BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Bakhars.

The royal period of Marāṭha history, by which we mean the reigns of Shivaji and his two sons (1660—1700), differs fundamentally from the Peshwā period (1707—1802) not only in the extent but also in the character of its historical records. A vast and varied mass of contemporary documents in English Persian and Marāṭhi illuminates the rule of the Peshwas. But when we come to study the lives of Shivaji and his sons, we are held up by an utter lack of State-papers, detailed official histories, personal memoirs and public letters such as are plentiful in the case of Mughal history. For one thing, few if any such historical materials were written in the days of this busy king and his sons; and secondly, at the close of the royal period, every Marāṭha capital and fort was occupied by the Mughals and the State records preserved there were burnt or dispersed. The original papers of this royal period in the Marāṭhi language that have come down to us are, with a very few exceptions, private legal documents, such as deeds of grant, decisions of law-suits, partition-awards, orders on petitions &c., which have been so long carefully preserved by private families as title-deeds. Hence, the only contemporary records of a truly historical nature relating to Shivāji’s and Shambhuji’s times, that now survive are in the English, Persian, Portuguese and Rājasthāni languages, and none in Marāṭhi.

Appropriately enough, the first narrative of Shivāji’s career in Marāṭhi was composed by his official chronicler and recorder, Wāqnis. But the original text of it, completed about 1685, is now lost, and we possess only extracts from it made probably a generation later by Khando Anāji Malkarē, who has padded out this source by interpolating in it every movement and posting of his father Anāji Ranganāth Malkarē in Shivāji’s reign. It is impossible to believe that the Wāqnis himself could have cared for such small fry as Anāji Ranganāth and considered him worthy of mention almost as often as the Prime Minister himself,—which is exactly what we find in this bakhar in its present form. In my opinion it would be truer to name it the Wāqnis Malkarē bakhar, as it is the composite work of the two men,—the Wāqnis supplying the nucleus and Malkarē the additions and embellishments.

This work is popularly known as the 91 Qalmi Bakhar or Narrative in 91 sections. V. S. Wākaskar has published (Baroda 1930) a highly valuable variorum edition of the different recensions of the text (originally printed by Pārasnis in the Bhāratvarsha magazine, Rājwādé in the Prabhāt and Sānē in the Kāvy-etihās S.), together with the English translation of the Rāigarh ms. made in 1806 by Lt. Frissell (and first printed by Forrest in Selections . . . . Maratha Series, Vol. I) and my English translation of the Persian version called the Tārikh-i-Shivāji (I.O.I. ms. Pers. 1957, Br.

The earliest Marathi account of Shivaji preserved intact, is the *Sabhāsād Bakhar*, which was completed in 1697 (according to the colophon of an old ms. with Y. R. Gupte.) It was written at Jinji at the request of Shivaji's son Rājrām, by Krishnājī Anant (*Sabhāsād*) courtier. We know from the *Mémoires* of Francois Martin that this Krishnājī was next only to the Peshwā in importance among Rājrām's ministers, and that the French in Pondicherry made him their patron at Rājrām's court. His book is free from many of the legends and supernatural elements which bring discredit to the *91 Qalmi Bakhar*, and its author gives evidence of a higher intellect than Malkarē's. But even the *Sabhāsād Bakar*, though written by a contemporary of Shivaji, is not based on State-papers and written notes, because it was composed while Rājrām was closely besieged in Jinji fort, to which he had escaped from Malhārāshtra by the skin of his teeth, leaving everything behind him, and after roving hither and thither in constant risk of capture. Such a master and his servants, running with their lives in their hands, before relentless pursuers, could not have burdened themselves with papers during their perilous flight across the entire Deccan peninsula. *Sabhāsād*’s work, therefore, is entirely derived from his memory—the half-obliterated memory of an old man who had passed through many privations and hardships. But he was a contemporary and servant of Shivaji, while Malhar Ram Rao Chitnis wrote 150 years after that king's death, and had no State-papers of Shivaji’s or Shambhuji’s times, because he does not cite a single document, and all his true facts are derived from *Sabhāsād*, thereby proving that he had no independent source of information. Therefore, I have totally rejected Chitnis.

