

SIVA CHHATRAPATI

**EXTRACTS AND DOCUMENTS RELATING
TO MĀRĀTHĀ HISTORY**

VOL. I

ŚIVA CHHATRAPATI

**BEING A TRANSLATION OF SABHĀSAD BAKHAR WITH
EXTRACTS FROM CHITṆĪS AND ŚIVADIGVIJAYA,
WITH NOTES.**

BY

SURENDRANATH SEN, M.A.,

**PREMCHAND BOYCHAND STUDENT, LECTURER IN MĀRĀTHĀ HISTORY, CALCUTTA
UNIVERSITY, ORDINARY FELLOW, INDIAN WOMEN'S UNIVERSITY, POONA,
FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF HISTORY AND ENGLISH LITERATURE,
ROBERTSON COLLEGE, JUBBULPORE.**



**PUBLISHED BY THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA**

1920

PRINTED BY ATULCHANDRA BHATTACHARYA,
AT THE CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY PRESS, SENATE HOUSE, CALCUTTA

श्रीः

कलकत्ता विश्वविद्यालय

येथील

पोष्ट-ग्राडुएट डिपार्टमेंटचे प्रेसिडेंट

शिवाजी सारखाच

“ निश्चयाचा महामेरु, बहुत जनांची आघारु

खंड स्थितिचा निर्धारु

यशवंत, कीर्तिवंत, सामर्थ्यवंत, वरदवंत ”

सर आशुतोष मुखोपाध्याय, सरस्वती, शास्त्रवाचस्पति

यांच

श्रीशिव छत्रपति महाराज

यांचे

पावन चरित्र

परम आदर व छत्रपतीता पूर्वक अर्पण करितो ।

PREFACE

The present volume is the first of a series intended for those students of Mārāṭhā history who do not know Mārāṭhī. Original materials, both published and unpublished, have been accumulating for the last sixty years and their volume often frightens the average student. Sir Asutosh Mookerjee, therefore, suggested that a selection in a handy form should be made where all the useful documents should be included. I must confess that no historical document has found a place in the present volume, but I felt that the chronicles or *bakhars* could not be excluded from the present series and I began with Sabhāsad bakhar leaving the documents for a subsequent volume.

This is by no means the first English rendering of Sabhāsad. Jagannath Lakshman Mankar translated Sabhāsad more than thirty years ago from a single manuscript. The late Dr. Vincent A. Smith overestimated the value of Mankar's work mainly because he did not know its exact nature. A glance at the catalogue of Mārāṭhī manuscripts in the British Museum might have convinced him that the original Mārāṭhī Chronicle from which Mankar translated has not been lost. Mankar's was a free rendering and his work is so rare now that I need not offer any apology for bringing out a second translation. I have translated from the text edited by Rao Bahadur Kashinath Narayan Sane, the most reliable and authoritative text in print. I have tried to be not

only accurate but literal in my rendering of Sabhāsad ; the translation of the extracts has been more or less free, but there also my attempt has been to be fairly accurate so that it may be safely recommended as reliable.

For the notes at the end I am indebted to Mr. V. K. Rajwade's Sources of Mārāṭha History (Mārāṭhi). The second and third notes are entirely based on Mr. Rajwade's introduction to his 8th volume. In the first note, however, I have differed on so many important points from Mr. Rajwade's views that I must take upon myself the responsibility for them.

I have to add here a word about my transliteration of Mārāṭhi words. The only thing that should be noted is that ञ has been represented both by *e* and *o* according to pronunciation and ण has been represented by *f* in words of Persian origin, (anuswār) and other nasal sounds have not been properly indicated, I have used *n* or *m* to represent the sound as in *Chiranjiv* and *Sampanna*. Persian words and proper names have not been properly transliterated mainly owing to my ignorance of that language and I have in some cases reproduced them in their Mārāṭhi form as in Śāistā Khān, Nizāmsūhi, etc., while in Bādshāh, Bahlol and Ādil Shāh, I believe the Persian form has been retained. I owe an explanation for writing Mārāṭha and Mārāṭhi instead of Marāṭhā and Marāṭhi. My reason is that the former pronunciation is prevalent almost everywhere outside Mahārāshṭra proper though the latter forms are correct.

I am deeply grateful to the Hon'ble Sir Asutosh Mookerjee, Kt., C.S.I., President of the Post-Graduate Councils, Calcutta University, but for

whose kind and inspiring encouragement this work would never have seen light.

I am indebted to Professor Jadunath Sarkar, M.A., who not only revised my manuscripts and gave me many valuable suggestions but also placed his whole library at my disposal, and Rai Bahadur, B.A. Gupte, who, inspite of his heavy work and advancing age, revised my manuscripts twice. Mr. G. S. Sardesai, B.A. borrowed for me a copy of now rare Śivadigvijay from the State Library of Baroda. I shall fail in my duty if I do not avail myself of this opportunity of publicly recording my gratitude to the late Professor H. G. Limaye, M.A. of Poona and Professor D. R. Bhandarkar, M.A., Carmichael Professor, Calcutta University, for the encouragement and the ready assistance I always got from them. My thanks are also due to Professor Harendranath Gupta, M.Sc. of Serampur College and Mr. Aswinikumar Mookerjee, B.A., who kindly prepared the Index. None of these gentlemen is, however, responsible for any defect of this work.

The misprints are mainly due to my inexperience in proof reading. It is futile to give a list of corrections. The main errors however can be easily corrected by my readers, *leirud*, for example in p. 125 should be *birud*, Kamaldākar in p. 113 Kamalākar and *Jaigir* in p. 2 *Jāgir*.

