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"It is of the first importance to the nation and to the world that every citizen should study history and study it intelligently"—Sir John Fortesque, LL.D., D.Lit., in The Writing of History, 43.

"The really new element in the thought of to-day as compared with that of three centuries ago is the rise of history"—Human Nature and Human History by R. G. Collingwood, F.B.A.
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This authentic work on the History of Mysore, devoted to the Wadiyar Dynasty of Kings, through the centuries, inspired by His Highness’ SRI KRISHNARAJA WADIYAR BAHADUR IV of revered memory, and based on original materials garnered during many years, is
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In token of His Highness’ deep and abiding interest in the scientific study of History and the pursuit of Historical Research along modern lines

By his humble and loyal subject

THE AUTHOR
VOLUME I
(13*)'..)-1704)
PREFACE

THIS History of Mysore, based on the latest epigraphical, literary and historical researches, owes its inspiration to His Highness Sri Krishnarajendra Wodeyar Bahadur of revered memory, whose interest in promoting true historical research in the State is well known. His Highness instinctively believed that research flourishes most when it is left unhampered, but properly provided for. The extensive scientific researches carried out in the State, in its different Departments, during his long reign and the advantages secured by them in adding to the material wealth of the country and to the resources of its people are the best evidence of this bent of his supremely cultivated mind. Likewise it was in the case of Literary, Archaeological, Ethnographic and Historical researches.

The writing of a history of the kind now presented has been long a desideratum. The ideal author would be one who is both a great literary scholar and a historian. Such a person not being available, it was inevitable that somebody should make the experiment. It is an accident that it fell to my lot to attempt it. Though my disqualifications are many, I have two defences to offer: I was attracted to the task and I have laboured at it for nearly forty-two years. My first attempts go back indeed to 1901, when I first published papers on it in the public journals of the day. The literature of the successive periods dealt with has been read and carefully examined with a view to its utilization in reconstructing history,

The need for a work like this one, bringing together the results of the critical studies extending over a century and a quarter since Lieut-Col. Wilks wrote his
Historical Sketches of the South of India in an Attempt to trace the History of Mysoor, from the Origin of the Hindoo Government of that State to the extinction of the Mohammedan Dynasty in 1799, to set down the complete descriptive title of the work as given by him, will perhaps be conceded as a necessity, especially in view of the very vast archaeological and literary researches that have been carried out in Mysore itself, not to mention beyond it in the Madras and Bombay Presidencies and in the rest of British India and the Indian States. The setting up of the Indian Historical Records Commission at New Delhi, has, within the past twenty years, given a great impetus to the study of History in its larger sense, while active research in the domain of History has been receiving increased attention. The documents relied on in this work, whether epigraphical or other, come accordingly from not only places now forming part of Mysore State but also from others which originally formed part of it before the cessions of 1792 and 1799. Some, indeed, come from places far beyond the present territorial limits of the State, from neighbouring States over which Mysore had extended or had attempted to extend its sway. Exact references to all these documents will be found given in the work in the proper places. The work of publication of the records of the Governments of India, Madras and Bombay and the India Office has placed at the disposal of research students a vast amount of material in a form capable of being dealt with in a most convenient manner. These have been indented upon, as will be seen even by a casual reader of these Volumes. Besides, careful personal researches have been carried out in the different Record Offices, for instance at Madras, Calcutta, Bombay, as well as at the Historical Museum at Satara, and the results of the researches incorporated in the work. The Oriental Libraries at Madras and Mysore have been
carefully searched for literary MSS. bearing on the history of the period to which the present work relates, with considerable advantage. Indeed, it might be said that almost every available source has been indented upon to present as complete and as authentic an account of the history of the present Ruling Family of Mysore as was possible. All these have helped materially in the working up of the narrative, which, it is hoped, will afford some glimpses of the more important episodes of the centuries covered by us. Of the greater figures that appear, some realistic accounts have been given, particularly of Rāja Wodeyar, Kanṭhiṇava-Narasarāja, Chikka­devaraja, Nanjaraja, Haidar Ali and Tipu Sultan. Occasion has also been taken to correct errors which have long persisted. Take, for instance, Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar and his alleged strained relations with a class of influential priests of his time and the stories told of him in that connection. That the evidence available does not support them is to confess the bare truth. But so crusted old were the beliefs held in regard to them that something more has had to be said and this has been done in the proper context. It ought to suffice here if we quote a parallel case to show how hard it is sometimes to root out wrong beliefs, however once formed. Gibbon records, in one of his more celebrated chapters, the "secret persecution" of Christians by the Roman Emperors Maximian and Galerius "within their camp and palaces," a persecution "for which the imprudent zeal of the Christians sometimes offered the most specious pretences." But the "veracious historian" he is, while he quotes his authority for this statement (Eusebius, lib. 8, c. 4. c. 17), he is ready to acknowledge that Eusebius limits the number of military martyrs' What is more to the point is that he mentions in this connection the story that the Theban legion, consisting of six thousand Christians, suffered martyrdom by the
order of Maximian, in the valley of the Pennine Alps and says that "notwithstanding the authority of Eusebius, and the silence of Lactantius, Ambrose, Sulpicius, Orosius, etc., it has been long believed." Such is the force of wrong tradition. "The story was first published," according to Gibbon, "about the middle of the fifth century, by Eucherius, Bishop of Lyons, who received it from certain persons, who received it from Isaac, Bishop of Geneva, who is said to have received it from Theodore, Bishop of Octodurum." That seems the way that tradition sometimes is built up. (See Gibbon's *Decline and Fall* Chap. XVI.) The picture of Haidar Ali given here would seem incredible but for the authentication that the documents quoted in support of it provide. The occasion has been utilized for affording a vivid picture of the whole colourful background of the period which called forth the energies of titans like Stringer Lawrence, Eyre Coote, Clive, Haidar Ali and others who dominate the mid years of the 18th century in South India and make it of enduring interest. The whole dramatic story of Haidar's life is told in a manner that will, it is hoped, prove of value not only to the student of history but also to the lay reader.

A serious attempt too has been made to treat objectively the period of history relating to Haidar. We know little of the acts of Haidar, little of what he did to achieve his aims. His wars we know, but what did he do to put on the field his vast armies, which struck terror into the hearts of his enemies and raised wonder in the minds of his foreign observers and critics? How did he contrive to clothe them, feed them, discipline them and march them to the field to die for him and the country the served? A constructive effort was needed to do all that and to that constructive work of Haidar some space has been found in these pages. Haidar was not only a destroyer as a warrior generally is but also a reformer,
who tried to build up a new army and a new discipline modelled to an assimilable extent on European lines. It would not be wrong if we said that he tried to build a new State along new lines and that it did not endure because he failed to appreciate the fact that the essence of human endeavour is grounded in morality. Nor did he care to frame his mind to be pliant and obedient to occasion. His continual habit of dissimulation proved but a weak and sluggish cunning, not greatly politic. It practically undid even what he did achieve. All that he did seemed but a web of his wit; it worked nothing lasting. His life proved verily a tragedy, not only because it ended with his death outside the country he was in and worked for but also because nothing survived to show that such a giant of a man had ever dived.

No historical work relating to Mysore can pretend not to owe its deep acknowledgments to Wilks' great, indeed, classical work. Though he finished the first volume of his work as early as 1810 and the other two volumes of his original edition in 1817—two years after Waterloo and within twenty years of the last siege of Seringapatam—he covered the early and later periods of history in an admirable fashion. He not only had the aid of those who took part in the campaigns of which he wrote, but also he had the material aid of Dewan Purnaiya, with whose support he set up a historical commission, as it were, which proved of considerable help to him in dealing with the earlier reigns of the Mysore Kings. If he told occasionally legendary stories about them, it is because, as Mr. H. G. Wells has aptly observed, history cannot be understood without them. While his historical instinct was sound, his judgment was generally in the right, though towards certain of his contemporaries it might have been marred slightly, as has been suspected in certain quarters. But Wilks' work cannot be superseded in any sense of the
term, though he may have to be used with caution for the earlier and even parts of the later periods in view of the advance made by modern research, archaeological and other. It is as much a classic as Orme's *Indostan* or Duff's *Mahrattas*, whatever their shortcomings from any point of view. At any rate, the present work does not attempt that altogether impossible feat and fully acknowledges its own indebtedness to Wilks' great labours as a pioneer in the field of *Mysore History* and seeks but to supplement its rich stores in a small way.

But there is need to remember one limitation to Wilks' great work, a work that filled with admiration the leading men and women of his times and helped to earn for him a Fellowship of the Koyal Society. What might be said of Orme's work may be said of Wilks' as well. Both have, for instance, written of Haidar. But the histories of Orme and Wilks belong to periods too close to Haidar All to be either full or free from doubt. They reflect the views of the English, while those of the French writers of the period—De La Tour and the rest of them—reflect those of the nation they belonged to. What Haidar and Tipū have said of themselves or what their own historians said of them we have some accounts of in the writings of the annalists of the period. Among these are the anonymous author of the *Haidar-Nāmdh*, Hussain Ali Khan Kirmani, Mirza Ikbal and others. While the histories of Orme and Wilks contain very little else—as Col. Miles acutely remarked writing as long back as 1842—than the wars the English waged in both the portions of the Karnātic in furious fashion, the annalists devote only a very small part of their space to these wars of the English. They help us to realize Haidar the man and the Usurper and Tipū the youth and the tyrant. There are other advantages as well to be derived from a study of these annalists, even in the purely historical portions, Kirmani's version, for instance, is generally
consistent with Orme's account up to 1760, except with regard to Trichinopoly, which is worthy of note. It is Trichinopoly that brought Mysore in the first instance into prominence in South India during what may be called the Anglo-French period and it was the injustice done to Mysore in regard to Trichinopoly that fired Haidar's imagination with the conquest of the South. The subsequent attempt to drive the Europeans—not merely the English—out of India is directly traceable to that cause. The annalists, therefore, have a place, however small or insignificant, in the study of the period dominated by Haidar and Tipū, quite apart from the help they give us to understand them as men who lived their lives to attain the objectives they aimed at.

Of the French writer De La Tour, who had served under Haidar All and whose work Ayder Ali was published as early as 1784, within two years of the death of Haidar All, though written while he was still alive, a special word would seem to be necessary in view of the adverse opinion passed on him. Wilks, indeed, goes so far as to castigate him in a foot-note in the body of his work. "The Frenchman calling himself Commander of artillery and General of ten thousand in the army of the Moghul, who has published the history of Hyder Ali Khan and was present in the service (in the fight at Tiruvannamalai), states," he writes, "the single trophy of the English to have been one iron three-pounder; this is a specimen of what he may be presumed to have seen. What he relates on the authority of others, resembles the information of a dramatic quidnunc, who hears everything, and seizes the wrong end of all that he hears" (Wilks, Mysoor, I. 587, f.n.). De La Tour considered Haidar a mon ami of his, "my friend," and perhaps wrote much of what he did write out of friendship for Haidar. We may even concede that he wrote as a frank partisan, but there, seems no justification for the
charge that he was deliberately falsifying history to suit his own ends. He says he was Commander-in-chief of Artillery in Haidar's army and of a body of European troops in it and that he has adhered to the strictest impartiality in relating Haidar's exploits. It must, however, be admitted he had strong national and political prejudices and these prejudices influenced his narrative. Hardly less serious defects than his political and national bias are his omissions, his want of the sense of proportion and his easy gullibility. Though he calls himself a "historian" and styles his book a "history," and asserts that "the true dignity and importance of history is placed in truth," and though he does not spare his own countrymen who had, in his view, "behaved unworthily" any more than Englishmen, while doing justice to Generals like Coote, Smith and Goddard, he is lacking in the sense of discrimination, and allows himself to be carried away by mere gossip in the most serious matters affecting a person's reputation. He disarms criticism by pleading that "if any of his recitals should be contrary to the ideas of certain persons acquainted with the same events, he begs they will please make a distinction between the facts he himself has been witness to, and those he could only learn from the information of others," The most that could be said about him is that as a witness he is at once honest and well informed in the few matters he writes of. For some aspects of Haidar's character, he is, at any rate, an indisputable witness. De La Tour gives us a summary of what he saw rather than a good and striking picture of the man Haidar. Not one of the 18th century writers, indeed, gives such a picture, as they only saw aspects of the man's work and character. There can be no question that great care and caution are needed in using him, but there can be no doubt that he is of some value for reconstructing the history of Haidar's period.
This work of De La Tour has had such vogue that it went through many editions in France in his own time in French, the language in which it was written, and in England in the translation in which it appeared first in 1784. A copy of the first edition of this translation, published in London in 1784, is to be found in the Conneraara Library, Madras, and another is now in the Mysore University Library, Mysore. Later, in 1855, Prince Gholam Mohammed, the only surviving son of Tipu Sultan, revised and corrected it, and re-issued it, by Messrs. W. Thacker & Co., in London. A reprint of the London edition of 1784, however, issued in 1848 at Calcutta is well known. This was published by Messrs. Sanders, Cones & Co., No. 7, Mission Eow of that city. This demand for De La Tour's book shows its appeal, whatever its merits. Some of its statements were hotly contested by English writers, one of the earliest to do so being Captain Francis Robson in his "Life of Hyder Ally", who published his work in 1786. He had lived "20 years in India" and had "been present in most of the actions fought between the English and Hyder Ally." Robson, who states he wrote his account of the war with Haidar, to correct the errors of De La Tour, and on whose narrative Wilks' own is primarily based in part, stands corrected in the light of contemporary records since published. But Robson cannot on that account be held to have not written the truth or written what he believed not to be the truth! Wilks' criticism of De La Tour has been referred to above, but neither Robson nor Wilks can be held to wholly invalidate De La Tour as the only source for some authoritative information about Haidar and his doings. Hence his importance, though he has to be used with due care and caution.

