ART. XIX—A few Notes on Broach from an Antiquarian point of view.

By

JIVANJI JAMSHEDJI MODI, B.A.

(Read March 15th, 1907.)

In December last, Khan Bahadur Adurjee Muncherjee Dalal conveyed to me an invitation from himself and his colleagues, the Trustees of the Parsee Punchayet of Broach, to pay a visit to their city for the purpose of delivering there one or two lectures and a reading from the Shah-námaeh of Firdousi. In response to this kind invitation, I paid a short visit to Broach from 31st December to 3rd January. While there, I made some inquiries on a subject suggested to me by our learned Secretary, Mr. Edwardes, some time ago, and on two or three other subjects suggested by the visit to the city. The object of this paper is to present few notes on those subjects.

The following are the principal three heads under which I beg to submit my notes:—

I.—The sites of the Dutch and English Factories.

II.—The past history of Broach from a Parsi point of view and the part said to have been played in that history by the Kabisah (i.e., the intercalary month) question of the Parsis.

III.—The Kabir Vad and the tiraths or shrines on the Nerbudda near Broach.

I.

The first subject on which I beg to present a few notes is that of the sites of the first English and Dutch factories. Our Secretary had written to me, in June 1905, to make some inquiries from friends at Broach, about the site of the first English factory. On 28th June 1905, I had written to my friend, Mr. Ruttonjee Muncherjee Dalal, requesting him to make such inquiries. On 21st August 1905, he wrote to me in reply giving the results of his inquiries. During my short visit I took up the question myself and made some inquiries personally.
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The Broach Gazetteer says: "In the year 1613, Broach was visited by Aldworth and Withington, English merchants, and in the next year (1614), on Withington's return from Sind, a house in Broach was hired for a factory. In 1616 Sir Thomas Roe obtained from the Emperor Jehangier permission for the English to establish a trading-house at Broach on very favourable terms. They were to be allowed to live near the Governor, and the decree commanded no man to molest them by sea or land or take any customs of them. The Dutch were not long of following the example of the English. In 1617 they also settled at Broach and established a factory. But the Broach factory does not seem to have risen to much consequence. In the eighteenth century there was but one junior merchant and one bookkeeper, with a few native servants under them." (Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. II, p. 468).

It appears from this account that the English (A.D. 1614) preceded the Dutch (1617) in founding their factory by about 3 years.

The site of the Dutch factory at Broach is well-known. There is no doubt about it. The large house in which it was situated, is still known as the Valandani Kothi, i.e., the factory of the Hollanders. In spite of the various changes which it seems to have undergone, the factory bears on the gate "as an inscription" the initials of the Company. (The Dutch East India Company, V with an 'o' and 'e' in the legs of V.)

1 Robert Orme gives the following version of Sir Thomas Roe in the matter of these concessions:—

"The two and twentieth (of July 1616) I received letters from Brampore, in answer of those to Mohobet Chan, who at first (request) granted my desire, making his firman to Barooch most effectual to receive our nation, and to give them a house near the Governor; strictly commanding no man to molest them by sea or land, or to take any customs of them, or any way trouble them under colour thereof. . . . . The firman I caused to be sent to Surat (in order to be forwarded by the agency there to Broach): so that Barooch is provided for a good retreat from the Prince's injuries; and the custom given, whereby fifteen hundred pounds per annum will be saved besides all manner of searches and extortion."—(Historical Fragments of the Mogul Empire of the Morattes, and of the English concerns in Indostan from the year 1659, by Robert Orme (1805), pp. 371-72.)

2 Mr. Bendien, the Bombay Consul for Holland, has, after the above paper was read, kindly sent me copies of his articles on the Dutch in Broach. He gives Pieter Gillesen as the name of this first factor. (Vide his articles on the Dutch factories in the Neerlandia of January and February 1907. Vide the February issue p. 26 for this reference).

