



THE LIFE OF SHIVAJI MAHARAJ FOUNDER OF THE MARATHA EMPIRE

Homepage: <http://www.gathacognition.com/book/gcb20>
<http://dx.doi.org/10.21523/gcb4>



Appendices

N. S. Takakhav

Professor, Wilson College, Bombay.

Editor

Kiran Jadhav

Published Online

17 March 2018

Appendix 1

Maloji and Shahaji

In an article on this subject in the first number of the Quarterly (Marathi) of the Bharat Itihas Sanshodhak Mandali, 1921, Mr. Vasudev Shastri Khare has examined the careers of Maloji and Shahaji and made certain speculations on the part played by Shahaji as the inspirer of Shivaji's programme, which in part corroborate and in part conflict with the views expressed in the text. Mr. Khare supports the claim of the Bhonsles to consider themselves Rajputs and points out that Maloji's father, Babaji made use of the title *Raja* (Rajwade XV, Extract No. 367), before Maloji had earned any honour from the Nizamshahi state. Mr. Khare controverts the view that Maloji began service under Lakhji Jadhav on such a low salary as five pagodas per month, holding that if his fortunes were so depressed as to compel him to serve on such low terms, he could not have married the sister of such a chief as Vangoji Naik Nimbalkar of Phaltan. He believes that Maloji must have taken service with the Nizamshahi state and his corps was then transferred to the Jadhav family, as the latter were the head of the Maratha forces attached to the Nizamshahi

Originally published in 'The Life of Shivaji Maharaj: Founder of the Maratha Empire', 1921. Adopted from the Marathi work by **K. A. Keluskar**.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.21523/gcb4.1836>

GATHA COGNITION®

state, and he thinks it probable that this connection with the Jadhav family sprang up in the regime of the father of Lukhji Jadhav. He thinks that the person who forced Lukhji Jadhav to give his daughter Jijabai to Maloji's son in marriage was, not so much the reigning sultan, Murteza Nizamshaha II (*alias* Buran Nizamshaha), who was a minor and a puppet, but Malik Ambar, who was already then (A. D. 1604) the mainstay of the Nizamshahi state. He holds that the Maratha Bakhars and other historians are wrong in stating that the marriage of Jijabai with Shahaji took place in the sultan's presence at Daulatabad (*vide* p. 14, *supra*). He maintains that it must have been celebrated at Perinda (Parande), which was then the Nizamshahi capital, since Malik Ambar who had revived the state after the fall of Ahmednagar and the capture of Bahadur Nizamshaha (the ward of Chand Bibi) in 1600, installed his puppet prince at Perinda until the foundation of Khadki (the modern Aurangabad) near Daulatabad, in the year 1607, when this new town became the Nizamshahi capital. As to this, it must be said that the Mahomedan chroniclers like Ferishta also give the date 1600 or 1601 for the revival of the Nizamshahi state by the Ahmednagar nobles and state that the capital of the puppet king was Perinda (Parande or Parendia), but it is doubtful whether at so early a period as 1600 or 1601 Malik Ambar had become the *de facto* king of the Nizamshahi state. Such a position he must have attained by the year 1609, when he re-conquered Ahmednagar for the Nizamshahi state. In the *Modern Review*, Vol. XXII No. 129, (p. 247), Prof. Sarkar states that "Buran Nizamshaha (Murteza Nizamshaha II) became a puppet of Malik Ambar about 1609." There were strong factions in the Ahmednagar state, (*Vide* p. 17 *supra*) and Malik Ambar could not have all at once made himself a *de facto* king, but must have risen, slowly, as the power of the other nobles declined. His chief wars with the Moguls were fought in the reign of Jahangir, rather than of Akbar. Malik Ambar died at the ripe old age of eighty in 1626 and he must have been a leading noble of the state in 1600, though he began his career as an Abyssinian slave. There is nothing impossible in the view that the patron of Shahaji at the age of 30 years should have also been a patron of Maloji at a time when Shahaji was 10 years of age, but it is not so easy to believe that he was already then a *de facto* king. Mr. Khare himself states in his article (p. 9), that till Malik Ambar became fifty-four or fifty-five years of age (i. e, till 1600 or 1601 A. D.) he was quite an obscure person.

