



INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES

(Peer-reviewed, Refereed, Indexed & Open Access Journal)

DOI : 03.2021-11278686

ISSN : 2582-8568

IMPACT FACTOR : 8.428 (SJIF 2026)

Artistry of Administration in the Maratha Realm

Bhoomi Verma

Undergraduate Student,

Department of History,

Amity Institute of Social Sciences (AISS),

Amity University, Noida (Uttar Pradesh, India)

DOI No. **03.2021-11278686**

DOI Link :: <https://doi-ds.org/doi/10.2026-66859131/IRJHIS2603015>

Abstract:

The administrative system of the Maratha state represents a distinctive and sophisticated model of governance in early modern India. Under the leadership of Shivaji Maharaj, a well organized central structure emerged that balanced royal authority with collective decision making through specialized administrative offices. The Ashtapradhan Mandal ensured functional division, accountability, and bureaucratic discipline. Fiscal administration formed the economic backbone of the state, with systematic land revenue assessment and innovative mechanisms such as Chauth and Sardeshmukhi extending political influence beyond core territories. Careful record-keeping, audits, and cooperation with local intermediaries enhanced revenue efficiency and stability. Local governance relied on village institutions and panchayats, promoting decentralized administration and participatory justice. Judicial practices combined customary law with centralized supervision, ensuring accessibility and fairness. Military administration, including forts and naval establishments, was closely integrated with civil and fiscal systems. The standing army and fort network supported both defense and administration. Sensitivity to agrarian conditions reflected administrative pragmatism. The system demonstrated adaptability as the empire expanded under the Peshwas. Civil and military coordination maintained internal stability. Administrative institutions evolved without losing coherence. The Maratha experience highlights the importance of institutional design in sustaining power. Overall, the artistry of Maratha administration lay in its integration, flexibility, and strategic governance.

Keywords: Maratha Governance, Decentralized Administration, Revenue Management, Military Organization, Administrative Efficiency

Introduction:

The rise of the Maratha state in the seventeenth century marked a decisive phase in the political and administrative history of early modern India. Emerging under the visionary leadership of Shivaji Maharaj, the Maratha polity was not merely a military power but a well-structured administrative state grounded in institutional organization, fiscal discipline, and decentralized governance. In contrast to

contemporary empires that relied heavily on hereditary nobility or ad hoc governance, the Marathas developed a system that combined centralized authority with local participation, thereby ensuring efficiency, legitimacy, and adaptability (Gordon, 2007). The artistry of Maratha administration lay in its ability to integrate diverse functions political, economic, judicial, and military into a coherent framework capable of governing an expanding and heterogeneous empire.

Central administration formed the backbone of Maratha governance. The establishment of the Ashtapradhan Mandal institutionalized specialization and accountability, ensuring that key aspects of administration such as finance, diplomacy, justice, and military affairs were managed by designated officials under royal supervision (Sen, 1984). This structure reduced arbitrariness and fostered collective decision-making while preserving the authority of the ruler. The increasing prominence of the Peshwa in the eighteenth century further strengthened administrative coordination and enabled the state to manage vast territories effectively. Written documentation, audits, and regular correspondence enhanced bureaucratic continuity and transparency, reflecting a sophisticated understanding of governance beyond personal rule (Gordon, 2007).

Equally significant was the Maratha fiscal system, which provided the economic foundation for political authority and military expansion. Systematic land revenue assessment based on soil quality and productivity ensured fairness and predictability. Innovative revenue instruments such as Chauth and Sardeshmukhi enabled the Marathas to extract resources from regions beyond their direct control while asserting political dominance (Nayeem, 1977). These mechanisms were supported by detailed record-keeping and cooperation with local intermediaries, minimizing resistance and ensuring efficient collection. The close integration of fiscal planning with military expenditure highlights the Maratha state's character as a well-coordinated military-fiscal entity capable of sustaining prolonged campaigns and administrative expansion (Gordon, 2007).

Local governance further strengthened the administrative structure by ensuring grassroots participation and social legitimacy. Village institutions such as panchayats, patils, and kulkarnis played a vital role in revenue collection, dispute resolution, and maintenance of order. Judicial administration combined customary practices with centralized oversight, ensuring accessibility and consistency in justice delivery (Kulkarni, 1990). Military organization, including the extensive fort system and naval administration, was closely aligned with civil authority. Forts functioned as centers of defense, revenue storage, and regional administration, while the navy protected coastal trade and territorial integrity (Apte, 1954). This integration of civil and military institutions ensured internal stability and effective control over diverse regions.