3 Jan Willem Six "Secundo" in the inscription in his tomb. Vide infra, p. 313.

4 "The factory at Baroche was established in the year 1617, and is still continued, yet with very little circumstance, for there is but one junior merchant, and one book-keeper, who reside there as factors, and who have a few native servants under them."—("Voyages to the East Indies by the late John Splutter Stavarius," translated from the Dutch by Wilcocke, Vol. III (1798), pp. 108-10.)

5 According to Mr. Bendien the factory bears on the gate "as an inscription" the initials of the Company. (The Dutch East India Company, V with an 'o' and 'e' in the legs of V.)
gone through, for being adopted for small residential quarters, it still bears an inscription on the inside of a wall. I give below the form of the sun-dial with the inscription on it as copied by me from a distance on 31st December 1906. The dial with an inscription is within the court-yard of the factory on the top of the inside part of a wall abutting on a public road. The inscription on bears the Christian year 1700 and the name of F. J. Groenevelt (F. J. Groenevelt Anno 1700). Above this inscription appear the initials of the Dutch Company.

The site of the first English factory is not known. But oral tradition, as heard there, says that the very house which was the seat of the Dutch factory was later on the place of the English factory. So, it appears that the English factory was, latterly, when the Dutch left it, transferred to this house. It is not known where it was when it was first founded.

The Dutch must have remained at least about 175 years at Broach. This appears from some of the dates on the tombs in their cemetery. This cemetery is situated about a little on the west of the village of Vijalpore, at a short distance from where the Parsi Towers-of-Silence stand. The Gazetteer says of the Dutch tombs that "these monuments bear dates ranging from 1654 to 1770." 1 It would have been well had the Broach Gazetteer, which appeared in 1877, published the inscriptions on the tombs which are falling in ruins.

1 Broach Gazetteer, p. 559.
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The Dutch cemetery is an interesting place to see, because the construction of the tombs in it seems to be different from what we see in the case of tombs in modern English cemeteries in India. I give the photographs of two of them at the end of this paper. I am indebted for these to Khan Bahadur Adurjee Muncheerjee Dalal of Broach. On entering from the west we find a tomb with a platform containing four seats. Then there is a block containing three tombs. This block seems to have had a tablet which is removed. There is another block containing six tombs, one tomb has the form of a Mahomedan dome over it. One can count the ruins of about 20 tombs besides a few masonry mounds. In close proximity we find a small ruin like that of a basin of water.

I beg to suggest that careful photographs of all the tombs and especially of the inscriptions may be soon taken. I have taken copies of the inscriptions.

I wrote about a fortnight ago to Mr. Couzens, the head of the Archaeological Department, to ascertain, if the inscriptions are published by his Department in any report. I have not heard from him yet. This week I took my copy of the inscription to the Dutch Consulate here to get it translated. Mr. J. G. Bendien, the Consul, having gone to Holland, I saw Mr. Y. Von Rykoum, the head of the Holland-Bombay Trading Company. He could not give me a correct translation, because being in a foreign language and being very old, I have not been able, in a hasty visit, to copy the inscriptions well. I had requested a gentleman there to kindly get a good photo taken of them, but he has not done so yet. However I learnt from Mr. Rykoum that the Dutch Consul, Mr. Bendien, had once visited the Dutch cemetery, and has taken a photo of the inscriptions which he has published in a Dutch paper in Holland. I have written to Mr. Bendien to send us a copy with its translation. When received it will be worth publishing in our journal.

1 Mr. Bellasis, while describing the old tombs in the cemeteries of Surat, assigns the following reasons for the grandeur of these old tombs: "The Agents of these several nations vied with each other to live in the greatest splendour... Men who lived in such grandeur may naturally be supposed to have emulated each other in creating ostentatious tombs to commemorate their dead; and thus we find the sepulchral ruins in the cemeteries of Surat, even at the present day, bearing witness to the large sums that must have been expended for these purposes." (Journal B. B. R. A. S., Vol. VI, pp. 146-47.) As Mr. Bellasis says, an idea of the grandeur of the Dutch tombs at Surat may be formed "by the fact of a bill being extant, charging Rs. 670 to the Dutch Company for mere repairs." (Ibid, p. 19).

