it. The pen cannot describe all that I have done for him, nor can I recount my own grief, or mention the anguish and weakness which oppress me in this hot climate, which is so injurious to my health, especially during these journeys and marchings which I am obliged to make in pursuit of him who is no longer my son."

The stone inscription which forms the subject of this paper refers to the events connected with this rebellion of Shah-Jahan. To enable one to have a clear grasp of the few events referred to in it, I will give here a list of a few important events with dates of the reign of Jahangir (1569—1627 A. D.) and of some subsequent events, as given by Mahomedan historians and by the Inscription.

Hijri year.	A. D.	
975	1567	Jahangir born.
1001	1592	Khurram (Shah Jahan) born.
	1600	Fortress of Asir taken by king Akbar.
1014	1605	Jahangir came to throne("Jahangir counted the years of his reign by the solar reckoning, and the first year of his reign as commencing on the New Year's Day next year after his accession with the entrance of the Sun into Aries, which corresponded with the 11th Zi-l ka'da, 1014 A. H. (10th March 1606 A. D.)." <sup>2</sup> He was about 38 years of age when he came to throne. His rebellious son Khusru was arrested and imprisoned.

<sup>1</sup> Elliot, Vol. p. 281.

<sup>2</sup> Elliot's History of India, Vol. VI., p. 290, n. 2. Owing to this reason, and the difference in the dates of the commencement of the Hijri and Christian years, the A.D. years will, at times, not correspond exactly

Hijri year.	A. D.	
1017	1609	Jahangir sent his son Sultan Parvez with his (Jahangir's) preceptor Khân Khânân (Mirza Khan) "to secure the settlement of the Dakhin."
1018	1610	An attempt by one Kutb to raise a rebellion, pretending that he was Jahangir's son Khusru, who had escaped from prison.
1022	1613	Campaign against the Rânâ—Rana Amar Singh—who was the greatest of the Rajas of Hindustan and ruled in Mewat and Jeypore. His ancestors had, at different times, assumed the titles of Rawal, Raja, Rup, and Rana. Jahangir first sent his son Sultan Parvez on the campaign. Then he sent Khurram (Shâh Jahân) on the expedition. (Both these sons are referred to in the Inscription).
1023	1614	The Rana submitted.
1024	1616	Jahangir as a matter of favour first gave permission to Prince Khurram to drink wine "on feast days, on New Year's Day, and at great entertainments, but always with moderation; for to drink to excess and weaken the intellect is avoided by the wise; in fact some good and benefit ought to be obtained from wine-drinking," <sup>1</sup>
1025	1616	Plague broke out in many parts of Hindustan.
1026	1618	Khurram saw Jahangir at Mandu and was honoured with the title of Shâh Jahân.  Jahangir's journey to Guzarat, when he visited Ahmedabad which he called Gardâbâd ( <i>i.e.</i> , the city of dust) on account of its dust, the result of its sandy soil. Later on he thus speaks of it. "I have previously called this city Gardâbâd. Now, I do not know what to call it—whether Samûmistân (the home of the simoom), Bimâristân (place of sickness), Zakûmdâr (thorn-brake), or Jahannamâbâd (hell), for all these names are appropriate." <sup>2</sup>  From Ahmedabad, he went to Khambait (Cambay, <i>lit</i> the place of a <i>khamb</i> or pillar, which was at first put up by a Raja there when he founded the city) which was a great port and which had a mint. His silver coins ( <i>tanka</i> ) struck there during his visit to Khambait commemorate the conquest of Deccan, the rebellion of which is referred to in the inscription, by saying on one side: "After the conquest of the Dakhin, he (Jahangir) came from Mândû to Gujarât." These silver and similar gold <i>tankas</i> were called, "Jahangiri <i>tankas</i> ."

<sup>1</sup> Ibid, p. 341. Cf. for wine-drinking Pahlavi Dadistan-i Dinik, Chaps. 50 and 51 S. B. E. Vol. XVIII, pp. 176-80.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 358.