SURENDRANATH SEN.

SENATE HOUSE,

Calcutta, the 19th May, 1920.

CONTENTS

Life of Śiva Chhatrapati by Kṛṣṇāji Anant Sabhāsad	1-154
Extracts from Śivadigvijaya and Chitōis bakhar	155-250
Śivāji at Bijāpur	157
Śivāji invited to the Darbār	159
Śivāji goes to the Darbār	160
Capture of Torṇa	162
Unfriendly attitude towards the Muhamma- dans	162
How Śāhāji excused Śivāji's Rebellion ...	163
Śivāji's education	164
Śivāji enlists Pāthān Deserters from the Bijāpur Army	164
Capture of Purandar	165
Chandra Rāv More	168
Śāhāji's Imprisonment	171
The Bhavāni Sword	181
Āfzal Khān Incident	182
Fighting after Āfzal's death	190
Jija Bāi congratulates Śivāji	191
Operations against Janjirā	191
Mālayan	193
Fortification of Henry and Kennery and operations against Janjirā	194
Bhukhān the Poet	197
Phirangoji Narsāli's Defence of Chākap ...	200
Śūstā surprised at Puṇā	201

Sivāji avenges his father's Arrest	...	208
Jaya Sing's Expedition	...	209
Difference between Jaya Sing and Dilel	...	211
Sivāji demands Janjirā from the Mughals	...	215
Sivāji goes to the Imperial Court	...	216
Sivāji interviews Aurangzib	...	218
Sivāji's night visit to his Forts	...	220
Vyankāji and Raghunāth Nārāyan	...	221
Sivāji demands his share from Vyankāji	...	227
Terms of the treaty between Sivāji and Vyankāji	...	232
Sambhāji's defection	...	236
Sambhāji joins Dilel Khān	...	238
Sambhāji captures Bhupālgaḍ	...	239
Rājārām's marriage	...	241
Coronation	...	241
The future of Sivāji's Kingdom	...	243
The duties of the Ashta Pradhāns	...	243
Sivāji's death	...	246
Sivāji's death-bed prephecy	...	248
Notes and Appendices	...	251-264
Sivāji's Mārāthi Biographies	...	251
Sivāji's relation with the Udayapur family	...	259
The influence of Persian on old Mārāthi	...	261

NOTES AND APPENDICES.

No. I.

ŚIVĀJĪS MĀRĪṬHĪ BIOGRAPHIES.

No less than nine *bakhar* or chronicles of Śivāji have come down to us. Of these the first in date as well as in importance is that by Kṛṣṇāji Anant Sabhāsad; in fact his is the only work that can claim to be contemporary. The next in importance are Chitṛṇis *bakhar* and *Śivadigvijaya*. The rest may be dismissed with a cursory glance, as for students of history they are of little or no worth.

Chitragupta's *bakhar* for instance is nothing but an elaborate paraphrase of Sabhāsad, with florid verses of the author's composition interposed here and there. It is significant that at least three out of these nine writers were Prabhu Kayasthas by caste, and two of these if not all were courtiers. Chitragupta was closely related to Śivāji's celebrated Chitṛṇis Bāḷaji Āvji, whose surname was Chitra. The author Raghunāth Yādava, writing in the pauranic style assumed the pauranic name of Chitragupta. According to his own statement, Chitragupta wrote his history in compliance with the request of Sāmbhāji of Kolhapur, so the possible date of his work must fall between 1760 and 1770. The *Śeḍḍgūṅkar bakhar* is also an adaptation of Sabhāsad, it has been largely copied from Sabhāsad's work but its date and authorship are unknown. The *Sākṣar kalmi bakhar* claims to be a contemporary work but its claim has not yet been uncontroversially established. The Tanjore temple inscription is interesting only as a wonderful specimen of human industry and has very little intrinsic merit. Śrī Śivāji

Propūp, published at Baroda as early as 1895, is very meagre and consists mainly of myths and legends.

Who wrote the *bakhar* first found in the fort of Rāyri and highly eulogised by Scott-Waring we do not know. An English rendering has been appended to Professor Sir George Forrest's Selections, who also holds a very high opinion of its reliability and historical merit. Forrest has merely echoed Scott-Waring who cannot be regarded as an authority. The late Justice Telang expressed his doubts about the authenticity of the so-called Rāyri *bakhar*. The translation at any rate does not seem to be accurate. The translator in all probability has been more or less free and sacrificed accuracy to the elegance of his style. The two languages are poles apart, so far as style is concerned, and it is futile to expect an elegant English rendering of an old Mārāṭhī *bakhar* to be so accurate as may be safely recommended for uncritical use by the average student. It is also difficult to believe that a Mārāṭhā chronicler, writing long after the foundation of the 'Hindu Pādshāhi' and fully believing Śivāji and his ancestors to be in the special favour of the goddess of Tuljāpur, compared a dark night with Śivāji's heart.

