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INTRODUCTION

Treaty of Warna, which was concluded in the year 1731, constitutes an important landmark in Maratha history. It put an end to Maratha Civil War. At the same time the treaty effected the partition of Maratha kingdom in two states of Kolhapur and Satara. The treaty of Warna was more favourable to Shahu Maharaj of Satara. So Chh. Sambhaji of Kolhapur had to always face some kind of disturbances at the hands of his chieftains. He did not control the situation and so very often represented his grievances before Shahu Maharaj. Shahu Maharaj therefore had to directly or indirectly interfere with the affairs of Kolhapur State. Relations between Kolhapur and Satara were chiefly dominated by the major issue of succession in the 1740s. This issue provided an opportunity to Peshwa to influence Kolhapur-Satara relation during the period between treaty of Warna (1731) and death of Chhatrapati Shahu Maharaj (1749) was full of fractions and conflicts. There were many ups and downs in this relationship. In this chapter relationship during crucial phases has been examined in the following pages.

TREATY OF WARNA

Before Sambhaji's return to Kolhapur the treaty of Warna was signed in 1731 between the two cousins. River Warna being the principal dividing line between the two kingdoms, it was called the "Treaty of Warna." The treaty of Warna contains the following nine clauses. This treaty was offered
by Shahu to Sambhaji. Manohar Malgaonkar has given English version of the terms of the treaty as follows:

1) Varun Mahal and from there the territory lying on the south bank of Warna together with the forts, stations and outposts is allotted to your share.

2) Of the principalities in the territory from the river Tungbhadra all the way upto Rameshwar half shall be retained by us and the other half shall be given to you.

3) The Konal fort has been transferred to you in the return of which you have given us the fort of Ratnagiri.

4) The fortified station of Wadgaon shall be possessed by you.

5) Those who become your enemies shall be opposed by us and those who become our enemies shall be opposed by you.

6) All the forts and stations lying to the south from the confluence of the Krishna and the Tungbhadra are allotted to your share.

7) In the Kokan the tract lying beyond Salsi all the way to the Panch Mahal and upto Ankola is hereby given to you.

8) Neither side shall offer employment to defectors from the other.

9) The district Miraj and the posts in the Bijapur district including Athani and Tasgaon shall be transferred by you to us.¹

Thus these were nine clauses of this treaty. By this treaty two separate Maratha Kingdoms were established. They were demarcated by the river
Warna. North side of river Warna or the demarcating line was Shahu's Kingdom of Satara and south side of river Warna was Sambhaji's Kingdom Kolhapur. But in reality this division was never clear. According to S.M. Garge this treaty was made on the basis of equal status. Because in the treaty there was no reference to their political rights. There was no specific mention of the roles of the giver and the taker. But G.S. Sardesai did not accept this view. He opined that Shahu did not give him a separate kingdom or Rajya, but only a Jahagir or small principality was given to Sambhaji as a member of the royal family. However, S.M. Garge did not accept this view of G.S. Sardesai. He noted "Shahu won the civil war but he did not show any subordination towards Sambhaji." According to Chintaman Vinayak Vaidya, "This civil war or problem of royal partition might be solved on the basis of Hindu religious faith or law according to which some territory was assigned to the younger branch under the authority of the elder one. Why was not this followed here? Under control of Shahu some territory could have been given to Sambhaji as his subordinate, not as a separate kingdom. It would have been beneficial for the Marathas to create strong and united kingdom. "It is true that Shahu had offered equal status to Sambhaji."

It was true that Shahu had offered equal share to Sambhaji in the future territorial expansion in the south. But G.S. Sardesai noted that Sambhaji was subordinate to Shahu as far as his foreign relations and safety were concerned. But when we consider the foreign policy of Sambhaji of Kolhapur, we find that he never consulted Shahu while determining his foreign policy. He used to take such decisions on his own. Manohar
Malgaonkar noted that “Sambhaji also entered into treaty with foreign powers without bothering to consult Shahu.” In the treaty it was clearly mentioned that Sambhaji had equal right to take specific requirements to transfer fort and territory. In that case we cannot state that Sambhaji had no equal rights at time of treaty. It is true that in future in Shahu was called as “Maratha Chhatrapati” throughout India and Kolhapur became a subordinate Raj. But this change took place as result of Shahu’s experiment of Maratha Mandal. Shahu got supremacy all over India because of his Maratha Mandal in which Peshwa played key role.

Though Shahu’s policy towards Sambhaji was ‘forgive and forget’ it was sure that Sambhaji was not satisfied with this treaty. Shahu’s views towards Sambhaji were less liberal as compared to his earlier views. Sardesai clearly noted that “During the 23 years of civil war one clearly notices three stages into settlement. The earliest in 1708, just after Shahu’s coronation, the next in 1725 and during this visit of 1731. At each stage Shahu’s terms grew less liberal on the account of continued opposition which Kolhapur openly offered to him.” It might be true that at the time of the treaty Shahu’s position was superior to that of Sambhaji and Sambhaji had no other way than to accept the terms of the treaty. He had turned down earlier proposal which was more liberal. About this treaty Manohar Malgaonkar observes “These are legalistic squabbles. The fact remains that Sambhaji had good reason for feeling dissatisfied with the terms that he now had to accept.”

But this treaty put an end to the Maratha civil war which started from 1708 when Shahu was released from the Mughal captivity. Shahu never
accepted any other person as a mediator. He handled personally every matter pertaining to Kolhapur. This treaty confined Sambhaji's territory and narrowed down his sphere of expansion.

By the treaty Shahu granted Varun Mahal to Sambhaji. But actually this territory was not in Shahu's possession. It belonged to Udaji Chavan. Udaji was Sambhaji's supporter but he had not surrendered his possessions. In future Shahu tried to take and transfer this territory to Sambhaji. But this territory never became a part of Kolhapur State.

By this treaty, Shahu had accepted Sambhaji's claim to half share in the southern conquests but in future this term was also not implemented. There were many profitable expeditions in the south in future but neither profit nor territory was given to either Sambhaji or his successors, by Shahu or his sardars. Sambhaji also did not take part in any expedition with Shahu in the south as they had decided in the treaty.