Hijri year.	A. D.	
1027	1618	Appearance of a comet. This appearance of the comet was taken to be ill-omened because plague again broke out extensively. "It was also through the effects of this phenomenon that a misunderstanding arose between His Majesty and the fortunate Prince Shâh Jahân. The disturbances which thus originated lasted 7 or 8 years. What blood was shed in the country! and what families were ruined!" <sup>1</sup>
1027	1618	Jahangir presented to Khurram (Shâh Jahân) the first copy of his Jahangir-nâma containing an account of all the events of the first twelve years of his reign. He presented this first copy to Shâh Jahân whom he "considered in all things the first of all his sons." <sup>2</sup>
1028		Aurangzeb born.
1029		Khurram sent for the conquest of the fort of Kangra "situated in the hills north of Lahore." The fort was besieged. It surrendered later on, on 1st Mohorrum 1031.
1029	1620	Rebellion in the Deccan. Shâh Jahân sent to suppress it.
1030	1621	Khurram (Shâh Jahân) gains some victories over the rebels.
1031	1622	Khurram rose in rebellion against his father Jahangir.
1032	1623	Jahangir appointed his son Shah Parwez to the command of the army against Shâh Jahân. This event is referred to in the inscription. Shâh Jahân coming out of the fort of Mandu, was defeated. So, crossing the Nerbudda he fled towards the fort of Asir.
1032	1623	Shâh Jahân places his things and women under the charge of Gopaldass at Asir. This is the first event referred to in the inscription.
1033	1624	Shâh Jahân fled to Orissa and thence to Bengal. This seems to be referred to in the inscription as going to Purab or the East. He then "proceeded towards the Dakhin." This return to the Deccan is also referred to in the inscription.
1034	1625	Shâh Jahân arrived in the Deccan. Being defeated more than once by his father's army, he sued for peace. Jahangir consented on condition that Shâh Jahân sent "his sons Darah Shukoh and Aurangzeb to Court and would surrender Rohtâs and the fortress of Asir which were held by his adherents." Shâh Jahân then proceeded to Nasik.

<sup>1</sup> Elliot's History, VI, p. 407.<sup>2</sup> Ibid, p. 360.

Hijri year.	A. D.	
1035	1626	Khusru died.
1036	1627	Jahangir died aged 60. Shâh Jahân came to throne. The inscription also gives the date of accession as 1036 Hijri.
	1627	Shivaji born.
	1646	Shivaji withheld the tribute due to Shâh Jahân.
1062	1652-53	Raja Manohardas appointed commander of the Fort of Asir. (We do not find any reference to this in any book of history. It is the inscription that refers to it.)
1068	1658	Aurangzeb came to throne. The inscription gives the date as 1068.
	1664	Shivaji attacks Surat.
1075	1665	Treaty of Purandhar, by which Shivaji surrendered the territory he had taken from the Moguls. By that treaty, he surrendered the Thana Hill forts also.
		Raja Manohardas appointed to the command of the Mahâvli forts surrendered by Shivaji.
1076	1666	Shâh Jahân died.
	1707	Aurangzeb died.

## IV

## A SURVEY OF THE EVENTS.

We will now proceed to understand clearly the events referred to in the stone inscription.

The short Hindi inscription at the top and on the right hand margin simply says, that it was during the governorship of Raja Manohardas, the son of Mahârajâ Mândhâtâ Gâr that some works, relating to (the forts of) Mahâvli, Palâsghad and a third fort which seems to me to be Bhandârgad, were done. We will speak of the persons and places, mentioned in this short Hindi inscription, in our description of the larger Persian inscription.

The first event referred to in the Persian inscription is that of Hijri 1032, when Shâh Jahân is said to have entrusted all his property and servants of the palace to the charge of Gopaldas Gor in the fort of Asir and to have started on a journey of war.

1. Shâh Jahân, Raja Gopaldass and the Fort of Asir.

This event and the circumstances which led to this event and the fight with Sultan Parwez, another son of Jahangir, are all explained by the following passage which we read in the Târikh-i-Jahangiri or the History of Jahangir:

The Târikh-i-Jahangiri.

از آب نربدۀ عبور فرموده و کشتیها را به آنطرف کشیده بپرم بیگ بخششی را باجمعی بر کنار گذاشته خود با خانخانان بصوب قلعه آسیر و برهانپور شتافتند ..... چون موکب کهان شکوة پدای قلعه آسیر پیوست میر حام الدین ولد میر حبال الدین حسین انجو از قلعه بر آمده ملازمت نمود و آنحضرت خود اهل حرم بر فراز قلعه شتافته سه روز توقف فرموده و حراست قلعه بکوبالداس را چپوت که سپاهی کاردان بود تفویض یافت سامان آذوقه و سائر مصالح قلعه داری به وجه دلخواه فرموده بسیاری از پرستاران حرم اقبال را و سائر اسباب زیادتی که همراه گردانیدن آن تعدر تمام داشت در آنجا گذاشته متوجه برهانپور شدند<sup>1</sup>

