

*A Note of Correction for the Paper "A Persian
Inscription of the Mogul times" (Journal, B. B. R. A.
Society, Volume XXIV, No. 1, pp. 137-161.)*

(Read on 30th March 1916.)

I had the pleasure of reading a Paper before this Society, on 18th March 1915, under the title of "A Persian Inscription of the Mogul times on a stone found in the District Judge's Court at Thana." I had sent a copy of it to Mr. H. Beveridge, I.C.S. (Retired), a well-known writer on the subject of Mogul History. In his letter, dated 1st December 1915, acknowledging the receipt of that Paper, he writes that "the inscription is a valuable one," and kindly draws my attention to a mis-reading of the inscription and to a consequent mistake in my translation. I thank Mr. Beveridge for this, and take this early opportunity for correction.

In my above Paper, I had said: "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 of an altogether correct decipherment. Another cause is the difficulty of deciphering the nuktehs (نکته) or points occurring in 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 a 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 of the inscription."¹

¹ Journal B. B. R. A. Society, Vol. XXIV, No. 1, p. 140.

The error, to which Mr. Beveridge, from his vast knowledge of the history of the Moguls, draws my attention, occurs in the fifth line of the inscription. The error arises from the above alluded difficulty of the nuktehs or points. In the fifth line there is a word, the last letters of which bear no nuktehs. I took two nuktehs *under* a letter and read it as *تہیم tahiyè (tahaiyat)*, in the sense of "preparation, arrangement." But as said by Mr. Beveridge the word is *تہہ* "Tatta" He says: "The word is not *تہیر* but *تہہ* Tatta, and the meaning of the passage is that Raja Gopaldas and his son Balaram were both killed at the siege of Tatta in Scinde." Mr. Beveridge then gives references to works which refer to the siege of Tatta and the connection of Gopaldas and his son with that siege. I thankfully accept his reading of the word as Tatta, which is supported by historical references given by him. I would, therefore, correct my translation of this portion, and translate the words *درجنگ تہہ بکار آمدند* as "they fought¹ in the battle of Tatta or "they became useful in the battle of Tatta."

Shâh Jahân had laid siege to Tatta, and in that siege, both Gopaldas and his son Balaram, referred to in the inscription, had proved themselves very useful. Raja Sivram Gor *راجہ سیورام گور* was the son of Balaram and grandson of Gopaldass. While speaking of him the *Maâsiru-l-Umara*² says thus :

راجہ سیورام گور—پور بلرام بن راجہ گوپال داس
است چون پدر و پدر کلان او در عہد شاہزادگی اعلیٰ
حضرت بہنگامئہ یرش تہہ بکار آمدند او بیش از پیش
مورد التفات گردید

Translation.—Raja Sivram Gor. He is the son of Balaram, the son of Raja Gopâldâs. As his father and grandfather, in the time of the principedom of His Most Exalted Majesty had fought (or had become very useful) during the period of the siege of Tatta, he was more and more honoured with favours.

¹ *کار* kâr, war, battle. *بکار آمدند* also means to be useful. So, the sentence may also mean "They became useful in the battle of Tatta."

² The *Maâsiru-l-Umarâ* (Histories or traditions of the noblemen) by Nawâb Samsam d-Daulah Shah Nawaz khan, edited by Maulavi Abdur Rahim and Maulavi Mirza Ashraf 'Ali. (1890), Vol. II, p. 263.

Again, while speaking of Raja Bithadass (Vithaldas) Gor, the second son of Gopaldas, the above work says thus ¹:—

راجہ بیتھلداس کور—پسر دوم راجہ گوپال داس کور
 است کہ در ایام مراجعت سلطان خرم از بنگالہ و ورود
 بدہانپور قلعہ داز آسیر بود پس از آن شاہزادہ اورا نزد
 خود طلب داشتہ سردار خان را بجای او گذاشت و در
 محاصرہ تہہ باپسر جانشین خود بلرام نام بمردانگی جان
 نثار گردید—

Translation.—Raja Bithaldas Gor. He is the second son of Raja Gopaldass Gor, who in the time of the return of Sultan Khurram from Bengal, and arrival at Barhanpur, was the fort-commander of Asir. Afterwards, the prince, calling him before him, appointed Sirdar Khan in his place, and in the siege of Tatta, he with his son (and) heir, Balaram by name, sacrificed his life in a manly way.