But *Sabhāsād*’s is still the most valuable Marathi account of Shivaji and our main source of information from the Maratha side. Later biographies in the same language have mostly copied this *Sabhāsād Bakhar* and padded it out with Sanskrit quotations, miracles, rhetorical flourishes, commonplace remarks, and details imagined from the probabilities of the case, and in some cases also forged letters.

Of these bogus *bakhars* only one deserves examination because of the trust placed in it by some modern Marathi writers. It is the *Shiva-digvijaya*, published by P. R. Nandurbarkar and L. K. Dandekar (Baroda, 1895.) Falsely described as written by Khando Ballāl (the son of Shivaji’s secretary, Bālājī Āvji) in 1718, but really fabricated by a modern writer familiar with the style of the Europeanised vernacular novels written in imitation of Bankim Chandra Chatterjee. Too much gush (esp., pp. 453, 208, 444), rhetorical padding and digression. Historical anachronisms of ludicrous absurdity abound (esp., pp. 58, 59, 138, 199, 357, 417, 434, 447). The author speaks of an English General being present at Shivaji’s coronation and of artisans from *Calcutta* being brought to decorate his hall in 1674! Shiva bows to his mother *two years after* her death (p. 296). Tānaji Mālvārē visits Haidarabad seven years after his death (p. 301). Mirzā Raja Jai Singh retires to die at Jaipur in 1667, whereas that capital was founded in 1727 (p. 357.) Many passages prove it to be a concoction of
modern Prabhu Kāyasthas for the purpose of glorifying the men of that caste who served Shivāji (pp. 172-176, 347, 368.) Many incidents alleged here are proved false by known histories.

Abstract Chronologies in Marāthi.

The Jedhē Shakāvali or skeleton chronology in its surviving fragment runs from 1618 to 1697, without any formal preface or conclusion. Its correctness depends upon three conditions, viz., (a) the Jedhēs' personal knowledge of what they wrote down, (b) their promptness in recording every event after its happening, instead of trusting to a dim and distant memory, and (c) the accuracy of the transcriber of the only manuscript of it (copied in the middle of the 18th century) that has come down to us. This family did not record the successive occurrences in a bound volume (or in a big family Bible as in old English houses), but on loose sheets of paper, which were afterwards compiled together, we know not with what accuracy nor with what gaps between. For the period before 1660,—in which year Shivāji first clearly demonstrated his power of standing on his own legs and former vassals of Bijapur like the Jedhē chieftains found that it was safer to join him than to keep aloof or play a double game (which is Bhave's charge against Kanhoji Jedhē),—the dates in the Jedhē Chronology are often demonstrably wrong (e.g., the death of Ibrahim Adil Shah, the fall of Daulatabad, etc.) Even for later times, some months and years have been wrongly given or at least copied (e.g., the interview with Aurangzib and the fall of Vellore). Several of the entries, particularly those relating to the Muslim States, were merely borrowed by Jedhē's clerks from other sources, because we know that short Persian manuals of historical dates were in circulation in polished society in the 18th and early 19th centuries. Hence, it is not safe to rely on Jedhē's testimony for any doubtful date when not supported by some other authority.

As a general rule, where Jedhē gives three incidents under one year, the date of one is demonstrably true, that of another equally false, and the third is one on which other authorities are silent. How can this third be accepted on the ground of one of its companions being correct? It is equally reasonable to reject it because the second date in that year is admittedly false (see p. 158 before).

Such skeleton chronologies (Shakāvalis) were in use among various noble families in Mahārāṣṭra in the 18th century, and have been recovered in parts only. There was a short kernel of the leading events common to them all; but each family added entries about what happened to its own ancestors or about events in its neighbourhood, and therefore they cannot serve as independent checks on one another. Many mistakes were also made in reading the old Modi script of the original MSS.

Sanskrit laudatory poems

Some Sanskrit poems written in Shivāji's time have survived and have been printed in the present century. Only two of them are of historical
value, though for a single small episode in each case, namely Jayarām Pidyē's *Parnāla-parvata-grahān-ākhyaṇam* and Nishchal Puri's *Shivarāj-Rājyāvishek-Kalpataru*. The rest are worthless.