No apology is therefore needed for presenting Haidar in this work, in the character in which he has been seen
by posterity. Great as he was as a soldier, a commander, an organiser of armies, and as a practical administrator, we have reason to remember that he was also fired by human ambitions and was guilty of acts of which many a historical character has been adjudged guilty. That he secretly canvassed the death of some of his royal masters while professing loyal allegiance to them outwardly as the Regent of Mysore has now to be admitted, and that the eighteenth century picture of his having been a kindlier man than his son Tipu cannot well be substantiated to some extent at least. For the rest, the facts set out in these Volumes ought to speak for themselves. Similarly, the portrait of Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar drawn here is of the 17th century original and not the 19th century reproduction. Sivaji, again, is seen to be dominated by the ambitions of not only a kingdom but an empire as well. It was the greatness of the vanishing Vijayanagar Empire that to some extent kindled, we now realize, the political ambitions of that great military genius. The operations of the Mughals in the Deccan in the 17th century, although they broke to pieces the Consistency of both the Muslim and Hindu principalities, substituted no paramount authority in their place, and thus furnished an opportunity for the rise, not of military adventurers, as some past historians have remarked, but of the Mahratta Empire, and of the Empire dreamt of by Chikkadevaraja and later by Nanjaraja, the Dalavai, and last but not least by Haidar, backed by all the resources of Mysore and the country that was once Keladi. It was not so much a scramble for power, annihilating all right except that of the sword, but a fight for keeping out, each in his turn and in his own way, the other from dominating a territory that was not legitimately his. No doubt the disorder, and even the anarchy, that resulted opened the way for the
contentions of the English and the French, and the ultimate establishment of a British Empire in India. The attempt of Chikkadēvarāja and Nanjarāja, the Dalavāi, is better appreciated when we remember the connection of Mysore with the Vijayanagar Empire and the Empire that Haidar dreamt of was but an inverted picture of the Hindu attempt at continuity of existence in the South of India, which in his son's hands became a veritable attempt at the establishment, if possible, of a Muslim Sultanate with all the paraphernalia of a foreign hierarchy of officials, which offended the practical good sense of even the Persian annalists of the period. From the large documentary evidence tendered in these Volumes, it will be seen how hard the representatives of Mysore fought for the possession of the South and how just their cause was and how they were foiled of it. The struggle for the possession of the South before the Anglo-French struggle, so familiar to students of history, was preceded by a struggle between the Mahrattas and Mysore and between Mysore and Nawab Muhammad Ali, the alleged Mughal representative, whose credentials for the pretensions he set forth were forged firmans of which Orme makes no secret in his writings. If History is, indeed, a record of something more than struggles in space, it is only when we reduce the apparent struggle between certain apparent forces into the real struggles which vary from age to age, between competing races and civilizations, that the story gains point as well as dimension. The history of 18th century Mysore shows that it put forth its wealth of men and money to retain the South to those it justly belonged and it seems but right that this attempt at local freedom should be recorded in a manner worthy of the theme.

The process of sifting of facts that go to make up history is subject to the ordinary laws of historical
evidence. One cannot shape history as he chooses. He has to base it on certain ascertained facts. "Critical" history like "critical" biography, since the time of Fronde, demands inquiry and appreciation of facts, of evidence, of direct documentary or other tangible proof. The search for material is attended with difficulty, the more so as you recede into earlier periods. But almost every source has to be worked up—public acts, spoken words, monuments, inscriptions, visits to places connected with the events of the period and the persons figuring in it; travels over the scene of the campaigns fought; narratives of contemporary writers and annalists, etc. Nearly all these sources have been made use of in these Volumes. A study such as this is bound to help not only towards understanding the prominent men of the period but also enabling us to trace the workings of their minds. To understand a man is to know his mind and its intricate workings. Without such knowledge, you cannot understand either his genius or how he manages to dominate a period. Such is the case with the greater men and women who figure in these pages. Human action is as much governed by mental as by physical laws and the history of a nation in its truest sense is the history of tendencies which are perceived by the mind and not of the events which are discovered by senses. It is, in a word, the illumination of the mind that directly contributes to the making of the events which, in the common sense, make up history.

A word or two may, perhaps, be added about other important matters relating to this work. The problem of illustrations, always a difficult one, has been especially hard. In regard to it, care has been taken to make them representative. The maps are not by any means hypothetical but are intended to bring out the historical position of the time they belong to. They
must be deemed part of the text, the most vital and
decorative part-
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The Volumes forming this work, being intended expressly for rapid reference, it has been sought, by an ever-increasing insertion of marginal notes and other references, to make them indices unto themselves. It is hoped that these notes would prove a convenience to the general reader as well.

This work, it will be seen, stops at 1799, with the installation of Sri Krishnaraja Wodeyar III. The story of his memorable reign is proposed to be told, circumstances permitting, in a volume by itself, while in another volume, it is hoped to cover the reigns of 6rl ChSmaraja Wodeyar IX and Srí Krishflaraja Wodeyar IV, thus ending the series with the coming to the throne of Srí Jayachamaraja Wodeyar Bahadur, the present Ruler of Mysore.

BANGALORE, )
24th March 1948. ) C. HAYAVADANA RAO.
I. MANUSCRIPTS.

1. TRADITION RECORDED IN LATER WRITINGS

Among the Mss. which are helpful in the elucidation of the early history of the Ruling Dynasty of Mysore and the reconstruction of its genealogy are:


Mysūru-Rdvra-Charitre (c. 1800) by Venkaṭaramapaiya. Mss. Nos. 19-1-12 and 19-3-44, P.; Mad. Or. Lib. (A paper Ms. of this work bearing No. A. 273 under the title Mysūru-Dhoregala-Pūrvdbhuydaya-Vivara by Thimmappaiya and others is available in the Mysore Oriental Library).

Bettadakōṭe-Kaifiyat (c. 1800). Ms. No. 18-15-20; P.; Mad.'Or. Lib.


* This Bibliography relates to the entire period 1899-1799. For a discussion and estimate of the sources of the History of Mysore for the period down to 1761 vide Ch. I of this Volume; for the period 1761-1799, vide Vol. II. Appendix IV— (2), pp. 786-791. All the authorities—including the numerous literary and other works of general interest—will be foundi specifically referred to or noticed in the proper places in the course of the work. The Genealogical Tables have been given at the end of Vol III.

Among the Mss. in the Local Records of the Mackenzie Collection in the Madras Oriental Mss. Library recording traditions relating to Haidar's period of office in Mysore (from 1761 onwards) are the Haidarana-Kaifiyat (c. 1800) and the Nāgarada-Kaifiyat (c. 1800). Mss. Vols. 24 and 43, P.

2. CONTEMPORARY LITERARY WORKS (enshrining tradition, etc.)

Among the literary Mss. bearing incidentally on the genealogy and history of the Ruling Dynasty of Mysore, etc., in the 17th and 18th centuries are:—

Devaraja-Sangatya (c. 1670) by Chamaiya. Ms. No. 19-3-44, P.; Mad. Or. Lib.


Munivamidbhyudaya (c. 1700) by Chidānanda: Ms. No. A. 198, P.; Mys. Or. Lib.


Sringarardjatilaka-Bhdttiah (c. 1733) by Avināslvara. Ms. No. 12, 708, Ditto.

Nanjardja-Vanivilasa Tiku (c. 1734-1751), a series of literary works by Karāchūri Nanjarāja. See Vol. I I, pp. 606-609, with f. n., for details of these paper and palm leaf Mss. in the Mysore and Madras Oriental Libraries.
3. INSCRIPTIONS.


4. CONTemporARy CHRONICLES AND MEMOIRS,

*Memoirs of Hyder Ally* (1770) by Eloy Joze Correa Peixoto. British Museum Additional Mss. 19,287. The copy in the Mysore Archaeological Office, made available for examination by courtesy of the Director of Archaeology, is said to have been purchased by the late Mr. M. N. Balaraj Urs when he was on a visit to London. The author, as he tells us, served in the Mysore army under Haidar as "Chief of the vanguard and of all the European Fusiliers and one Regiment of Grenadiers" during 1758-1767, and as officer in charge of "all the Europeans with firelocks" during 1769-1770. The Ms. in 160 pages contains useful particulars relating to the rise of Haidar and the events of the early years of his regime in Mysore down to 1770. It has also been noticed at some length in the *M. A. R.* for 1937, pp. 82-119.

*Haidar-Ndmah* (1784). An anonymous work, a *Bahhar* in 110 folios from His Highness the Maharaja's Palace Library, Mysore; the earliest available contemporary local chronicle in Kannada, bearing on the life and times of Haidar, completed about two years after his death; a reliable supplementary authority for the period
down to 1782. A copy of this work from Nallappa's family, known as Nallappa Ms., has been noticed at some length in the M. A. B. for 1930, pp. 79-106.

5. DESPATCHES, LETTERS, MINUTES AND OTHER CONTEMPORARY DOCUMENTS.

An invaluable authority for the history of Mysore in the 18th century are The Fort St. George Records for the period 1760-1799, preserved in the archives of the Madras Record Office. The following among other series were consulted:—

Country Correspondence, Vols. VIII-XIII, XVI-XIX, XXIV, XXV, XXVII, XXVIII, XXXI, XXXIII, XXXVI, and XXXIX.

Despatches to England, Vols. V, VI, XVI-XVIII.

Military Consultations, Vols. XIII-XV, XXII-XXVIII, XXX, XXXIX, XL, XLI, XLVI, XLVII, LXXX-LXXXXV, LXXXVIII, LXXXIX, XCI, OXIX, CXXVII, CXXXIV, CLXVI, CLXVII, CLXXXII, CCXXI and CCXXIX.

Military Sundries, Vols. XXXII, XLV, LXXII, XCI, CI, CXI.

Secret Consultations, Vols. IV-VI.

Tellicherry Factory Records (Diaries and Letters Received), Vols. XXVIII, XXIX; and Vols, for 1765-1768.

Among other Mss. consulted are the Macartney Papers of the Parasnis Collection, preserved in the Satara Historical Museum—see sections IV-6 (a) and (6) and V (6) of the General Catalogue in the Museum. These consist of Lord Macartney's correspondence in seven volumes of copy books, called the Phillipps Mss., and the papers proper in 22 bundles of loose sheets—mostly autographs—roughly arranged in eleven sections. They cover a wide field ranging from 1775 to 1792, and the documents relating to India, besides containing occasional references-
to Mysore, reflect, in the main, the course of Indian affairs during 1781-1785, the period of Lord Macartney's Governorship of Madras.

The Marathi Bumdls in the Museum are mostly collections of news-letters in Mod̄i characters—see sections I and II of the General Catalogue. They are contained in the Manavli Daftar of Nana Fadnis in the Parasnis collection. They bear on the Mysore-Mahratta affairs during the period c. 1780-1798, and require close attention.
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(a) Historical compilations (based on or referring to original sources.)


Early Records of British India. Calcutta, 1879.
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Bice, B. L.: Mysore Gazetteer. Vols. I and II.
Westminster, 1897.
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London, 1914.
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II and III: Bangalore, 19 J 9, 1929.
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Oxford, 1924.
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*Bussy in the Deccan*. Dr. Miss. A. Cammiadé's Translation of portions of Prof. A. Martineau's work. Pondicherry, 1941.


(b) Periodicals.

Articles on Mysore History with special reference to South India, published [from time to time in the pages of the Madras Review, Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society, Journal of Indian History, Half-yearly Journal
of the Mysore University, Modern Review, Hindustan Review, Indian Historical Quarterly and Proceedings of the Indian Historical Records Commission. Vols, for the period from 1900 onwards.
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CHAPTER I.

THE SOURCES OF MYSORE HISTORY.


The earliest attempt at writing a history of Mysore was made by Lt. Col. Mark Wilks (1760-1831), British Resident at the Court of Mysore (1803-1808). His work, Historical Sketches of the South of India in an attempt to trace the History of Mysoor, was first published in 1810 and has remained an authority on the subject since then. Wilks, however, carefully avoided giving his book the title of "History." Writing as he did in the early years of the nineteenth century when archaeological and historical research in India was yet in its infancy and when he had to depend mostly on the uncritical summaries and translations of admittedly a few of the local sources (such as memoirs and chronicles of a later date) available to him, Wilks's treatment of the

early history of Mysore, from the origin and founding of the Ruling House down to the usurpation of Haidar Ali (1399-1761), is neither exhaustive nor satisfactory judging from the critical demands of modern scholarship.\(^2\)

The principal sources\(^3\) for the history of this period, now available, are, however, of a two-fold character—primary and secondary. Among the primary sources are: inscriptions, literary works, coins, travels and tracts, contemporary chronicles and memoirs, *The Records of Fort St. George*, *The Diary of Ananda Ranga Pillai* and *The Selections from the Peshwa Daftar*. The secondary sources comprise later compilations.

Inscriptions\(^4\)—lithic as well as copper-plate—of the rulers of the Woḍeyar dynasty of Mysore, come, for the most part, from the present districts of Mysore, Hassan, Bangalore and Tumkur, and from parts of Salem and Coimbatore districts of the Madras Presidency. They are found scattered over the volumes of the *Epigraphia Carnatica* (including the supplemental volumes for Mysore and Bangalore districts), the *Mysore Archaeological Report*, the *Madras Epigraphist's Report*, the *Inscriptions of the Madras Presidency* and the *Mackenzie Collection* (in the Madras Oriental Manuscripts Library). They range from the middle of the sixteenth century to about the close of the eighteenth. Being mostly dated records in Kannada or Sanskrit, they generally relate to gifts, donations and grants of the rulers to institutions

---

2. Wilks has been invariably followed by all subsequent writers, notably by B. L. Bice in the *Mys. Gaz.* (I. 361-381), and by S. K. Aiyangar in *Ancient India*. The latter, in his brief but "imperfect sketch" (pp. 272-313), goes a step further in trying to utilise a few of the inscriptions, literary works and the *Palace History*, available to him.

8. For details about the sources indicated and discussed here, *vide* General Bibliography and text of Chapters (with f.n.) and the Appendices thereto.

4. Include *nirupas* (Orders) also.
(such as temples and maths) and private individuals. A few of these, however, incidentally throw light on the pedigree of the ruler of the time and echo the event or events connected with his rule or his predecessor's. Though by no means an adequate source of information, these documents, used with care, are of great value in identifying and locating the rulers and in reconstructing their genealogy and the political and social history of their times.