#### Translation.

He (Shâh Jahân), having crossed the river Narbudda, and having drawn all the boats on this side (*i.e.*, bank of the river), and having placed Bairam Beg Bakhshi together with a number (of troops for guard) on the banks, hastened with Khân-Khânân in the direction of the fort of Asir and Barhanpur. . . . . When the army of the Majesty of the world (*i.e.*, Shâh Jahân) came to the fort of Asir, Mir Hamu-l-din, the son of Mir Habalu-l-din Husein Anju coming out of the fort, paid his respects. And His Highness himself, going up the fort with the people of his harem and staying there for three days, confided the custody of the fort to Gopaldas Rajput, who was an experienced

<sup>1</sup> Manuscript of the Tarikh-i-Jahangiri *تاریخ جهانگیری* in the Moola Feroze Library. (IV. R. 12). Events of the *سال ہز دہم*, *i.e.*, the 18th year, 14th page of this year's account.

soldier. And having arranged, according to the desire of his heart, for the materials of provisions and for the rest of the affairs of the command of the fort, and having left in that place, many of the female servants of his royal harem and the rest of superfluous goods that were difficult to be taken on his way (of journey), went towards Barhanpur.

The Wakiât-i-Jahangiri or the Memoirs of Jahangir, as translated in The Wakiat-i-Jahangiri. Elliot's History of the Mahomedan rulers of India, describes this event as follows :

“ On the 25th Urdibihisht <sup>1</sup> (1032 Hijri 1623 A.D.), I appointed my son Shâh Parwez to the command of the army operating against the rebel. He was to have the supreme command.”<sup>2</sup> Shah Parwez, of whom the inscription speaks as Sultan Parwez, had an army of “ 40,000 horse, with suitable artillery.” Shâh Jahân, who was then in the fort of Mandu, came out with an army of “ 20,000 horse, 600 elephants and powerful artillery with the intention of giving battle. . . . Shâh Jahân, not daring to risk a general action, and thinking always of his retreat, sent his elephants over the Nerbadda. He then sent his forces against the royal army near the village of Kâliya ; but he himself, with Khan-khânân and several others, remained a *kos* in the rear.” When he heard that some of his trusted officers had gone over to the side of his father “ he gave up resistance, and, being unable to place reliance upon any one, he determined to fly. With his forces in disorder, he crossed the Nerbadda. . . . He himself went off towards the fort of Asir. . . . When the rebel Shâh Jahân reached Asîr, he placed Khân-khânân, Dârâb, and all his other children in confinement in the upper part of the fortress. He remained there three or four days, attending to the victualling and preparation of the fortress, which he placed under the command of Gopâl Das, a Rajput. . . . When he departed he left some of his women and superfluous things there in charge of Gopâl ; but he took with him his three wives, his children, and such maids as were necessary.”<sup>3</sup>

The inscription places this event in 1032 Hijri (1623 A.D.). The Wakiat-i-Jahangiri also places it in the same year. The Târikh-i-Jahangiri also gives the same year.

There is one word in the account of the first event referred to in the inscription which requires a little explanation. The inscription speaks of *khâdamân* (خادمان), *i.e.*, domestic servants being left by Shâh

<sup>1</sup> Urdibihisht is the month Ardibehesht, the second month of the Parsees. Jahangir, following the precedent of his father Akbar, used Parsi months.

<sup>2</sup> Elliot VI, p. 386.

<sup>3</sup> Elliot's History of India, Vol. VI., pp. 387-88.



Jahân at the fort of Asir together with goods and property (مال و متاع). The Târikh-i Jahangiri speaks of the female servants of the royal harem (پرستاران حرم). We must understand that both seem to mean the same thing, because the word *khâdam* (خادم) in Persian is used for both, male and female, domestic servants.

The Raja Gopaldas Gor (راجہ گوپالداس کور) of the inscription is the Gopaldass Rajput (گوپالداس راجپوت) of the Târikh-i Jahangiri.

The next event referred to in the inscription is that of Shâh Jahân crossing a river and going to Deccan. This event is thus referred to in Jahangir's Wakiât : "Shâh Jahân, when he heard of the defection of Khân-khânân, the passage of the river by the Imperial troops, and the retreat of Bairam Beg, fell back. Notwithstanding heavy rain and inundations, he crossed the river Mati in a wretched state, and went off towards the Dakhin."<sup>1</sup> According to the Wakiât-i Jahangiri Prince Parwez and his army then "pressed on in pursuit of the rebel across the river (Tâptî)."