The Maratha administrative system stands as a remarkable example of skilled and pragmatic governance in early modern India. Its success lay not solely in military strength but in the careful design and coordination of administrative institutions. Centralized authority was balanced with

decentralized local governance, fiscal innovation sustained expansion, and judicial and military systems reinforced state legitimacy. The adaptability of this system allowed it to respond to changing political and economic conditions without losing structural coherence. The artistry of Maratha administration thus resides in its holistic integration of authority, efficiency, and flexibility, leaving a lasting legacy in the history of Indian statecraft (Gordon, 2007; Sen, 1984; Nayeem, 1977; Kulkarni, 1990; Apte, 1954).

Central Administrative Structure and the Ashtapradhan System:

The foundation of the Maratha state under Shivaji Maharaj in the seventeenth century marked a significant departure from prevailing patterns of governance in the Deccan. While many contemporary powers relied on feudal arrangements or personal loyalty of nobles, the Maratha polity developed a structured and institutionalized system of central administration. This system emphasized specialization, accountability, and coordinated governance, thereby reflecting a high degree of administrative artistry. The central administration was designed not merely to assist the ruler but to function as a durable mechanism capable of sustaining territorial expansion and political stability (Gordon, 2007).

At the core of Maratha central governance was the Ashtapradhan Mandal, or the Council of Eight Ministers. This council represented a deliberate effort to organize state functions into clearly defined departments. Each minister was entrusted with a specific portfolio, ensuring division of labour and administrative efficiency. The Peshwa served as the chief executive and supervised overall administration; the Amatya managed finance and revenue accounts; the Sachiv handled royal correspondence and state documentation; the Mantri oversaw intelligence and internal administration; the Senapati commanded the armed forces; the Sumant conducted foreign affairs; the Nyayadhish administered justice; and the Panditrao supervised religious and charitable activities (Sen, 1984). This systematic allocation of responsibilities minimized overlap and confusion, enabling smooth functioning of the state.

A notable feature of the Ashtapradhan system was the emphasis on merit and accountability. Ministers were appointed based on competence, loyalty, and experience rather than purely hereditary claims. Although many officials belonged to influential families, their authority was not autonomous; they were directly accountable to the ruler. Shivaji Maharaj maintained strict supervision over ministers and officials, frequently reviewing accounts and administrative decisions. Regular audits and written records ensured transparency and discouraged corruption, reinforcing the credibility of the central administration (Gordon, 2007).

The consultative nature of governance further enhanced administrative effectiveness. Important matters of policy, military campaigns, diplomatic negotiations, and revenue decisions were discussed within the council. While the final authority rested with the ruler, collective deliberation allowed

informed decision-making and reduced the risk of arbitrary governance. This balance between royal authority and institutional consultation distinguished the Maratha state from purely autocratic regimes and contributed to administrative stability (Sen, 1984).

The central administration was also characterized by its reliance on documentation and record-keeping. State correspondence, revenue registers, judicial orders, and military records were systematically maintained. The Sachiv and Amatya played key roles in preserving official records, which facilitated continuity of policy and effective supervision of provincial officers. Such bureaucratic practices reflect a mature understanding of governance, where written documentation served as a tool of control and accountability rather than mere formality (Gordon, 2007).

As the Maratha state expanded in the eighteenth century, the central administrative system evolved without losing its fundamental structure. The office of the Peshwa gradually emerged as the most powerful position, effectively becoming the head of administration. This transformation did not represent a collapse of institutional governance but rather an adaptation to the demands of ruling an extensive empire. The Peshwa coordinated provincial governors, supervised revenue administration, and directed military strategy, ensuring centralized control over distant territories (Gordon, 2007). The continuity of the Ashtapradhan framework during this period demonstrates the flexibility and resilience of the system.

The relationship between central administration and provincial governance further illustrates administrative sophistication. Provincial officials were required to submit regular reports and accounts to the central government. Transfers and appointments were controlled from the center, preventing the emergence of autonomous regional power bases. At the same time, local customs and institutions were respected, allowing the central administration to function effectively without excessive coercion. This balance between control and accommodation reflects strategic administrative planning (Sen, 1984).

