Reference is made in an earlier chapter to the Maratha activities in Kanara. These Marathas appeared on the political scene with the commencement of their activities of Sivāji from 1646 A.D. Himself and his successors raided Kanara many times with the intention of exacting tributes from the local chiefs and also to have some territorial gains. These were followed by the raids of Angreys as well as the Peshwas. Some details of these incursions are noticed in this chapter.

Actually Sivāji does not appear to have had much contact with Kanara in the early years of his career.
Grant Duff says\(^1\) that 'Sivāji had an eye on Kanara and perhaps he tried to secure some gains in that region through bribing the governor of Sultan of Bijapur who had jagir at Karwar. We have, however, no corroborative evidences to this effect. During that year, busy as he was, in dealing with the Bijapur forces, 'Sivāji could have hardly any time to pay attention to Kanara. His first attempt of raid on Bhatkāmpōrt in the year 1664 A.D. was unsuccessful.\(^2\) He was stopped on the way itself by the armies of Sultan and 'Sivāji had to retreat,\(^3\) even though the raid was meant for acquainting himself with topography and politics of Kanara as surmised by Shri Sejwalkar\(^4\) and it is not known if he achieved this at all. But his next attack on Basrūru in 1665 A.D. through sea was more serious consequence. It is said that he started his expedition on February 8th 1665 A.D. through Goa reached Basrūru and plundered it and camped at Gōkārṇa (North Kanara) on 13th February 1665 A.D. From there he went to Ankola and he was near Karwar on 22nd of the same month.\(^5\) The Kelādi sources are silent over this, though the Portuguese heard from Nāyana Mallya, the trade agent of the Kelādi Nāyaka at Basrūru, that the people feared that 'Sivāji was going to attack the kingdom, and they were 1ōst.\(^6\) Further, the English and the Dutch, whose trade interest were much affected by this expedition give some
details. According to them the English kept their goods in a ship on high seas and took shelter under Sher Khan the governor of Bijapur Sultan. The latter forbade Sivaji from entering the town, whereupon Sivaji demanded the surrender of English merchant. Ultimately, the English saved themselves from disaster by paying good amount of money to Sivaji. Final effect of this raid was that on the one hand Sivaji could collect huge amount of money as booty and on the other the roots of the foreign merchants began to shake. But it did not affect the political condition of Kanara in any way, and perhaps, this accounts for the silence of the Keladi source about this matter.

For quite some time onwards Kanara was free from the Marathas attack. There are, however, evidences to show that the Maratha soldiers frequently attacked the bordering areas in small numbers to collect booty. The English could not put up this menace and ultimately suspended their trade activities at Karwar.

In 1673 A.D. Sivaji sent another naval expedition to Karwar and conquered it. If we believe the statement made in a document quoted by Duff, it appears that this invasion affected the Nayakas of Keladi. The document is supposed to state that the Rani of Bednur alarmed by the plunder of Hoobalı, solicited protection and agreed to
pay early tribute and permitted a wakeel from Sivaji to reside at her capital. But there is no corroborative evidence for this event in the Keladi sources either literary or epigraphically. One of the English records dated in the year 1673 A.D. refers to the attack on Hubli with a large army and its occupation by Sivaji. The record also adds that the latter had to vacate Kanara in view of the opposition he met from the troops of Bijapur. It is obvious that this invasion did not affect the Keladi authority in Kanara. It only affected the merchant community and trade interest of the English.

In 1675 A.D. Sivaji again invaded Kanara, when he appears to have established a good hold on the portion of North Kanara. After raiding Phonda, he is said to have sent his army to Kanara and this force besiezed Sivēśvara and burnt Kārwār. He is also stated to have established his authority upto Ankola or Gangola. This is confirmed by the Marathi sources like the Sabsad Bhākar and the Jede Śakavali.

Sivāji followed up this victory by a raid on Svādi and as stated in a record of 1675 A.D. there was not much opposition from the Svādi chief and thereby he could establish his hold on Sūpa and Ullāvi. But his hold was temporary. In view of the fact that the English factory record of 1679 A.D. refers to Svādi as a separate
principality, it would not be correct to think that the Svādī principality was annexed to the Maratha kingdom as has been stated by Sardesai G.S. The fact seems to be that the chief of Svādī paid tribute to Śivāji. Sardesai further surmised that the Keṭadi queen sought the help of Śivāji and agreed to pay annual tribute and to keep a Maratha resident at her court. But the English factory record of 19th August 1675 A.D. states that Timmanṇa the chief minister of Keṭadi Chennājī after the imprisonment of Nārāyaṇa Mallya, the court merchant, called on the latter to pay up large sum to assist in war against Śivāji in that year. From this record it seems that the Keṭadi government decided to fight against Śivāji, but as regards the details of this affair, the record is silent. On the basis of the Qualim chronicle of 1678 A.D. Shri Sethū Madhava Rao asserts that the campaign of Śivāji did not penetrate into the territory of Bednūr and it touched the border of Svādī principality.

There are exaggerated account of the conquest of Śivāji as also its effects in Kanara. For instance Fr. Frêyer, an English Doctor who was in Kanara between 1675 and 1676 A.D. states that Śivāji had occupied considerable area in North Kanara and that the people were thoroughly dissatisfied with his rule. But it is difficult to
depend entirely on this. It, however, seems certain that Sivāji's raid did have an effect on Kanara especially the English whose trade interests were thoroughly affected. So far as Keladi was concerned its position seems to be that they followed a policy of compromise rather than stiff fight.