The earliest in date, as we have already seen was the work of Kṛshṇājī Anant Sabhāsad, an officer in the service of Chhatrapati Rājārām. Sabhāsad's historical efforts were inspired by the command of his master and he wrote a succinct account of the deeds of Śivāji some of which he must have witnessed. Written only sixteen years after Śivāji's death, Sabhāsad's biography is a contemporary work, mainly based on the personal knowledge of the writer and hearsay evidence. It is needless to say that the science of historical criticism was absolutely unknown to the Mārāṭhā chroniclers. Incapable of sifting historical evidence and over credulous of divine and non-human agencies, these simple old men recorded what they honestly believed to be true. To them Śivāji was a divinity, an incarnation of Śiva, guided at every step by a divine mentor, rescued at every crisis by his patron deity and none of his actions to their opinion at least needed any justification. So

the stories of the capture of Purandar, of the murder of Chandar Rāv More and his brother Hanmant Rāv are plainly told without any comment and without any attempt at justification, the only exception being the Āfzal Khān incident. There, however, all the Mārāṭhā chroniclers are unanimous. Sabhāsad knew how to call a murder a murder, and he and his fellow historians did not think that Śivāji was the party to be blamed so far as that incident was concerned. Grant Duff put his reliance on Khafi Khan why, of course, he knew best. But the different accounts of Śivāji's death and death bed will are perhaps tainted by party bias. Sabhāsad serving under Rājārām could not possibly accuse his mother of an ignoble conspiracy. The unknown author of *Śivadigvijaya* however boldly accuses Sayrā Bāi of the unnatural offence of poisoning her illustrious husband.

Śivāji had become a divinity even in his life-time; people expected, with a fond belief, superhuman deeds of him, and as time progressed, the glamour of the past went on increasing and obscuring more and more the less brilliant but perhaps not less glorious kernel of truth that underlies the tangled masses of Śivāji legends. Every age had some thing new to contribute to the legends of the brave deeds of the glorious dead and that explains many of the interesting anecdotes of Chitṭis and *Śivadigvijaya* not to be found in the earlier work of Sabhāsad. What evidence did these later works rely on, and what new sources of information had their authors discovered? Both Mallār Rām Rāv and the author of *Śivadigvijaya* were well versed in Sanskrit lore, they were certainly better scholars than their old predecessor, but what old state papers that they profess to have used could tell them that Śivāji, when a boy of eight, had chastised a Muhammadan butcher in the very streets of the Muhammadan metropolis for the very common offence (?) of cow-slaughter? Whence could they learn that the young boy smarting under the disgrace of Muhammadan dependence and dying to liberate his motherland and coreligionists from the intolerable tyranny of the *mlechchhas*, boldly refused to salute

the non-hindu Sultan of Bijāpur, heedless of the earnest expostulations of his timid father? We can guess why the author of *Śivadigvijay*, laid so much emphasis on the misgovernment and the tyranny of the alien rulers, but what evidence, better than tradition, had he for his assertions? Traditions they evidently had in their favour, and ignorant of the science of history they uncritically recorded what they believed to be true. Sabhāsad, a contemporary, had the advantage of having more intimate knowledge of his own times but he is absolutely silent about the incidents of his hero's childhood. Anecdotes he had very few to relate and except while contemplating with evident satisfaction upon the dis-comfitures of his Muhammadan enemies, and dilating on their lamentations, we can safely rely upon the evidence of the old courtier. Traditions had not yet sufficiently grown in volume to mislead him, nor is he in a mood to be too much talkative. Very brief is he and we wish he might have been more communicative, but he writes his history more as a task than as a labour of love and begins his work with his master's behest and ends it with a very expressive though formal sentence,—“What more should I write?”

Equally incapable of sifting and fabricating evidence as they were, the old chroniclers laboured under a still greater difficulty. They had not realised the necessity of a sound chronological arrangement. Narration devoid of chronology seems to have been their sole idea of a historian's work, and they narrated what legends or facts they could compile from traditions, hearsay and state papers without any attempt of ascertaining the date of any event. No doubt they give us a few dates of very important events, as for example those of the birth and death of Śivāji but even on these rare occasions the chroniclers do not agree with one another. Nor are they unanimous in their account of the deeds and exploits of their great hero. Not only do they give different accounts of Śivāji's marriages but they hold very different views about the paternity of his wives. Sai Bāi, the first wife of Śivāji, says Sabhāsad, was a daughter of the Nimbālkar family. According to Chitragupta she belonged

to the Mohite family, while according to Chitṭis and *Śivadigvijaya* she was a Śinke by birth. According to the last two authors, Śivāji was born on Thursday the *Śuddha Dvitiyā* of *Vaiśākh*, the *Samvatsar* being Prabhava by name, in the year 1549 of the Śaka era. But the *Vaiśākh Śuddha Dvitiyā* of that year was a Saturday and not Thursday. These contradictions and mistakes led Mr. V. K. Rajwade to hold the extreme view that all *lakhars* are equally untrustworthy except when they are corroborated by foreign evidence. But Sabbāsad, I think, should be credited with greater authority than his successors in historical efforts. Let us take for example his account of Āfzal Khān's sacrilege at Tuljāpur. Both Chitṭis and the author of *Śivadigvijaya* say that the goddess was not pounded in a mill but she was saved by a timely removal by her priest, whom she had forewarned of the evil designs of Āfzal. Modern criticism will not allow the admission of such divine agencies into sober history and Sabbāsad as a contemporary had certainly better means to know the truth. The author of *Śivadigvijaya* evinces throughout his work a more hostile attitude towards the Muhammadans than Sabbāsad anywhere does. It was perhaps the Hindu pride of these later writers that led them to give an irrational account of the Tuljāpur incident. Evidently for such events Sabbāsad is more reliable. But Mr. Rajwade is certainly right when he says that neither a reliable chronology nor a satisfactory history of the period can be compiled unless the ill-arranged materials of the *lakhars* are rearranged and supplemented by original Mārāṭhi state papers and letters, the Persian *twarikkas* and the contemporary English, Dutch, French and Portuguese papers.