The third event referred to in the inscription is that of Raja Gopaldas being further honoured by Shâh Jahân with the title of Mândhâtâ and a *mansab* of Rs. 5,000. The Raja, thus honoured, continued with his son Prince Balrâm (Balârâm), to serve Shâh Jahân faithfully. This seems to be a minor event, and so, we find no reference to it in any historical book. But we know this much, that Gopaldas held the fortress of Asir for Shâh Jahân very long. Shâh Jahân, on being defeated at first, had gone to Orissa and from there to Bengal, and from there back to the Deccan in 1034 A.D. He had then laid siege to Barhanpur. He carried three assaults over the city but failed. Then he retired to Balaghât. Thence he went again towards the Deccan. Then he made peace with his father. It was then that Asir was surrendered to Jahangir. We read the following about its final surrender in the supplement to Jahangir's Wakiât (Tatimma-i Wakiât-i Jahangiri) :

"But he was seized with illness on the way (to Deccan). The error of his conduct now became apparent to him, and he felt that he must beg forgiveness of his father for his offences. So with this proper feeling he wrote a letter to his father, expressing his sorrow and

<sup>1</sup> Elliot VI, p. 389.

repentance, and begging pardon for all faults past and present. His Majesty wrote an answer with his own hands, to the effect that if he would send his sons Dârâ Shukoh and Aurangzeb to Court, and would surrend Rohtâs and the fortress of Asir, which were held by his adherents, full forgiveness should be given him, and the country of the Balâghât should be conferred upon him. Upon reading this, Shâh Jahân deemed it his duty to conform to his father's wishes ; so, notwithstanding the love he had for his sons, he sent them to his father, with offerings of jewels, chased arms, elephants, &c., to the value of ten *lacs* of rupces. He wrote to Muzaffar Khân, directing him to surrender Rohtâs to the person appointed by the Emperor, and then to come with Sultân Murâd Bakhshi. He also wrote to Hayât Khân directions for surrendering Asir to the Imperial officers. Shâh Jahân then proceeded to Nasik." <sup>1</sup> This was in 1035, the 21st year of the reign of Jahangir.

The Hindi inscription speaks of the commander of the fort as Mândhâtâ Gôr. The Persian inscription speaks of him as Raja Gopaldas Gôr and says that the title of Mândhâtâ was given him later by Shâh Jahân. This word 'Mândhâtâ' seems to be Sanskrit मान धात, meaning one upon whom honour (mân मान) is bestowed (dhâta धात from root dhâ, to confer, grant).

The next event referred to in the inscription is the accession of Shâh Jahân to the throne, the date of which is given as 1036 Hijri. But the Ikbâl-nameh-i Jahangiri gives the date of Jahangir's death as "the 28th Safar, 1037 Hijri in the 22nd year of his reign."<sup>2</sup>

So Shâh Jahân came to the throne after that day. His elder brother Parwez, who had fought against him during his rebellion against his father, died on 6th Safar 1035 Hijri. <sup>3</sup> So on Jahangir's death, "Âsof Khân, the chief personage in the State, in concert with Khan-i-azam (Irâdat Khan), brought Dawar Bakhsh, son of Khusrû, out of confinement, and held out to him the prospect of his becoming king."<sup>4</sup> But in the end "on the 2nd Jumâd-l-awwal, 1037 A. H., agreeing with 10th Bahman, in the twenty-second year of the reign of Jahangir, by general consent Shâh Jahân was proclaimed at Lahore, and the *Khutba* was read in his name."<sup>5</sup>

The Badshah-nama of Abdu-l-Hamid Lahori, which gives an account of the first twenty years of Shâh Jahân's reign, also gives 28th

<sup>1</sup> Elliot, p. 396.

<sup>2</sup> Elliot VI, p. 435.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 432.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid, p. 435.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid, p. 438.

Safar A. H. 1037 (28th October 1627) as the date of Jahangir's death<sup>1</sup> (age 58 years one month) and "18th Jumâda-s Sani 1037 A. H. (6th February 1628)" as the date of Shâh Jahân's accession. So, the date given by the inscription as that of Shâh Jahân's accession does not seem to be quite correct.

The next event in the Inscription is that of the appointment, in 1062 Hijri, of Raja Manohardas, the son of Raja Mânhardas' appointment. (i. e., Raja Gopaldas, who is now spoken of by his titular name given to him by Shâh Jahân), to the command of fort Asir. We saw above, that Shâh Jahân had, on making peace with his father in 1034 Hijri (1625), surrendered the fort of Asir to his father. So, it appears, that sometime after coming to the throne, he honoured the son of his former faithful commander with the command of the fort. Raja Manohardas continued on the command for six years. We know nothing of this appointment from the books of history of Shâh Jahân.