Vide Appendix to this paper. As I have latterly received copies of the Inscriptions more carefully taken by Mr. Bendien, the Dutch Consul, I give them in the appendix. Mine being those by one not knowing the language are naturally faulty.

Vide n. a.
While on the subject of the inscriptions on the Dutch tombs, I beg to draw the attention of a future reviser or editor of a second edition of the Gazetteer of the Broach district to several errors in the copies of the inscriptions of two other tombs as given in the Gazetteer.

The Gazetteer gives the inscriptions on two tombs near the village of Vijalpore. I give my copy of the inscription of the tomb of one which I saw, viz., that of Capt. W. Semple:

Beneath this stone are deposited the remains of Captain William Semple, 1 of His Majesty's 86th Regiment, who was killed by cannon shot at the siege of Broach on the 25th of August 1803. Universally and most sincerely regretted by all his brother Officers.

To us who are nearer the time, the mistakes may appear trivial, but after several centuries they, especially the mistake of "Her Majesty" for "His Majesty," may cause serious doubts about the date. A future student of historical data may, in the absence of other materials to put him on the right track, long linger in doubts about the date. If he takes the word "Her Majesty" to be correct, he may think, that perhaps the year 1803, given later on, may be a mistake for 1893 or for some other year. If he takes the date as correct, he may linger in doubts about the period of Her Majesty's reign.

I found similar carelessness on the part of either the copyist or the printers, in the matter of the inscription on the slab in the compound of the Civil Hospital within the fort on the grave of Brigadier David Wedderburn, who was killed while storming the city. He is the officer who is often referred to with curses and maledictions by Abas Alli in

1 The name is not Sempie as given by the Gazetteer.

2 The Gazetteer gives "Her Majesty", which is not, and cannot be, correct, as the year is 1803 when the late Queen had not come to the throne.

3 The Gazetteer omits this word.
his Urdu Kisseh-i-Broach to which I will refer later on. I give below a list of the errors and my amendments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line of the inscriptions as given in the Gazetteer.</th>
<th>The Gazetteer's errors.</th>
<th>Correction.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line 6</td>
<td>July 26th 1861</td>
<td>July 22nd 1761.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, , 6</td>
<td>arrived</td>
<td>arrived here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, , 8</td>
<td>Supreme Highness</td>
<td>Serene Highness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, , 16</td>
<td>Kirk Denkun (?)</td>
<td>Kirch Denckern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, , 16</td>
<td>Hillock</td>
<td>Hiltrup.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, , 18</td>
<td>Luxenburg</td>
<td>Lunenburg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, , 20</td>
<td>pounds, was made</td>
<td>pounds, and was made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, , 26</td>
<td>The troops</td>
<td>Their troops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To come back to the subject of the Dutch factory, the ancestors of Mr. Doolabhbhai Hargovandass (हरगवंडस, डूलाबबहाई), who is now living, were in possession of a part of the Dutch factory building. One of these ancestors, Kisorebhai Tricumbhai (किसोरेख त्रिचंब्हई), was the broker or agent of the Dutch factory. He had relations with the Dutch in connection with their four factories of Agra, Ahmedabad, Broach and Surat. When the English took Broach, they made the place too hot for the Dutch. So they left it, but the factors being indebted to the broker, Mr. Kisorebhai, they gave him the factory-house in settlement for their debt. Laloobhai Divan, whose name is mentioned more than once in the Urdu account of the Nawab of Broach, as one who played false to his master the Nawab, and secretly assisted the British, then had it in mortgage from the proprietor for a small sum.

He is said to have obtained it under a threat, saying, that, if the then owner did not mortgage it to him, he (Laloobhai) would ask the British to loot it. They mortgaged it to him with a curse that the owner may not be happy. So the curse was said to live long on the subsequent owners, who, all in turn, are said to have been ruined in their business. The building is said to have once passed into the hands of Mr. Merwanji Frazer of Surat and of Mr. Merwanji Framji Panday of Bombay. I give this account on the authority of a member of the family. I had no other means to verify it.