Shivaji's court poet Paramānand wrote a Sanskrit epic on the Bhonsle royal house; edited with a Marathi translation by S. M. Divekar in 1927, under the title of the *Shiva-Bhārat*. It is a fragment, in 31 cantos and 9 verses, which ends abruptly in April 1661. It has been hailed by the ignorant as a historical source of first-rate authenticity written by a contemporary. But the author himself makes no such high claim. He has given his poem the title of *Surya-vamsham*, showing thereby that his literary model was Kālidās's epic the *Raghu-vamsham*, which deals with legendary pre-historic kings. Paramānand also calls his poem an *anu-Purāṇa* or *quasi-epic*, which places it in the class of mythical stories, without any pretension to historical truth.

In fact it is merely a laudatory poem written by a Court flatterer. In India the art of literary beggary was carried to nauseating lengths by the Brahman Court poets of the Hindu kings, as well as by the Persian chroniclers of the Mughal Emperors; the very training, mode of life, and literary models of these men made them unfit to be sober recorders of fact. At best they reproduce the traditions current among their class. Paramānand beats Abul Fazl hollow in his exaggerated praise of his patron. That Muslim author, even when lauding Akbar up to the skies, restrains himself within the bounds of human possibility; but the Hindu sycophant ascribes supernatural feats to his hero! When confronted with contemporary Persian histories many of Paramānand's statements of fact prove to be false. [One school of writers in Mahārāshtra now suspect it of being a very late Tanjore fabrication.]

*Value of European Factory Records and other non-Marathi sources.*

The records of the English factories on the Bombay coast and inland are of the highest value for dates and facts. Sometimes the factors frankly confess that the reports they have heard and are writing down immediately after are so contradictory that they know not what to believe. But, on the other hand, the English at Rajapur and Karwar employed paid spies who travelled in Shivaji's dominions and brought back news of his doings and plans; the information from the different factories helped to check and correct one another; and a false rumour is usually followed in the record of a later date by its contradiction. Above all, these factory records have the supreme merit of having been preserved in the original manuscript without any later garbling or interpolation.

The value of the *Mémoires* of Francois Martin (of Pondicherry) is the highest imaginable for Shivaji's Karnatak expedition. His agents were frequently in attendance in the camp of Shivaji and the reports they brought back were immediately entered in his diary. The English of Madras also sent a clever Brahman to Shivaji on two or three occasions. The reports of such witnesses entirely disprove the later gossip about the
Karnatak expedition given in the Marathi books. The Jesuit annual letter for 1677 (Madura) is mostly wrong and based on rumour.

The Portuguese Government possess records which are of first-rate authenticity within their own limited sphere and for their relations with Shivaji and his neighbours. Their official letters and diaries were immediately copied, and have been preserved ungarbled ever since. The Dutch touched only one fringe of Shiva's dominions and their reports were made from too great a distance from him to be of use to us except in lighting up some stray incident or detail.

The Persian and Rajasthani sources are of unrivalled authenticity and importance for the history of Shivaji. In Persian we have the very detailed annals of Shah Jahan and Aurangzeb based upon the records in the State archives, the despatches of Jai Singh and the letters of Aurangzeb, the correspondence of many of the higher nobles, and the personal memoirs of Bhimsen and Khafi Khan who lived in the Deccan at the time. As for dates and incidents, the most correct information is given in the Persian news-letters, called ākhbārāt, which are preserved in Jaipur and London (Royal Asiatic Society.) All these are absolutely contemporary and ungarbled. The same praise is due to the letters written by the officers of the Jaipur Rajahs in Dingal, or the Rajasthani dialect. (See pp. 138-139 of this book.) These two groups of materials clearly show that their authors were accurate matter-of-fact observers or realists, while the Marathi, Hindi and Sanskrit writers on our subject are mostly found to be neurotics.

**SOURCES**

**Marathi**

The following is a list of the most reliable and useful sources in Marathi. I have excluded all works which have been superseded by more recent publications or deserve to be rejected as unauthentic; and also taken no note of dissertations in that language which are mostly prolix, irrelevant, and unconvincing to a detached observer.


A small book of 106 pages, composed from memory without the help of written memoranda or documents. The events are not arranged in the order of time. Some of the statements are incorrect. Weak in topography, no dates. Language very condensed.