On the authority of a bakhar in the Tamil language entitled the “*Shiv Bharat*”, Mr. Khare thinks that including Shivaji, Jijabai bore six children to Shahaji, of whom the first four died in childhood, (Shedgavkar p. 11), the first to grow into manhood being Sambhaji, the fifth child, born in 1623 (*Vide* p. 51 *supra* and foot-note). Mr. Khare thinks the date of the birth of Shivaji given in the Jedhe Chronology, viz.: March 1630, to be more correct than the date given by most of the bakhars, viz.: April 1627. Mr. Khare ridicules the theory that Shahaji married his second wife, Tukabai Mohite, on account of any disfavour with Jijabai and is so far happily in agreement with our view on this subject (*Vide* pp. 55 and 66 *supra*). He holds that this marriage with a daughter of a Bijapur noble, celebrated at Bijapur, in honour of which he received certain grants of land from the Bijapur durbar (Shivadigvijaya p. 53), must have taken place after Shahaji had taken up permanent service under Bijapur, i. e. after 1637. But he makes this marriage an important thread in a speculative web about Shahaji’s purposes which he weaves in the rest of his article. He says this marriage was purposely contracted by Shahaji, in order to throw dust into the eyes of the Bijapur authorities, so that while in one direction, Shivaji could go on laying the foundations of an independent power under his own secret guidance and inspiration, he could easily disclaim all responsibility, by saying that he had quarrelled with Shivaji and Jijabai. The theory is too subtle to believe in. It is impossible to believe that even a great master mind like Shahaji should enter upon a simple event in his family life like a second marriage, with such deep-laid political schemes in his head. The rest of the article is taken up with the attempt to show that from beginning to end Shivaji entered upon his task, under his father’s inspiration. So far as this theory gives the death-blow to the popular view, sanctified by Grant Duff, that Shahaji was opposed to the plans of Shivaji, it is acceptable to us and has been maintained in these pages. But it is too much for us to view Shivaji’s labours as the mechanical execution of ready-made schemes presented by his father. The officers lent by Shahaji were of great service to the youthful hero, the example set by Shahaji was even of still greater service, the many proofs of his father’s encouragement and assistance, which he received from time to time, were most valuable in stimulating his enterprise: but it is difficult to believe that the whole plan was laid out by Shahaji already as early as 1637 or 1639, (or even 1643 as sometimes alleged) and entrusted for execution, with an insufficient army and with hopelessly inadequate financial resources, to a

promising but after all a raw and inexperienced *boy* like Shivaji, who in the year 1639 was, according to Jedhe, scarcely *nine* years of age, - even if by any gift of observation or prophecy it could be predicted that boy would turn out a prodigy of genius, and even if that boy were assisted by Shahaji's officials. It seems to us more natural to assume that the ideas of liberty and independence, which were implanted in Shivaji by nature, were fostered by the sympathy of his mother and the example of his father, and with that example before him, he carved out his career and made his preparations from about 1643 to 1648, when the wisdom and the bravery and the perseverance he displayed evoked from the sagacious father cautious acknowledgments of his sympathy, approval and encouragement. (*Vide* foot-note to pp. 94, 95)

As to the reflections of Mr. Khare about the motto of Shivaji's seal and the use of it at a time when Shivaji was barely ten years of age, nothing more need be added to our remarks in the foot-note at pp. 107, 108 *supra*.