II.

The next subject which drew my attention during my visit, and on which I beg to submit a few notes, is its past history especially from a Parsee point of view. It is said that the Parsees had, in more than one place, some hand, however small it may be, in the establishment
of the British power in this Presidency. Now, in the case of Broach, the information has come to me as a surprise, that it was the religious dispute, which the Parsees had among themselves in the 18th century on the question of the Kabiseh or the intercalary day, that had something to do, though indirectly and though very little, with the conquest of Broach by the British. The fact has been recorded, not by a Parsee author, but by a Mahomedan author who was a favourite courtier of the Nawab of Broach.

Before coming to this subject, I will put down here in brief (A) a short outline of the history of Broach from a Parsee point of view and (B) of the events that had brought about the rule of the Nawabs in Broach.

(A) Firstly, taking a bird's eye view of the history of Broach from the point of view of the modern Parsees and their ancestors, the ancient Persians, we determine the following land-marks:—

1. Fireshté dwells at some length on the early connection of India with the ancient Persians, beginning with the very early dynasties of the Peshdādians and the Kīānians. He makes an Indian king Krishna a contemporary of the Iranian monarch Tahmurasp and then traces the relations, both friendly and hostile, subsisting at one time or another, between the Indian and the Persian kings. We would lay aside this narrative as one not standing on certain historical ground.

2. We have the authority of the Behistun Cuneiform inscriptions to say, that there was a closer connection between India and Persia, the former being one of the satrapies of the latter. But we would lay aside the consideration of that connection also, as we are not sure whether the influence of Persia extended so far as Broach.

3. But when we come to the Parthian times, we stand upon somewhat surer grounds. Fireshté speaks of an Indian king Sīnsārchand and says that he paid tribute to the Iranian king Godrez. Briggs says that this Sīnsārchand was the Chandragupta of the Hindus and the Sandrocoitus of the Greeks (Brigg's Ferishta, Vol. I.). Now we know, that there was a king of the name of Godrez among the Parthian line of kings. The Sīnsārchand, with whom his relations are referred to, seems to be, not Chandragupta himself, but one of his successors.

Again in the second century before Christ some of the Bactrian kings are said to have sent expeditions to the south so far as Cutch and Gujerat (181-167 A.D.). Here then we see, that with the successes of these expeditions in Gujerat, Broach must have passed for some time into
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the hands of the Parthian kings of Persia. It continued for some time under the Parthian rule. It is to this fact, that the Gazetteer of Surat and Broach refers, when it says: "About 1,800 years ago, Broach seems to have passed into the hands of Parthian princes, known by the name of Sāhas or Kshatrapas. Rudradāman’s Girmār inscription, dated in the year seventy-two, probably of the Sāka era (A.D. 150), states this distinctly, and the occurrence of Sāha coins in the Broach District confirms it." 1

Menander to whom Prof. Wilson assigns the date B.C. 126, was connected with Parthia. He held paramount authority in Saurashtra. According to the author of the Periplus his coins were current in Broach in the first century after Christ. 2

4. Coming to Sassanian times, we find Wilford 3 saying that Gandhārāva, referred to in the Agni Purāṇa and known as the Gadhā-rupa in Indian history, was the same as Behramgour of Persian history. In my paper on "The Bas-relief of Behrmgour at Naksha-i-Rustam, and his marriage with an Indian Princess", 4 I have added a few points of similarity to those advanced by Wilford to prove the identity. Now Wilford says of this monarch that Hindus 5 show to this day (1809), the place where he (Behearmsgour or Gadhā-rupa) lived about one day's march to the north of Baroach, with the ruins of his palace. In old records, this place is called Gad'hendra-puri or the town of the lord of asses. The present name is Goshērā or Ghōjarā for Ghosha-rāya or Ghosha-rājā: for, says my Pandit, who is a native of that country, the inhabitants, being ashamed of its true name, have softened it into Ghoshera, which has no meaning." 6 According to Firdousi, the throne of Kanaouj passed, by virtue of the last testament of Sangel, the Hindu king, to the Persian king Behramgour and his heirs. This confirms what Wilford says that "the dynasty of the Gardabhinas is probably that of the descendants and successors of Behrm Gour in Persia. The princes in the north-western parts of India were vassals of the Persian kings at a very early period; and the father-in-law of Behrm-Gur used to send a yearly tribute to them." 7