This passage then shows, that Gopaldas and his son Balaram had not only fought bravely in the siege of Tatta, but were gloriously killed. So, Shâh Jahân showed all possible favours to the other sons of Gopaldas.

This corrected reading will add an event to the number of events, referred to in the inscription, on which I have dwelt at some length in my previous paper. I will describe that event here, at some length, resting on the authority of the *Ikbal-Nâma-i-Jahangiri*, as referred to in Elliot's History:—"Shâh Jahân, with a small party of adherents, had proceeded to Thatta. . . On approaching Thatta, Sharifu-l Mulk, the Governor of the country, and a devoted son of Shahriyâr's, came forward arrogantly with 3,000 or 4,000 horse, and 10,000 infantry, collected from the country, to oppose Shâh Jahân's progress. The Prince had with him only 300 or 400 horse; but Sharifu-l Mulk was afraid to attack them, and retired into the fortress of the city. The fortress had been lately repaired, many guns had been mounted and chosen parties of men held the various bastions, prepared to make a vigorous defence. Shâh Jahân forbade any attempt upon the fort, and desired to avoid a sacrifice of life from the fire of the fortress. A party of his brave fellows, not heeding his prohibition, made an attack; but the works were too strong, and the fire too heavy, so they were repulsed. Some days later another party, unable to repress their ardour, made their attack. The ground round the fortress was level and open, with

¹ *Ibid* pp. 250-251.

not a mound, a wall, a tree, or any kind of shelter. So they placed their shields in front of them and rushed forward. They came upon a broad and deep ditch, which was full of water. To advance was impossible, to return still more so. Trusting in Providence as their fortress, there they stayed. Shâh Jahân sent to recall them, but they did not retire. Some of his most devoted servants went to bring them back ; but each one that went took part with them, and choosing the road to death, never returned" (Elliot, VI pp. 432-33).

Mr. Beveridge draws my attention to two more points in my paper, not for correction, as they require no correction, but for further elucidation. These points do not refer to the inscription, but still it is worth while to draw to them the attention of the readers of my paper.

(a) I have referred to Raja Roz-Afzun.¹ In the abovenamed Maâsir-i-Umara,² we have a long account of this Raja. He is there spoken of as the son of Raja Singram (راجہ سنگرام). In the Ain-i-Akbari,³ this Singram is spoken of as the Raja of Kharakpur (Bihar). He had a Mahomedan name, because, though Hindu by birth, he had turned a Mahomedan.⁴

(b) I have referred to a seditious person, Kutb, whom I have compared with the Pseudo-Smerdis of the Achæmenian times of King Darius of Persia. This Kutb (Qutb), is thus referred to in the Tuzuk-i-Jehangiri or Memoirs of Jehangir.⁵ "On the 19th Urdibihisht, in the fifth year of my reign . . . there occurred a strange affair at Patna . . . An unknown man of the name of Qutb belonging to the people of Uch, who was a mischievous and seditious fellow, came to the province of Ujjaiyoja (Bhojpur) . . . represented to them that he was Khurram who had escaped from prison and conveyed himself there . . . He showed those deceived ones the parts about his eyes."

There are two references to Raja Mândhâta in the Maasir-i-Alamgiri.⁶

¹ Journal Vol. XXIV, p. 145. Page 9 of my Paper.

² Vol. II, p. 218.

³ Blochmann's Translation, Vol. I, p. 446.

⁴ *Ibid*, n. 1.

⁵ The Tuzuk-i-Jehangiri, translated by Alexander Rogers and edited by Henry Beveridge (1909), p. 173.

⁶ Pages 207 and 317, Bengal Asiatic Society's Text (1871). (a) In one place he is spoken of as holding the Thanedhâri of Gorband ; (b) in another as the son of Râokanku.