Let us now try to ascertain the date and the authorship of the remaining two *lakhars*, viz., *Chitṭis* and *Śivadigvijaya*. About the authorship of the former there is no doubt, as it is named after the author Malhār Rām Rāv Chitṭis. He commenced his work on the 10th of June 1610 at the command of Śāhu Chhatrapati—at least so says he or the writer of the introductory sentences of his history. But Mr. V. K. Rajwade points out that

the Second Śahu Chhatrapati died on the 4th of May, 1808 and so it is absurd to suppose that he could request Malhār Rām Rāv to write a history of his great ancestor (on the 8th of June 1810) two years later. This discrepancy, says Mr. Rajwade, makes us hesitate to put implicit confidence in Chitṇīs. It may be an oversight on the part of the author but it is difficult to believe that a contemporary could commit such a blunder, and I feel inclined to suppose that these introductory sentences were not written by Malhār Rām Rāv at all. We know how the old Bengali poets felt it incumbent on them to attribute their poetical inspiration to some divine behest. There is at least one case (see Vijayagupta's *Manasāmangal*) where the introductory portion dealing with the supposed interview of the diety and the poet was the work of a second party. Such might have been the case with Mālhār Rām Rāv's work also. Almost every chronicler offers the customary excuse that his literary effort had its origin in the request of some royal personage or some grandees or some friends—in short their work was not altogether voluntary. Perhaps the convention of the times demanded for such historical work some excuse more valid than the initiative of the historian's own mind. Malhār Rām Rāv had perhaps omitted to supply this customary plea for his literary attempts. The omission was perhaps regarded as so glaring a blunder in those days that perhaps later on a relative or an admirer or a mere copyist felt it his duty to supply it.

A comparison of these introductory sentences with those in *Sabhāsad bakhar* will confirm the above view;—writes Kṛshṇājī Anant Sabhāsad—To Śrīmant Mahārāj Rājśrī Rājārām Sāheb Chhatrapati with the *humble respects* of his *servant* Kṛshṇājī Anant Sabhāsad *Your Majesty very kindly said to your servant* etc. (विनतो सेवक कृष्णाजी अनंत सभासद कृतानेक विनम्रताया सेवो जे साहिबी सेवकानो वचन सेवकास पुनीसि कीं etc.) The introductory sentences of Chitṇīs run as follows, on (a date is given), Kehatriyakulāvatanesa Śrīrājālbirāj Śrīmahārājā Paratāpt (valiant) Śāhunṛpati master of the throne and umbrella ordered *Rājāmūya Rājārī Mālhār Rām Rāv Chitṇīs* as follows. The customay phrases—

Rājmānya Rājshri before Chitṛis's name offer a striking contrast to Sevakā (Servant) as Sabhāsad styles himself. An officer in the royal service writing at the personal command of his royal master, would with more consistence to courtesey and good manners dispense with these ordinary terms of distinction. The death of that master would entitle him still more to the humble respects of his servant. The absence of such courteous considerations on the part of a courtier like Malhār Rām Rāv cannot otherwise be explained. The obvious conclusion is that these few lines were added by one to whose courtesey and respect Malhār Rām Rāv also was entitled.

Although, ignorant of the necessity of a chronological arrangement, Malhār Rām Rāv divided his history into seven chapters and Grant Duff describes his history as a voluminous work. Chitṛis says that he used many Sanskrit works and old state papers, for writing his biography of Śivāji and he gives us many additional materials mainly anecdotal. Whatever may be the value of these legendary contributions we cannot dispense with his account of the administrative system where we get more details than in the short pages of Sabhāsad and as Chitṛis had access to old state papers his authority on this branch of history should not be challenged.

As Sabhāsad's is the shortest, *Śivadigvijaya* is the most voluminous of these three *bakhars*. Its authorship is however a mystery yet unsolved and its date cannot be very accurately ascertained. It was published at Baroda about a quarter of a century ago and its authorship is ascribed by the joint editors, Messrs. Nandurlarkar and Dandekar, to Khanḍo Ballāl Chitṛis son of Bālāji Āvajī. It is certain that the author was a Prabhu Kayastha by caste and probably a lineal descendant of Śivāji's Chitṛis. Bālāji is described by the unknown author as the foremost statesman whose wisdom and fidelity secured the confidence of his master to such an extent that nothing was done without previously consulting him. He was entrusted with the highly important and delicate task of recording the divine behest when the king himself was possessed by the

goddess of Tuljāpur. While Brahman, Mārāṭhā and even Muhammedan commanders were won over by bribe or persuasion, the Prabhu subjects of the Habṣi clung to their master and proudly told the founder of the Mārāṭhā power that they could not sully their honour by committing treachery even for so good a cause. The heroism of the Prabhus roused the enthusiasm of the chronicler much above the ordinary bound of admiration and he devotes page after page to an account of the gallant defence of Bhuikoṭ of Belvāḷi by a Prabhu Kāyastha lady. All these jointly and severally leave no doubt about the caste of the author, he was a Prabhu and rightly proud of the brilliant service rendered by his castemen to the national cause. He was like Malhār Rām Rāv a good Sanskrit scholar, he had evidently read the Purāṇas and his work is full of Sanskrit quotations both short and long. But who was he? Certainly not Khandō Ballāḷ. According to him artisans from Calcutta were invited to participate in the construction of Śivājī's throne. Had such an intimate relation either commercial or political been established with Calcutta in Khandō Ballāḷ's time? Probably not. While describing the boundaries of the four provinces that constitute the Deccan, he mentions Madras to indicate the frontiers of one. We should expect Khandō Ballāḷ and even his grandson to call it by the now obsolete name of Chinapatṭan. Evidently Khandō Ballāḷ could not be the author of *Śivadigvijaya*.