This was also true of the Konkan or seaside tracts. This territory was also not passed on to Sambhaji because at the time of treaty, it was not under Shahu's control. In the matter of transfer of forts and stations between the Krishna and the Tungbhadra rivers from Shahu to Sambhaji, Shahu acted within three days of the treaty. He wrote to Sambhaji More on April 16th "The Kopal fort has been transferred to Rajashri Sambhaji. It should be handed over to whoever bring his orders...." Another letter of Shahu to Hindurao Ghorpade and Balwantrao Shivdeo states, "...The master and Chiranjiv Rajashri Sambhaji Raje have met together and become reconciled their territories from Warna to Tungabhadra. The territory, the forts, the
stations were given to him. So that the posts, forts under your control are to be transferred to Sambhaji Raje. These should be promptly handed over to whosoever brings his orders.\textsuperscript{11} But in future the actual possession of these forts or territory was not handed over Sambhaji. But it is certain that Shahu himself tried to implement the treaty. But he could not fully implement the treaty at his own costs due to certain other causes. So Manohar Malgaonkar describes the treaty correctly as he writes, "The overall effect of this treaty was that, while it put an end to the ruinous civil war, it confined Sambhaji’s territory and narrowed down his sphere of expansion while it guaranteed Sambhaji’s kingdom from any further depredation by Shahu or his commanders. It also created a climate by which that kingdom would not be able to expand."\textsuperscript{12}

Thus, this treaty was beneficial mostly for Satara. Shahu’s troops and chieftains were engaged in civil war right from the 1708. Now they were free to undertake other expeditions. From 1708 precious time and money was wasted in this civil war. Now all that was ended to the satisfaction of all. On the side of Kolhapur Sambhaji was free to expand his possessions but quarrels among his chieftains and lack of proper leadership prevented Kolhapur from bringing about the expansion. Everybody thought that the problems with Sambhaji or Kolhapur were ended by this treaty. But in fact, all such assumptions were belied in future. After the treaty Satarkars and mostly Kolhapurkars could not manage their respective administration smoothly in their territory as they thought they would. Sambhaji had troubles from his neighbour or his own chieftains like Senapati Ghorpade, Pant Amatya or Udaji Chavan. Sambhaji was not strong enough to solve this
problem on his own. So he began to complain against them to Shahu. Shahu always tried his best to resolve Sambhaji’s problem. But Sambhaji was not satisfied with the treaty. Sambhaji’s visits to Satara to discuss sometime the family affairs or sometimes political affairs continued.

**SAMBHAJI’S VISIT TO SATARA (1732)**

The Varun Mahal was given to Shahu by Sambhaji by this treaty, but actually this territory was not under the control of Sambhaji. But it was under control of Udaji Chavan. Udaji was a very powerful sardar. Actually he was a great supporter of Sambhaji but, he did not like the fact that Sambhaji signed a peace treaty with Shahu. He was also displeased with Sambhaji because Sambhaji had given this territory to Shahu without his consent. Since all this territory was under his control he was collecting tax on behalf of Sambhaji. He also gave some part of it to the Nizam as the Mughal representative. Nizam on the other hand had given a Jahagir for his tax collection work. As the territory was transferred to Shahu without his consent Udaji was not ready to surrender this territory to Shahu. Under the changed circumstances he joined hands with the Nizam and began to plunder Kolhapur territory. Sambhaji complained against Udaji Chavan to Shahu and in response to his complaint Shahu wrote a letter to Udaji in which Shahu asked Udaji to stop the depredation of Sambhaji’s territory. To resolve this problem and other problems too both cousins again decided to meet.

Shahu deputed Shripatrao Pratinidhi Fattesingh Bhosale and others to invite and escort Sambhaji to Satara. Shahu himself camped at Pali near
Satara to receive Sambhaji. Ambaji Purandhare, the envoy of Peshwa in Satara Court described this ceremonial meeting.

At Pali, both brothers met and they later came to Satara. Sambhaji came with his wife Jijabai. Ambaji Purandhare stated, "...They were given our (Peshwa's) mansion or wada for their residence. Rajashri Swami has done all honours to Sambhaji and Jijabai and, also elephants, horses, dress material and fifty thousand rupees were presented to them. Swami also agreed to help Sambhaji to extend his rule in the southern province. Swami has given promise to send Pratinidhi with his contingent to help Sambhaji. After this other matters were satisfactorily settled. They parted and Sambhaji Raje returned to Panhala."¹⁵

Details regarding their discussion and measures adopted to redress Sambhaji's grievances are not available.

**SENAPATI GHORPADE**

From a long time there were conflicts between Karveerkar (the royal family of Kolhapur) and Ghorpade. The quarrel between Ghorpade brothers was the main cause of this conflict. The office of Senapati was the main cause of quarrels between Sidhojirao and Pirajirao. In 1712-13, Sidhoji was incharge of the Senapati office during which Pirajirao Ghorpade had supported Tarabai. But after the bloodless or Palace Revolution, Sidhoji was removed from his office and Piraji was made the 'Senapati'. Sidhoji went towards Karnataka and tried to get his title back but without success.

Piraji also tried to get Senapati's Saranjam from Shahu in 1726. But Shahu did not accept his demand of Senapati Saranjam as he had offered him
only "Mamlatdar" and Sardeshmukhi in Karad and Miraj Prant. But Piraji was not satisfied with this. So he did not leave side of Karveerkar. However, in 1728 he died in a battle.\(^{16}\)

At that time his son Ranoji was still a minor and Shidoji took advantage of this situation and thus became Senapati of Karveer Raj.

On behalf of Ranoji his grandmother Dwarakabai tried to get Saranjam of Senapati for her grandson. But Sambhaji did not heed her request. At last she went to Satara and complained against Sambhaji to Shahu. She requested Shahu to ask Sambhaji to give Saranjam of Senapati again to Ranoji. At a grand meeting of the royal cousins in 1731, Shahu asked Sambhaji to reappoint Ranoji as Senapati. Sambhaji accepted Shahu’s request and promised to do so. But, for five years thereafter, i.e., till 1736, Sambhaji did nothing about his promise to make Ranoji Ghorpade his Senapati. So Dwarkabai again complained that Sambhaji had done nothing in this matter.

During Sambhaji’s visit to Satara, in 1936 Shahu got his way. Ambaji Purandhare described this matter in his letter to Peshwa as, “... Rajashri Swami personally went to the mansion (wada) of Ghorapade and brought Ghorapade with him to the residence of Sambhaji Raje... At this time Sambhaji Raje granted Ghorapade the ceremonial robe of the office of Senapati and also Deshmukhi ... Sambhaji Raje gave Ichalkaranji jahagir and cash award of five thousand to Ghorapade.”\(^{17}\) The formal document containing these grants were also given.\(^{18}\) Sambhaji too was not wholeheartedly in favour of Ranoji. He had accepted Shahu’s proposal only to give respect to Shahu’s wishes.
On the other hand, Ranoji was disloyal to Sambhaji after taking charge of office of Senapati. Ranoji with the help of Amatya caused an uprising against Sambhaji. Consequently Shahu wrote a letter to Chimaji Appa and scolded him for helping Ranoji Ghorapade in this matter. He wrote to Chimaji, “...Ranoji Ghorapade and Bhagwanrao have shown their disrespect to Sambhaji Raje and both had disturbed Sambhaji’s province. For that you (Chimaji) had given your help to Ranoji. This was not good. Quickly call your forces back or I would send help to Sambhaji....”?19

Thus Sambhaji could not control his own chieftain’s without the help of Shahu. His own chieftains created difficulties and this might have prevented him from expanding his kingdom. On the other hand Shahu’s ministers and chieftains were spreading his kingdom in the south as well as in the north too. So Manohar Malgaonkar noted, “...Sambhaji’s troubles with his own Amatya and his army chief still unresolved and that these difficulties kept him tethered down to his domain and unable to put into practice whatever plans he might have envisaged to take out an expeditions into the south and to expand his kingdom, while Shahu’s ministers and commanders were spreading his kingdom to the very corners of the subcontinent.”20

UDAJI CHAVAN

Udaji Chavan was Sambhaji’s great supporter from Palace revolution till the treaty of Warna. But Sambhaji had accepted to give Varun Mahal to Shahu which was actually under possession of Udaji. Udaji was displeased with Sambhaji as he had given that territory without his consent to Shahu of
Satara. Because of this Udaji suddenly turned hostile. He began to conduct raids in Sambhaji’s territory.