Most of the literary works extant—in Kannada and Sanskrit—owe their origin to royal patronage in] Mysore during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Only a few of these have been so far published, while the rest are preserved still in the form of manuscripts—palm-leaf and paper—in the Government Oriental Manuscripts Libraries at Mysore and Madras. Exceptions apart, these works are generally undated and the probable chronological limits of their composition are determinable only from their internal data and, in certain cases, from inscriptions referring to or quoting from them. Written in poetical or prose form, they relate, in the main, to religion, philosophy, poetics, morals, etc., and refer only incidentally to the reigning king of the time, his pedigree and achievements. Only a few of the productions, however, profess to deal with the traditional history of the Euling House (down to 1610) and the genealogy and exploits of the author's patron—as, for instance, the Kanthirava-Narasardja-Vijayam (1648) of Grovinda-Vaidya, the Chikkadevardya-Vamsavali (c. 1678-1680), the Chikkadevaraja-Vijayam (c. 1682-1686) and the Apratima-VtRa-Charitam (c. 1695-1700) of Tirumalārya, and the Saundara-Kāvyā (c. 1740) of Nuronda. And even these works are more literary in character than regular histories. Nevertheless the value

5. See, for instance, section on Literary activity, in Ch. XIV below.
of literary works—as a supplemental source of information—in historical reconstruction, is not inconsiderable, provided, in using them, due allowance is made for the literary flourishes, fulsome eulogies, etc., characteristic of them.

Although the available coin-types of the Woḍeyars of Mysore are few, they are of unique importance as witnesses to contemporary history. Especially the coins issued by Kaṇṭhārava-Narasaraṇa Woḍeyar I (1638-1659) and Chikkadevaraṇa Woḍeyar (1673-1704), throw valuable light on the political evolution of the kingdom of Mysore and the religion of the Ruling House in the seventeenth century.

The travels and tracts include the letters of Father J. Bertrand (S. J.) included in the La Mission Du Madure (1659-1686), John Lockman's Travels of the Jesuits (1701), Dr. John Fryer's Travels in India (c. 1676-1680), Niccolao Manucci's Storio Do Mogor (1653-1708) and the gleanings and extracts from documents published in Robert Orme's Historical Fragments, William Foster's English Factories in India and the Proceedings of the Indian Historical Records Commission. These records generally contain the observations of the Jesuit missionaries and foreign travellers and settlers, on the political events, customs and manners in South India in general, and Mysore in particular. Their chief merit consists in that they supplement the local sources by throwing a flood of light on the foreign relations of Mysore, which, but for them, would have been lost for ever. Foreign observers are, however, not always accurate in their accounts, are sometimes found to be misinformed and are not infrequently known to exaggerate. While, therefore, their writings are indispensable authorities for the history of the period (c. 1630-1705), they are to be used with caution.
Of the contemporary chronicles and memoirs, the *Muhammad-Namah*, recently brought to light by Sir Jadunath Sarkar in the columns of the *Modern Review*, is an undated manuscript official history in Persian, of the reign of Muhammad Adil Shah of Bijāpur (1627-1656), by Zahur bin Zahuri. It deals, among others, with the campaigns of the Bijapur generals in the Karnāṭak and Mysore between c. 1638-1654, a period practically covered by the reign of Kanṭhirava-Narasarāja Wodeyar I (1638-1659) in Mysore. Its chief peculiarity, however, is that while it corroborates and supplements other sources of information, it contradicts them also. It requires, therefore, to be handled with care, as an authority for the history of Kanṭhirava's reign. The *Tuzak-i-Wdldjdhi* (1781) of Burhan Ibn Hasan of Trichinopoly, recently translated from Persian and published in part under the auspices of the University of Madras, deals with the history of the Nawabs of Arcot (c. 1700-1761). Written from the point of view of the contemporary Indian chronicler, it embodies a wealth of detail relating to the history of South India during the eighteenth century that is worthy of note. Its chief value for us, however, consists in enabling us to understand and estimate the foreign politics of the kingdom of Mysore (c. 1740-1761), from the larger perspective of South Indian affairs of the period. The *Haidar-Namah* (1784), an old paper manuscript (*Bakhar*) from H. H. the Maharaja's Palace Library, Mysore, is a memoir in Kannāḍa, of the life and times of Haidar All (1717-1782). It is an anonymous work, the writing of which, according to internal evidence, was finished in June 1784, i.e., an year and a half after its composition.  

6. See also and compare *M.A.R.*, 1980, pp. 79-106, noticing a copy of this Ms. from a private source (i.e. from Nallappa's family).
after the death of Haidar. The manuscript bears throughout the stamp of freshness of outlook and independence and vigour of judgment on the part of the author. While the work is a source of first-hand information for the history of the period of Haidar's usurpation in Mysore (1761-1782), it is an equally reliable authority for the reign of Krishnārāja Woḍeyar II (1734-1766), particularly in regard to Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya's struggle for Trichinopoly, the early career and rise of Haidar All and the course of events leading to his usurpation (1751-1761). Though not exhaustive, it supplies, on these topics, the genuine contemporary point of view of the local historian, while the chronology of events recorded in it, stands the test of comparison with the other sources for the period. The Haidar-Nāṇḍh even records, with a fair degree of accuracy, certain details connected with the general history of South India (c. 1740-1761).

The Records of Fort St. George, bearing on Mysore thus far published, comprise, the Diary and Consultation Book (1679, 1694, 1696, 1698, 1733-1734, 1739, 1752-1756), Country Correspondence (1740, 1751, 1753-1755, 1757-1758), Selections from Public Consultations, Letters, etc., (1740-1741), Fort St. David Consultations (1740), Letters to Fort St George (1682, 1712, 1738-1741), Letters from Fort St George (1698, 1736, 1739-1740, 1743-1744), Despatches to England (1701-1702 to 1710-1711, 1711-1714, 1727-1733, 1741-1742, 1743-1746), French Correspondence (1752), Letters from Tellicherry (1732-1733, 1733-1734, 1734-1736), Tellicherry Consultations (1732-1733, 1734-1735, 1737-1738).

8. For a guide to these Records, see Press List of Ancient Records in Fort St. George (1670-1796); also Dodwell's Hand-book of Madras Records.
9. The Diary and Consultation Book and Country Correspondence contain documents of Military and Public Departments of the Government of Port St. George, Madras. They are the same as the Military Consultations and the Militaryflountry Correspondence in the unpublished form.
1745-1751) and the extracts from documents published in Dodwell's *Calendar of the Madras Records* (1740-1744) and *The Madras Despatches* (1744-1755, 1754-1765) and in Talboys Wheeler's *Madras in the Olden Time* (History of Madras) and *Early Records of British India*. These records, including the unpublished volumes of *Military Consultations* and *Military Country Correspondence* (for 1760-1761), contain information of a varied character. They generally relate to the administration of the affairs of the English East India Company on the Coromandel and West coasts and to the colonial and commercial rivalry between the English and the French in India, particularly during 1746-1761. They refer only incidentally to the course of political events in South India in general and Mysore in particular, in so far as they affected the Company's commercial interests in the country and brought them into contact with the Indian powers of the time. While the *Tellicherry Letters* and *Consultations* yield some light on the early relations of Mysore with Malabar (1733-1746), the remaining series of records, to a considerable extent, supplement the other sources of information on the foreign and political affairs of the kingdom of Mysore, roughly during c. 1679-1761. So valuable, indeed, are these records (especially the *Diary and Consultation Book*, *Country Correspondence* and the unpublished volumes for 1760-1761), that they become an indispensable authority for the period 1751-1761. *The Records of Fort St. George*, as is usually the case with foreign sources, are not, however, always accurate in their references to the internal affairs of Mysore and are, in such cases, to be used with caution.

*The Private Diary of Ananda Banga Pillai* (1747-1761) and the news-letters contained in the recently published volumes of the *Selections from the Peshwa Daftar* (1746-1761), likewise constitute a
supplemental source of information of considerable value, on the affairs of Mysore during 1746-1761, from the French and the Mahratta points of view. They, however, are, as of necessity to be used with great care, especially as they often record from hearsay and are, sometimes, not well-informed.

Among the secondary sources, unpublished and published, are, the Mysiru-Dhoregaḷa-Puṇvdbhayudaya-Vivara\(^{10}\) (c. 1710-1714), Mysuru-Nagarada-Purvottara\(^{11}\) (c. 1734-1740), Mīṣuru-Dhoregaḷa-Vamidvali, (c. 1800), Mysiru-Rdjara-Charitre (c. 1800) by Venkaṭaramanaiya, the Kaifiyats (c. 1800-1804), the Kelādi-Nripa-Vijayarn\(^{12}\) (c. 1800), a Hala-Kannaḍa Champu by Lingaṇṇa-Kavi, the Kalale-Arasugala-VamSdvali (c. 1830), the Rdjdvali-Kathd (1838) of Dvachandra and the Annals of the Mysore Royal Family\(^{13}\) (first compiled in the Mysore Palace, in 1864-1865). Although these sources, in Kannada, are, as indicated, compilations of a later date, they are by no

10. This is one of the few later compilations relied upon by Wilks. For a detailed account of the Ms., vide Ch. XV and Appendix VII—(2).
11. This paper Ms. from the Mad. Or. Lib. (No. 18-15-18, pp. 24-80), is the same as the one referred to as having been in the possession of Mr. Muddaraja Urs, a former Bakshi of the Kḥats Samukha Department of the Mysore Palace (Annals, I I . 86-88). The Annals (I I . 86), however, speaks of it as having been written in 1785 (cf. 1707). But the Ms. from Madras, examined by us, is undated and stops with the beginning of Krishnaraja Wodeyar II's reign (1784-1766). It appears to have been compiled, in all probability, between c. 1784-1740, though it is not impossible that a copy of it was made in 1785. Wilks, as we shall see, makes use of this Ms. also, in his work.
12. The Editorial Introduction (p. vii) to this published work, fixes it between c. 1768-1804. For convenience of reference, the medium date, c. 1800, is adopted here.
13. This Kannada work, otherwise known as Palace History, was first published, during the reign of H. H. Sri Chamarajendra Wodeyar (1881-1894), as Vamtaratndkara. It has been revised, enlarged and republished in two parts (Part I in 1916 and Part II in 1922), under the title Vamia-vali, by Mr. B. Ramakrishna Rao, late Palace Controller, Mysore. Part I deals with the period 1899-1868, and Part II contains a detailed account of the reign of H. H. Sri Krishnaraja Wodeyar I I I (1799-1868).
means to be ignored. Based as they generally are on earlier writings, they are chronicles of a quasi-historical character. Often they reflect genuine local tradition and sometime enshrine valuable material and sometimes throw sidelights which enable the modern historian to invest his characters with flesh and blood and give a complete picture of their lives and times. Especially where other sources fail, he has to rely, to a certain extent, on these sources. Their reliability, however, is one of degree. Sometimes their statements are loose and their chronology defective and confused, while some of them interpolate and are actually gossipy in character. Extreme caution and great discrimination are, therefore, necessary in utilising them. For it is a critical and comparative study of these writings alone which must precede any serious attempt at historical reconstruction.
CHAPTER II.

PRE-WODEYAR DYNASTIES IN MYSORE.


FROM time immemorial the area now covered by the State of Mysore has had an individuality and importance of its own. Traces of paleolithic and neolithic settlements in different parts of the country point to its pre-history. During the Vedic and Epic periods it would appear to have formed part and parcel of the non-Aryan belt of territory in the south and the scene of contact between Aryan and non-Aryan races in it. The Mauryas ruled over a portion of the country during the last centuries before Christ leaving their memorial edicts. Recent excavations—at Chandravalli in the present Chitaldrug district—go to show that the Satavahanas held their sway over it in the early centuries of the Christian era, with a fairly advanced civilisation. The Kadambas, the Gangas, the Chalukyas, the Cholas, the Hoysalas and the Vijayanagar Emperors, among others, successively governed the country or parts of it leaving vestiges of their rule. Geographically the country during these epochs formed, as it does now, part of the Karnataka (Kar-nddu, Karnata, Kannada), being apparently a division of, or coterminous with, the extensive tract Variously referred to in inscriptions and other sources as Kuntala-desa, Erumai-nddu, Mahisha-mcndala, etc.
The rise of Vijayanagar (1336-1530) following closely on the decadence of the empire of the Hoysalas, was an important landmark in the political and cultural evolution of the Karnāṭak, particularly the central and southern parts of what at present constitutes the district of Mysore. Indeed Vijayanagar was the heir and successor of the Hoysalas. The Hoysalas gradually disappeared from the arena of history but left lasting relics of their government in the tracts over which they had exercised their control. The division of administrative units into nddu and simė and the system of provincial administration under members of the ruling family as imperial representatives, were among the most significant legacies of their rule trans, mitted to their illustrious successors. Consequently the feudatories in various parts of the Hoysala dominions had to transfer their allegiance from their erstwhile supreme but declining masters to the progressive and steadily advancing sovereigns of Vijayanagar. The imperial policy of the latter towards them was generally centripetal, the objective being the maintenance of the statics quo on the one hand and stemming the ever-growing tide of Muhammadan advance on the south on the other. The task of welding together the heterogenous elements of the body-politic scattered over the remote corners of the empire, from the Tungabhadra in the north up to the Tamraparni and Ramesvaram in the far south, proved, therefore, of more than ordinary importance to the energetic and far-sighted monarchs of the period. The dynasties of old feudatories, while reconciling themselves to the new situation, evinced their loyalty to their new masters, exceptions apart. In certain cases, the tracts formerly under the Hoysalas, had to be reconquered at the point of the sword and a new line or lines of chiefs, loyal to the imperial cause, set over them as local rulers.
The more remote the local administrative unit was from the imperial capital, the more frequent was the need for the adoption of a policy of this type. Another method of exercising effective sway over such territories was, it would seem, the extending of encouragement to enterprising members of ruling dynasties of repute who sought imperial patronage and protection, to settle there under imperial authority and to carry on the administration as feudatories, generally subordinate to the empire through their immediate superior, a Viceroy (Mahamandalesvara).