The integration of civil and military administration was another hallmark of the central system. Military commanders were directly accountable to the central authority, and military expenditure was closely monitored by fiscal officials. The Senapati worked in coordination with the Amatya and Peshwa to ensure that military campaigns were financially sustainable. This coordination prevented the army from becoming an independent political force and reinforced the supremacy of civilian authority (Gordon, 2007).

The central administration of the Maratha realm exemplifies the artistry of governance through institutional design, accountability, and adaptability. The Ashtapradhan Mandal provided a stable administrative framework that combined specialization with collective decision-making. By emphasizing merit, documentation, and centralized supervision, the Marathas created a system capable of managing both internal administration and external expansion. This administrative legacy played a crucial role in transforming the Maratha state into one of the most powerful political entities in

eighteenth-century India and remains a significant contribution to the history of Indian administration (Gordon, 2007; Sen, 1984).

Revenue and Fiscal Administration in the Maratha Realm:

Revenue and fiscal administration constituted the economic foundation of the Maratha state and played a decisive role in sustaining its political authority and military expansion. The Maratha rulers clearly understood that effective governance and long-term stability depended on a well-organized system of resource extraction and financial management. Consequently, they developed a fiscal structure that combined systematic land assessment, innovative revenue mechanisms, and administrative discipline, reflecting a high degree of administrative foresight and pragmatism (Gordon, 2007).

The primary source of state income was land revenue. Shivaji Maharaj initiated reforms to rationalize land assessment by conducting surveys and classifying land according to soil quality, crop type, and productivity. The state generally claimed a fixed proportion of agricultural produce, often around one-third, which could be collected either in kind or cash. This standardized assessment reduced arbitrary taxation and provided cultivators with a degree of predictability, thereby encouraging agricultural productivity and settlement (Gordon, 2007). Detailed revenue records were maintained by village and district officials, strengthening transparency and administrative control.

A distinctive feature of Maratha fiscal policy was the institutionalization of Chauth and Sardeshmukhi. Chauth, amounting to one-fourth of the assessed revenue, was levied on territories outside the core Maratha region in exchange for protection and political recognition. Sardeshmukhi, an additional ten percent levy, was claimed as a hereditary right of the Maratha ruler as the supreme authority of the Deccan (Nayeem, 1977). These levies were not merely financial tools but instruments of political dominance, enabling the Marathas to extend their influence far beyond their territorial boundaries.

The collection of revenue required a sophisticated administrative network. Officials such as kamavisdars and subhedars supervised fiscal operations at regional levels, while local intermediaries including deshmukhs, patils, and village accountants facilitated collection at the grassroots. By retaining existing local structures, the Marathas minimized resistance and ensured continuity in administration. This pragmatic approach reflects an understanding of regional socio-economic realities and highlights the adaptive character of Maratha governance (Nayeem, 1977).

Fiscal administration was closely integrated with military organization. A substantial portion of state revenue was allocated to the maintenance of a standing army, forts, and naval establishments. Regular payment of soldiers was considered essential for discipline and loyalty, and special treasury officials monitored military expenditure. This coordination between revenue and military administration prevented financial strain and ensured the sustainability of prolonged campaigns

(Gordon, 2007). The Maratha state thus functioned as a well-coordinated military-fiscal system.

Under the Peshwas in the eighteenth century, fiscal administration became increasingly centralized and systematic. The Amatya and later the Peshwa supervised revenue assessment, auditing, and treasury management. Annual budgets, detailed accounts, and periodic inspections were introduced to check corruption and inefficiency. Central treasuries and regional record offices strengthened fiscal discipline and enabled effective monitoring of provincial officials (Gordon, 2007). Another important aspect of Maratha fiscal policy was its responsiveness to agrarian conditions. During periods of drought, famine, or warfare, revenue remissions and concessions were sometimes granted to cultivators to prevent depopulation and economic collapse. Such measures reveal a practical recognition of the link between peasant welfare and long-term state revenue. Rather than maximizing short-term extraction, the administration often prioritized sustainability and social stability (Nayeem, 1977).