Appendix II

Anandrao Bhonsle and Hambirrao Mohite

The perplexing question as to the identity of Anandrao, one of Shivaji's great generals, has been referred to in the foot-note to pp. 259. Sarkar (*Shivaji*, p. 260 and foot-note) identifies Anandrao, the lieutenant of Prataprao Guzar, with Hambirrao, who succeeded Prataprao to the office of Sir-nobut, when the latter was killed in the battle of Jessary. He says "Anandrao, a lieutenant of Prataprao, rallied the disheartened army of his chief. Shiva (Shivaji) appointed him Commander-in-chief in succession to Prataprao, gave him the title of Hambirrao, and ordered him not to return alive without defeating the enemy." In his foot-note to this passage, Sarkar says, "I here follow the account of Narayan Shenvi (interpreter to the East India Company, Bombay), written at Raigad only a month later, on information supplied by Shivaji's ministers." Sarkar adds that Sabhasad and Chitnis give the new commander-in-chief's name as Hasaji (Hansaji) Mohite. With full knowledge of this, Sarkar identifies Hambirrao with Anandrao. He is quite consistent in this identification throughout his account of the Karnatic campaign, but breaks down all of a sudden when he comes to describe the last operations against Dilerkhan, when the latter was besieging Bijapur. For here he speaks of Hambirrao and Anandrao as different individuals. He describes Anandrao as being in command of 2,500 men sent to relieve Bijapur (p. 417) and again mentions him as being in charge of a cavalry force of 10,000 operating in the south, while Shivaji himself marched with the other half of his army into Khandesh, plundered Jalna and on the return fought with Ranmastkhan, in which battle *Hambirrao was wounded*. This would show clearly that in this context Anandrao is taken as quite a different individual from Hambirrao and to this extent Sarkar is inconsistent with his former account.

Whence came this Anandrao all of a sudden, a general of such acknowledged merit and experience, as to have been put in command of a squadron of 10,000 horse against such a redoubted Mogul general as Dilerkhan, while Shivaji himself, with Hambirrao, was carrying his flying columns into another theatre of war?

The fact is that this Anandrao was not a new general who then blazed into a sudden glory, but is the same Anandrao whom Sarkar had previously

mentioned at page 260 of his *Shivaji*, the only mistake being his identification of this general with Hambirrao *Mohite*. This Anandrao was a *Bhonale*. There are many references to him in Sabhasad and Shedgavkar, as well as in Jedhe. He was probably the same general who figures in most of the bakhar lists as Anandrao *Haft-hazari*, or commander of 7,000, rather an unusual distinction in Shivaji's army, the more common rank under the Sir-nobut, being that of the *Panch-hazari* or commander of 5,000. There must have been a special reason for this unique distinction of *Haft-hazari*, which almost stands on parity with the Sir-nobutship itself. Verily the status of Anandrao becomes a case of "A Sir-nobut and no-Sir-nobut", i. e. a commander who was as good as a Sir-nobut without the title.

The first mention of Anandrao in Sabhasad is at page 63. There this general is named Makaji Anandrao. Everywhere else Sabhasad speaks of him simply as Anandrao. At page 63 Sabhasad says : - "And Makaji Anandrao, the natural son of Maharaja Shahaji, and Venkoji Datto, a Brahman, a great military sardar of renown, who had left the service of the Maharaja (i. e. of Shahaji) and come to the Raje (i. e. Shivaji), these the Raje exalted and invested with the rank of *Panch-hazari*. And Prataprao Sir-nobut and Venkoji Datto and Anandrao and other Sardars.... these he (Shivaji) took with him.... and marched straight to Surat." It follows then that Anandrao was a natural son of Shahaji and had served under his father, and began service under his brother as a *Panch-hazari*, at least about 1670, if not earlier. Jedhe seems to hint at his serving, under Prataprao Guzar a year earlier in the Maratha contingent that co-operated with Prince Muazzim at Ahmednagar. He is often mentioned as a brother officer along with the Brahman Venkoji Datto, taking part in the same exploits, both having come over together to Shivaji's court *from the service of Shahaji*. This would mean either that they came in the life-time of Shahaji, i. e. before the end of 1664 or that they came from Tanjore after his death. There is, however, no reason why Sabhasad should not be taken literally when he describes them as "leaving the service of Shahaji", so as to mean that they left him in his life-time. This subject is further discussed at the end of Appendix IV and we will provisionally hold that Anandrao joined Shivaji before 1664.