This matter was already discussed in the meeting between Shahu and Sambhaji which took place in November 1732. Udaji after the treaty of Warna, shifted his loyalties. He left Sambhaji’s side and joined hands with Nizam. So Shahu wrote a letter to Udaji and asked him to desist from causing destruction in Sambhaji’s territory.21

But Udaji did not stop his raids in Sambhaji’s territory. At last Shahu himself took charge of this matter. He himself assumed command of his troops and launched a campaign against Udaji. Shahu defeated Udaji and took his three principal fortified posts, viz., Miraj, Tasgaon and Athani. After this campaign Shahu thought that Udaji had learnt his lesson and hence would stop the raids and would not plunder Sambhaji’s territory. But still, Udaji’s raids into Sambhaji’s territory continued. So, Sambhaji again complained to Shahu about Udaji’s raids. Sambhaji complained that Mirajkar had raided his territory and took away all his cattle. In reply Shahu asked Balaji Salokhe not to undertake any campaign on the other bank of river Warna.22

Again Shahu invited Sambhaji to Satara to discuss this episode and other related matters. In this meeting Shahu accorded ceremonial welcome to Sambhaji and gave him valuable things also. But again there were no significant discussions on any matter.

**GHORPADE ICHALKARANJIKAR**

Ichalkaranjikar Ghorpade were actually Brahmins with the family name Joshi. But due to their close association with Santaji Ghorapade, they
began to call themselves Ghorapades. Most part of their jahagir land was
given by Ghorapade out of their own saranjam. In the early period, Venkatrao
Ghorpade considered himself as a sardar of Kolhapur darbar. He had also
fought on Kolhapur side in the battle of Wadgaon preceding the Warna treaty.
He was taken as a prisoner by the Pratinidhi in this battle. At that time,
Sambhaji did not make any effort to effect his release and did not pay any
ransom for Ghorapade’s release. Shahu’s Peshwa Bajirao who was brother-in-
law of Venkatrao Ghorapade, paid the ransom to Pratinidhi for Ghorapade’s
release. Since then, Ghorapade allied himself with Peshwa and deserted
Kolhapur side. This led Sambhaji to consider Ghorapade a rebel.

In February 1736, there arose conflicts between the Ghorapades and
the Kolhapurkars. Ghorapade had close relations with Peshwa and taking
advantage of this Ghorapade made some hostile activities against Kolhapur.
Sambhaji sent his forces against Ghorapade to defend his Raj on the 25th of
February 1736 but was unsuccessful in his endeavours. So again he
complained against Ghorapade to Shahu. He knew that only because of
Peshwa’s strong support, Ghorapade was destroying his territory. But Shahu
too could not settle this dispute. Consequently, there were always tensions
between Ghorapade and Kolhapurkar.

When Venkatrao Ghorapade acquired the territory of Sashti and
Panchmahal in Goa from the Portuguese as a Peshwa’s chieftain, Sambhaji
though that this was a violation against his jurisdiction. So Shahu warned
Venkatrao Ghorapade not to cause any trouble in the territory of Kolhapur. After that because of Peshwa Nanasaheb’s pressure Venkatrao signed a treaty
with Kolhapurkar. The clauses of the submission made by Venkatrao on November 8th, 1741 were as follows:

1) The cannons maintained in the principalities of Sondhe, Bidnur and Savnur shall be handed over to Sambhaji and that Venkatrao will hold himself responsible for maintaining order in these three principalities.

2) Venkatrao would build a mansion (wada) in Karveer and reside there with his family and that he would remain in attendance upon the master.

3) The promise given by Sambhaji shall be carefully observed for seven years, so that Venkatrao is given an opportunity to serve his interest.24

GOA ISSUE

Before the death of Peshwa Bajirao a problem of Goa had raised its head. In 1716, Sambhaji had assigned a treaty with the Portuguese of Goa, so, since then his relations with Goa had always been peaceful. By the treaty of Warna Shahu accepted the territory along the coastal line down till Ankola which previously belonged to Sambhaji. During his visit to Satara in 1738 Sambhaji must have come to know about the plans prepared by Peshwa Bajirao and Shahu to undertake expedition to Goa, in the next few months. But neither Bajirao nor Shahu had consulted him in this matter. According to Sambhaji it was clearly a violation of the Warna treaty. Sambhaji thought that Portuguese were not his enemies. So this type of expedition was unnecessary. And even if, in the larger interests of the Maratha State it was necessary to drive away the Portuguese from India an attack on Goa without inviting Sambhaji to participate in the expedition, might result in an encroachment upon Sambhaji’s territory and authority.
Peshwa Bajirao thought that the Portuguese should be bundled out of India. But Sambhaji and Shahu also thought that the Portuguese must survive in Goa. But Bajirao decided to march against the Portuguese and thus launched two expeditions against them simultaneously. One was the Bessain campaign under Chimaji Appa and the other, was the Goa campaign under the leadership of Venkatrao Ghorpade. When Sambhaji was at Satara in 1738, he must have come to know of Bajirao’s plans to launch a campaign against the Portuguese in Goa.

Goa was nearer to Sambhaji’s territory. When Goa campaign started, Shahu’s troops marched through Kolhapur territory without formal consent of Sambhaji. Earlier, after Karnataka expedition, Shahu’s Peshwa had not offered Sambhaji half-share of all his conquests in south as per provision of the treaty. So this time Sambhaji was very much doubtful whether Peshwa would offer him half share of his Goa campaign or not.

Sambhaji decided to conduct an operation against Goa on his own. He knew that Bajirao had entrusted the leadership of the campaign to Venkatrao. At that time his relations with Ghorpade were strained, so Sambhaji decided to stop Ghorpade with the consent of his ministers. Sambhaji chose his two senior commanders, Suhbanrao Shinde of Toragal and, Subarao Shinde of Nesari for this expedition. He also tried to seek help and cooperation from the other chieftains like Ramchandra Sawant of Wadi. The letter written by the Portuguese agent throws light on Sambhaji’s plans. He wrote, “...Venkatrao accompanied by a force is going to come down and Sambhaji Raje has come to Shengaon... to hold talks with Ramchandra Sawant and an
agreement is being discussed. ... As soon as finalising an agreement both the Maratha columns intend to mount a giant operation against you....”