The legend on a set of old Indian coins, popularly known as "Gadhia-ka paisā," supports the fact of Behrmgour's visit to India and his marriage with an Indian princess, the daughter of the king of

3 Asiatic Researches, IX, pp. 147-151.
5 Asiatic Researches, IX, p. 151.
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Kanouj referred to by Wilford. Prinsep affords us very valuable help on this point. In his essay on Saurāstra coins he says that the type of the series of Indian coins known as Gadhia-ka paisa is an “example of imitation of a Grecian original,” 1 and that “a comparison (of these coins) with the coins of the Arsakian and Sassanian dynasties of Persia, which are confessedly of Greek origin,” satisfactorily proves that. Prinsep says on the subject of these coins: “The popular name for these rude coins—of silver and copper—is, according to Burnes, in Gujarāt, ‘Gadhia-kâ paisâ,’ ‘Ass money,’ or rather, ‘the money of Gadhia,’ a name of Vikramâditya. . . . . The Hindus insist that this Vikrama was not a paramount sovereign of India, but only a powerful king of the western provinces, his capital being Cambât or Cambay: and it is certain that the princes of these parts were tributary to Persia from a very early period. The veteran antiquarian, Wilford, would have been delighted, could he have witnessed a confirmation of his theories afforded by the coins before us, borne out by the local tradition of a people now unable even to guess at the nature of the curious and barbarous marks on them. None but a professed studier of coins could possibly have discovered on them the profile of a face after the Persian model, on one side, and the actual Sassanian fire-altar on the other; yet such is indubitably the case, as an attentive consideration of the accumulation of lines and dots (on the figures of the coins) will prove. Should this fire-altar be admitted as proof of an Indo-Sassanian dynasty in Saurāshtra, we may find the date of its establishment in the epoch of Yxsdîjîrd, the son of Behrâm-Gor; supported by the concurrent testimony of the Agni-pûrâña, that Vikrama, the son of Gadhâ-rupa, should ascend the throne of Mâlayâ (Ujjain) 753 years after the expiation of Chañakya or A.D. 441.” (*)

A painting in the Âjanta caves refers to a Persian embassy to India. This also seems to refer to Behrâmgour, who, according to Firdousi, came in disguise as his own ambassador.

We have so far seen, that the ancient Persians had some connection with the country round Broach, and that old tradition, as found in the Agni-pûrâña, and old coins prove that connection.

Now we will speak of the connection of Broach with the early Parsee settlers in India.

(a) Div in Kâthiâwâr was the first port where a band of refugees from Persia had landed in 761 A.D. and Sanjân the first place where they made their permanent settlement in 785 A.D. and built their first fire-temple in 790 A.D. They continued there for full 300 years.

Then they began to disperse in the different cities of Gujarat of which Broach was one.

The Kisseh-i-Sanjan, thus refers to this exodus from Sanjan (1):

Translation.—In this way, passed away 300 years: more or less, (i.e., about 300 years), as several persons, more or less, went away from that place. They were dispersed in the country of India and they got hold of (i.e. took abode in) attractive places in all directions. Many went to Banskähir. Some went in the direction of Broach.

(b) This was in 1090. Two hundred years after this event, i.e., in 1270 A.D. they divided Gujarat into five pantaks, i.e., ecclesiastical divisions for the performance of sacerdotal functions. This was to avoid differences and quarrels among the priesthood about the spheres of their work. The Kisseh-i-Zarthushti-i-Hindustän thus speaks of this event.²

2 Vide Ibid, pp. 16-17.