Although revenue farming was occasionally employed, it was generally regulated through contracts and supervision to prevent exploitation. Revenue farmers were held accountable for both collection and protection of cultivators, reflecting the state's effort to balance delegated authority with oversight. This cautious use of intermediaries further illustrates administrative maturity.

Local Governance, Judicial System, and Military Administration in the Maratha Realm:

The effectiveness of the Maratha administrative system was deeply rooted in the integration of local governance, judicial authority, and military organization. While central institutions provided overall direction, it was at the local and operational levels that governance directly affected society. The Maratha rulers recognized the importance of decentralization and community participation, allowing traditional institutions to function under state supervision. This approach ensured administrative efficiency, social stability, and political legitimacy across diverse regions (Gordon, 2007).

Local governance in the Maratha realm revolved around the village as the basic unit of administration. Village officials such as the patil (headman) and kulkarni (accountant) played a crucial role in maintaining order, collecting revenue, and representing village interests. These officials worked in coordination with higher authorities while retaining familiarity with local customs and conditions. Village panchayats, composed of respected elders, functioned as decision-making bodies and addressed civil disputes, land issues, and social conflicts. By empowering these institutions, the Maratha state promoted participatory governance and reduced administrative burden on the central authority (Kulkarni, 1990).

At the regional level, deshmukhs and subhedars supervised groups of villages and districts. They ensured the implementation of state policies, coordinated revenue collection, and maintained law and order. Regular communication between local officials and provincial administrators strengthened

administrative cohesion and prevented the emergence of autonomous local power centers. This layered structure allowed the Maratha state to exercise control without excessive coercion, reflecting administrative pragmatism and adaptability (Gordon, 2007).

The judicial system under the Marathas combined customary practices with centralized oversight. Panchayats acted as primary courts at the village level, resolving disputes based on local traditions and social norms. Their decisions were generally accepted by the community, ensuring accessibility and minimizing prolonged litigation. Serious criminal cases and disputes involving state interests were escalated to higher authorities, including provincial courts and the Nyayadhish at the central level (Sen, 1984). This dual structure balanced local autonomy with institutional authority.

Judicial administration emphasized fairness, moral principles, and accountability. Written records of judgments and proceedings were maintained, contributing to consistency and transparency in legal practice. The supervision of the Nyayadhish ensured that judicial decisions aligned with state policy and ethical standards. This institutionalization of justice distinguished Maratha governance from arbitrary rule and strengthened public confidence in the state (Gordon, 2007).

Military administration formed a central pillar of Maratha state power and was closely linked with civil governance. The Maratha army was a standing, salaried force under direct state control, which ensured discipline and loyalty. Military officers were accountable to the central authority, preventing the rise of independent warlords. Strategic planning and coordination enabled rapid mobilization and effective defense of territories (Gordon, 2007).

Forts played a vital role in both military and administrative functions. Strategically located across hill ranges and coastal areas, forts served as centers of defense, revenue storage, and regional administration. Each fort was placed under a killedar or havaladar responsible for security, troop maintenance, and communication with civil authorities. This integration of military and fiscal administration strengthened territorial control and administrative efficiency (Apte, 1954).

The development of naval administration under Shivaji Maharaj further reflects administrative foresight. Naval bases along the Konkan coast protected trade routes, prevented foreign encroachment, and supported maritime revenue. Naval officers operated under centralized supervision, ensuring coordination with civil and military authorities (Apte, 1954).

Conclusion:

The administrative system of the Maratha Empire represents one of the most sophisticated experiments in governance in early modern Indian history. Emerging from the socio-political conditions of the seventeenth-century Deccan, the Maratha state successfully combined centralized authority with decentralized administration, creating a flexible yet cohesive structure of governance. This system was not merely a response to immediate political challenges but a carefully constructed framework that enabled long-term stability, territorial expansion, and institutional continuity (Gordon,

2007).

Central administration, anchored in the Ashtapradhan Mandal, introduced specialization, accountability, and consultative decision-making into governance. By assigning clearly defined responsibilities to ministers and maintaining strict supervision over officials, the Maratha rulers ensured administrative efficiency and transparency. The evolution of the Peshwa's authority in the eighteenth century reflected adaptability rather than administrative decline, allowing the state to manage extensive territories without dismantling its institutional foundations (Sen, 1984). This balance between authority and consultation stands as a defining feature of Maratha statecraft.