But in the meantime, Bajirao’s commanders had already marched against Goa. Before Sambhaji’s plan got underway, Ghorpade had managed to compel the Governor of Goa to sue for peace. Thus Sambhaji’s plan of Goa campaign had been thwarted by Venkatrao Ghorapade.

The Portuguese decided to take help from Sambhaji in order to survive in Goa. They requested Sambhaji for help when Sambhaji was at Malwan, the Governor of Goa wrote a letter to him. He wished for a long friendship between them and wrote “...Bajirao had sent his troops against Sasti in which some of your chieftain’s troops were also included. But I thought they came here without your consent. But this might not be a breaking point of our friendship.”

As Sambhaji was angry he sent his protest note to Shahu. Mr. Pissurlekar has correctly quoted, “...The fact that Peshwa has entered into the territory of Sasti and Panchamal in Goa made Sambhaji Chhatrapati angry and sent a protest to Shahu insisting that Bajirao must vacate this aggression.”

Sambhaji thought that Peshwa had openly insulted him. The Portuguese knew his displeasure against Shahu. So they tried to get protection from Sambhaji. For Sambhaji it was great chance. So immediately he welcomed the Portuguese. He wrote to the Governor of Goa, “...The district of Bassein has, after four years of depredation and campaigning, been conquered by Bajirao. Last year he sent his troops into Goa. Even this was
happening you never complained to us in writing. But because of this you have suffered major losses and they were able to establish their post in your region of Phonda. You have conveyed through your emissary Rango Narayan that if the district of Phonda were to be transferred to our jurisdiction, you would do everything in your power to render service... ... it is our pleasure to retain the Phonda district as our own private possession so that you should not be molested by Bajirao again. For that under command of Rajshri Hindurao Ghorpade our troops have been sent. They will be reaching there soon. Goa is an old settlement which should survive for a long long times...”

Thus Sambhaji promised to the Portuguese that he would send his troops to protect them from Bajirao’s troops and in return he demanded to retain Phonda district as his private possession. But Bajirao was also very strong in that territory. Shahu and Sambhaji both had tried to preserve Goa as a Portuguese settlement. But Bajirao tried to get its possession. Bajirao also knew that the Portuguese always tried to convert the Hindus there to Christianity. He tried to prevent this conversion by proposing a treaty that forbade the Portuguese to cause trouble or to destroy the Hindus in Goa. After Bajirao proposed this treaty after Venkatrao’s victory against the Portuguese. So after the victory of Venkatrao in the proposed treaty was drafted Bajirao had put his demand not to destroy or give trouble to Hindus in Goa.”

Sambhaji had planned his Goa expedition. His attitude towards the Portuguese was conciliatory. But this attitude was due to his anger against Peshwa Bajirao. He felt that Peshwa had encroached upon his special rights
in the coastal territory. His feelings were truly recorded by the Portuguese emissary Rango Shenavi in his letter to the Portuguese Governor of Goa. He wrote, “...After he had reported the situation, Chhatrapati of Karveer Sambhaji Raje called all his eight ministers and exchanged views. They felt that the territory south of Krishna is our and territory north of Krishna belongs to Shahu Maharaj by the treaty before 10-12 years. They have no concern in our territory. Chhatrapati Sambhaji has written letter to his elder Maharaj that you yourself have already abided by these limitations. Why then should your commanders come to our district and capture our posts? Is it by your orders that your Peshwa has taken these posts or he has disregarded your orders? Then how can the treaty between us be observed in future..... Please send a detailed letter explaining the matter.” Shahu responded quickly and assured Sambhaji. “…we have no designs over any of your districts and you should never entertain the least doubts about this. We should meet. Who other than you do we hold in such great esteem?”

Shahu wanted to transfer this newly acquired post to Sambhaji. But Peshwa Bajirao demanded that this district should be made over to him in the name of his young son. But Shahu did not accept Peshwa’s request.

Sambhaji once again visited Satara to discuss Goa matter on the invitation of Shahu. Shahu seemed willing to surrender Goa to Sambhaji against his Peshwa’s wish. But because of Bajirao, the Portuguese could not accept Sambhaji’s suggestion that they should jointly relieve the Phonda outpost by joint military action of Sambhaji and Portuguese. But in the meantime Peshwa Bajirao died on 9 May 1740 and his young son Nanasaheb
was appointed as new Peshwa on 25 June 1740. During this period, Sambhaji who was at Satara, made a secret treaty with Nanasaheb. In this regard Manohar Malgaonkar correctly observed, "Sambhaji who had gone to Satara to press his claims to a small tract of neighbouring territory returned to Panhala with a treaty that promised the entire Maratha kingdom, his own as well as Shahu's." 32

SAMBHAJI'S VISIT TO SATARA

On the invitation of Shahu, Sambhaji visited Satara once again. It is recorded that Sambhaji Raje arrived in Jejuri on June 2nd, 1740. There is another reference about his visit. "... Sambhaji left Satara on March 30th 1741." 33 If both the reports refer to the same visit, it means that Sambhaji was in Satara for nearly ten months. At that time the new Peshwa Nanasaheb had assumed charge of Peshwaship at Satara on 25 June 1740. Nanasaheb was accompanied by his Uncle Chimaji Appa who was a great statesman. This visit had great importance because a secret plan about unification of two Maratha States was drawn up.

A SECRET PLAN OF UNIFICATION

Under the leadership of Bajirao the Marathas became the supreme power on the land. Bajirao's nineteen-year-old son, Nanasaheb took charge of this supreme power. But he knew that his path was very difficult. Nizam and some other foreign powers were his main enemies. But the main obstacle was the division of loyalty of the Marathas. Because of Warna treaty the civil war ended but the division of Maratha loyalty did not end. The treaty confirmed
the division of Maratha kingdom. And this division had the most damaging influence on the Maratha aspirations.

When Nanasaheb became Peshwa Sambhaji Chhatrapati was also at Satara. They both stayed there for at least three months. During that period they met frequently and eventually confirmed a secret plan for reunification of Maratha kingdom.

This treaty was concluded sometime in the summer of 1740 between Peshwa Nanasaheb and Chh. Samhaji of Kolhapur. It was in the form of a letter addressed by Peshwa Nanasaheb and his uncle Chimaji Appa to Chh. Sambhaji. It consisted of 10 clauses. However, original draft of this treaty of 1740 is not available. But the treaty concluded in 1749 soon after the death of Shahu Maharaj was more or less based upon the earlier secret understanding arrived at between Peshwa Nanasaheb and Chh. Sambhaji in 1740.