The next event in the Inscription is that of Aurangzeb's accession to the throne of Delhi, which, it says, occurred in 1068. The Muntakhabu-l-Lubab of Muhammad Hashim Khafi Khan also gives the same date. It says : "On the 1st Zi-l-Kâda, 1068 A. H. (22nd July 1658 A. D.), after saying his prayers, and at an auspicious time, he took his seat on the throne of the Empire of Hindustan, without even troubling himself about placing his name on the coinage or having it repeated in the *khutba*. . . . Such matters as titles, the *khutba*, the coinage, and the sending of presents to other sovereigns were all deferred to his second taking possession of the throne."<sup>2</sup>

Aurangzeb ascended the throne during the lifetime of his father Shâh Jahân. "On the 7th Zi-l-hijja 1067 A. H. (Sept. 8, 1657 A. D.) (the Emperor Shâh Jahân, called after his death) Firdaus Makani was attacked with illness."<sup>3</sup> His son "Dâra Shukoh looked upon himself as heir to the throne, and even in the time of his father's health he had held the reins of government. But he had fallen into ill repute through having imbibed the heretical tenets of the Sufis. . . . He had also associated himself with the *Brahmans* and *Gosains*. Seizing the opportunity (of his father's illness) . . . he closed the roads of Bengal, Ahmadabad, and Dakhin against messengers and travellers. . . . When intelligence of these proceedings reached Muhammad Shuja in Bengal and Muhammad Murad Baksh in Ahmadabad (two of the sons of Shâh Jahân), each of them, vying with the other, had coins struck and the *khutba* read in his own name."<sup>4</sup> Aurangzeb, at first pretended to be

<sup>1</sup> Elliot VII, p. 5.<sup>2</sup> Ibid, p. 229.<sup>3</sup> Ibid, p. 213.<sup>4</sup> Ibid, Vol. VII, p. 214.

friendly with Muhammad Murad Bakhsh and offered him his co-operation. He then defeated Dara Sukoh and confined Shâh Jahân. He then imprisoned Murad Bakhsh and declared himself king. He then defeated prince Shuja, who marched from Bengal. He abolished the Ilahi calender and the festival of Nauroz. He was "unwilling that the *Nauroz* and the year and months of the Magi should give their names to the anniversary of his accession." <sup>1</sup> Shâh Jahân died "at the end of Rajab 1076 A.H. (22nd Jan. 1666), in the eighth year of the reign of Aurangzeb.....Shah Jahan reigned 31 years and he was secluded and under restraint nearly eight years." <sup>2</sup>

The next event referred to in the Inscription is that of what occurred in 1075 Hijri (1665 A. D.), the eighth year of the reign of Aurangzeb. The inscription says, that the Emperor, in order to reward the above-said Manohardas for his faithful services as the Commander of Asir, on the command of which he seems to have continued during his reign, appointed him as the Commander of Mahâvli.

This event seems to have happened in connection with Aurangzeb's war with the Mahrathas under Shivaji. Aurangzeb's troubles with Shivaji had begun in 1070 A.H. (1660 A. D.). The author of the *Mutakhabu-l-Lubab* who describes the history of Aurangzeb's reign thus commences his narrative of Shivaji: "I now relate what I have heard from trusty men of the Dakhin and of the Mahratta race about the origin and race of the reprobate Shivaji." He traces the descent of Sahu Bhoslah, the master of Shivaji's father, from a good stock, in the 7th or 8th generation of a person of a mixed Rajput and Mahratha marriage. He then refers to Shivaji's gradual rise and the murder of Afzulkhan at his hand. At Aurangzeb's command, Shayasta Khan, the Amiru-l-umara marched to punish Shivaji. Sometime after, in 1023 A.H. (1663 A.D.), Shivaji surprised Shayasta Khan at Poona. The next year despatches arrived at Aurangzeb's camp that "Shivaji was growing more and more daring, and every day was attacking and plundering the Imperial territories and caravans. He had seized the perts of Jiwal, Pâbal and others near Surat, and attacked the vessels of pilgrims bound to Mecca. He had built several forts by the sea-shore." <sup>3</sup> In 1075 A. H. (1665 A. D.), Shivaji was hard pressed by the generals of Aurangzeb. "Accordingly he sent some intelligent men to Raja Jai Singh (a great general of Aurangzeb), begging forgiveness of his

<sup>1</sup> Ibid, p. 243.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, p. 275.