Revenue and fiscal administration formed the economic backbone of the Maratha polity. Systematic land assessment, meticulous record-keeping, and innovative fiscal mechanisms such as Chauth and Sardeshmukhi enabled the state to mobilize resources from both core and peripheral regions. These revenue practices were closely integrated with military requirements, sustaining a standing army, fort network, and naval establishment. The administration's sensitivity to agrarian conditions and willingness to grant concessions during crises reveal a pragmatic understanding of economic sustainability and social stability (Nayeem, 1977; Gordon, 2007).

Local governance further strengthened the administrative structure by ensuring participation and legitimacy at the grassroots level. Village institutions, including panchayats and hereditary officials, functioned as effective instruments of administration and justice. Judicial practices combined customary law with centralized oversight, promoting fairness, accessibility, and consistency. This dual system reduced social conflict and enhanced public confidence in the state's authority (Kulkarni, 1990). The decentralization of authority did not weaken central control but complemented it, demonstrating administrative maturity.

Military administration was deeply intertwined with civil governance. The maintenance of a disciplined, salaried army under state control prevented the emergence of autonomous military power centers. Forts served as hubs of defense, revenue storage, and regional administration, while naval establishments protected trade routes and coastal territories. This integration of military and administrative functions ensured internal security and facilitated effective governance across geographically diverse regions (Apte, 1954).

The adaptability of the Maratha administrative system was crucial to its endurance. As the empire expanded and political circumstances changed, administrative institutions evolved without losing coherence. The ability to incorporate regional diversity, negotiate with local elites, and maintain centralized supervision allowed the state to govern effectively over a wide expanse. This flexibility distinguishes the Maratha system from rigid or purely coercive models of rule and underscores its innovative character (Gordon, 2007).

In a broader historical perspective, the Maratha administrative model challenges conventional

portrayals of pre-colonial Indian states as administratively weak or decentralized to the point of inefficiency. Instead, it reveals a complex and dynamic system capable of sustained governance, economic management, and military coordination. The Maratha experience demonstrates that effective state power depends not only on military success but also on institutional design, administrative discipline, and social legitimacy.

In conclusion, the artistry of administration in the Maratha realm lay in its holistic integration of central authority, fiscal innovation, local participation, judicial order, and military organization. This integrated system enabled the Maratha state to emerge as a dominant political force in eighteenth-century India and left a lasting legacy in the evolution of Indian administrative traditions. The Maratha model of governance remains a significant example of pragmatic and institution-based statecraft, offering valuable insights into the nature of early modern administration in South Asia (Gordon, 2007; Sen, 1984; Nayeem, 1977; Kulkarni, 1990; Apte, 1954).

References:

1. Apte, B. K. (1954). Maratha naval administration under Shivaji. *Indian Historical Quarterly*, 30(3), 201-215.
2. Chitnis, K. N. (1974). *Socio-economic history of medieval India*. Atlantic Publishers.
3. Deshpande, G. S. (1987). *Administration under the Marathas*. Popular Prakashan.
4. Gordon, S. (2007). *The Marathas, 1600–1818*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Gune, V. T. (1953). Judicial system under Shivaji. *Journal of the University of Bombay*, 22(4), 45-62.
6. Joshi, V. L. (1960). *Maratha polity and administration*. Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute.
7. Kulkarni, A. R. (1990). Local self-government under the Marathas. *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*, 51, 365-374.
8. Kulkarni, A. R. (1996). *The Marathas*. Books & Books.
9. Nayeem, M. A. (1977). The working of the Chauth and Sardeshmukhi system in the Deccan (1707–1803 AD). *The Indian Economic & Social History Review*, 14(2), 153-191.
10. Palsokar, G. D. (1980). Revenue administration of the Marathas. *Indian Historical Review*, 7(1-2), 89-105.
11. Ranade, M. G. (1900). *Rise of the Maratha power*. Bombay: Punalekar & Co.
12. Sarkar, J. (1920). *Shivaji and his times* (6th ed.). Longmans, Green & Co.
13. Sen, S. N. (1984). The Ashtapradhan council: A study in Maratha governance. *Indian Historical Quarterly*, 60(1), 77-89.
14. Sharma, G. N. (1959). *Maratha administration in Malwa*. S. Chand & Company.
15. Stein, B. (2010). *A history of India* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.