The Bijapur Sultan had some hold over the extreme northern portion of Kanara and his position was adversely affected. The role of Sivāji in the history of Kanara resulted in ousting of the Adilshahi from this region and Sivāji's stationing of his officers in some places like Mirjan, Ankola and Karwar.

The death of Sivāji in the month of April 1680 A.D. resulted in losing of the Maratha hold on this region. His son, Sambhaji, however, tried to regain it, but not with much success. He attempted to take possession of Anjālā island, near Karwar, but even this was opposed by the Portuguese and he had to withdraw. The chief of Svādi withheld his tribute perhaps at the instigation of the Portuguese. Other chiefs like the Khēma Sāmanta of Kūdal, the Nayakas of Phonda and the Desai of Karwar rose in revolt. Thus the efforts of Sambhaji to keep his position in Kanara ended in continuous rebellion and confusion. It is, however, to his credit that he was
in instrumental abolition of slave trade in Karwar zone. A treaty entered by him with the English at Karwar states that the English shall buy none of my people belonging to my dominion to make them either slaves or Christians.\(^\text{36}\)

The next Maratha ruler, Rajaram, the brother of Sambhaji, maintained good relationship with the Svāḍī chiefs. He once wrote to Sōde Sadāśivanāyaka I that he had not paid the accepted tribute and requested him to send it to the Maratha officer. Madhavrao, carried this letter to the court of Svāḍī.\(^\text{37}\) In another letter Rajaram expresses satisfaction for the prompt response of Sadāśiva nāyaka in payment of tribute and expressly desires that such friendly relationship would continue between them.\(^\text{38}\) Yet in another letter dated 4th July 1696 A.D. from Rajaram states that the latter handed over the Panchamahal region including Ankola to Sādaśivānāyaka in view of annual payment of 22 thousand gold coins (Honnu). The letter also speaks of the arrangements that one would help the other in case of aggression from any outsiders.\(^\text{39}\) Rajaram appointed Rāmachandra Amātya as an agent to deal with the affairs of Sōde. It was he who negotiated a treaty with Svāḍī and according to it the Svāḍī ruler agreed to supply quota of cavalry to the Maratha and abide by the instruction which would be conveyed to Svāḍī chief from time to time.\(^\text{40}\) But
one of the English records of April 1699 A.D. makes reference to the raid of the Marathas on the Svādi principality, their destruction and their retreat after accepting tributes from the Svādi chief.  

The Peshwas, during their heydays of their glory, regarded the chiefs of Sōde and the Keḷadi as their tributary and for that we have the evidence of the Peshwa daftars of 1717, 1752 A.D. But these chiefs constantly faced the raids of the Marathas under the Peshwas, as they could not pay the stipulated tribute to them. After receipt of the tribute, the Marathas withdrew. For instance, in 1720 A.D. the Marathas fell upon Svādi and the latter paid stipulated tributes to the former. Within five years after this event, Shahu, the grand son of 'Śivāja', took Svādi chief under the Maratha's protection. Even then, the Marathas under the direction of the Peshwas continued to harass the Svādi principality in the years 1726, 1743 and 1758 A.D. 

Similarly the Nāyakas of Keladi faced frequent incursions of the Marathas between 1725 and 1758 A.D. In almost all these cases, the Nāyakas of Keladiwarded off the Maratha menace by paying them tributes. Vīrammāja, the last ruler of the Keḷadi, made serious attempts to shake off the Marathas' overlordship, as it proved to be too costly.
to Keladi. In order to strengthen herself she allied herself with the chief of Chitradurga against the Marathas. Further she withheld the tribute to be paid to the Marathas. But the Marathas forced her to pay heavy tribute. On the eve of the close of our period, i.e., 1763 A.D. the Marathas were receiving tributes from the major rulers of Kanara like the Svādi chief and the Keladi Nāyakas. The tributes paid by these rulers especially the Keladi Nāyakas, to the Marathas caused misery to the people of Kanara and drained their treasury.

In the meantime the Angres, who nominally owed allegiance to the Peshwas, carried on raids independently in the neighbouring areas, also invaded the Kanara coast occasionally. The activities of Angres began in 1698 A.D. Kanhođi Angre's siege of Honnāvar in 1699 A.D. and his raid on Mangalore in 1720 A.D. were repulsed by the Keladi forces. Then followed a cordial relationship between the Angres and the Keladi Nāyakas. For example Tulaji Angre helped the Keladi Nāyaka (Sōmāśekhara II) in his military campaign in Malabar. However, the Keladi and the Angre's forces clashed in the days of Keladi Basava­ppanāyaka. The Angre gained upperhand and carried on plunder in the Keladi ports of Honnāvar, Gōkarna in North and Mangalore in South Kanara. Subsequently a treaty was concluded by them in 1751, which brought an end to their hostility.
In the course of the campaigns of the Angres in Kanara, the Europeans were the worst sufferers.

Other than plunder and disruption of the European activities, the Angres' activities did not achieve any substantial gain in Kanara. Thus, though there were continuous inroads of the Marathas in Kanara, they did not affect the sovereignty of Keladi as such. However, it did affect the economy of the kingdom seriously.
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