*91 Qalmi Bakhar*, ed. by V. S. Wakaskar (Baroda 1930).

*Shiva-Kālin-Patra-sār-sangraha*, 3 vols. (Poona), a most useful calendar of letters and other documents, with a full chronology and index, which lighten the student's labour. For documents published later than the third volume, consult *Shiva-Charitra-Sāhitya*, 9 volumes issued. *Shiva-Charitra Sāhitya* useful for society and administration, when the wheat is patiently sifted from the mass of chaff.

*Shri Shiva-Shāhīchā Lekhanālamkār*, by Joshi and Chāndorkar (Poona, 1934), prints and discusses a letter containing a line at the end (unsigned) ascribed to Shivaji's hand.

Shivaji Souvenir, ed. by G. S. Sardesai (Bombay, 1927). in English, Marathi and Gujarati.

Rejected—Chitrāgūpta Baṅkar (written c. 1760), Shiva-dig-vidasa (pub. 1895), Chhitnis Baṅkar (wr. 1810), Shiva Pratap (Baroda), Shēdgoonkar Bāhliar (1917), Mīreyanchi Bakha, Jedhe Karinā, Powādas, Tanjavur chā Shīlālekh (1809), etc.

Sanskrit

Parnāva parvata-graha akhyānam, by Jayaram Pidyec, ed. by S. M. Divekar (1923.) Business-like straightforward narrative, singularly free from the usual hyperbole and verbosity of poets. Covers only 1673.

Shiva-tāj Rāyānshēk Kalpataaru, a short poem of 234 verses, describing Shivaji's coronation (1674), written by Aniruddha Saraswati in the form of a dialogue between Govinda and Nischal Puti, both on pilgrimage to Konkan: śrīthas. RASB. ms. 3088, G. 10185

Surya-vanśaṁ by Paramānand, (wrongly called by modern Maharashtrians as the Shiva-Bhārat), ed. by S. M. Divekar (1927). Other cantos of this poem, since discovered, have been printed as Paramānanda Kāvya in the Gaekwad Oriental Series, Baroda, 1952. ed. by G. S. Sardesai Very useful for the tantrik influence on Shambhuji

Section III of 13 cantos is invaluable as giving the inner history of Shambhup's rebellion and Shivaji's plans of succession. Written by a partisan of Shambhuji and Shāhū. Critically examined in my House of Shiva and foreword to Param Kavya.

Rādhāmādhava vilasa-Champa of Jayaram Pindyc, ed by V. K. Rājwadé (1922)—mere fulsome adulation of the boy Shivaji.

The Hindi poems of Bhushan have been rejected, as totally unhistoric: indeed, Bhushan is now held to have been born two years after the death of Shivaji and to have written to gratify his grandson Rājah Shāhū! The Chhatra-prakāś of Lāl Kavi is equally late and traditional.

Persian

Alamgir-namah by Mirzā Md. Kāzīm.
Masīr-i Alamgir by Sāqi Mustad Khan, Eng. tr. by me (R.A.S.B.)
Mun'ākhab ul-Lubāb, by Khāfī Khan.
Nushkhā Dīkshā by Bhimseñ Burhanpuri (personal memoirs.)
Akhbārā i Darbār 9-mualā, for many years (London and Jaipur MSS.)
Muhammad nāmah (or History of Muhammad Adil Shah) by Md. Zahur, the son of Zahuri, (my own copy made from the Kapurthala MS.)
Turīk i Ali Adil Shah II. (only the 1st ten years of his reign), by Sayyid Morullah. (copy made for me from the India Office MS.)

*Adāb i- Alamgir by Qabil Khan.
Half Anjuman by Udiraj Tala-yar, Paris MS. and Benares MS.
Faiyya-ul-qawainin.
Khurul-I-Shivaji, R. A. S. MS.

Parasnis MS.—A volume in which some Persian letters from the Mughal Government to Shivaji and his descendants were copied (evidently for the use of Grant Duff) by order of the Rajah of Satara. Some of the dates are wrong. There is a MS. English translation in another volume.