In the service of Shriman Maharaj Chh. Swami, Balaji Bajirao and Sadashiv Chimnanaji have given in writing the following agreement.

1) At Satara, Shahu Maharaj ruled, and it was because of this that the treaty of Warna had been concluded. Since the venerable Shahu Maharaj is dead, he has no issue, therefore the kingdom is now the master’s. The master’s unipartite rule shall prevail.

2) During Shahu Maharaja’s lifetime, at Satara, the servant had submitted that while Shahu Maharaj is living, we shall be only outwardly, be his servants, while inwardly we shall be the master’s. Shahu Maharaj has passed away both kingdoms became the master’s and we the Master’s
servants shall act only according to the Master’s orders. This is what we had sworn to do. Both kingdoms shall be now unified and the Master’s unipartite rule shall prevail we shall serve him as during the reign of Shahu Maharaj. This is binding upon us and we shall not deviate from this.

3) This territory between the Warna and the Tungabhadra shall be regarded as the personal estate of the Maharaja. The forts, fortified posts and stations lying in this belt between the Warna and the Tungabhadra shall also be made over to the Maharaja as his private property.

4) The Maharaja shall be given sufficient income for administrative expenses of the Satara court, as well as a saranjam for the expenses of personal establishment. “We shall ensure this as during the reign of Shahu Maharaj.”

5) The retainers of the master, big and small, shall be continued in service as befitting their merits. “We shall continue them (in employment) according to their merits and as ordered by the Master.”

6) The villages, land grants and Vatans hitherto bestowed under the orders of the Master shall be continued inviolate; there should be no default in this. “The grants of villages and Vatans given by the Master in his kindness shall be continued as ordered by the Master.”

7) The Chauth income, from the principalities of Bidnur, Sondhe, Antruj and Savnur, as well as the tax imposed for the armaments maintained in these forts, shall be credited to the Master’s (personal) revenues.
"This revenue shall be made over as in the past; we shall see that it is duly paid in without hindrance, as ordered by the Master.”

8) There should be no hypocrisy between you and the Master. Whatever the Swami has done you should carry to a successful conclusion and serve according to the Master's wishes and in all sincerity; remain dutiful in the service of the Master.

"We shall serve the Master with single-minded devotion, and shall carry out the Master's commands and behave according to the Master's wishes, without duplicity.”

9) As in the past, the contingents Scindia, Nargunde and the Huzurpaga shall come under the personal command of the Master. Also, as in the past, the expenses of these troops shall be met from a special Saranjam.

"We shall ensure that they shall remain obedient to the Master; and also that, in case they do not serve as the Master orders them, we shall take away from them the saranjam, the forts, fortified posts and stations and hand them over (to Sambhaji).”

10) The Vatans of Sardeshmukhi and other receipts that constitute a part of the private resources (of the ruler) shall be continued as before.

"These shall be continued as in the reign of Shahu Maharaj.”

11) The income from the personally owned villages as well as the income derived from the right of Sardeshmukhi and Kulkarni shall be continued undisturbed. “This shall be done as your order.”
12) The forts, island forts and fortresses, in the tract between the Panchmahal and Jaigad which are in the possession of Angre, shall be repossessed and included in the King's domain.

“As ordered the forts, island forts and fortresses in the possession of Angre shall be repossessed and included in the King's domain.”

“As ordered, the fort, island forts and fortresses in the territory between Panchmahal and Jaigad are in the possession of Angre, shall be repossessed and included in the king's domain.”

“As ordered, the forts island forts and fortresses in the territory between Panchmahal and Jaigad which are in the possession of Angre shall be seized and transferred to the master.”

It is known that there were some ulterior intentions on the part of the signatories. But it cannot be denied that it was also a great readymade solution to the question of that time after Shahu, who? The Peshwa on his part tried to reunite not only the kingdom but also the divided people.

Some object saying that this treaty was never concluded in fact. But there are other evidences which prove it beyond doubt that the treaty was actually concluded. A letter from Jijabai, wife of Chhatrapati Sambhaji to Peshwa gives us clear idea of the treaty. Jijabai wrote to Peshwa Nanasaheb and Sadashivrao from time to time. She had asked them to do something positive about the secret pact. Thus the letters written by Jijabai certainly established the fact that the treaty of 1740 was actually concluded. It is probable that the treaty of 1740 was in the form of secret understanding between the Peshwa and Sambhaji of Kolhapur.
Some historians objected that Nanasaheb was disloyal to Shahu because he had signed such treaty. But till the end of Shahu’s life and afterwards too he had never committed any act of disloyalty to Shahu. He had only accepted Sambhaji’s claim to the Maratha throne after Shahu’s death. But when Shahu gave an order in writing asking him not to bring any one from the Kolhapur line, he did not try to bring Sambhaji as a successor of the Marathas Kingdom even though he was powerful enough in the Satara court at that time. However, the motive of this treaty of 1740 was not clear.

According to Dr. A.G. Pawar, “After the death of Shahu the legal responsibility to choose the heir to the throne of Satara and to install Sambhaji on the throne was that of Peshwa Balaji Bajirao.” Even though Balaji Bajirao alias Nanasaheb had signed the treaty he never tried to bring Sambhaji to Satara as the Chhatrapati of United Maratha Kingdom. So this treaty seems to be a mere diplomatic move of the Peshwa to please Sambhaji at that particular moment.

Peshwa and Shahu thought that after the treaty of Warna the Civil War would come to an end. Shahu tried to end hostilities in that region by this treaty. But Sambhaji was not satisfied with the treaty. There were always problems in the actual implementation of the treaty. For example, relations between Venkatrao Ghorpade and Karveerkars or Udaji Chavan’s activities in Miraj and Karveer territory proved troublesome for Sambhaji. He could not solve the problems related to his own chieftains on his own. He always complained to Shahu in order to provide relief to Sambhaji. Shahu always sent his troops or letters to the trouble shooters asking them to help
Sambhaji. Once he himself marched against Udaji Chavan who had carried out raids in Sambhaji's territory. Sambhaji also complained against Peshwa Bajirao in connection with Ghorapade Ichalkaranjikar in 1736. When Sambhaji launched a campaign against Ghorpade, Peshwa ordered the Patwardhans of Miraj to help Ghorpade of Ichalkaranji. But Sambhaji complained against Peshwa's action and told Shahu that, if Ghorpade and Patwardhan did not stop their activities, he would take help from the Nizam against them.

Such circumstances always prevailed which caused a lot of trouble for Satara State as well as the Peshwas. In the Satara court the Peshwa already had many powerful enemies. When problems of Sambhaji arose, these enemies became very active against the Peshwa. So Peshwa could not freely expand the Maratha dominion in the north and south. Peshwa knew that the Nizam and foreign powers like the Portuguese and the British were ready to take advantage of dissatisfaction of Sambhaji. So the Peshwa desired to enlist support of both Chhatrapati Sambhaji and his chieftains for achieving the objective of expansion of Maratha powers.