Later on Sabhasad mentions him as second in command under Prataprao Guzar, sharing in his exploits, being in fact a sort of "*fidus Achates*"

to him. He took part in the battle of Vani-Dindori after the plunder of Surat and is mentioned among the four honoured victors on the field of Salheri. At a later stage Sabhasad describes him as accompanying Shivaji in his retreat from the Karnatic (p. 68) and here Anandrao is clearly indicated to be a different individual from Hambirrao, since the latter was left behind to co-operate with Raghunathpant Hanumante. According to Sabhasad, Anandrao accompanied Shivaji to Kopal and Lakshmeshwar upto Sampgaon (Belgaum district), while Manaji More (one of the great officers who had also accompanied Shivaji) was left behind at Kolkar. The Shedgavkar bakhar corroborates all this, giving additional details. At page 46-47 (and *Errata* p. 2) he is described as a “*palak lek*” or illegitimate son of Shahaji and as coming over, along with Venkoji Datto, to Shivaji’s service as a “Panch-hazari”, accompanying him to Surat and serving in the battle of Vani-Dindori. At page 76 he is mentioned under the name “*Anandrao Farzand Bhonsle*” and is described as having been honoured among the greatest victors of the battle of Salheri. At pages 88, 89, he is described as accompanying Shivaji in his retreat from Jinji, when Raghunathpant and Hansaji Mohite (Hambirrao) were left behind. It should be noted that this bakhar always speaks of *Hansaji* Mohite as *Asoji* Mohite. While speaking of some of these events this bakhar mentions Anandrao under the name *Anandrao Farzand Kuwar* (i. e. kumar or prince), so that there is no doubt that the same Anandrao is meant as the one who took part in the battle of Salheri and who is there called *Anandrao Farzand Bhonsle*.

The Jedhe Chronology corroborates this with more details. At p. 188, we are told that on the cessation of peace with the Moguls, Prataprao and Anandrao left the camp of the *Shahazada* (prince Muazzim) at Aurangabad and came away to Raigad. At p. 190 we have an account of the battle of Salheri and we are there told that Prataprao and Anandrao captured Bahlolkhan (i. e. Ikhlaskhan, the son of Bahlolkhan) and Mahakam Singh and Darkoji Bhonsle, together with eleven elephants and 1,700 horses. At p. 191 we are told that Prataprao Guzar and Anandrao fought with and defeated Bahlolkhan (i. e. Abdul Karim) near Bijapur. This was the battle of Umrani. On the same page Jedhe records the battle of Nivte (or Jessary) in which Prataprao fought with Bahlolkhan (Abdul Karim) and was killed. But within one month after that battle, as related by Jedhe, Anandrao defeated Khidarkhan (i. e. Khizarkhan) at Sampgaon. Now this battle Prof. Sarkar has