Mr. Rajwade thinks that its author was probably some scion of the Baroda branch of the Chiṭṭis family. This does not however settle the question of authorship. The question of its date of composition is no less uncertain. If we accept the suggestion of Mr. Shankar Balkrishna which has the support of Mr. Rajwade, we get the possible date of 1818. But here the language of the chronicle stands in our way. Messrs. Nandurbarkar and Dandekar are of opinion that the language is very old and resembles more the style of the first half of the 18th century than that of the first decade of the 19th. I am not well acquainted with the Mārāṭhi

literature other than historical and do not feel myself competent to pass any opinion on such a delicate question as that of style so I must yield to such high authorities as Messrs. Nandurbarkar, Dandekar and Rajwade, but all the same I cannot help noticing that the language of the work is at times very modern. But this only confirms the view of Mr. Rajwade who holds that the work was nothing but a revised edition of an old *bakhar* by a comparatively modern editor. Prof., Sarkar thinks that *Śivādigvijaya* is the revised edition of a now lost *bakhar* of which *Tūrikh-i-Śirājī* is the Persian rendering. The chronicler derived his information from documents, letters and state papers among other sources, and gives minute details of many incidents not to be found in older works with perfect confidence. But voluminous as the work is, it lamentably lacks any detailed account of Śivāji's administrative system. Sabhāsad and Chitṭis are by far its superior in this respect but the legends of Śivāji found one of their best compilers in the unknown Prabhu author who wrote or revised *Śivādigvijaya*. On the whole I am inclined to think that the work is more modern than is ordinarily supposed.

No. II

ŚIVĀJĪ'S RELATION WITH THE UDAYAPUR FAMILY.

(From Mr. F. K. Rajwade's *Mārūthī Article*)

A controversy has lately arisen on the question of Śivāji's relation with the royal family of Mewār. It appears from the old *bakhars*, that the claim was first set forward at the time of Śivāji's coronation. According to the author of *Śivādigvijaya*

the learned Brahmins of Benares headed by the renowned Gāgā Bhaṭ were opposed to the coronation of a Śūdra monarch, and Śivāji's envoy tried in vain to obtain their sanction and spent no less than six months in his fruitless attempts at persuasion. The resourceful *Chitnis* Bāḷāji Āvji, however, was not to be so easily baulked, and although his master had made some remarks similar to that of Napoleon about the vanity of fabricated pedigrees, it was by that very means that Bāḷāji gained his end. He maintained that Śivāji was descended from the royal family of Udayapur and was therefore a Kshatriya. The Brahmins could no longer object to take part in his coronation, and Śivāji assumed the sacred thread, when according to Indian ideas he had wellnigh passed the prime of his life. His family name Bhonsle was according to this tradition, derived from his ancestor Bhoṣāji, son of Dillip Sing, son of Sujan Sing, son of Ajay Sing, son of Lakshman Sing, the Rānā of Chitor and a contemporary of the famous Allauddin Khilizi, Emperor of Delhi. Mr. G. S. Sardesai holds that there is nothing improbable in the story. And he argues that like the Pawārs, the Jādhavas and many other northern families, with whom Śivāji had blood relation, the Bhonsles also might have migrated from the north. Mr. V. K. Rajwade is however opposed to this view and his arguments are here quoted in extenso. In the temple inscription of Maṭh,—says Mr. Rajwade—are found the names of Narsidev and Bhām Sāvānt of Wāḍji. The date of this inscription is 1397 A. D. As Narsidev built this temple to gratify his departed father Bhāmdev, the latter must have died a few years before 1397 A. D. Therefore Bhāmdev's regime may be roughly calculated to have lasted from 1360 A. D. to 1397 A. D. The original surname of the Sāvānts was Bhonsle. Before Bhām Sāvānt could have assumed the new surname, his ancestors for 3 or 4 generations must have been feudatories to some great overlord. Otherwise the new surname of Sāvānt could not be assumed in lieu of the old family name of Bhonsle. Therefore it seems that for about a century the Sāvānts were known in Konkan as chiefs of note

and their old surname Bhoṣle must have been familiar there at least for a century before Bhāmdev came to power. This gives us the possible date of 1260 A. D. The Sāvants of Wāṣi belonged to the same stock as Śivāji and his ancestors, as can be conclusively proved by the evidence of Sabhāśad and also from two documents published by Mr. Rajwade in the 8th volume of his sources of Mārāṭhā History (documents No. 132 and 62). According to the tradition however Devji, son of the Bhoṣāji was the first man in the family to come to the south. Devji was the seventh in descent from Lakshman Singh, whose date was 1235 to 1303 A. D. From the evidence of the temple inscription of Maṭh, it has been proved that the old familiar surname of the family was known in Konkan as early as 1260 A. D. It is therefore incompatible with the traditional genealogy which Mr. Rajwade holds to have been forged by Śivāji's admirers.

No. III

THE INFLUENCE OF PERSIAN ON OLD MĀRĀṬHI

(From Mr. F. K. Rajwade's *Mārāṭhi Article*)

In modern Mārāṭhi, Sanskrit words abound as much as in modern Bengali, but in the Mārāṭhi of Śivāji's time there was a preponderance of Persian words, so much so that old Mārāṭhi documents are as unintelligible to a non-Persian-knowing Mārāṭhā, as to a foreigner. Yet in the earliest Mārāṭhi writings like *Dnāneśvart* or *Paṣārāmopdeś*, not one word of Persian origin is found. From Śivāji's time downwards the Mārāṭhā writers were striving for eliminating Persian from their writings, and although the movement was crowned with eminent success,

Persian has not failed to leave a lasting impression, not only upon the Mārāṭhi vocabulary, but also upon its style and syntax.