During the period of which we are writing (1336-1530), the political geography of Southern Kannāṭaka—which occasioned the rise of the town of Mysore, from which the kingdom and the State derive their name—was as follows: On the north, it was bounded by parts of the modern Bangalore and Tumkur districts then going by the name of Morasa-naḍu, ruled over by the Kannāḍa speaking chieftains of the Morasu-Vokkaliga community; to the south lay the territory of the Tamilians (Kongunddu, Chola-mandala, Pandya-desa); in the east and the north-east was the kingdom of the Telugu chieftains with Mulbagal (Muluvoy) as the seat of their authority; and in the west and the north-west flourished the Changāyas and the Male-rджya (kingdom of the hilly tract)—all these territories and powers being under the control of the imperial house of Vijayanagar. The Southern Kannāṭaka itself, comprising mostly parts of central and southern taluks of the present district of Mysore (i.e., Nagamangala, Seringapatam, Mysore, Nanjangūḍ, Heggadēsvankote, Gundlupet, Chamaraja-nagar, T.-Narasipur and Malavalli), generally appears to have been known by the name of Hosana-naḍu—after the Hoysalas—with such divisions as Kuruvaṇka-naḍu, Uduvanka-naḍu, Muḍuvanka-naḍu, etc., the portion of the country immediately surrounding Seringapatam and
the units \((sime)\) in its neighbourhood, in particular, forming part of the Kuruvanka-ṇāḍu. The whole of this area was divided into a congeries of principalities ruled over by feudal chieftains, of varying degrees of status, under the designation of \(Wodeyar,\) a colloquial word meaning generally "lord," "master."

Terakanambi, Seringapatam \((Srirangapattana)\), Ummattūr and Sivasamudram were among the places which loom large in the history of the period under the Vijayanagar rulers. Inscriptions reveal, to some extent, the connection of these places with the imperial dynasty. Chikka-Kampanṇa Woḍeyar, a son of Bukka I (1356-1376), was the governor of the Terakaṇāmbi province. Under Harihara II (1376-1404), Achaṇṇa Woḍeyar was in charge of the Hoysala country. Chikka-Dēvappa, under Deva-Raya I (1406-1422), was governing the Ummattur territory. Harihara-Raya III, a son of Dēvā-Raya I, was also the governor of the Terakaṇāmbi kingdom. Under Bukka III I (1422-1424), Vīra-Pārvati-Rayā Wodeyar, a son of his, was ruling the same province as a Mahamandalesvara. Nanja-Raja Woḍeyar and Depañṇa Woḍeyar, two of the sons of Mallikārjunā (1446-1487), ruled over different parts of the same tract, also under the designation of Mahdmandaletivara, while Timmanna-Dannayaka, a general of note, appears to have held the charge of the Seringapatam province. Narasa Nāyaka, under Šaluva-Narasimha I (1486-1497), was connected with the administration of the southern part of Seringapatam as his Mahapradhana (chief minister). He even claims to have conquered the latter place. During the same period Parvataiyā, another son of Mallikārjunā, was in charge of the Terakaṇāmbi country. Narasa Nāyaka himself, on his accession as the Vijayanagar ruler (1497-1503), put a stop to the

1. For the derivation, etc, of this word, \textit{vide} Appendix I—(1).
inroads of Nanjarāja Woḍeyar, chief of Ummattūr, and reduced that place to order (1499). Under Vīra-Narasimha II (1504-1509), Mallarāja, son of the Mahā-māṇḍatīvara of Ummattūr, appears as bearing the royal title Chikka-Bḍya (Crown-prince or Yuvarāja). Mahā-mcmḍaUivara Govanṇa Woḍeyar, a governor in the south, showed a spirit of defiance of imperial authority. Vfra-Narasimha seems to have been unequal to the task of putting these local rulers down. The first act of Krishnadeva-Raya (1509-1530), after his coronation, was, therefore, intimately connected with curbing the local chiefs and governors ill-disposed towards the Empire. Early in his reign (c. 1510-1512), he proceeded by way of Seringapatam and reduced Chikka-Kṛṣṇa (? Ganga-Raya) who probably fell during the investment of his stronghold of Sivasamudram. The latter's son, Virappa Woḍeyar, was evidently allowed by Krishnadeva-Raya to rule over the Seringapatam country as the chief of Seringapatam. Domingos Paes, writing in 1520, refers to him as "Cumarvirya" (Kumāra-Viraiya), father-in-law of Krishnadeva-Raya, and as the king of Seringapatam and all the territory bordering on Malabar. He also refers to him as having been held in high esteem by Krishnadeva-Raya. The province of Terakanambi taken from the Ummattūr chiefs, was placed under Saluva-Govinda-Raya, brother of Saluva-Timma, the distinguished minister of Krishnadeva-Raya. 2

During the latter part of the heyday of the Vijayanagar Empire (1530-1565), the connection of the rulers with the southern part of their vast dominions, became more and more pronounced. According to the Achyutardydbhyudayam, Achyuta (1530-1542) is said to have paid a visit

Second Phase: 1680-1665.

to Seringapatam on his way back from Srirangam. Here he received the local governors who made, it is said, large presents of money. From the description that Nuniz gives of the administration of Achyuta, we cannot but draw the broad inference that, though there was some discontent on the part of the feudatories, there was no serious falling off in its efficiency. The Government continued as before in the hands of the king assisted by his minister and the provinces were under local governors, while the feudatories ruled the tracts under them, maintaining their quota of troops and paying the annual tribute to their overlord. Under Sadasiva (1542-1570), the government was carried on by Aliya Rama-Raja with the aid of Tirumala as prime minister and Venkatadri as commander-in-chief. Of these two younger brothers of Rama-Raja, Tirumala appears to have wielded, according to inscriptions, considerable independent powers. He was known as Mahamandalesvara Rama-Raja-Tirumala, Yara-Timma (Hiriya-Timma, Timma, the elder), Timmayadeva-Maha-Arasu, etc.

At this point, we may pause and take stock of the general conditions of provincial administration of Vijayanagar after the memorable battle of Baksas-Tagdi, near Talikota (1565). The general political effects of that battle were of a far-reaching character. These may be thus summed up: It broke up the Hindu power in the south, though the Empire held fast for nearly another century under the next (The Iravidu) dynasty of kings. Slowly and surely, it eventually opened the way for Muhammadan incursions into almost every part of the country followed by Mahratta inroads. Later, with the disappearance of an organised central government, centrifugal tendencies began gradually to manifest themselves and Southern India came to be dotted over
with chieftainships exercising more or less local authority. The power of resistance against a formidable aggressor was thus gone for ever. Disunion spread in the land, with the result that South India became the happy hunting ground for ambitious rival Nawâbs, aided by groups of foreign merchant-settlers and military adventurers like Muhammad Yusuf and Haidar All.

Imperial power was, however, for the time being, still secure in the south. The writ of the Emperor still ran throughout the land. The whole country was divided between Tirumala and his brother and nephews. Tirumala—afterwards Tirumala I—brother of Aliya Râma-Raja, practically managed to hold together the greater part of the south under the nominal suzerainty of Sadâsîva. One of his objects in fixing upon Penukonda was possibly to save as much of the Empire in the south as possible and in this objective he appears to have been generally successful. From the social point of view, it is significant that within the half century that followed Rama-Raja's death, Sri-Vaishnavism had become the prevailing creed in the south of India among most classes.

Sadâsiva was at Penukonda, the new capital, probably from about 1567. There is epigraphical evidence to show that, despite the great reverse the Empire had sustained in 1565, he was still respected by his southern feudatories, and that the Empire did not wholly break-up as the result of the defeat at Raksas-Tagdi. Sadâsiva's later records come from, among other places, Seringapatam and Manâdya.

The assassination of Sadâsiva in or about 1570 was followed by the accession to the throne of Tirumala I (1570-1574), the first de jure sovereign of the fourth or the Aravâdi dynasty of Vijayanagar: Tirumala, it would appear, continued the time-honoured custom of appointing princes of the Royal House as Viceroy of the provinces. Of his four sons, according to inscriptions and literary
sources, Sri-Ranga—afterwards Sri-Ranga II—became the Viceroy of the Telugu or home province of Penukonda; Venkaṭa—afterwards Venkaṭa I—governed from Chandragiri the Tamil country comprising the Tūṅḍīra, Chōla and Pāṇḍya kingdoms, corresponding, respectively, to Gingee, Tankore and Madura; and Rāma or Rānia-Rājaiya-dēva (Rāma III) was Viceroy of the Karnāṭa or the Seringapatam country. The Vasucharitramu mentions that Rāma's rule extended over the territory between the Cauvery and the Arabian Sea, with his capital at Seringapatam. Several records of his attest to his rule at Seringapatam, the earliest available being dated in 1569, in which he is styled Maṇḍamandalaśvara. His records in the Seringapatam country, during Tirumala's rule, range from 1569 to 1573, and from 1576 to 1581, under Sri-Ranga II (1574-1586).³

Rāma-Rājaiya appears to have associated with himself one Daḷavī Rēmaṭī-Venkaṭaiya, in the administration of the Seringapatam Viceroyalty. He predeceased his brothers, Sri-Ranga II and Venkata I, leaving behind him two sons, Tirumala II and Ranga III. These were brought up at Penukonda under their uncle, Venkaṭa I. During their minority, the administration of the Viceroyalty, according to the Chikkādevardya- VamMvaḷi (c. 1678-1680), was conducted by Rēmaṭī-Venkaṭaiya as agent of Tirumala II, the heir-designate of Rama-Rājaiya, down to 1584.

In or about 1585 Tirumala II succeeded to the charge of the Viceroyalty and ruled it till 1610, partly during the reign of Śrī-Ranga II and throughout a considerable part of the reign of Venkaṭa I (1586-1614). Tirumala's records extend from 1585 to 1610, the latest available being dated in 1626. He appears to have been associated with himself in the administration of the Viceroyalty, one

Ramanujaiya, Pradhani and Dalavai, the successor, probably, of Bémati-Venka$aiya. Tirumala's records further indicate that he ruled more or less independently in his province, though holding only a subordinate position (as a Mahdmanḍalevara) under his uncle, Venkaṭa I.

The Ghikkadevardya-Vamidvali presents an overwrought picture of Tirumala's government in Seringapatam, by way of indicating that it was loose, corrupt and weak. Other sources, however, seem to convey a different impression. Father Coutinho, one of the Jesuit missionaries of the time, writing of Tirumala in 1600, states that he was "liked by more as well as more powerful chieftains than his brother Banga." The extent of Tirumala's jurisdiction as Viceroy is, perhaps, indicated by the circumstance that he could command levies from the chieftains of Hadinaḍ, Yeḷandūr, Piriyāpaṭṇa, Talakāḍ, Kereyūr, Narasimhapura (Hoḷe-Narasipur), Bēlūr, Nuggehallī, Kōḷāḷa, Ballāpur, Punganūr, Bangalore, Māgaḍi, Ammachavaḍi, Heggaḍeṇvakote, ChiknSyakanahalli, Bāṇavār, Basavaṇapṭṇa and Śrīya, etc.,—places situated in different parts of the Karnataka country. Tirumala's own inscriptional records show that his rule was accepted without demur from Manjara-bād to Mysore. There is thus enough data at hand to hold that he was popular in his province and that his administration was attended with a fair measure of success, although it was not free from defects at one period or another during his long regime of twenty-five years.

There is a regular succession in Tirumala's records between 1585-1592 indicating his actual rule in the Viceroyalty during that period. There is a gap in them between 1592-1595; they continue after 1596, leaving a gap again between 1607-1610.

It was probably during the period covered by the first gap (1592-1595) that Tirumala; according to the
Chikkadevaraya-Vamsavali, proceeded with his uncle, Venkaṭa I, against Vlrappa Nāyaka of Madura (1572-1595)—who appears to have shown signs of disloyalty—accepted a bribe from the latter and retired to Seringapatam. This attitude on the part of Tirumala was, it would seem, due to Venkaṭa's early predilection for Banga, younger brother of Tirumala, as the heir intended to succeed him, and Tirumala's disappointment at his being superseded by Venkaṭa. At any rate, Tirumala, by his treacherous conduct at Madura, we are told, incurred the displeasure of his uncle. From this time onward a change is naturally perceptible in the attitude adopted by Venkaṭa I towards Tirumala—an attitude of indifference, if not open hostility. Almost simultaneously Tirumala, as we shall see, began to feel the rising power of the Ruling House of Mysore. Towards the latter part of his rule, covered by the second gap in his records (1607-1610), Tirumala even experienced a serious falling off from allegiance on the part of some of his feudatories. All these, as we shall relate, contributed to the overthrow of his power and his retreat from Seringapatam (in 1610), ushering in a new landmark in the history of Mysore.  

---

4. For the general references on Tirumala's rule, see Mys. Gaz., II. iii. 2196-2197, 2200-2209; O. Vam., 2-6, 14; K.N.V., III, 29-80; also see and compare Rev. H. Heras, Aravidu Dynasty, I, 342-843, 412-414, etc. For farther details about Tirumala, vide Ch. V of this work.
CHAPTER III.

ORIGIN AND FOUNDATION OF THE WODEYAR DYNASTY.

Early references to "Mysore"—Traditional accounts of origin:
In nineteenth century manuscripts—In eighteenth century manuscripts and inscriptions—In seventeenth century literary works and inscriptions—Examination of the different accounts—Probable date of the founding of the Dynasty c. 1399-1420.

DURING the greater part of the period we have thus far sketched in general, very little is known from authentic sources about the place called Mysore and the ruling family there. Among the earliest available documents, a lithic record, dated in 1128 (4. 1050), belonging to the reign of the Hoysala Vishnuvardhana (1111-1141), refers incidentally to the Mahabalachala hill (the present Chamundi Hills, near Mysore), situated in Maisunādu. The next one, dated in 1175 (4. 1097), belonging to the reign of Vīra-Ballāla II (1173-1220), refers to a Hoysala-gauda of Mysore. Coming to later times, another lithic record, dated in 1494 (4. 1416), claims our attention. It registers a grant of the village of Bommanahalli—assigned to God Triyambaka—to provide for the feeding of the great Haradanahalli Wodeyars. The grant was made by Parvataiya, a son of Mallikārjunā of Vijayanagar (1446-1487). The record incidentally

1. For the derivation of "Mysore," vide Appendix I—(2).
3. Ibid, My. 8,1. 10: Mayisura Hoysala-gauda.
4. Ibid, IV (2) Gu. 2, 11. 28-29: Mahisilra-devara nidana. Niddna here is a colloquial for nidhana, treasure. Bice renders the passage as "treasury of the lord of Mysore," taking divara apparently to mean the ruler of the place. But, according to the context, divara would suggest a local god.
refers to the setting up of a stone charter both at
Triyambakapura and at the treasury of the God of My-
sore. The God of Mysore referred to here, was probably
God Somesvara, now situated in the Mysore fort, which
claims\(^5\) to have been set up in the time of the Cholas.