<sup>3</sup> Elliot VII, p. 271.

offences, promising the surrender of several forts which he still held, and proposing to pay a visit to the Raja." <sup>1</sup> His offer of surrender was accepted. Shivaji was admitted into the presence of Raja Jai Singh to whom he said: "I have come as a guilty slave to seek forgiveness, and it is for you either to pardon or to kill me at your pleasure. I will make over my great forts, with the country of the Konkan, to the Emperor's officers."<sup>2</sup>

Leaving aside the question of some possible exaggeration of the Mahomedan historian in the matter of Shivaji's affairs, what we learn, in connection with the event in question referred to in the Inscription, is this, that in 1075 Hijri (1665 A. D.) Shivaji surrendered to Aurangzeb's officers his forts in the Konkan. According to the Inscription, one of such officers of Aurangzeb, was Raja Manohardas, the Commander of Asir; and one of the forts of Konkan thus surrendered was Mahâvli in the Thana district in Konkan. We learn from the inscription that Aurangzeb rewarded the services of Raja Manohardas by placing him in command of the newly possessed fort of Mahâvli.

The last and the most important event, in fact *the* event which is the *raison d'être* of this inscription, which is noted on the stone, is the fact that it was during this commandership of Mahâvli by Raja Manohardas, that the forts of Mahâvli and Pâlâsghad and Bhandârgad were put into proper order. The stone inscription commemorates this important event. The Mahâvli fort or Mahâvli Hill already existed, but Aurangzeb's abovenamed Commander put its fortifications in a better order or rebuilt them.

9. The Fortifications of Mahâvli put in order.

## V

### PLACES, REFERRED TO IN THE DESCRIPTION.

Having spoken of the personages referred to in the Inscription and the events connected with them, we will now speak of the places mentioned in it. The places mentioned therein are the following :—

1. Asir
2. Purab
3. Mahâvli
4. Pâlâsghad
5. Bhandar Dârang.

<sup>1</sup> Ibid, p. 273.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, VII, p. 274.

The Persian inscription and the Persian extract from the *Târikh-i Jahangiri*, both refer to the fort of Asir. Asir or 1. The Fort of Asir. Asirgadh (*i.e.*, Asir, the fort), is a great fort in the Deccan. It was said to have been built, sometime before 1370, by Asa, the shepherd king, who was the last of the race of Ashirs or shepherds who ruled over the country of the Satpura Hills, near Nimûr.<sup>1</sup>

Abu-l-Fazl in his *Akbar-nâmah* thus refers to the first foundation of a fort on the hill:—“The rulers of Khandesh were of the Faruki tribe, and the family had held rule in the country for more than 200 years. An ancestor who had connexions with the Dakhin and had served there as a soldier, being aggrieved, left that country and went to Khandesh, which country was then held by different *samindars* and *Râjâs*. He came to a village which pleased him, and there a dog which accompanied him set off in pursuit of a hare, but the hare turned round and attacked the dog. This unusual exhibition of courage greatly impressed him, and he thought that the land where such a sight could be seen must be fertile in courage and daring, so he resolved to take up his abode there. He expressed his wish to the *samindar* of the place, but it was refused. Afterwards he seized an opportunity of seeking assistance from the King of Delhi, and having collected some of his brethren (tribesmen?) he overpowered that *samindar*, and took possession of the village. He extended his power over other villages around, and in the end he was master of several *parganas* and commander of an armed force.

“When he died, his authority descended to his grandson, who saw the value that a fortress would be as a place of safety for his family and dependents. Asir which is situated on the top of a hill, was at that time an inhabited place. He continued by various stratagems to obtain this place from the *samindar* who held it, and fortified it strongly. He then assumed the name of ruler, and at length the whole country of Khandesh, about 150 *kos* in length, and 50 in breadth, more or less, came under his sway.”<sup>2</sup>

Akbar had besieged the fortress in about 1599, when it was in the hands of the King of Khandesh. Abu-l-Fazl, his prime minister, and author of the *Akbar-nâmah* was sent by Akbar to invest it in the 43rd year of his reign. The attempt was unsuccessful at first, but in the end the fort was taken.

<sup>1</sup> Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. I, Part II. p. 619.

<sup>2</sup> Elliot's History of India, Vol. VI. p. 137-38.