How far Mārāṭhi was influenced by Persian is very interesting to note. Mr. V. K. Rajwade says that out of 91 words in a letter written by Diānat Rāv, a Brahman minister in the service of the Bijāpur Government, thirty were purely Persian and out of the rest all except three or four were translation of Persian words or terms. Even चन्द्रित लक्ष्मी प्रसन्न and परोपकारार्थे in the address of the letter are nothing but a literal translation of *Dāmdaulathun* and *Mushfikmihrbān*. The word सेवक so often found in Mārāṭhi letters, is also, according to Mr. Rajwade, an imitation of Persian *bandā*—for such use is not found in the few Sanskrit and pre Muhammadan Mārāṭhi letters that have come down to us. It may be objected,—says Mr. Rajwade—that Diānat Rāv was an officer of a Muhammadan state and the prevalence of Persian in his letters, does not prove that other Mārāṭhās also used so many Persian or Persianised words in their everyday language. In answer to this possible objection Mr. Rajwade points out that in a letter of Śivājī himself no less than 31 Persian words have been used and some of them more than once. The following figures collected by Mr. Rajwade is worth noticing

Date of letters.	Persian word.	Mārāṭhi.	Total.	Percentage of Mahrathi words.
1628	202	34	236	14·4
1677	51	84	135	62·2
1728	8	119	127	96·3

Nor was this influence confined to state papers and diplomatic correspondence alone. Although the general literature and poetry were better protected against the foreign invasion, they had not escaped altogether unscathed. And to illustrate how the poetic language also had been affected by Persian influence Mr. Rajwade quotes an extract from Eknāth's writings. We quote here only half a dozen verses from the above mentioned

extract and a cursory glance will convince the reader how far Persian had replaced words of purely Sanskrit origin—

अजंदास अजंदार । बंदगीबंदनेवाज
 अलकं सलान । साईबांचे सेवेसी
 बंद शरीरकार । जीवाजी सेवंदार
 बुधाजी कारकुन । प्रगवे शरीरनाद
 किल्ले काशपुरी । सरकार साईबांची

Let us now see how far Mārāṭhi syntax and style have been influenced by Persian. In Mārāṭhi documents and state papers, we come across, at every step, expressions like किल्ले A, जीवे B, and परगवे C; Mr. Rajwade points out that in pure Mārāṭhi they should be किल्ला A, जीजा B and परगवा C, but the form in use is the Persian form *Killā-i-A*, *Manjā-i-B* and *Parganā-i-C*. Some common expressions like शफव खावे to swear and हाव नारवे to call out are nothing but literal translation of Persian expressions like *Kasam Khurdan* and *Bang jadan*. Instances of this kind could be multiplied, it will suffice here if we simply quote from Rajwade some Persian adjectives and adverbs now in common use in Mārāṭhi—

1. हर (each), हर रोज
2. बे (without), बेदीख (disheartened).
3. ईखील, with, even.
4. ते to, बाळीख ते पदाल
5. गैर wrong, गैर राहा etc.

A list of proper names of Persian extraction, once so common in Mahārāshṭra will also be of interest to us—

(1) Sultān Rāv, (2) Jān Rāv, (3) Bāji Rāv, (4) Rustom Rāv, (5) Śāhāji Rāv, (6) Śāhu, (7) Phirangoji Rāv, (8) Diānat Rāv, (9) Sarje Rāv, (10) Haibat Rāv, (11) Sarfoji Rāv, (12) Gul Bāt, (13) Daryāji Rāv, etc. And surnames like Chitṭīs Faḍnīs, Potnis, Mushrif have also been borrowed from Persian. We may also note that for such sobriquets as चव, पाव, चतु, चना, जामा, जमी, जाली, जामा, जाली, जमी, डाडा, डाकी, etc., Mārāṭhi is indebted to Persian.

How far Mārāthi writers have been successful in shaking off the influence of Persian may be seen also from a comparative study of the three *bakhars* presented here to our readers. In style as well as in language, Sabhāsad's work gives evidence of the Persian influence, and the style and language of *Chitṛis* and *Śivadigvijaya* as conclusively show that their work belonged to a period when Persian words had gradually yielded place to words of Sanskrit extraction.

INDEX

A

Abdul Karim Bahlol Khān	84, 107,
Abdul Khān, (see Āfzal Khān.)	168, 169, 191, 212,
Adiśāhī	2, 37,
Āfzal Khān	9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29,
			48, 49, 62, 66, 91, 120, 183, 184,
			185, 188, 189, 191, 212
Ākājī Ghorpaḍe	308
Ākappa Pant	120, 121, 122, 123
Āli Ādilshāh	8, 20, 182
Ānand Rāv	67, 104, 105, 127, 138
Appājī Datto (Surnis)	11, 72, 75, 85, 106, 107
Appājī Banganāth	229
Ān Jijāī	2, 3
Ān Tukāī	2
Aurangzib	1, 39, 79, 151, 166, 209, 219, 249

B

Bābājī Bāpuji	42, 43
Bābājī Dhanḍhara	122
Bābājī Rām Honap	205
Bābājī Rāv	7
Bāhā Yākud	194
Bājī Sāhebp	8
Bahādur Khān	98, 106, 112, 118, 119, 128
Bahādur Khān Koka	118
Bahirji Ghorpaḍe	151
Bahirji Jādhar, Nāik, Jānd	31, 85, 130
Bahlol Khān	98, 108, 104, 105, 109, 111
Bājī Gholap	194
Bājī Ghorpaḍe	95, 169, 171, 173, 175, 179, 191, 208
Bājī Pasalkar	89, 90
Bailes	52, 53
Bāja Prabhu (Bābājī Āvijī)...	65, 117, 184, 220, 241, 242, 248
Bājam Bhaḍ	8, 115, 228
Bāi Krahpa	2, 6
Bāi Krahpa Pant	110