These records, however, do not help us much regarding
the early history of the place and its rulers, beyond
indicating that in the twelfth century Mysore formed
part of, or was situated in, Maisa-nādu (the buffalo
country) and was known as Mayisur\(^6\) (lit. buffalo town),
and that towards the close of the fifteenth it was known
by the still earlier form Mahisur,\(^6\) the place itself
being directly under the control of the Vijayanagar
governor at Terakāmnambi (Triyambakapura).

The founding of the Ruling House of Mysore has to be
dated in 1399, according to tradition
preserved in the Annals of the Mysore
Royal Family\(^7\) (1864-1865). Yadu-Raya
and Krishna, two brothers, princes of
the lunar race and of Yadava descent, of Ātreya-gotra
and Āśvalayana-sūtra, having left the region of Dvaraka,
proceeded, it is said, by way of the Vindhyas to Vijayanagar.
From there they went to Meṭkote (Yadugiri),
where they paid their obeisance to their family god
Nārāyana. Crossing the Cauvery, they next paid a visit
to the Goddess Chamundēśvari- of the Mahabalachala hill
and were taking rest in the temple of Kōdi-Bhairava
situated near the tank behind the temple of Trinesvara
in Mysore. About this time, however, the chief of that
place, Chamaraja, had died, leaving behind him the
dowager queen (Devajammanni) and a daughter (also
named Devajammanni). Mara Nayaka, the general of
the late chief, had usurped all power and was causing
much distress to the queen. The two princes, informed

\(^5\) Mys. Nag. Pur., p. 26; vide also Ch. I V.
\(^6\) See also Appendix I—(2), for details.
\(^7\) I. 4-18,
of this state of affairs, entered the town of Mysore, assisted by a loyal Jangama preceptor (Wodeyar). Despatching Māra Nāyaka's men who obstructed them at the gate, they took up their abode in the palace. Later Yadu-Rāya slew Māra Nāyaka in a mortal combat. The qfdeen, in deep gratitude, bestowed her daughter on Yadu-Rāya. Yadu eventually succeeded to the principality of Mysore and became the progenitor of the Mysore Royal Family, the title Wodeyar being subsequently affixed to the name of each ruler, in recognition, it is said, of the valuable assistance rendered by the Jangama preceptor to Yadu-Rāya during his chivalrous exploit.

Jaina tradition, as narrated in the Rājavali-Kathā (1838) of Devachandra, is as follows: There was a twelve-year famine in Vijayanagar between 1414-1426 (4. 1336-1348). Thereupon, runs the account, the Arasus and Setṭis of the place went over to the Karnāṭak and other parts of the Empire. Among them three Arasus, of Yādava descent, established themselves in Nuggehalli. The youngest of them by name Vijaya-Rāja, however, settled in Kumbara-Koppal (Kumbakara-Koppal, lit. Potters' settlement), near Mysore (Mahistir), devoting himself to agricultural pursuits. He married a maiden of the potter community in the locality and leased out for himself five villages near by. After some time Vijaya-Rāja died, leaving behind him his wife and a daughter. The Toreyas, taking advantage of the situation, were forcing Vijaya-Rāja's widow to marry away her daughter against her wishes. At this juncture, two of the descendants of Vishnuvardhana of the Yadu dynasty, namely, Deva-Raja and Santa-Raja, then going about the country in search of a kingdom for themselves, happened to pass thither and were halting for the while on the tank bund at Mysore. Having ascertained the state of affairs in the locality, they entered Mysore and became masters

8. XII. 446-449; also X. 285-288, etc.
of the situation by despatching the ring-leaders of the trouble and forcing others to take to their heels. Devaraja and Santa-Raja became the lords of Mysore. Devaraja acquired some villages and made two Jain Brāhmans (Sāntaiya and Padmanāpāiya) of Maleyūr, his chief officers. In due course Santa-Raja, owing to differences with his elder brother, settled himself in Kārugahalli and became master of some adjoining villages. Later Devaraja was slain by one Māra Nāyaka, a powerful member of the Toreya community, who usurped all power in Mysore. Māra Nāyaka was, however, eventually put to death by Rāja Wodeyar, a posthumous son of Devaraja, the main line of rulers in Mysore being restored with the help of his Jain adherents.

The *Mysuru-Rdjara-Gharitre* (c. 1800) of Venkatarojmanaiya,⁹ has it that from the closing years of the incarnation of Lord Krishṇa the kings of the Yādava dynasty had been settled in Mysore (Mahishapura) favoured by the Goddess Chamundēvarl of the Mahabalāchala hill, that among them one by name Yadu paid a visit to Melkote (Narayanagiri) and worshipped God Tirunṛāyaṇa there, and that his descendants continued to rule from Mysore.

The *Mysuru-Dhoregala-Vamsavali*¹⁰ (c. 1800) merely refers to the kings of Yādava descent who were settled and were ruling in Mysore.

A manuscript entitled *Mysuru-Nagarada-Purvottara*¹¹ (c. 1734-1740), relied upon by Wilks,¹² contains the following account: From Dvāraka two brothers by name Vijaya-Rāja Wodeyar and Krishṇa-Rāja Wodeyar, it is said, proceeded to Vijayanagar and were staying with the king (Bāya) there. The latter proposed to give them a territory (stme) to administer. The brothers accepted the offer, expressing their desire to choose one in the south

---

Having obtained the king's permission, they went about the Seringapatam country and devoted themselves to the service of the Goddess Chamundesvari to the south of the Cauvery. They proceeded as far as the fort named Hadadana in the vicinity of the Chamundi Hills. About this time the chief of Hadadana, one Santa Wodeyar, having for some reason or other renounced the world, had left the place (vairagya hutti . . . horatu hodaru), leaving behind him a daughter, who was being looked after by a certain Wodeyar. The Toreya chief of Karugahalli, profiting by the absence of the ruler in Hadadana, became puffed up with pride and arrogance and plotted to marry the chief's daughter himself. The two brothers, who were stationed near the tank of Hadadana, came to know of all this and were also told that preparations were afoot for the coming marriage. Vijaya and Krishna offered their willing help in the cause of the distressed maiden and, accompanied by the Wodeyar, proceeded to the fort where temporary structures had been erected for the marriage. They quietly won over the local militia (halepaika men and the ranuves), led the leading members of the Karugahalli party one by one to the marriage pavilion and made short work of all the mischief-mongers. Vijaya then married the princess; Hadadana, and subsequently Mysore (Mahisur)—then a sort of irregular fort (hudevu)—came into his possession.

A still earlier manuscript entitled Mysuru-Dhoregala-Purvabhyudaya-Vivara (c. 1710-1714), is silent regarding the origin and founding of the dynasty.

Inscriptions of the eighteenth century, ranging from 1716 to 1761, record, that certain princes of the race of Yadu, having left the region of Dvāraka (or Dvārāvatī-pura), proceeded to the Karnāṭaka country, either led by fancy (ichchāya) or to visit their family god Nārāyaṇa (ikṣhitum Rama-ramanam), and being attracted by the

13. Vide references cited in f.n. 1 to Table II.
beauty and fruitfulness of the land, took up their abode in the city of Mysore (Mahisūr), from where they ruled.

The available literary works and inscriptions of the seventeenth century,\(^{14}\) unanimously echo the same tradition, the earliest among the former being the *Kanthirava-Narasaraja-Vijayam* (1648) and among the latter, the *Hdlagere copper-plate grant* (1663).

Tirumalārya, however, in his *Chikkadevardya-Vamsa-vali* (c. 1678-1680), elaborates thus\(^{15}\): In the lunar race Yadu sprang up. Among his descendants, Bala and Krishṇa, with a view to worship their family god, proceeded to Yadugiri (Melkote). There they worshipped God Niirayana, presented him with the sacred jewelled crown (*Vaira-mudi*) and returned to Dvāraka, leaving one of their descendants for the protection of the place (Melkote) and carrying on the services to the god. The latter resided at Yadugiri for some time, but later, under the advice of the Śri-Vaishnavas, went over to Mysore, from where he began to govern. In the *Yddavagiri-Māhāditya* (of Timma-Kavi)\(^{16}\) also, among others, we have a similar account.

Only one record of the seventeenth century, namely, the *Gajjiganahalli copper-plate grant*, dated in 1639,\(^{17}\) however, echoes the following tradition, in a direct and more significant manner: "The glorious kings of the banks of the Godāvarī, formerly sent forth with honour by the rulers (before the Vijayanagar king, Venkaṭa II), again obtained the Karnāta portion of the earth, to protect it; sprung from the *Atreyanya-anvaya*, of the

---

14. Vide f.n. 1 to Tables II and III.
17. E. C. I I I (1) Nj. 198, 11. 29-38:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Purvam Godavaritira bhupala bhuri tejasah} \\
\text{Stat pilrvair maṇḍalindraiḥ sddaram priritah punah } \\
\text{Pdtum Karnata bhābhhdgam prdpdh, prdhita tījasah }\, (1) \\
\text{2treñhaya sambhutd Ṭffvadyana-sudrvīṇaḥ } \, (1) \\
\text{Ijtg-Vidino maḥbhhdgd Mahishḍpur-nivṛśiṇaḥ } \, \|
\end{align*}
\]
Asvalayana-sutra, followers of the Rg-Veda, dwelling in Mahishāpura."

It will be seen from the above gleanings from the available sources that the tradition relating to the Yadava descent of the present Ruling House of Mysore has had a continuous course of development during the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. An examination of the nineteenth century tradition preserved in the Annals, in the light of the earlier sources of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, would show that it has been based, in the main, upon the latter. The traditional date 1399, assigned in the Annals to the founding of the dynasty, remains, however, uncorroborated, there being, so far, hardly any reference to the Ruling House in Mysore, in the inscriptive and other records prior to c. 1550. The Jaina tradition in the Rajavali-Katha, while it confirms the Yadava descent of the Ruling House, differs totally from other accounts in regard to the details about the founding of the dynasty. The sequence of events narrated appears also to be loose and vague. The twelve-years' famine referred to, stands uncorroborated, while the names of the progenitors of the dynasty form a distinct departure from the position taken in other sources. In the absence of confirmatory evidence, the Jaina tradition would only seem to indicate a later attempt to connect the Ruling House of Mysore with the Hoysalas and trace the Jaina connection with it from the time of its foundation—a position perhaps best borne out by a further examination of the Rajavali-Katha itself.19

The information contained in the Mysiru-Bdjara-

18. Vide Table VIII, compared with Nos. V and IX.
19. See, for instance, XII. 460-476, where Devachandra, while closely following the text of Tirumalarya's Chikkadevareya-Vamudvam, freely makes his own interpolations. One of these (Bdjvali-Kathd, 464-456), in keeping with Devachandra's earlier position (XII. 446-449 and X. 286-288, etc.), clearly connects the progenitors of the Mysore Ruling House with a collateral branch of the Hoysalas.
Charitre, is clearly an improvement on the earlier tradition. The tradition referred to in the Mysiiru-Dhoregaḷa-Vamiaḷal is in keeping with the one preserved in the literary and epigraphical records of the seventeenth century, while the Mysuru-Dhoregaḷa-Purvdbhyudaya-Vivara only attempts to fix the succession, etc., of some of the early kings of the dynasty, on a chronological basis.

There seems, however, to be an air of reality in the account narrated in the Mysuru-Nagarada-Purvottara, though it lacks chronological data and fuller genealogical details. The archaic nature of its language—which seems to correspond to the type of colloquial Kannada prose prevailing in the earlier part of the sixteenth century—would appear to reflect the genuine historical tradition handed down from time immemorial. The place Hadadana referred to in the manuscript as the fort at which the two princes Vijaya and Krishṇa are said to have arrived in the course of their sojourn, is to be seen even to-day as a village south of the Chāmunda Hills, Mysore, though in a corrupt form as Ḥaadana or Ḥāḍaṇa, in the Kadākola hoblı of the Mysore taluk. Wilks, while first using this source, spelt Hadadana as Hadana, which has been identified by later scholars with the distant place Hadindru, or Adindru in the Nanjangud taluk. The information recorded in this manuscript, is also, in general outline, in keeping with the trend of Śri-Vaishnava tradition echoed in the earlier sources of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, particularly in respect of the extraneous origin of the dynasty.

The tradition preserved in the seventeenth century sources (inscriptions and literary works), is of a general

20. Vide Mysore Government List of Villages, 83. The identification of Hadadana with Hadadana was first made in the Annals (II. 87), on the authority of a copy of the Mys. Nag. Pur., in the possession of Mr. Muddaraja Urs, noticed in f.n. 11 to Ch. I.
character, there being in them very little data which would enable us to determine the exact chronological limits within which the founding of the dynasty in Mysore can be fixed. There is also a tendency in these sources, as in the case of the works of Tirumalārya and Timma-Kavi among others, to elaborate and improve upon the Vaishnava tradition relating to the origin of the dynasty.

The Gajjiganahalli copper-plate grant (1639), is, however, of some interest. The statements in it that "the glorious kings of the banks of the Godāvarī, formerly sent forth with honour by the rulers (before Venkata II), again obtained the Karnāta portion of the earth, to protect it" and that they dwelt in Mysore, are significant. The record belongs to the reign of Kantīrava-Narasarāja Woḍeyar I of Mysore (1638-1659), who acknowledges the suzerainty of Venkata II of Vijayanagar. If we are to identify "the glorious kings of the banks of the Godāvarī" with a branch of the line of Yadu princes—from the circumstance that the Yaḍavas of Devagiri formerly ruled in that region (c. 1200-1312)—than this record should be taken to suggest that they (i.e., the line of Yadu princes) having been for long out of power, obtained the permission of the Vijayanagar rulers—predecessors of Venkata II—to proceed to the south and establish their sway in Mysore. Hence the expression "again obtained the Karnāta portion of the earth, to protect it" (punah pattern Karnāta bhūbhagam prāptadh). Thus this record would, in the main, corroborate the tradition contained in the Mysuru-Nagarada-Purvottāra, noticed above.