Abu-l-Fazl calls this fort of Asir “one of the wonders of the world.” So, the following report of Akbar’s generals, when they captured it after a siege of eleven months, will be found very interesting :

Report about Asir  
by Akbar’s generals.

“They had never seen in any country a fort like this ; for, however long an army might press the siege, nothing but the extraordinary good fortune of the Emperor could effect its capture. Old soldiers, and men who had travelled into distant lands,—men who had seen the fortresses of Irân and Turân, of Rum, Europe, and of the whole habitable world, had never beheld the equal of this. It is situated on a high and strong hill, and three smaller hills, each having a fort, stand around it, like a halo round the moon. The ways of entrance and exit were difficult to discover. Near it there was no other hill commanding it, and no way of approach. All around was level ground, and there were no trees or jungle to serve as cover. All the time the country had been held by the dynasty, each prince, as he succeeded, did his best to keep the place in repair, to add to its strength, or to increase its stores. It was impossible to conceive a stronger fortress, or one more amply supplied with artillery, warlike stores and provisions. There were 500 *mans* of opium, *Akbarshâhi* weight in its stores. Were the fortress placed upon level ground, its reduction would be difficult, but such a hill, such a well secured fortress, and such artillery, were not to be found in any one place on the face of the earth.”<sup>1</sup>

This strong fort was taken “on a dark rainy night by a force under (Abu’l Fazl’s) command, by means of a secret way into its outwork, of which information was obtained from one of the garrison.”<sup>2</sup>

The means of  
defence of the  
fort of Asir.

The following account of the means of defend-  
ing a great Indian fort in those times will be  
found equally interesting :—

“After the capture of the fortress, accounts were taken of the munitions. Of pieces of artillery (*zarb-zan*), small and great, there were more than 1,300, besides some which were disused. The balls varied in weight from nearly two *mans* down to a *sir* or a half *sir*. There were great numbers of mortars (*hukkadân*), and also many *man-janiks*, each of which threw stones of 1,000 or 2,000 *mans*. On every bastion there were large iron cauldrons, in each of which twenty or thirty *mans* of oil could be boiled and poured down upon the assailants in case of assault. No account was taken of the muskets. Of provisions of all sorts, wines, medicines, aromatic roots, and of everything required for the use of man, there was vast abundance. When,

Elliot VI, pp. 138-39.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, p. 141 p. 1.

after a protracted siege of eleven months, the place fell into the hands of the Imperial army, the quantities of grain, oil, etc., which remained, after some thousands of men had been fed (during the siege), seemed as the stores had never been touched. The stores of ammunition were such, that thousands of *mans* were left, although the quantity consumed had been enormous. For throughout the siege a constant firing was kept up night and day, with object and without object, so that in the dark nights of the rainy season no man dared to raise his head, and a demon even would not move about. There were large chambers full of powder. There were no springs of water in the fortress; but there were two or three immense reservoirs, in which the (rain) water was collected and stored from year to year, and amply sufficed for the requirements of the garrison. In the dwelling of each officer of importance there was a separate reservoir, containing a sufficient supply of pure water for his household. Nor had all this preparation been made for the occasion; it had been kept up from the foundation of the fortress. The rulers of the country had incessantly cared for the strengthening and provisioning of the fort, more especially in respect of artillery. The revenues of several *parganas* were specially and separately assigned to keep up the supply of artillery, so that the officers of the department had independent sources for maintaining its efficiency. The population in the fortress was like that of a city, for it was full of men of every kind. After the surrender, the inhabitants came out, and there was a continuous throng night and day for a week.

“The houses of the chiefs were fine lofty buildings, and there were open spaces, gardens and fountains. In the walls of the fort, which were of great thickness, chambers and rooms were constructed for the officers of the artillery, where, during all seasons, they could live in comfort, and keep up a fire of cannon and musketry. The fortress has one gate, and outside this gate there is another fort called Kamargarh, the walls of which are joined on both sides to the great fort. This was looked upon as an outwork, and was held by inferior ranks of men, such as musketeers and archers. Below this fort, but still on an elevated spot, is another fort called Mâlgarh, which also is very strong. In comparison with the fortress, it seems at the bottom of the earth; but compared with the surface of the ground, it looks half-way up to the sky. This being the most advanced of the works, great care had been taken to strengthen it with guns and other implements. Below this was an inhabited place called Takhati, as large as a city. In short, the fortress is one of the wonders of the world, and it is impossible to convey an idea of it to any one who has not seen it.”<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid, pp. 139-41.