Bandā, Saīd	21
Bhām	25
Bhīmji Rāje	125, 129
Bhukhān,	197, 198

C

Chandar Rāv More	5, 6, 7, 168, 169, 171.
Chimpājī Bāpuji	43
Chintāman	197, 198, 199.
Chitpāis,	197

D

Dabīr	3
Dādājī Koudder	3, 4, 157, 163, 164, 165
Dattardār	84
Daryā Sārang	94, 192, 197
Dasaratha	176
Dattājī Trimbak	61, 66, 68, 72, 75, 76, 85, 107
Dāud Khān	87
Daulat Khān	194
Dāvājī Gājge	61
Deśi	37
Deś Kulkarji	38
Deśmukh	37, 38
Dhansaji Jadhava	151, 250
Dikshit, Nāro Pant	3
Dilāl Khān	47, 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 96, 99, 102, 105, 106, 112, 113, 130, 131, 210, 211, 212, 213, 215, 237, 239
Dīpā BAI	235
Duryodhan	25

E

Ekōji Rāje	3, 125, 126
-------------------	-------------

F

Fate Khān	195
Fasal Khān	24
Fulad Khān	65, 68, 69

G

Gāgā Bhaṭ	112, 117, 241, 242
Galvata	93
Gangāji Mangāji	7, 11
Gangāji Pant Vāknis	76
Ghorpaṭe	180
Ghorpaṭe, Bāji (see under Bāji)	
Gomāji Naik	11, 164
Gondji Jagtāp	104
Govind Bhaṭ	8, 227
Gurab	89, 93

H

Hambir Rāv	110, 111, 112, 113, 123, 123, 123, 129, 241
Hanmant Rāv More	7, 168, 170
Heḍamba Bākahasa	67
Hiroji Farzand	61, 67, 68, 69
Husain Khān Miān	111 1.

I

Ibrāhim Khān	97
Ikhās Khān	98, 101, 102, 104
Iḍramani	98

J

Jādhava Rāv	164
Jāfar Khān	65, 66
Jagjivan	88
Jaganmāth Pant	125
Jamnis	80, 81
Jasvant Sing	63, 64, 218
Jasrādan Nārāyaṇ	110, 112, 122
Jasrādan Pant	8
Jaya Sing	47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 52, 52, 60, 200, 210, 211, 212, 214, 215
Jhoojar Rāv Ghāḍge	24
Jijā Bai	2, 3, 11, 20, 157, 161, 164, 173, 191, 248
Jil Mahāli	19, 21, 22

K

Kaḍṭājī Gujar (also see Pratsp Bāv) ...	78
Kākājī Pant	125, 227
Kāliya	207
Kamāvis	35
Kārkhānnis	29
Kāśī Bāū	71, 75
Kauravas	25
Kāy Sāvant	90, 191
Kesar Sing	130
Khair Khān	197
Khaṇḍojī Jagtāp... ..	104
Khawās Khān	95
Kilāstāv	94
Killedār	73
Konḍdev Dādājī (see under Dādājī) ...	
Koneri Pant	229, 230
Kṛṣṇājī Bhāskar	10, 13, 14, 19, 182, 184
Kṛṣṇājī Pant Dewān	190
Kṛṣṇa Bāv More	171
Kṛṣṇa Josī	228
Kṛṣṇājī Nāik	11
Kṛṣṇājī Pant	71, 75
Kṛṣṇa Bāv	169
Kṛṣṇājī Sakhojī	228
Kulkarṇi	37
Kutub Shāh	228

L

Lakham Sāvant	95
Lambājī Bhoṇale	24

M

Madappā Pant	120, 121, 122, 123, 224, 225
Mahabat Khān	87, 97
Mahādev	2
Mahādik	241
Majumdār	3, 31, 33, 35
Makājī Ānand Bāv	85
Māi Sāvant	106
Malik Ambar	151
Mālik Sāheb	197
Māloji Bāje	1, 2
Mānājī More	104, 127, 128, 229

Mānbhāva	117
Māphoji Dāhātōnda	5
Māwjes	2, 4, 5, 33
Māy Nāik	94, 192, 194
Mirjā Bājā	47, 61, 66, 68, 69, 60, 212, 213, 215
Mohite	101, 241
Moro Pant	7, 11, 12, 18, 22, 42, 59, 71, 72, 75, 81, 85, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 112, 196, 250.
More Nāgnāth	104
Murār Sāji Prabhū	63
Murār, Dādāji	213
Murār Pant	162, 173, 174

N

Nāik	29, 21, 23
Nāro Pant	4, 108, 110, 221
Narāli Phirangoji (see under Phiran- goji)	200, 201, 205, 237, 239, 240
Nāsiri Khān	124
Notāji Pāikar	6, 11, 12, 18, 28, 42, 59, 78, 201
Nīlkanṭha Haibatrav	165
Nīlkanṭha Nāik	167
Nīlkanṭha Rāv	5
Nījo Nīlkanṭh	165, 166
Nījo Pant	11, 59, 72, 75, 151, 166, 238
Nījōbā Nāik	227
Nījo Prabhū	117
Nījo Sondav	7, 108
Nimbājkar	8
Nirāji Pant	66, 71, 72, 75, 61, 62, 63, 118, 119, 128, 151.
Nirāji Rāji	61, 68, 250
Nisām Śāhi	1, 2, 37
Nyāyādhi	76