Pushing our inquiries further backwards, we have already seen that the earliest available reference to Mysore in the fifteenth century, is in a record dated in 1494. It contains no reference to the ruler of the time in Mysore, nor, as indicated, is there any decisive evidence to fix the date of the founding of the
Kuling Dynasty. The earliest ruler of the dynasty who can, however, be fairly well located, is Hiriya-Betṭada-Chāmarāja Wodeyar III (1518-1553), who is found invariably referred to, in the seventeenth century inscriptions and literary works, as one of the immediate descendants in the line of Yadu princes in Mysore. Apart from differences in point of detail, the manuscripts are agreed that Vijaya or Yadu-Kāya was the founder of the dynasty. If, in the light of the seventeenth century records, we are to allow a period of about one hundred to one hundred and fifteen years for the ancestors of Hiriya-Betṭada-Chāmarāja Wodeyar III, the founding of the dynasty itself will have to be fixed not later than c. 1420 and not earlier than c. 1399. The circumstance that there is no reference to the early members of the House, in the records up to about 1550, is, perhaps, due to their having been purely local rulers within the jurisdiction of the Terakanambi or the Seringapatam province of the Vijayanagar Empire. The dynasty, it would seem, emerged from small beginnings into an important local power about the early years of the sixteenth century. This position would find some support from the traditional history of the contemporary dynasty of Kalale, the founding of which is dated in 1500, in a family manuscript entitled Kalale-Arasugala-Vamsēvali (c. 1830). From this work we find that matrimonial relations between the Kalale and Mysore families began only subsequent to 1500, during the reign of Hiriya-Betṭada-Chāmarāja Wodeyar III of Mysore, who is referred to in the manuscript as Vijaya- Chādmaraṇa Wodeyar of Mysuru-Nagara, Vijaya probably indicating that he was named after Vijaya, the progenitor of the Mysore ruling House according to the Mysuru-Nagarada-Purvasara. At the same time it is to be noted that the

24. Vide Tables, II and III I and references cited in f.n. 1 thereto.
26. Vide Tables IV-IX, 26. ff, 2-8; see also Ch. X and Table XIII.
tradition relating to the origin of the dynasty, noticeable in the records of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, ill conspicuous by its absence in the extant records of the rulers of the sixteenth century. In particular, one Ethic record, dated in 1598 (S. 1520), refers only to the Ztrtiyasagôtra, Jival&yana-sutra and Rk-îdkha2 of the Mysore Boyal House.

It would thus appear from an examination of all the available sources that the founding of the Mysore Ruling House—of Yadava descent, Atreyasa-gotra, Asvalayana-sutra and Rk-sakha—took place towards the close of the fourteenth century or the earlier part of the fifteenth (c. 1399-1420), more probably under the circumstances narrated in the Mysuru-Nagarada-Purvottara and in keeping with the main trend of tradition preserved in the Annals.28 The development of tradition relating to the Yadava origin of the dynasty, by about 1639 and rnone markedly throughout the rest of the seventeenth century, seems to have kept pace with the parallel rise of the dynasty from small beginnings to a prominent position commanding a powerful kingdom, and the gradual growth of 6rî-Vaïshâavism in the country.

---

Yadu-Raya (Vijaya), 1399-1428.
CHAPTER IV.

THE EARLY RULERS.


OF THE early rulers of the dynasty down to Hiriya-Bettada-Chamaraja Wodeyar I I I ((1513-1553), very little is known from authentic sources. Some accounts of them, particularly of their genealogical succession and domestic life, are given in later writings.¹ Certain differences, genealogical and other, are noticeable amongst them. The Annals, however, seems to push back and fix up the succession of the rulers, mostly in the light of the manuscript sources. As indicated, the dates for the early rulers (down to 1513), as given in the Annals, remain uncorroborated. Till more authentic evidence is forthcoming, these have to be treated as traditional dates. From 1572 onwards a certain measure of chronological agreement is noticeable as between the Annals and the Mysuru-Dhoregala-Pirvdbhyudaya-Vivara (c. 1710-1714), the earliest available manuscript recording the succession, etc., of the Rulers of Mysore.

¹ Vide sources, on which Tables IV-IX are based.
Yadu-Bāya, the traditional progenitor of the Mysore Royal Family according to the Annals, is assigned in it a period of twenty-four years' rule (1399-1423). He is identical with Vijaya of the Mysuru-Nagarada-Purva-tara. He is said to have married Dēvājammanī, daughter of Chāmarāja of Mysore, and had by her two sons, Hiriya-Bettada-Chāmaraja Woḍeyar I and Chāmaraja Woḍeyar. Yadu-Bāya, it is also said, proceeded against, and slew, Santarajaiya, a kinsman of his father-in-law and chief of Kārugahalli, bestowing that place on his brother Krishnāraja. According to the Mysuru-Nagarada-Purva-tara, however, Vijaya had subdued the chief of Kārugahalli before he became the lord of Hadadana and Mysore.

Hiriya-Bettada-Chāmaraja Woḍeyar I, eldest son of Yadu-Bāya, is next assigned a period of thirty-six years' rule (1423-1459). He is mentioned first in the order of succession as given in the Mysuru-Dhoregala-Purva-bhyudaya-Vivara. His younger brother, Chāmaraja Woḍeyar, is credited with the founding of the Kenchalgūḍ branch of the Mysore Royal Family. Hiriya-Bettada-Chāmaraja is said to have married Gopājamma of Beettadakote and had by her a son named Timmaraja Woḍeyar.

The next ruler, Timmaraja Woḍeyar I, is allotted a period of nineteen years' rule (1459-1478). He is identical with Appanna-Timmaraja Woḍeyar of Mysore, mentioned as second in the order of succession, in the

---

2. I. 4,11-12; also Table IX. 8. Vide Table V. 4. Annals, I. 12-13.
8. 11.68; also Table IV.
9. Annals, I. 12; also see and compare Baj. Kath., XI I . 449; Mys. Baj. Oha., 15; Mys. Dho. Vam., ft. 8; and Tables VI-I X.
10. Ibid, 1.13; Baj Kath., I. c.; Mys. Baj. Oha., 16-16, etc.
11. Annals, I. c.
PLATE IV.

Timmaraja Wodeyar I, 1459-1478.
Mysuru-Dhoregala-Purvabhyudaya- Vivara, Timnia-raja. Woḍeyar I is said to have married Kāntājamma of Kaḷale and had a son by name Hiriya-Chāmaraṅjarasa Woḍeyar II. From the Kaḷale-Arasugala-Vamsavali, however, it would appear, as indicated already, that there were matrimonial relations between the Mysore and Kaḷale families, only subsequent to 1500, after the founding of the latter.

Hiriya-Chāmaraṅjarasa Woḍeyar II is next assigned a period of thirty-five years' rule (1478-1513). He is identical with Chāmarasa or Hiriya-Chāmaraṅjarasa Woḍeyar, the Arberal, (lit. six-fingered), mentioned in the manuscripts. He is said to have married Padmājamma of Bilikere and had a son named Hiriya-Bettada-Chamaraja Woḍeyar III.

Perhaps the most acceptable date of the Annals, as already indicated, seems, however, to be the one assigned to Hiriya-Bettada-Chamaraja Woḍeyar I I I (1513-1558)." He is said to have been born on September 29, 1492, and is the first ruler known to us within the limits of authentic history.

Hiriya-Bettada-Chamaraja Woḍeyar I I I is identical with 'Dodda-Chamaraja Woḍeyar,' 'Bettendra,' 'Bettrajendra,' 'Betta-Chamarat,' 'Betta-Chamendra,' 'Sama,' 'Bettada-Chama,' etc., mentioned in the inscriptions and literary works of the seventeenth century, as one of

12. I. 1; I I . 58 and Table I V; cf. Mys. Dho. Vam., I. c, and Table V I I; of. also WUks, I. 41 and Table I.
17. I.14-16; of. Mys. Dho. Vam., ff. 3; see also Tables V I I and I X.
19. Vide Tables II and I I I and references cited in f.n. 1 thereto.
20. Vide references cited in f.n. 1 to Tables II and I I I.
the immediate descendants of the Yadu princes in Mysore. He is identical also with 'Hiriya-Chamarasa Wodeyar,' 'Beftada-Chamarasa Wodeyar,' 'Hiriya-Beftada-Chamaraja Wodeyar,' 'Vijaya-Chamarasa Wodeyar' and 'GhSmarasa Wodeyar' of the manuscript sources. According to the Mysuru-Dhoregala-Purvabhyudaya-Vivara, he was actually known as Timmaraja Wodeyar. This appears borne out by a lithic record, dated in May 10, 1551, mentioning 'Timmaraja Wodeyar of Mayisur' (Mysore). The probabilities are that while 'Timmaraja' was his real name—after his grandfather's—'Chamaraja or Hiriya-Beftada-Chamaraja' was only a later appellation in keeping with the traditions of the family.

Chamaraja I I I seems to have been an important ruler. Inscriptions speak of him as "a mill for grinding the corn, his enemies, victorious in war and delighting in the spoils of victory," "destroyer of enemies, famous among kings as the moon from the milky ocean," etc. He is also said to have acquired the title Antembaraganda, under the following circumstances: Certain chiefs

22. I. 72; also Table IV.
23. E. C. I I I (I) My. 60. Rice doubtfully fixes this record in 1611 (?). But Vê-Gdhikrit, Jyetïha toi. 5, the actual date of the document, corresponds to May 10, 1661.
24. Ibid, Sr, 64; T. N. 63; IV (2) Yd. 17, etc.
25. C. Vam., 18; also see C. Vi., I I , 4-6; E.G., Mys. Diet. Suppl. Vol., My. 116,11. 20-21, (M. A. B. 1912, para 127); I I I (I) Sr. 64,11. 24-26, etc. Cf. the literary works of Chikkupadhyaya and Timma-Kavi; E. C. I I I (I) Sr. 14 (1686); Mys. Raj. Cha., 16; Raj. Kath., X I I 460 and Annals, I. 16, ascribing the acquisition of this title to Timmaraja Wodeyar II (1663-1672), son of Chamaraja I I I , under similar circumstances. E. C. X I I , Kg. 37 (1663) ascribes it to Timmaraja I, father of Chamaraja I I I (? [vide also Table I I , f.n. 2]) ; and the Mys. Dho. Vam., (ff. 5), to Bola-Chamaraja IV. Cf. also Wilks, I. 42 and S. K. Aiyangar, Ancient India, pp. 277-278. The version in the O. Vam. (c. 1678-1680) is preferred as the earlier and more specific one. The right to this title, as we shall see, seems to have been securely established under Timmaraja Wodeyar.
26. Short for Birud-antembara-ganda, champion over those who say they have such and such titles. Cf. Bhashege-tappuva-rayara-ganda, champion over kings who break their word—of the Vijayanagar inscriptions.
Hiriya-Chamarajarasa Wodeyar II, 1-176-1613.
had once, during his reign, assembled at Najângūḍ; on the occasion of the car festival of the local god. Nanja Setti of Kalale, a faithful adherent of Hiriya-Bettada-Chamaraḷa, was also on the spot. The chiefs recited the various titles which they claimed to belong to themselves. Not tolerating this, Nanja Setti challenged them as to the lawful Ownership of the title Birud-antembara-ganda. Whereupon a scuffle ensued and all the chiefs attempted to put an end to him. Nanja Setti was, however, able to hold his own against his opponents and proclaim the title of his master, which became thenceforward the distinctive appellation of the Rulers of Mysore.

We have some glimpses of Mysore in the time of Chamaraḷa III. Till his period of rule, Mysorē (Mahisur), it is said, was only a sort of irregular fort (hudevu), with an outskirt named Purageri (lit. main street of the town) containing a Tammatageri (drummers' lane). To the north-east lay the temple of God Somesvara, set up, according to local tradition, by a certain Chola king. Near by the temple was a tank named Chola-kere (after the Cholas) and near its outlet, the temple of Bhairava. There was also the temple of Lakshmiramanasvami likewise set up in the time of the Cholas. In 1524 Chamaraḷa, it is further said,

27. Eferred to as Muttaya of Raja Wodeyar, which literally means 'great-grandfather,' but from the context 'grandfather' is obviously meant. The allusion here is to Hiriya-Bettada-Chamaraḷa Wodeyar I I I, grandfather of Raja Wodeyar.
29. For an explanation of this word, vide Appendix I—(3).
30. Vide Appendix I—(4), for an explanatory and critical note on this word.
31. Probably identical with, or the nucleus of, the extant Dodda-kere to the east of the Mysore fort.
32. Vide Appendix I—(5).
33. Identical with the extant Lakshmiramanasvami temple to the west of the Mysore fort.
34. My a. Nag. Pur., I c. The event is dated in i. 1444 Tarana. The Saka date, however, does not tally with the cyclic year mentioned. Taking the cyclic year as the correct date, Tarana corresponds to 8. 1446 which is equivalent to 1624.
laid the foundations of the fort of Mysore by putting up the inner enclosure-wall (vālasuttinakōṭe) and named the place Mahisuru-nagara\(^{35}\) (the town of Mysore).

Hiriya-Bettada-Chamaraja Wodeyar I I I was a contemporary of Krishṇadēva-Bāya (1509-1530), Achyūta (1530-1542) and Sadasiva (1542-1570) of Vijayanagar, of whom he appears to have been a loyal feudatory. He was also, we note,\(^{36}\) a contemporary of Kanta Wodeyar I (1505-1527) and Timmaraja Wodeyar I (1527-1546) of Kalale and of the chiefs of Hura, Muṅur, Tagadur, Ummattur, Heggaddevankote, etc. His authority seems, however, to have been confined to the territory comprising the town of Mysore and a few villages in its neighbourhood.