I cannot identify the place mentioned as Purab. In the Mahomedan history of the period no place of that name is mentioned. The inscription says that after arranging the affairs in the fort of Asir, Shâh Jahân went to the direction of Purab (به سمت پورب شدند). The Târikh-i Jahangiri says, that he went to the direction of Burhanpur (متوجه برهانپور شدند). So, perhaps, Purab was a place in the direction of Burhanpur. Perhaps the scribe who inscribed the inscription misunderstood or mistook Purab (پورب) for Burhanpur. (برهانپور)'

The Thana Gazetteer gives the following account of the history of the Mahâvli hill fort: "In the year 1485, Mahuli along with other Konkan forts, was taken by Malik Ahmad, afterwards the founder of the Ahmadnagar dynasty. In 1635, Mâhuli surrendered to Shahu, and here Jijibai, the mother of Shivaji, occasionally took refuge with her young son. In 1636, it was invested by Khan Zâman and Shahu forced to surrender. In 1661 it was taken by Shivaji, though defended by a Rajput garrison. It was soon after given to the Moghals but in 1670, after a serious repulse and a siege of two months, it was taken by Moro Trimal, Shivaji's Peshwa or Prime Minister. It seems to have been held by the Mârâthas till it was ceded by them to the English under the terms of the treaty of Poona, June 1817".<sup>2</sup>

We read the following in the Bombay Gazetteer<sup>3</sup> about the Mahâvli, Pâlasgâd and Bhandârdarang forts: "Mahuli Mahâvli; Pâlasgâd, and Bhandârdarang. Fort on the hill of the same name 2,815 feet high, is in the Shahapur sub-division about four miles north-west of Shahapur . . . . The fortifications are said to have been built by the Moghals and on the top are the ruins of a place of prayer and of a mosque." According to Captain Dickinson's survey in 1818, as described in the Gazetteer, "The hill has three fortified summits, Pâlâsgad on the north, Mahuli in the centre, and Bhandargad in the south. Mahuli, the middle peak, is the largest of the three, being upwards of half a mile long by nearly as much broad, with a plentiful supply of water and in many places fine soil . . . . The other two forts Pâlâsgad to the north and Bhandargad to the south, can be reached, only up the heads of the narrow ravines which separate them from Mahuli. From the country below, Pâlasgâd alone is accessible. In Mahuli

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps it is a Hindi word meaning 'East', as suggested by Prof. Isfahani.

<sup>2</sup> Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. XIV, Thana, Places of Interest, p. 220.

<sup>3</sup> Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. 14, Thana, Places of Interest, p. 219.

and Bhandargad there were a few buildings which required a little repair, while Pâlâsgad and other works were rapidly going to decay. In Captain Dickinson's opinion the fort was untenable. In 1862, it was very dilapidated. Time, it was said, would shortly wipe away all traces of fortifications except small parts of the old wall and the foundations."

The writer of the article in the Thana Gazetteer, when he says, that "the fortifications are said to have been built by the Moguls," says that perhaps on old traditions. He has given no authority to say that, but this newly-discovered stone inscription confirms the oral tradition that the fortifications were re-built by the Moguls. The fortifications are of the three forts Mahâvli, Pâlâsgad and Bhandargad, the names of which are found in the inscription.

The place spoken of as भंडारदरंग (Bhandârdarang in the Hindi inscription and as بندار درنگ Bandâr-darang in the Persian inscription is the same as the Bhandargad of the Gazetteer. The word *ambâr-khanah* (i.e., storehouse) in the inscription, has the same signification as the word bhandâr which also means a store.

The question is : Who had put up the stone ? I think, it was Raja Manohardas or one of his immediate successors who put up the stone. The fact of the stone inscription being bi-lingual points to that conclusion. A part of the inscription is in Hindi and in Nagari characters. So, it must have been put up by a Hindu governor. Had it been by a Mahomedan governor, possibly it would have been wholly in Persian. The ruins of a Mahomedan Musjid, referred to by the Gazetteer, point to the Mahomedan occupation and population, but the Hindi inscription points to the Hindu commandership of Manohardas.

Value of the  
Inscription.

The discovery of the inscription confirms several known facts and gives some new facts, not known before.

(1) Firstly, it confirms the old tradition that the fortifications on the Mahâvli hill, consisting of the forts of Mahâvli, Pâlâsgad and Bhandargad were built by the Moguls. (2) It settles the fact that it were the officers of Aurangzeb who put up the fortifications in good order. (3) It gives some new facts about the commanders of the fort of Asir and Mahâvli, not known from the books of History.