English

Original Correspondence (O. C.), India Office MS. records. This series includes letters from Surat and Bombay to the E. I. Co., (London) and letters between Surat and Bombay and the subordinate factories. There is a catalogue of these, giving writer, place and date, but very little indication of the contents. In most cases there is a volume for every year. O. C. volumes are indiscriminately with all parts of India where the Company had factories. From 1682 to 1689 they contain little beyond duplicates of what is given in the F. R.

Factory Records (F. R.), India Office MS. records. There is a distinct series for each principal factory, such as Rajapur, Surat, Bombay, Fort St. George, etc. They include (a) consultations at these factories and (b) copies of letters received and dispatched by them (some being repeated in O. C.) There are several gaps in the period 1660-1689 and the existing volumes are unindexed.

Surat Consultations—none extant for 1636-60, 64, 67, 68, 71, 73, 75, 76, 78, 80, 81, and 84-96, but the gaps are partially filled by the Letters received and dispatched and the O. C. Only four volumes have survived for 1660-1683.

Surat Letters—about 20 volumes for the period in question.

Records of Fort St. George: Diary and Consultation Book, for 1672-78 and 1678-79, printed at Madras, (1910 and 1911.) A few other papers are given in Love's Vestiges of Old Madras, 3 vols.

Orme MSS. in the India Office Library (catalogued by S. C. Hill) contain copies of several factory records the originals of which have perished.


Dutch Factory Records preserved in the India Office, London. Vols. 23-29, covering 1659-70, are in English translations, while Vols. 30-42, covering 1670-89, are in Dutch. They are very disappointing to the historian of Shivaji and contain very few references to the Marathas. The volumes from 1671 onwards contain scarcely any remarks on the affairs of eastern India. "Up to 1664 or so, the compiler copied the letters from India into the Dagh Register, verbatim or almost so. From about 1665 to the end of the series, the Indian letters were copied into a different
Register, *viz.*, 'Incoming letters'; the *Dagh Register* refers to this for details, and gives at most an occasional scrap of news. It is conceivable, but I fear very improbable that the Registers of Incoming Letters, or some of them, may be in existence at Batavia.'’ (Moreland.)

*Storia do Mogor* or travels of Manucci, tr. Irvine, 4 vols.
Bernier's *Travels*, ed. by Constable.
Tavernier’s *Travels*, ed. by Ball, 2 vols.
J. Fryer’s *New Account of East India*, ed. by W. Crooke, 2 vols. (1909.)
Orme’s *Historical Fragments of the Mogul Empire, etc.*, London (1805.)
J. Grant Duff’s *History of the Mahrattas*, 3 vols. (1826.)
Jadunath Sarkar’s *House of Shivaji*, a collection of studies, documents (translated), critical discussions. An indispensable companion volume to this *Shivaji and His Times*.

**Portuguese and French**


A. B. de Braganca Pereira—*O Oriente Portugues*, nos. 24 and 25 (1939.)
J. F. J. Biker—*Colleccao de Tratados . . .*, tomo iv. (Lisboa 1884), contains treaties and diplomatic correspondence.

Cosme da Guarda—*Vida e accoens do famoso e felicissimo Sevagy* (Lisbon 1730), composed in 1695, 168 pages. Full of gross inaccuracies, mistakes of persons, useless digressions, and bazar gossip. Contains a minimum of facts, dates and proper names, and a maximum of words and general descriptions. It tells us nothing new that is historically true. C. da Guarda was not the real name of the author.

**G. French**


*Mémoires* of Francois Martin, 1665-1694. 3 vols. (1931-4.)

The *Journal* of B. Deslandes (from the Paris MS.) has been translated by me into English and published in the Puna Mandal's periodical.

*La Compagnie Indes Orientales et Francois Martin*, par Paul Kaeppelin (Paris, 1908.) Extremely valuable narrative with exact citations of original documents (and even extracts from them.)

The *Histoire de Sevagi et de son successeur*, par J. D'Orleans, S. J., appended to his *Histoire des Deux conquérants Tartares*, (Paris, 1688), though the earliest life to be printed, is worthless. I have published an English translation of it in the *Modern Review*, May, 1924.

The other French and Dutch works that treat of Shivaji—of very little value—are described in Orme's *Fragments* (ed. of 1805), pp. 171-179.