Of his domestic life, we have some particulars. He was, it is said,\(^{37}\) married to Alagajamma (otherwise known as Gopara-samma) and had by her, three sons, Timmaraja Wodeyar, Krishnaraja Wodeyar and Chamaraja Wodeyar (surnamed Bola or the bald), who are invariably referred to in inscriptions and literary sources.\(^{38}\) He had also three daughters,\(^{39}\) Dodda-Deviramma, Chikka-Deviramma and Nanjamma, the eldest of whom was given in marriage to Kanta Wodeyar of the Kalale family, and the second to Mallaraja Wodeyar, the latter's nephew.\(^{40}\)

Chamarāja, we note,\(^{41}\) made also, during his life-time, a partition among his sons. To Timmarāja Wodeyar, the eldest, he gave Hemmanahalli,\(^{42}\) to Krishnaraja

---

36. See also Appendix I—(4), for a critical notice of Wilks's position, 86. K. A. V., ff. 2-10; also Table XIII. 37. Annals, I. 14; Mys. Raj. Cha., 16; Raj. Kath., X I I . 449; see also and compare Tables VI-IX. 38. Vide Tables II and I I I , with f . n. thereto. 39. Annals, 1. o. 40. K. A. F., ff. 2, 9 and 10; also Ch. X and Table XIII. 41. See Annals, I. 14-15; Raj. Kath., I.e. 42. The Annals (I. 15) speaks of Betta Wogeyar, son of Timmaraja Wodeyar,
PLATE VI.

Hiriya-Beṭṭada-Chāmarāja Wodeyar III, 1513-1563.
Wođeyar, the second, Kembal, and to Bōla-Chāmarājā Wođeyar, the third, Mysore. It is said, he so arranged the succession that Timmarājā should be installed first and that the latter should be followed by Bōla-Chāmarājā.

Timmarājā Wođeyar—afterwards Timmarājā I I — appears to have been living in Mysore during his father's rule. Krishnarājā Wođeyar is referred to as 'Krishna-Nripa,' 'Krishna-Bhupati' and 'Krishna Wođeyar of Mysore,' and spoken of as possessed of "distinguished valour," etc. He was reputed also for the beauty of his person. During his father's reign, it would appear, he was victorious over the chiefs of Haravu and other places and acquired the title &ringa,ra-hdra (ornament of beauty). He seems to have spent the rest of his lifetime in the village assigned to him.

Bōla-Chāmarājā Wođeyar—afterwards Chamarāj IV—the third son of Hiriya-Bettada-Chamarājā, appears to have stayed with his father in Mysore.

It has been pointed out above, that Chamarāj III was actually known as Timmarājā Wođeyar. Wilks as having been given Hemmanahalli; but the Raj. Kath. (I. c.) clearly refers to the partition among the three sons of Chamarāj I I I, and Wilks also adopts the same position (I. 41). Moreover Bettada Wođeyar or Bettada (Devaraja) Wođeyar was the son of Krishnarājā Wođeyar and not of Timmarājā (vide Tables IV, V and VI I).

43. Annals, 1. c; see also f. n. 47 infra.
44. Vide references cited in f. n. I to Tables I I and I I I.
47. The Mys. Raj. Cha. (1. c.) and the Mys. Dho. Vam. (ff. 3) speak of Krishnarājā's rule, the former fixing his accession after Timmarājā, and the latter after Chamarāj I I I himself (vide also Tables VI and VII). The earlier manuscript, Mys. Dho. Pur., is silent on this point (vide Table IV). The C, VI. (II, 10-11) speaks of Krishnarājā's rule in succession to Timmarājā, apparently by way of a literary flourish. The probabilities are, however, that Krishnarājā never actually ruled, having predeceased his father and brothers, which seems to account for why his younger brother, Bōla-Chamarājā Wođeyar, was intended by his father to succeed Timmarājā Wođeyar and why his (Krishnarājā's) son, Bettada (Devaraja) Wođeyar, was, as we shall see, chosen to rule in succession to Bōla-Chamarājā Wođeyar (in 1576), in preference to the latter's own eldest son, Raja Wođeyar. Cf. S. K. Aiyangar, Ancienl India, pp. 278-280.
48. I. 42; see also f. n. 51 infra.
speaks of an extant grant from Timmaraja, dated in 1548, which has not come down to us. We have, however, as already referred to, a lithic record dated in May 10, 1551, in which Channa Wodeyar and Mallaraja Wodeyar of Hura make a transfer of the villages of Nannigahalli and Minnanahalli to Timmaraja Wodeyar of Mysore. The villages, we are told, were transferred with all the usual rights, and the transfer arrangement between the parties was to last for a period of eleven years, 1541-1552 (Plava-Paridhavi). The document, it is significant, was drawn up ten years after it came actually into force.

Hiriya-Bettada-Chamaraja Wodeyar, it is said, got constructed, behind the temple of Chāmundaśvarī on the Chāmundi Hills, a tank named Hiri-kere, probably so named after himself. In November 1548 (Kilaka, Margasira), we note, he purchased the village of Tippūr for the temple of Chaluvarāya-svāmi of Melkote. He is said to have passed away on February 7, 1553. —

Hiriya-Beṭṭada-Chāniarāja Wōdeyar I I I was succeeded by his eldest son, Timmarāja Wōdeyar I I , who is assigned a period of nineteen years' rule (1553-1572) Timmaraja Wodeyar is referred to in inscriptions and literary works as 'Timmāvanipa,' 'Timmarājendra,' etc., and spoken of as "always engaged in destroying the hostile kings at the point of the sword " and as having been distinguished for his "dignity, depth and bravery."
He is said to have been an expert in political policy (niti vidam nipunareyari) and was noted for his pious rule. It seems not impossible that the right to the title Antembara-ganda, which was evidently a matter of dispute during the reign of his father, was securely established under Timmarāja Wodeyar.

Timmarāja Wodeyar appears to have been a loyal feudatory of Sadasiva (1542-1570) and Tirumala I (1570-1574) of Vijayanagar. He is mentioned as having protected his local contemporaries, the chiefs of Sindhuvalli, Huṇasanālu, etc., places and been victorious over the chief of Ummattūr, becoming famous as Monegara (a daring hero).

He was married, it is said, to Kempamma of Toravalli and appears to have had no issue.

Timmarāja Wodeyar was succeeded by his younger brother, Bōla-Chāmarāja Wodeyar IV (Chāmarāja, the bald), under the arrangement said to have been effected by Chāmarāja Wodeyar III, already referred to. Bōla-Chāmarāja is identical with 'Mysūru-Chamarasā Wodeyar,' 'Chamarāja,' 'Chama-nripa,' 'Chamarājendra,' 'Immai-Chamarāja,' etc., mentioned in inscriptions and literary works. He is said to have been born on July 25, 1507, and was so named because

---

55. C. Vi., I I , 9; Yad.-Mahat., I I , 29, etc.
57. Annals, I. 15.
58. The Annals (I. c.) speaks of his having had a son by name Bet(a Wodeyar (see also Table IX). But Betta Wodeyar or Betṭāda (Devaraja) Wodeyar was a son of Krishṇarāja Wodeyar, according to the earlier sources, i.e., Mys. Dho. Pur., and Mys. Dho. Vam. (vide also f.n. 42 supra).
59. Annals, I. 16; see also and compare Tables I V -I X ; also f.n. 47 supra.
60. Vide references cited in f.n. 1 to Tables II and I I I . The reference to Bola-Chamaraja as Immadi-Chamaraja, is in keeping with the position of these earlier sources (i.e., inscriptions and literary works), according to which Hiriya-Bettada-Chamaraja was known to have been the first ruler. Cf. Mys. Dho. Par. (I. 1-9, 60, 72 ; I I . 58), which loosely makes Bola-Chamaraja identical with Hiriya or Dodda-Chama (vide also Table IV), a position uncritically followed by Wilks (I. 42-44).
tradition has it that once, while on a visit to the Chamundi Hills, during his boyhood, he had a narrow escape from a stroke of lightning which, however, only burnt away the hair on his scalp leaving it bald. Bōla-Chāmarāja Woḍeyar, we note, ruled for four years (1572-1576).

The Dalavai-Agraharam Plates (1623) speak of Bōla-Chāmarāja as an expert in archery and in the handling of weapons of war, and as possessed of great courage and prowess. The Gajjiganahalli Plates (1639) and the Hūlagere Plates (1663) also echo his valour. The Kanthirava-Narasaraja-Vijayam points to him as a pious ruler.

Bōla-Chāmarāja Woḍeyar was a contemporary of Tirumala I (1570-1574) and Sri-Ranga II (1574-1586) of the Āravīḍu dynasty of Vijayanagar. Of Rāma-Rājaiya (Rāma III)—son of Tirumala I— the Vijayanagar Viceroy at Seringapatam, he was, we note, a local contemporary. The extant records of Rāma-Rājaiya in the Seringapatam Vicerealty, as indicated already, range from 1569 to 1581. But it does not appear that he was actually present in Seringapatam in 1572-1573, i.e., early during the reign of Bōla-Chāmarāja Woḍeyar. Indeed one record seems to suggest that he was in Penukonda in 1573, when Bōla-Chāmarāja Woḍeyar, probably taking advan-

62. See and compare Introd. Ch. in the Divya-Suri-Charitre (1678) and other works of Chikkupadhyaya and Timma-Kavi, noticed in Ch. XIV; also Mys. Dho. Pur., II. 68; Mys. Dho. Vam., ff. 5; Mys. Raj. Cha., 17; Raj. Kath., XII. 460; and Annals, I.17.
63. See Mys. Dho. Par. (I. 8, 9) and Annals (1.16-17); cf. Mys. Dho. Vam., tt. 8,7; see also Tables I, V and X.
64. E.C., III (1) T.N., 63, 11.18-17 : Suraha yudhi vikhyata dhanurvidya visaradah Mahipala . . . . rauhnatejaschamarajoti kirtiman II
65. Ibid, Nj. 198,1. 84 : aprathiṣa vikramah.
66. E.C., XII Kg. 87,1. 26 : Surassanabhavat . . . . Chamaraja mahipath.
67. 111, 8. . . . 68. Vide Table XIV. 69. Ibid.
68. Vide Table XIV. 71. See Mys. Gas., I.I. iii. 3127.
tage of the absence of a strong local government in the viceroyalty, appears\textsuperscript{72} to have showed signs of aggression against the neighbouring chiefs of Kaṇṭugahalḷḷi, Kannambāḍi, Talakāḍ and Ammaehavāḍi. In or about 1574 Rama-Rajaiya, we glean,\textsuperscript{73} proceeded against him at the head of these chiefs and laid siege to Mysore for a period of three months. Chāmarāja intercepted the supplies and reduced to considerable straits the advancing forces commanded by Remati-Venkataiya, the general of Rama-Rajaiya. The latter was obliged to raise the siege and the former put to rout by Chāmarāja, who made prize of his (Remati-Venkaṭa's) insignia Suguna-Gambhira) horses, elephants, palankeens and war-drums. The enemy was hotly pursued by Chāmarāja's men who cut off the noses\textsuperscript{74} of those who persisted in opposing them. It was a complete victory for Mysore, and, for a time, there was no security in the neighbourhood of Seringapatam. At length Rama-Rajaiya concluded a truce with Chāmarāja by the cession of Kalve-Kottagala\textsuperscript{75} to Mysore.

Evidently this event seems to have considerably enhanced the prestige of Bōḷa-Chāmarāja in the eyes of his contemporaries. Indeed an inscription (dated in 1635)\textsuperscript{76} speaks of his "fame pervading all quarters." Already by 1576, we note,\textsuperscript{77} he had become an overlord of thirty-three villages\textsuperscript{78} commanding a force of 800 men and surrounded by hostile neighbours.

\textsuperscript{72} See G. Vain., 23; also 7,8 and 10, mentioning the chiefs referred to on p. 23.
\textsuperscript{73} G. Vam., 23-24; C. Pl., 11, 20-22; E. G. III(I) Sr. 14, 11. 13-14; Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol., My. 115, 11. 24-26: ajau ajayat Ramaraja senanyam. Also see and compare Mys. Raj. Cha., 17; Mys. Dho. Vam., ff. 6, 10; Annals, 1. 17, etc.
\textsuperscript{74} This is the earliest recorded instance, in the history of Mysore, when "nose-cutting" was freely resorted to during war.
\textsuperscript{75} Probably identical with the extant Kottagala, in the T.-Narasipur taluk (see List of Villages, 90). There is no village of this name, either in the Mysore or the Seringapatam taluk (Ibid).
\textsuperscript{76} M. A. B., 1924, p. 23, No. 6.
\textsuperscript{77} Mys. Dho. Vam., ff. 6 and 7.
\textsuperscript{78} For the names, etc., of these villages, vide Appendix I -(6).
Bola-Chamaraja Wodeyar, it is said, had two consorts, Kempamma (Hiriyamma) of Bilikere and Dēvājamma (Kiriyamma) of Kōṭe (Heggaḍēvakṣē). He had four solis, two by the former, Raja Wodeyar (b. 1552) and Beṭṭada-Chāmaraja Wodeyar (b. 1554); and two by the latter, Dēvarāja Wodeyar (b. 1553)—afterwards known as Muppina-Dēvarāja Wodeyar—and Channarāja Wodeyar (b. 1555). He is also said to have had three daughters, one of whom, Chikka-Depamma, was, we are told, married to Timmarāja Wodeyar I of Kalale (1527-1546).

Bōla-Chāmaraja is credited with having drained the Chōlagere (near the Somēśvara and Kōḍi-Bhairava temples in Mysore) and erected a temple to Trīṇēśvara—the image of which is said to have been, for long, lying immersed in the tank—and arranged for the conduct of worship in it, offerings, etc. He died on November 9, 1576.

Bōla-Chāmaraja Wodeyar was, we note, succeeded by Bettada (Dēvarāja) Wodeyar, a nephew of his and grandson of Hiriyapuram. His selection in preference to Raja Wodeyar, the eldest son of

---

81. *Annals*, I. c.
82. K. A. V., ff. 10; also Ch. X and Table XIII.
84. Extant in the fort of Mysore, opposite the Palace.