After the death of Shahu Ramraja acceded to the Satara gadi. But Peshwa became very powerful. In fact Ramraja also belonged to Kolhapur branch of Bhosle family. So the question arises as to why the Peshwa did not install Sambhaji and implement the treaty. Peshwa could have brought Sambhaji on the Maratha throne at Satara in the same way as Peshwa helped Ramraja and, could have fulfilled his promise.
All this proves that it might have been Peshwa’s tactical move to please Sambhaji and thus rid himself of Sambhaji’s nuisance. After the death of Shahu critical situation in Satara court might have thwarted such plans and schemes.

It can be observed that after this treaty, Sambhaji did not lodge any more complaints with Shahu’s court. This treaty also improved the relations between Peshwa and Sambhaji which were quite strained in the past. They became increasingly amicable after 1740.

Sambhaji candidly believed that he would become the ruler of United Maratha Kingdom of Satara and Kolhapur after signing the treaty. There was no open opposition to Sambhaji’s plan of expansion in the South towards Konkan. Neither Shahu nor the Peshwa opposed the plan so that we can describe this pact can be described as the beginning of a new relationship between the Peshwa and Chhatrapati of Kolhapur. On the other hand Peshwa had put his pressure on Ghorpade to sign a treaty with Sambhaji. Sambhaji had tried to get Phonda district for himself but after signing the treaty he never again complained against the Peshwa regarding Phonda district. So Manohar Malgaonkar correctly observed this changing nature of relations between the Peshwa and Kolhapur Chhatrapati. “The relation with the Peshwa which during the days of Balaji Vishwanath and Bajirao often bordered on open hostility were now increasingly amicable.”

Before this pact Sambhaji never forwarded his complaints to Peshwa but rather used to put forward his complaints in Shahu’s court. But now this scene changed. Sambhaji also placed his complaints before the Peshwa.
Peshwa also started extending his co-operation by taking necessary action in connection with Sambhaji’s complaints.

But Dr. A.G. Pawar does not agree with the fact that the Peshwa had no other alternative but to bring Ramraja as Shahu’s successor as per his last will (Yadi). The Yadi clearly stated not to bring any successor from the Kolhapur line but Ramraja actually was from the Kolhapur line. So according to A.G. Pawar, the prohibitory clause Kolhapurche Na Karane either applied to both Ramraja and Sambhaji, or applied to neither of them. If the Peshwa were free to interpret, as he appears to have thought, then he could have, if he wanted to interpret it in favour of Sambhaji. 38 So this treaty basically was not implemented because of Peshwa’s stand. It is probable that after Shahu’s death Nanasaheb Peshwa did not want Chhatrapati to be a defacto ruler of Maratha State. He perhaps preferred weak, nominal Chhatrapati. In future too, the Peshwa had no opportunity to install Sambhaji on Satara throne and make him the Supreme ruler in India.

So it can be observed that this pact might have been a diplomatic move made by the Peshwa in order to reduce to prevent Sambhaji’s complaints and problems in the Satara court. He wanted to keep himself free from Sambhaji’s matter and thus pay his undivided attention towards expansion of Maratha power. From the above discussion it is evident that Kolhapur-Satara relations were influenced to some extent by the Peshwa since 1740.
In the year 1746 Sambhaji paid another visit to Satara. He stayed there from the month of April till August. During his sojourn at Satara Sambhaji made an attempt to solve the problem of Babuji Naik.

Babuji Naik was a usurer who carried on his business in Karnataka against the wishes of Chhatrapati Shahu Maharaj and had plundered the territory of Sambhaji Raje by regular raids. This adversely affected the collection of tribute which Sambhaji Raje received from the local chieftains. So Sambhaji lodged his protest against this. A report from Satara gives a clear picture of this situation. "....Because of this Rajashri Sambhaji had made protests. Everyday the same complaint was put forward to Rajashri Swami. It was decided that Bapuji Naik should brought over. Accordingly Rajashri Keshawrao went and brought him. Since it was felt that to bring him to Satara itself might cause great distress to Rajashri Sambhaji Raje, Rajashri Swami ordered him to proceed directly to Baramati and he has gone to Baramati. The solution demanded by Rajashri Sambhaji was immensely difficult to put into practice and everyday it is a matter of life and death... it was decided that he should refrain from going into Sambhaji Raje’s territory....."

Bapuji Naik didn’t pay any heed to Shahu Chhatrapati’s warning, so ultimately he was defeated by Sadashivarao in an expedition launched against him. But Bapuji Naik still continued his activities in the south. So later on Jijabai on behalf of Sambhaji decided to make more positive efforts to protect interests of Karnataka.
Jijabai, the wife of Sambhaji Chhatrapati was a very wise and courageous woman. She always tried to keep cordial relations both with Peshwa and Chhatrapati Shahu. Towards the end of 1747, she undertook an expedition to secure the border of her kingdom. Some Yadav, one of the supporters of Ranoji Ghorpade was occupying the outlying posts of her kingdom. So she personally led her forces against him and captured the posts of Wadgaon, Herle, Tipkurle, Taladge in December 1747. At that time, she also decided to march against Bapuji Naik who was still active in Karnataka. She also tried to get help from Murarrao Ghorpade and the Nizam. Still Sambhaji could not control the activities of Bapuji Naik. So, he established contacts with the Nizam. In one of the reports sent from Satara to the Peshwa all activities of Sambhaji were mentioned. That report was as follows:

"...Bapuji Naik cannot be controlled from Satara. With this reason in mind, contact has been established with the Nawab who has sent letters both to Maharaj and to Sidoji Ghorapade. It is believed that Sidoji will pay a visit to Nawab. In the old days of the late Peshwa Bajirao the Nizam caused a lot of trouble by supporting those of Panhala. Some plans are being hatched now. It is said that in Satara there is petticoat rule. This is what is being discussed in the camp of the Mughals...."

Again the Nizam tried to take advantage of internal dissensions of the Marathas as he had done earlier in 1728. However, the Nizam died soon on May 2, 1748 and due to his death discussions between Kolhapur and Nizam were halted.
Here the letters from Peshwa Daftar must be considered. The dates of those letters are not yet confirmed but they clearly show how Jijabai tried to get help from Peshwa and how Peshwa and Sadashivrao Bhau neglected her request for help in Karnataka affairs. There was a letter from Ramchandra Bawaji, representative of the Peshwa in Kolhapur in which he had requested the Peshwa not to neglect the affairs in Karnataka and the south simply on the account of the wavering attitude of the king of Kolhapur. It was due to Peshwa’s policy of neglecting Sambhaji’s request for help that he tried to get help from the Nizam. In another letter despatched in March 1748 Ramchandra Bawaji reports to the Peshwa about an interview which he had with Jijabai in which she complained about the Peshwa’s failure to help her in maintaining order in her paragana near Ghataprabha, though she had totally relied on him. Ramchandra Bawaji attributes this indifference of Peshwa to vacillation on the part of Jijabai.