transferred to the credit of Hambirrao consistently with his mistaken identification of Anandrao with that hero. But according to Jedhe (as also Sabhasad and Shedgavkar), the constant companion of Prataprao in almost every engagement was Anandrao, not Hambirrao, and the latter, as seen from other statements of Sabhasad and Shedgavkar was a different individual altogether from Anandrao. According to Jedhe, about two months after the battle of Jessary (or Nivte), Shivaji reviewed his army at Chiplun, where it was cantoned for the rains and then it seems that the title of Sir-nobut was formally conferred upon Hambirrao Mohite. Sabhasad (p. 79) also expressly states that “Shivaji came in person to the army, went with the forces to Chiplun, and remained there. Then after reviewing his army, he looked for a man for the Sir-nobutship and lighted on one Hansaji Mohite and conferred on him the title of Hambirrao and appointed him Sir-nobut.” This is repeated by Shedgavkar, page 79. It is possible that during this interval of two or three months between the battle of Jessary (Nivte) and the appointment of Hambirrao Mohite, Anandrao, who had all along been second in command under Prataprao Guzar, had to *act* as Sir-nobut, and he perhaps deserved to be promoted to that post, as the man who had always been next under Prataprao and who had rallied the Maratha forces after the death of Prataprao. (The account given in the text that Hansaji Mohite rallied the army of Prataprao Guzar and was immediately appointed Sir-nobut with the title of Hambirrao is based on the version of Chitnis, which requires to be corrected in the light of these facts). But the bar sinister of illegitimacy perhaps stood in the way of his being admitted to the permanent rank of Sir-nobut, which carried a place in the Ashtapradhan Cabinet, and Shivaji with his orthodox notions and having a regard for the feelings of the high minded Maratha nobles in his command, may have deliberately conferred the appointment finally upon Hansaji Mohite. The temporary command of Anandrao might have led to the mistake of Narayan Shenvi, which has misled Prof. Sarkar into wrongly identifying Anandrao with Hambirrao Mohite. It is true that on a later occasion another illegitimate son of Shahaji was made viceroy at Jinji, but he was kept practically under the control of Hanumante and had no place in the Ashtapradhan Cabinet. It was perhaps on this occasion that the extraordinary mansab of *Haft-hazari*, or command of seven thousand, was conferred upon Anandrao, so that he had practically the power of a Sir-nobut, though that dignity was not formally conferred upon him.

According to Jedhe, Anandrao accompanied Shivaji on the Karnatic expedition, and was with him on the return march, while Hambirrao was left behind with Hanumante at Jinji. He was present at the capture of Gadag-Lakshmeshwar. He completed the capture of Vellore in conjunction with Hanumante (August 1678). He captured Balapore in April 1679. At this time perhaps a junior officer of the name of Anandrao was rising into prominence, for at this point, the captor of Balapore is described by Jedhe as the “senior Anandrao.” No further entries about Anandrao are recorded by Jedhe; but Prof. Sarkar describes his exploits in the final war between Dilerkhan and Bijapur, at a time when Shivaji and Hambirrao began to plunder Khandesh, in order to divert. Dilerkhan from the siege of Bijapur.

It is clear from this sketch that Anandrao was one of the greatest generals of Shivaji, one who next to Shivaji himself had inherited the best of Shahaji’s valour. It is a mystery how his exploits came to be buried in oblivion. The reason was probably the same which, as surmised above, had deterred Shivaji from conferring the honour of the Sir-nobut upon him.

[Shivaji’s son Rajaram was married to a daughter of Prataprao Guzar and also to a daughter of Hambirrao Mohite (Shivadigvijay, p. 287 and Sardesai’s *Riyasat* Genealogy p. 2). Our foot-note at p. 358 should be corrected in this light].

Appendix- III

The Battle of Khanderi

With reference to the account of the battle of Khanderi at page 377 and footnote, it seems to us advisable to quote the original account of Keigwin himself in reporting the battle to the British authorities. An extract from his letter is given below in his own English, without altering his spelling, punctuation marks and capital letters.