P

Pājagāra	69, 222
Pāndavas	25
Pantāji Gopināth	12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 26, 182
Patakā	76
Pāṭṭi	27, 28
Pandhāris	52
Pandā	2, 44
Phirangoji	200, 201, 205, 237, 239, 240

Pilāji Nilkanth	165, 167
Pitāmbar Śaṅvi	96
Prabhākar Bhaṭṭ	8, 115
Prahlād Pant	76, 81, 118, 120, 122, 123, 161
Pratāpji Rāje	125, 139
Pratāp Rāv (also see Kavṛtāji Gujar)	78, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 87, 102, 103, 104, 105, 107, 108, 109.

R

Rāghoji Mitra	61, 68, 72, 75
Rāghunāth Paṇḍit	50, 51, 55, 210
Rāghunāth Ballāl Sabnis	3, 4, 5, 11, 91, 92, 168, 170, 191, 192.
Rāghunāth Nārāyaṇ	110, 119, 122, 127, 128, 129, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 231, 232.
Rāghunāth Paṭ Korḍe	59, 61, 64, 65, 80
Rājā Rām	100, 132, 150, 153, 243, 250
Rām Dās Swāmi	238, 247
Rām Daḷvi	97
Rāmchandra Bābāji	242
Rāmchandra Pant	161
Rāmchandra Nilkanth	250
Rāmāji Pṅgera	102
Rām Sing	51, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 69, 210, 217, 218, 219, 220.
Randullā Khān	174
Rangobā Nāik	227
Ranmast Khān	130
Rauf Khān	124
Rājāji Somnāth	81, 82
Rāvaṇa	41, 216
Rāy Bāgiṇ	88
Rohilā Khān	219
Rupāji Bhonele	104, 229
Rustam-i-Zaman	84

S

Sabbāśad Kṛṣṇāji Anant	1
Sabnis	3, 29, 33
Śābāji	1, 2, 3, 8, 14, 20, 90, 110, 157, 159, 161, 163, 167, 171, 173, 174, 178, 185, 208, 218, 221, 226, 227, 231.

Baf Baf	8, 172, 176, 248
Baid Bandā	20, 22
Bāista Khān	40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 53, 66, 91, 120, 200, 201, 202, 208, 204, 206, 207, 211, 212, 237.
Bān Bāv Nilkanth	2, 4, 7, 12, 194, 202
Bānjl Nāik Punde	229, 230
Bambhāji Raje	8, 11, 12, 59, 66, 68, 75, 80, 81, 130, 131, 132, 150, 153, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 247, 249, 250.
Bambhāji Kāvji	19, 21, 22, 168, 205
Bambhāji Mohitā	4
Bānkrāji Nilkanth	165, 167
Bānāji Ghorpaḍe	151, 250
Bardār Khān	120
Bārufji Raje	2
Bārjā Khān	174, 178
Bārānjām	22
Bārphat	4, 5, 29, 31, 32, 41, 44
Bāntāji Jagtāp	104
Bāyrā Baf	100, 160, 248
Bhāb Alam	79
Bhāik Yāskud	196
Bher Khān	124, 228
Bihād	93
Biddi	94, 192, 196
Biddi Ābar	196
Biddi Johar	78
Biddi Sambol	197, 215
Bidojl Nimbājkar	104, 130
Biva	250
Bivājl	2, 4, 8, 9, 20, 25, 29, 57, 61, 79, 82, 105, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 164, 168, 173, 182, 183, 187, 196, 199, 200, 203, 206, 207, 208, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 221, 222, 223, 225, 236, 228, 231, 232, 238, 240, 241, 248
Bivāyā Nāik	97
Bivājl Bānkar	229, 230
Binghe	5, 241
Bihā Baf	241
Bānājl Pant	2, 4, 11, 59, 61, 122
Bat Bhavāul	9, 11, 27, 42, 68
Bat Karpur Gaur	51

Śrī Kṛṣṇāji	207
Śrī Sambhu Mahādev	3, 55, 63, 152
Subhānji Nāik	11
Subhān Sing	57, 58
Subhedār	35
Sultān Dhavā	213
Sultān Mahammad	8
Sumitrā	176
Surve	5, 7,
Suryāji Mālsurā	74
Surya Rāv More	6, 168
Surya Rāv Kānkḍe	104
T.	
Tānā Shāh	120
Tānāji Mālsurā	72, 73, 74, 190, 203
Tān Sāvānt	97
Taḷ Sarpobat	29
Tārāḍḍe	93
Tārān Sāheb	241
Tārā	93
Timāji Ikhtyār Rāv	227
Trimbak Bhāskar	13
Trimbak Pant	66
Tukoji Chor Mārāṭhā	4
U.	
Ude Bhān	73
Umāji Pant	238, 239
V.	
Viśāji Ballāl	104
Viśāji Pant	71, 75
Viśvās Rāv Nānāji Prabhu	189, 190
Viṭṭhal Bhāle Rāv	237
Viṭhoji Rāje Bhoṅale	1
Vyankoji Datto (also Vyankāji Pant)	85, 87, 92, 104, 105, 192, 195, 198
Vyankāji Rāje	110, 125, 126, 128, 129, 221, 222, 223, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 235
Y.	
Yādo Bhāskar	234
Yāskud Khār	195, 215
Yama	203
Yecāji Kank	8, 83, 190, 191, 203
Yesu BAI	239