This Means that when Sadashivrao went to Karnataka to settle the problem of Babuji Naik, had promised Jijabai that he would settle the matter in Karnataka. But after some time, the Peshwa didn’t this promise. This might be the reason for Sambhaji’s efforts to get help from the Nizam.

But if Sambhaji had got the help from Nizam, it might have been very dangerous for both Chhatrapati Shahu and the Peshwa. Because this would have facilitated Nizam’s interference with the domestic affairs of the Marathas. But after Nizam’s death in 1748 the question of Nizam’s successor
could not be easily resolved. Hence the Nizam’s successors could not meddle with the Maratha affairs.

But Sambhaji’s action could have been the bone of contention between him and the Peshwa of Shahu, Nanasaheb, who had prepared the plan of reunification of Maratha Raj. If had Nizam really helped Sambhaji, it would have inevitably caused great trouble for Shahu and indirectly for the Peshwa too. When Peshwa came to know about Sambhaji’s plan to take help from Nizam it created tensions between Sambhaji and the Peshwa. Because of this both Sambhaji and Nanasaheb Peshwa lost their earlier mutual respect. This can be seen in one of Jijabai’s letters written in December 1748 which clearly shows that she suspected that Nanasaheb was deviating from his goal of reunification of Maratha States of Kolhapur and Satara. In that letter she wrote, “.....However, even though during the past years my messages have been sent one after the other asking you to make these plans bear fruit there is no evidence before the Saheb that anything is being done ..... everything should be done to give effect to this scheme that would be beneficial for the kingdom.... For the sake of the kingdom your lap has been made a pillow to rest on ...what is important is that you should prove to the master that what you have undertaken is going to be fulfilled.”44

Thus this letter clearly states that there must have been tension between Sambhaji of Kolhapur and Peshwa Nanasaheb. Jijabai, the queen of Sambhaji tried to bring them together and also managed to prevent open discord between the Peshwa and Chhatrapati of Kolhapur. Jijabai knew that only the Peshwa could do something to put Sambhaji on the Satara throne.
Jijabai also wrote a letter to Sadashivrao who was of great importance in Peshwa administration at that time. In that letter she calls upon him to do something positive about the secret treaty. She wrote, "....The result should be seen without delay...... what is being done about the promise given by the master (Sambhaji) as result of the Peshwa’s mediations? ....... whatever has been discussed earlier the treaty should be put into effect.... You should mention this to Rajashri Balaji Pandit Pradhan and things should be accomplished with speed....."\textsuperscript{45}

As can be seen from the above sequence of events, that the treaty of 1740 was only a diplomatic move of the Peshwa. According to Sardesai, "In future Peshwa had always tried for union of two Maratha Gadi."\textsuperscript{46} But this statement is not born out by facts of history.

**PROBLEM OF SHAHU’S SUCCESSOR**

Shahu’s Peshwa and his other Sardars greatly expanded his dominion in the south and the north and that led to the establishment of Maratha supremacy. But Shahu did not lead a happy personal life in his last few years. The reasons for his great anxiety were the question of succession and that of the heavy debts. Shahu’s only son had died. So, he was thinking about adoption of a child from various Bhosale families belonging to this clan. Shahu’s favourite concubine Virubai who had more influenced the household matters the most died in 1740. Thereafter his two queens Sakwarbai and Sagunabai were trying to exercise influence in Satara Court. They were interested particularly in the matter of adoption. The Peshwa’s clerk at Satara gives more graphic picture of Satara court in his letter.\textsuperscript{47}
SHAHU’S OPPOSITION TO SAMBHAJI

Peshwa Nanasaheb had accepted the plan of unification of two Maratha kingdoms through secret understanding with Sambhaji of Kolhapur in 1740. But Shahu – the Chhatrapati of Satara – did not like Sambhaji of Kolhapur. Shahu’s impressions about Sambhaji were not good and so Shahu did not accept him as an outstanding heir to his Gadi. Shahu didn’t hold Sambhaji in high esteem. He thought, “.... Sambhaji Raje does not possess restraint or a wealth of knowledge that is why it is necessary to adopt son.”

According to Shahu, restraint and wealth of knowledge were the necessary qualities for royalty which were not present in Sambhaji. During the last few years Sambhaji could not prove himself worthy for the office of Chhatrapati. Shahu thought that if Sambhaji could not solve his problems on his own, then how would he become a good ruler of this great and growing kingdom. Most of the sardars were not in favour of unification of these Maratha kingdoms. According to Manohar Malgaonkar, “It was as though after Warna, the Maratha world had adjusted itself to the division, the separation had gone on so long that the pattern had become set and hardened...... Shahu’s own inclination effectively blocked the private plans of Nanasaheb and Sambhaji ....” Actually this idea of reunification was beneficial for the Marathas in future but it was not accepted by Shahu.

Shahu also thought that Sambhaji himself was about fifty years old and he too had no son. So if Sambhaji were to succeed Shahu, the problem of succession would soon arise again. Under such circumstances elderly persons in the royal family though that it might be better to have another successor for Shahu’s gadi.
Shahu's hostile attitude towards Sambhaji was the biggest factor which led to the suppression of the secret understanding of 1740 arrived at between the Peshwa and Sambhaji. Because of this strange situation Peshwa himself sacrificed the idea of reuniting the Maratha kingdom. But both Sambhaji and his wife Jijabai both were in a relaxed mood, as they believed that Peshwa would implement the secret plan.

ADOPTION OF RAMRAJA

Both Sambhaji and Jijabai believed that Peshwa would implement the treaty at his own cost. Shahu's queen Sakwarbai was also a supporter of Sambhaji. Shahu was searching for a suitable candidate for adoption from amongst the close members of Bhosale clan. Shahu wanted to adopt Mudhoji Bhosale, the son of Raghuji Bhosale. But at that moment Tarabai asked Shahu to adopt Ramraja — a direct heir of Bhosale clan and also a grandson of Tarabai. Ramraja was the son of Shivaji I of Kolhapur. She demanded that "why adopt an outsider when thee is a direct member of our own family?" But Shahu did not understand Tarabai's stand because Shahu himself and Sambhaji had no male issue. Tarabai's grandson had died then how was there a direct heir? But Tarabai then told the story of Ramraja's birth and how she secretly brought him up. In the Bawada Daftar the full story of Ramraja is given. According to that "after the death of Shivaji I, Ramraja was born at the fort Panhala. Sambhaji of Kolhapur saw the son and gave instructions that the baby should be brought up with great care. But later, because of queen Jijabai, Sambhaji's attitude towards Ramraja turned hostile. So Tarabai decided to send the child outside the fort. She made a plan to send the baby
outside. According to that she told all people that the child had died. But actually she had sent the child to the house of Amatya at Gagan Bawada. But later, after some years, Jijabai came to know that the child was alive. So again Tarabai managed to send the child to Ramraja’s sister’s at his sister’s house at Pangaon. Now that the child grew up at his sister Daryabai Nimbalkar’s house at Pangaon, Tarabai announced that her grandson was alive and she demanded to adopt Ramraja as Shahu’s successor. Shahu then called Bhagawantrao Amatya and commanded him to tell the truth on oath. Bhagwantrao also gave his support to the story of Tarabai so Shahu made up his mind to adopt Ramraja as his successor. But his will was nowhere recorded clearly.