Let us prefix to this quotation a brief account of the beginning of the battle. At daybreak on the 18th October 1679, “*Shivaji’s Armada*”, as Keigwin calls it, bore down on the small English squadron with sails and oars, firing as they came from Cheul. A *grab* (or *guraba*) in charge of a Mr. Gape was the nearest to Shivaji’s armada. Mr. Gape was a civilian and the naval or military commander of the vessel, (which was a *guraba* christened the *Dover*), was Sergeant Maulverer. Next to the *Dover* was the *Revenge*, a British frigate, under the command of Capt. Minchin, a sea-captain in the Company’s service and Lt. Keigwin, commandant of the Company’s land forces in Bombay. The British force comprised eight vessels in all. Soon after the commencement of the battle, Mr. Gape struck his colours and surrendered to the Marathas. Speaking of this act of Mr. Gape, Keigwin writes in his letter, “What accident befell him (Mr. Gape) I know not, but half a mile before the enemy was up with him, *his ensign and top-sail was struck*”. On seeing this act of cowardice, the rest of the English squadron were seized with panic and tied, and the *Revenge* was left alone to face the enemy, one ship against about forty Maratha vessels. The *Revenge* is usually described to have fought gallantly and to have sunk five of the Maratha vessels and to have pursued the rest to Nagotna. Quite a miraculous feat in the history of naval warfare, which the history of Orme, the Bombay Gazetteer XIII and above all Sarkar’s *Shivaji* require us to accept without questioning! But the report of Keigwin himself betrays the cloven hoof. His report of the battle was written on the evening of the day of his triumph, no doubt after he had helped himself to copious libations of “*that accursed Bombay Punch*” compounded of our home-brewed Bombay *bevada*. Here goes Keigwin’s account of his own treachery:

“Seeing ourselves alone, Captain Minchin and myself encouraged our Souldiers and Seamen admonishing them what disgrace it would be to

Christians to be prisoners to heathens, but courageously to defend, and fight the enemy bravely they unanimously said they would live and dye with us, wee promised to show ourselves forward for their example, we hal'd up our sailes the Enemy thinking we were as easily swallow'd as the other, came up our sterne, with 24 Grobs I know not how many Galwets, I order'd our men not to fire until the word of Command, So when they came within Pistoll Shot, and they finding us mute, thrust themselves forward in their boates to enter, but wee discharged our Sterne Chase with Round Shot and Patridge, and presently our blunderbusses and small shot so smartly ply'd, that check their drums and Pipes, and in half an hour, we beat them from their Guns and Musquets and brought them by the Lee."

This passage shows the dodge played by Keigwin and Minchin. Although they did not "*strike their ensign and top-sail*", as Mr. Gape had done, they, to all intents and purposes put Daulatkhan and the Marathas under the belief that they were going to surrender, as Mr. Gape had done, and when the Marathas advanced to board their frigate and accept their surrender, they treacherously opened fire. No wonder that the Marathas quailed before this unexpected offensive. Our only regret is that Prof. Sarkar, who has made so liberal a use of the British authorities, should have failed to quote just this passage, which is to be found in the India Office Library, *Original Correspondence*, No. 4665. As it is, Prof. Sarkar's reflections at page 358 of his *Shivaji* are absurd.

Capt. Minchin had a few years before fought a duel with a Mr. Hornigold, British factor; and President Aungier had occasion to denounce the event, attributing it to the use of the "accursed Bombay Punch", indulgence in which was too notorious, "to the shame, scandal and ruin of our nation and religion". Both Capt. Minchin and Mr. Hornigold had been fined fifty "zeraphins" each, a "zeraphin" being equal to twenty pence. Keigwin afterwards rebelled but though the governor, John Child, spoke of him as a "notorious, noughty rascal" and wanted to have him hanged, he managed to escape and died in an attack on a town in St. Christopher, in the West Indies.

Appendix IV

Raghunath Ballal Korde

There are two officers of Shivaji, who are constantly confounded with one another. Both are spoken of as Raghunath Ballal or as Ragho Ballal. The surname of one is Korde and that of the other Atre. Even Mr. Kincaid has confounded them. The Bakhars rarely use the surnames and hence the uncertainty. The title *Sabnis* is often found used of each of them. An attempt is here made to separate the exploits of these two men. Both were apparently Brahmans. The name Korde also occurs in the Kayastha Prabhu caste, which has led Mr. B. A. Gupte in Sen's Sabhasad (p. 59) to conjecture that Raghunath-pant Korde being a Prabhu, the name is a mistake for Raghunath-rao Korde. The point is well argued in the '*Vividhdnyan-Vistar*' (Marathi), February 1921, p. 70. This Korde was a brother-in-law of a Brahman officer of Shivaji.