My previous paper has drawn the attention of another gentleman, Rai Bahadur B. A. Gupte. He thus writes to me from Belvedere, Alipore, (P.O. Calcutta), on 16th January, 1916 :—

“ In connection with the Persian inscription found near the District Judge's Court at Thana, published in Volume XXIV, No. I, (1914-1915), of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, I know the following particulars: In the house now called the Chândraseniya Kâyasth Prabhu Social Club (No. 7 Ganpatrâw Jairâm Street), there lived in the fifties, an old gentleman, named Dâdâ Sâheb Asirkar. He was our neighbour as between his residence and my family house, there intervened only one building. I knew his grandson who was a little younger than myself. His name was Ramchandra, one of his arms was injured and much shorter than the other. The Asirkar family finally shifted to Bhivandi in the Thana district. My grandfather Ganpatraw Janardan Gupte was the first Government Prosecutor of the Thana District Court. He was a friend of this Dâdâ Sâheb Asirkar, and I remember to have heard the members of that family, talking of their official connection with Asirgad. I was only 6 or 7 years of age at that time, but I think that in the south-east corner of his compound, there lay a stone with some letters on it. I have asked Mr. B. V. Kharkar, B.A., who lives in the intervening house, to trace this Asirkar family and to try to get some information about their connection with Asirgad and Mâhuli. I will send you further particulars with pleasure, if I get them. I do not know whether Dâdâ Sâheb Asirkar was employed in the District Court, nor do I know how the stone was taken to the District Court. But one thing is certain that the family left Thana soon after 1858. I also know that the late Atmaram Mahipat Paralikar, Mamlatdar of Bassein (and subsequently of Poona) had in his possession a long roll of the account of building a fort, but I am not sure whether it was Parali or Mâhuli. I have a faint idea that, that fort was somewhere in the Nasik District in which my grandfather was a Munsiff. Mr. Atmaram's son is employed in the Baroda State. I have written to him too.”

This letter seems to suggest, how the stone may have come to Thana. The Asirkar family, which had derived its name from its official connection with the fort of Asir in the Thana district, may also have been connected with the Mahuli fort in the Thana district. So, it is possible, that some member of that family may have brought the stone to Thana.

P.S.—After writing and reading the above correction Note, I have received another letter from the same gentleman, which shows further

the connection of the Asirkar family with some forts in the Thana district. They may also have been in charge of the Mâhuli fort and may have brought the stone from there to Thana. We do not know how it passed from their house to the Court house. In this second letter, from Belvedere, Alipore, Calcutta, dated 12th April, 1916, Rai Bahadur Gupte says :—

“ I have at last been able to trace the history of the Asirgad stone. Mr. Purshottam Vaman Likhite Asirkar, a descendant of the Dadasaheb I mentioned in my last, lives at Thana, in the house known as Mulki's Vada. He says, that his ancestors held the hereditary Potnisship of Fort Kohaj, about 7 or 8 miles from Asir Mahal in the Mahim Taluka of the present day. There is a Fort called Asirgad in that locality.

“ After the British conquest, his ancestor Laxman Ramchandra Likhite lost the hereditary appointment, and became talati of Asirgad. He was subsequently made Mahalkari of Nagothana, Mamlatdar of Pen, and finally Mamlatdar of Mahim, his ancestral tract.

“ After the retirement he lives in house No. 7, Kharkar Ali, *viz.*, that I have described in my last. It is quite possible that as a Mamlatdar, he may have brought down the old stone of that house, where I saw it.”

The following facts about Tattah may be mentioned. It was founded by Nandu Bâhiniya, a chief of the tribe of Şamma, who had received the title of Jâm Tattah. (Târikh-i-Tâhiri by Mir Tâhir Muhammad Nasyâni of Thatta who lived in the beginning of the 17th century. Elliot I, p. 273). Firoz Shâh attacked and took it (Târikh-i-Firoz Shâhi, Elliot IV 12). Shah Beg took it in about 1520 (*Ibid* I, p. 500). Mujahid Khan took it in 1574, on behalf of king Akbar (*Ibid* I, p. 241). In the Maâsir-i Alamgiri, the city is called Thatta (The Bengal As. Society's Calcutta edition by Mahmud Saki Mustakhan (1871), p. 517).