But the situation worsened further. Shahu’s queen Sakwarbai, after receiving the news of Ramraja, declared that it was a plot on the part of Tarabai to regain power once again through Ramraja. She strongly opposed the adoption of Tarabai’s grandson Ramraja. She sent an urgent message to Sambhaji of Kolhapur to come to Satara alongwith a powerful force. Now clouds of another civil war loomed over the Marathas. Sakwarbai who also supported by Parsuram alias Dadoba Pratinidhi and his Mutalik, Yamaji Shivdev and planned to put Sambhaji on Satara throne.

On the other hand Sambhaji thought that Tarabai’s move was an attack on his chance to take over Satara kingdom as a direct heir. So when Sakwarbai invited him to come to Satara he, immediately marched towards Satara with his troops. However, Sambhaji still did not know Peshwa’s stand on this issue. Contrary to Sambhaji’s expectations, Nanasaheb Peshwa gave
his full support Shahu's solution – Ramraja. When Peshwa heard about Sambhaji's march, he and Sadashivrao ordered their local commandants to oppose Sambhaji and keep him tied beyond the river Warna. Bhasker Hari provides information about the measures taken by the Peshwa to prevent Sambhaji from reaching Satara in a letter written on 19th December 1749, “...... we have come as far as Warna and coming there Rajashri Shivaji Thorat has through agent kept himself information all that is happening at Karveer. The news is that Rajashri Swami Sambhaji has set out from Karveer towards Wadgaon on his way to Satara. As soon as I hear this I have with two hundred horsemen managed to arrive here before midnight.”52 This letter clearly stated that on the invitation of Sakwarbai, Sambhaji had proceeded towards Satara and Sadashivrao had made arrangement to prevent Sambhaji.

Another letter of Sadashivrao Bhau from Purandhar Daftar throws light on this situation. Sadashivrao wrote that, “If Karveerkar and queen mother (Sakwarbai) are thinking to make secret agreement, please find out and let me know about their plans. Troops under commandant of Indraji Kadam should be kept along the Warna..... also give instructions to Thorat who has already been at Ashta to put check on movement of Chhatrapati Sambhaji. Peshwa had also appointed Manaji Paygude and Hari Ram with two thousand troops to Sambhaji.”53 Sambhaji had begun to march towards Satara but, in the meantime on 15th December 1749, Shahu Chhatrapati died and Jijabai was prevented from moving further towards Satara.

Shahu always tried to keep cordial relations with Sambhaji, but still could not forget his lifelong differences with Kolhapur. So, while on his
deathbed, Shahu clearly ordered not to choose an heir from the Kolhapur line. Before his death Shahu gave his two written orders (yadi) to the Peshwa. By that order he gave the Peshwa full authority to run the administration of his government and bring Ramraja as his heir.

The very next day after Shahu’s death, Peshwa sent his troops to bring Ramraja to Satara. This news was a great shock for Sambhaji. His grand dream of becoming Chhatrapati of united Maratha kingdom was suddenly shattered to pieces. Sambhaji did not trust Nanasaheb from a long time and now, Sambhaji’s suspicion was proved right. Sambhaji knew that without the help of Peshwa his goal could not be achieved. Now it was an impossible goal for Sambhaji. He wanted to proceed further towards Satara. But, his wife Jijabai gave him a wise advice, not to proceed further, because the Peshwa had already had deployed troops to oppose him and there were no supporters for Sambhaji in Satara too. Also, it was not an easy job to oppose the Peshwa who had now become the most powerful man in India. For the Peshwa it had become impossible to support Sambhaji as the next Chhatrapati of United Maratha Kingdom, as before his death Shahu had clearly given green signal to Ramraja. Also, the public opinion in the Satara court was in the favour of Ramraja. So it was not easy for Peshwa to go against Shahu’s last wish. While on the other hand, Sambhaji thought that it was not impossible for Peshwa to appoint him as Chhatrapati of Satara because Peshwa was the most powerful man among all the Maratha chieftains. Thus Sambhaji’s grand dream which he had cherished since 1740 was shattered. So Manohar Malgaonkar rightly observed, “Now it was clear that the cleavage between
Thus this of reuniting the two kingdoms was lost as the Peshwa himself was not in a position to bring the union into reality. Tarabai, Chitnis and other Maratha Sardars thought that it was Peshwa’s duty to carry out Shahu’s order. But Dr. A.G. Pawar strongly argues that in the Yadi, Shahu had not mentioned Ramraja’s name. “If Shahu wanted to prohibit Sambhaji for succeeding him, he could have mentioned him by name.” Shahu had asked not to bring anyone from the Kolhapur line. Also the choice of fixing the heir to the throne was in Peshwa’s hand. If Peshwa had made a treaty with Sambhaji for the unification then why he did not bring Sambhaji in the place of Ramraja? So now, both Sambhaji and Ramraja were from the Kolhapur line and Peshwa was free to interpret the Yadi as he chose to. So then, why did Peshwa not interpret it in favour of Sambhaji? So according to A.G. Pawar “Peshwa was responsible for bringing Ramraja to the throne, it was the Peshwa that appears to have prevented Sambhaji, the king of Kolhapur, from being chosen as the successor of Shahu and it was the Peshwa that exploited the situation and usurped the entire power.”

On the other hand, Sakwarbai strongly opposed Ramraja’s adoption and installation as Chhatrapati of Satara. Thus the situation in Satara became very explosive. Sambhaji then returned to Kolhapur but was very angry. Sambhaji cancelled Peshwa’s right to collect the revenues from Sondhe, Bidnur and Savanur from Karnatak. He wrote to chieftains of Sondhe, “..The revenues are for the present reserved upto the master himself.” This enmity with Peshwa changed the Peshwa’s attitude towards Kolhapur and resulted in
far-reaching and indirect effects on the later history of Chhatrapatis of Kolhapur.

The strange situation created while implementing treaty of Warna and issue of succession provided Peshwa good opportunity to exercise his influence in Maratha politics. Since 1740 Peshwa Nanasaheb directly or indirectly influenced Kolhapur-Satara relations to some extent. However, the relationship between Kolhapur and Satara states during the period 1731 to 1749 was essentially the relationship between two Maratha Chhatrapatis. This was in keeping with nature of medieval politics.
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