Of these two officers, Korde entered into Shivaji's service earlier and served him longer. Sabhasad says (p. 7) that Raghunath Ballal was one of the officers whom Shahaji sent from Bangalore, along with Shamrao Nilkant (Peshwa), Balkrishnapant (Muzumdar) and Sonopant (Dabir). Raghunathpant came to Poona as Sabnis or paymaster. The name Korde is first mentioned at page 47, where we are told that he was a brother-in-law of Sonajipant Dabir. Korde besides being a Sabnis was constantly employed under Shivaji on the duties of a Dabir, or plenipotentiary. We find him employed in Shivaji's earliest overtures with the Moguls at the time of Shahaji's captivity (See footnote at p. 94 and 97). Sabhasad says he was engaged on the mission to Chandrarao More and that he killed him and his brother. We have seen Jedhe has quite a different story to relate (Jedhe p. 180-181) and we have shown (*Vide* pp. 141-142), that Chandrarao More was not murdered, but executed. Korde was probably sent to Javli to bring about a settlement of the dispute. When Sonopant Dabir, who acted as Shivaji's *vakil* to Shaista Khan (Jedhe p. 185), died in 1665 (Jedhe p. 187), the duties of foreign diplomacy fell upon Korde, for he went on an embassy to Aurangzeb at Agra, after the armistice made with Jay Singh (Sabhasad p. 47), although in treating with Jay Singh, the *Panditrao* was employed. Shivaji was accompanied to Agra by Trimbakji Sondev (the son of Sonajipant Dabir, a relation of Korde) and was met there by Korde himself (Sabhasad p. 47, 48). Trimbakji and Korde were practically

fulfilling the duties of Dabir and when Shivaji escaped from Agra, both Trimbakji and Korde were seized and imprisoned (Jedhe p. 188). They had been left behind on diplomatic business at the time of the flight of Shivaji. It is possible that on account of the captivity of these two kinsmen of the late Dabir Sonaji Pant, the vacant office of Dabir was at last conferred upon Somnathpant. The two kinsmen were freed about eight months later, when a new treaty was made with the Moguls (Jedhe. p 188). While recording this event Jedhe speaks of Trimbak Sondev as Trimbak Sondev *Dabir*, but it is not clear whether that title was ever actually conferred upon him. At p. 57, Sabhasad states that Pralhad Niraji was made a Deputy to the Sabnis or Deputy Paymaster of the Forces. Korde perhaps still held the office of Sabnis, though more often employed on other duties. He was again sent on a mission to Muazzim at Aurangabad (Sabhasad p. 60), the result of which was the grant of a Mogul mansab to Sambhaji. Thereafter the office of Sabnis was conferred upon Pralhad Niraji, about 1668. Korde is now neither Sabnis nor Dabir. What was he promoted to? There is reason to believe that he now served on the Konkan coast. In 1669 Shivaji began a desperate war with the Sidi. Korde had already once fought against Sidi Fattah Khan of Janjira, (*Vide* p. 188 *supra*). The hand of Korde may possibly be seen, though the name does not appear, in that intrigue by which Fattah Khan, the Sidi Chief, was won over in 1670 to surrender the sea-fort of Janjira (*Vide* p. 319 *supra*). But the plot was nipped in the bud and the rival chiefs put Fattah Khan in chains, transferred their allegiance to the Moguls, and saved Janjira (1671). Ten years before the Sidis had lost Danda-Rajpuri to Raghunath Ballal *Atre* (not *Korde*). In 1671 the Sidi chiefs made a determined effort to recover Danda-Rajpuri (*Vide* p. 334, *supra* and Khafi Khan in Elliot VII 290-292). *Korde* was the Maratha governor of Danda-Rajpuri. Korde was taken by surprise during the Holi carnival and was defeated and slain. The garrison was, cut to pieces and the women and children sold as slaves. The name *Atre* given at pages 250-251 is due to an oversight.

Atre, the original conqueror of Danda-Rajpuri, had died long before this event. Both Messrs, Kincaid and Sardesai have frequently confused *Atre* with *Korde*. Mr. Kincaid not only speaks of *Atre* as having been killed by the Sidis at Danda-Rajpuri in 1671, but he mentions *Atre* as Shivaji's ambassador to Chandrarao More.

Raghunath Ballal Atre was the man who was put in command of the corps of 700 Pathan mercenaries who came to seek service under Shivaji, (*Vide* page 147 *supra*). He distinguished himself by his defence of the fort of Panhala after Shivaji's escape to Vishalgad, in 1660. For this he was highly honoured (pp. 142-143). He was next appointed to lead the Maratha forces against the Sidi of Janjira. The first Peshwa Shamraj Ranzekar had been defeated by the Sidi (p. 109-110 *supra*), and though some ground was regained by Moro Trimal Pingle, the Sidi had raised his head again (p. 133 *supra*). Atre was sent against Janjira with a large army (*Vide* Sabhasad p. 67 and p. 192 *supra*). He retrieved the Maratha losses, and captured the harbour-town of Danda-Rajpuri (p. 143 *supra*). He died soon after this in 1660 and the Abyssinian power began to rise again (Sabhasad, p. 67). The name Korde occurring in the text at page 196 should be changed into Atre.

Unfounded statements are sometimes made that Korde's prospects in Shivaji's service were cut off on account of his unauthorized murder of Chandrarao More. It is argued that Korde and Sambhaji Kavji murdered Chandrarao by an unauthorized act, that Shivaji was not a party to the murder, and that in consequence Korde was not appointed to any position of trust after that event. But More was *not* murdered and this defence is fantastic. Even Mr. Kincaid has tripped by taking up this line of defence. This defence was urged by Mr. P. B. Joshi in a paper read before a Marathi literary conference and is the subject of a foot-note in Sardesai's *Riyasat*, p. 238. Nor did Sambhaji Kavji, whose name is also mentioned in that affair, come into disfavour with Shivaji, till his desertion at Shaista Khan's invasion (See p. 169 and foot-note).

A word may be added about Atre's successor in the Janjira war. This was Venkoji Datto, the companion of Anandrao Farzand Bhonsle. Sabhasad (pp. 67, 68) says that this commander went and utterly devastated the Sidi dominions and annexed their land. In a battle that followed, he killed 300 Abyssinians and captured their horses. This took place in August, 1660.

[A doubt arises here. Did Venkoji Datto and Anandrao, who according to Sabhasad (pp. 63, 64) came together to join Shivaji's service, leaving that of Shahaji, actually come in the life-time of Shahaji? That would be before 1664, the date of the first sack of Surat. But Sabhasad mentions them as immediately employed in the second sack of Surat, 1670. But Venkoji Datto

was employed under Shivaji already as early as 1660, as we have just seen, i.e. even earlier than the first invasion of Surat. We have a shrewd suspicion that somehow or other the Marathi Bakhars have made a jumble of the two invasions of Surat. They remembered only the particulars of the latter invasion, while their calculation of the amount of booty brought (“five crores of hons” according to Sabhasad) is likely to be more true of the first sack of Surat rather than of the second. The very fact that the bakhars are otherwise silent about the first sack of Surat is suspicious. There is certainly some confusion. The statement that Anandrao and Venkoji Datto left the service of Shahaji and were soon afterwards employed in an invasion upon Surat, joined to the fact that Venkoji Datto had been in Shivaji’s service already in 1660, would lead us to infer, that Sabhasad, while giving the particulars of the second invasion of Surat (1670), is thinking confusedly of some matters that belong to the first invasion.]