---
Bola-Chamaraja Wodeyar IV, 1572-1576.
Bōla-Chāmarāja, is, perhaps, to be accounted for by the circumstance that he was the only surviving member of the family, directly in the line of Hiriya-Bēttāda-Chāmarāja Wodeyar III. Bēttāda (Deyarāja) Wodeyar is recorded to have ruled for about two years (1576-1578), during which period, it is said, the affairs of the State were so ill-managed that the arrears of tribute due to the Seringapatam Viceroy (Rāmarāja) accumulated to 5,000 varahas. Thereupon the elders approached Raja Wodeyar and entreated him to assume the reins of government. Raja Wodeyar at first seemed averse to the proposal in view of the unsatisfactory state of the finances of the kingdom but Deva jamma, the dowager queen, saved the situation by offering 3,000 varahas while the halepaika officials made good the balance. The arrears of tribute were promptly cleared. On November 26, 1578, Bettada (Devaraja) Wodeyar was deposed and made to retire to Ankanahalli, and Raja Wodeyar succeeded to the kingdom of Mysore.

mainly following Wilks. But see and compare Tables I-IX, for the identity and exact relationship of Bettada Wodeyar and Bettada-Chamaraja Wodeyar, two distinct persons.

87. Vide Tables IV, V and VII.
88. Vide Tables IV and VII. Of. I, V and IX.
89. Vide Tables IV, V and VII compared with IX. Cf. S. K. Aiyangar, Ancient India, I.c.; see also f.n. 47 supra.
90. Mys. Dho. Pur., I. 9-10, 12, speaking of his accession on November 22, 1576 (Dhatu, Margasira su. 2), and the termination of his rule on November 26, 1678 (Bahudhana, Kartika ba. 12).
CHAPTER V.

RAJA WODEYAR, 1578-1617.
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Raja Wodeyar, 1578-1617.
Wodeyar's reign; others, like the *Mysuru-Nagaradapatruvottara*, *Mysuru-Rajarar-Charitre*, *Mysuru-Dhoregaja-Vamsavali* and the *Annals of the Mysore Royal Family*, contain traditional accounts of him. Among the literary works, the *Kanthirava-Narasardja-Vijayam* (1648) of Govinda-Vaidya and the *Chikkadevaraya-Vamsavali* (c. 1678-1680) and *Chikkadevaraja-Vijayam* (c. 1682-1686) of Tirumalarya, though more or less contemporary, embody an account of Raja Wodeyar drawn up in the poetical language. The available inscriptions of Raja Wodeyar himself illumine, to some extent, his political position and other particulars. Other literary works and inscriptions—of the reigns of the successors of Raja Wodeyar—seem to echo, in a significant manner, certain facts relating to his rule.

Raja Wodeyar was born on June 2, 1552, and was twenty-six years of age at the time of his accession on November 26, 1578. Of his early life very little is known, except that in his boyhood he had studied the sciences and practised at arms (elaveyol sastra sastrabhyasadol).

Raja Wodeyar appears to have been actually known as Timmaraja Wodeyar, having been probably so named after his grandfather, Chamaraja III, whose real name also was, as we


2. The *C. Vam.* (12) seems to convey a general picture of Raja Wodeyar as a person of a sufficiently advanced age at the time of his accession (see f.n. 180 infra, for further details). In the absence of confirmatory evidence on this point, the authority of the chronicles is preferred here.

3. *Mys. Dho. Pur.*, I. 12: *Bahudhanya, Kartika ha.* 12; cf. *Annals* (1.c), fixing the accession in *Bahudhanya, Vaisakha su.* 15 (April 20, 1578). The date of the former Ms. seems more acceptable, if we are to make a due allowance for the two years' reign of Bettada (Devaraja) Wodeyar (1576-1678).


5. *Vide* colophon to the *Chamarajokti-Vilasa* of Chamaraja V (1617-1637): *Timmaraja tanubhava Narasaraja garbha dugdha rindhu sudhakara Chamaraja Odeyeravaruru*. Here Chamaraja V, son of NarasarSja, is referred to as the grandson of *Timmaraja* who is, obviously, identical with Raja Wodeyar (*vide also Table II*). For a fuller notice of the work, see Ch. V I.
have seen, Timmaraja Wodeyar. In his own documents he appears mentioned as 'Raja Wodeyar,' 'Raja Wadeyaraiya' and 'Raja Wader of Mayisur' (Mysore). Other sources refer to him as 'Rajendra, 'Raja-Nripa' and 'Raja-Mahipati.'

At the time of his accession to the kingdom of Mysore, Raja Wodeyar was an overlord of thirty-three villages (of the revenue value of 3,000 varahas) and commanding 300 men. He was a feudatory of Sri-Ranga II of Vijayanagar (1574-1586) through Rama-Rajaiya (Rama III), the Viceroy at Seringapatam. Among his local contemporaries were, Rama-Raja-Nayaka of Hadinad and the chiefs of Kalale, Hullahalli, Hura, Miigur, Bilikere, Karugahalli, Kannambidi, Ammachavadi and Talakad. Rana-Pedda-Jagadeva-Rayá, the imperial representative of Vijayanagar and chief of the territory of Channapatna and Nagamangala (up to Seringapatam), was another important contemporary of Raja Wodeyar in the north of Mysore. Further north was Immađi-Kempe-Gauda of Magadi (1569-1658). In the far south was Virappa Nayaka of Madura (1572-1595). In the distant northwest flourished Rama-Raja Nayaka of Ikkeri (1570-1582).

During the early part of his reign (1578-1585), Raja Wodeyar appears to have been a loyal feudatory of Sri-Ranga II and Rama-Rajaiya of Vijayanagar. He appears also to have maintained friendly relations with Dalavai Remati-Venkataiya who was in charge of the Seringapatam Viceroyalty during the minority of Tirumala I I , eldest.

6. E. C., III (1) Sr, 150 and 157; TN. 116, etc.
7. K. N. V., I I I , 10, 48; C. Vam., 2, 6, etc.
8. Mys. Dho. Vam., ff. 6-7; see also and compare C. Vam., 13, referring to 28 as the number of the villages; 33, however, seems to be the correct figure, in keeping with the general political conditions of the times.
9. K. N. V., 111, 28, 26; C. Vi., 11, 28-29; C. Vam., 7, 8, 10.
son of Rama-Rajaiya. In 1584, however, apparently profiting by the absence of a strong hand in the Viceroyalty, Raja Wodeyar, it would seem, showed the first sign of aggression. In March of that year, he acquired Akki-hebbalu from Narasimha Nayaka of Hoçe-Narasipur.

The next period of Raja Wodeyar's reign in Mysore synchronised with the rule of Venkaṭa I of Vijayanagar (1586-1614) and the period of Tirumala's office as Viceroy at Seringapatam. Tirumala's records, as indicated already, bear unmistakable evidence of his having held the charge of the Viceroyalty, as early as 1585-1590, assisted by Dajavāi Rāmānujaiya, the probable successor of Rāmati-Venkataiya. In or about 1585, the first year of Tirumala's rule, Raja Wodeyar, it would appear, paid his first visit to Tirumala at Seringapatam and, when asked for the tribute, is said to have replied that it could not be paid owing to the alleged destruction of crops caused by wild cattle. Raja Wodeyar also seems

11. Ibid., 2.
12. Mys. Dho. Pur., I. 78; Annals, I. 48. See also and compare Wilks, I. 52-54. His list of Raja Wodeyar's conquests (Ibid., 58-54) is found, on examination, to have been based mainly on the Mys. Dho. Pur.
13. See Mys. Dho. Pur., I. 3. This work loosely assigns this event to the reign of Bola-Chamaraja Wodeyar (1572-1576), making Tirumala, the Seringapatam Viceroy, a contemporary of both Bola-Chamaraja and Raja Wodeyar. The Ms. (I. 5-7) even speaks of a subsequent attempt on Boja-Chamaraja's life, in Seringapatam, by Tirumala's Dajavāi, Rāmānujaiya. Wilks seems closely to follow this position (I. 44, 46-47). Tirumala was, however, as we have seen above, only a contemporary of Raja Wodeyar, while Rama-Rajaiya was a contemporary of Boja-Chamaraja Wodeyar. The overlapping and confusion in the Ms. are, however, reconcilable, if only the sequence of events is shifted on to the reign of Raja Wodeyar both from the points of view of contemporaneity and the probabilities of the case. The relations of Boja-Chamaraja Wodeyar with his contemporary, Rama-Rajaiya of Seringapatam, during the last two years (1574-1576) of his reign, could not but have been friendly, especially after Rama-Rajaiya's unsuccessful siege of Mysore and his truce about 1574 (vide Ch. IV). So that we would not be far wrong if we allow a fair interval of about nine years, from Boja-Chamaraja's death (1576), for the occurrence of an event of the type narrated in the Ms. This position, as we shall see, seems to find some measure of support from the earlier work, C. Vam., also.
to have sought Tirumala's permission to erect in Mysore a fort-wall of a man's height, to enable him to raise the crops and pay up punctually the annual tribute. No sooner was the permission accorded than the fort-wall was raised and the tax collectors of Seringapatam (Pattanada sunkada kolukararu) expelled from Mysore. Possibly Raja Wodeyar, who seems to have had a thorough knowledge of the conditions in the southern Viceroyalty, early found Tirumala unequal to the task of administering it. Accordingly we find him, in February 1586, acquiring Rangasamudra (with the adjoining twelve villages) from Tirumala. By 1590, Raja Wodeyar's position as the ruler of Mysore had become secure, though he appears to have continued diplomatic relations with the court of Seringapatam. In that year, he is stated to have paid a visit—a second one—to Tirumala. An interesting incident is recorded to have taken place on this occasion, which gives us an insight into the conditions of the times. Raja Wodeyar, says the manuscript, proceeded to the court accompanied by music. On his way he met Deparaja Wodeyar of Kembal, likewise accompanied. At this Raja Wodeyar was much incensed and visited Tirumala unattended by music. Asked by the latter why he had stopped the music, Raja Wodeyar replied that he had to do so because he could not tolerate Deparaja of Kembal—who was much inferior to him in status—being also accorded the same honour. Further, he represented that the right of either of them being attended by music should be determined in an open contest. This being agreed to, Raja Wodeyar proceeded against Deparaja and took possession of Kembal in the course of the same year. Whatever the truth in the story may be, there can be no question that Raja Wodeyar was a man both proud and

15. Ibid., I. 78-74; also see and compare Annals l.c.
16. Ibid., 1.18.
17. Ibid., 1.18-15; see also and compare Wilks, 1.46-47,
courageous and bent on maintaining his status as the ruler of an expanding kingdom. Next year (1591), he acquired Mullur.\textsuperscript{18}

Between 1592-1595, Raja Wodeyar's aggression went on apace. Tirumala's absence from the Viceroyalty in this period, as suggested by the absence of his records for these years, would indicate that he was engaged in the war against Virappa Nayaka of Madura. Tirurnala, it is said,\textsuperscript{19} sought Raja Wodeyar's help on the occasion, but the latter refused it. However, the absence of Tirumala from Seringapatam seemed a favourable opportunity for Raja Wodeyar to advance further. In 1592, he built a new fort at Rangasamudra\textsuperscript{20}; in 1593, he acquired Harohalli;\textsuperscript{21} and in July 1595, he took Narunelli from Mallarājaiya.\textsuperscript{22} In October 1595,\textsuperscript{23} assisted by his younger brother (Bettada-Chāmarāja Wodeyar) and 300 select followers, Raja Wodeyar curbed\textsuperscript{24} the power of his cousin, Virarajaiya,\textsuperscript{25} chief of Karugahalli, who had incurred his hostility by encroaching upon the boundaries of Mysore up to the Chamundhi Hills (Chdmundiya giriya piridelle gattigoskara vairava berasi),\textsuperscript{26} and had also, it is said,\textsuperscript{27} plotted in vain against Raja Wodeyar's life. An action is recorded to have taken place near an elevated place known as Kadubasavana-tittu,\textsuperscript{28} in which Raja

\textsuperscript{18}Mys. Dho. Vam., ff. 10.
\textsuperscript{19}See Annals, I. 21-22. This work, however, loosely refers to the Viceroy of Seringapatam as SrI-Ranga-Raya (for Tirurnala) and to the Nayaka of Madura as Venkatappa Nayaka (for Virappa Nayaka).
\textsuperscript{21}Mys. Dho, Pur., ff. 10. There is no evidence for a siege of Mysore by Bijapur in 1598—referred to by Ferishta and accepted by scholars. Vide Appendix II—(1), for a discussion of the subject.
\textsuperscript{22}Mys. Dho, Pur., I.e.; see also and compare Annals, I.e.
\textsuperscript{23}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{24}Ibid., I. 16-24; cf. Wilks, I. 46.
\textsuperscript{25}Identical with Vira Wodeyar of Karaganaha))i, mentioned in M. A. R., 1912, p. 64, para 118—a lithic record of c. 1600.
\textsuperscript{26}K. N. V., I 11, 16 ; also see and compare C. Vam., 7.
\textsuperscript{27}Annah, I. 19-20; vide also section on Raja Wodeyar's piety, for further details.
Wodeyar fought a hand to hand fight on horse-back, horse-whipped (kasabhihatiyim) Virarajaiya and removed his nose by a sledge-hammer (chammatigeyim . . . mūgu paridu; muģam bēruliyaqantaridu). The fort of Kārugahalli was felled down, the township razed to the ground and the land sown with castor seeds.

In or about 1596, shortly after Tirumala's return from Madura to Seringapatam, the local chiefs, disheartened by the aggressions of Raja Wodeyar (aggalikege kangettu), proceeded to the court of Seringapatam with tribute and presents, and acknowledged the suzerainty of Tirumala by accepting the insignia of office from him (kappa-kankegalanoppisi-yavana mudreyam vahisi). From hence, favoured by him and being settled in the sovereignty of their respective territories (avanolavam paddedu tamtamma neladoqetanamam nelegolisi); they all, it is said, began to pursue an attitude of hostility towards Raja Wodeyar (anibarum ondagi . . . viach-charamam mananqolisi ; mulisabalidu). At the same time Raja Wodeyar had sent his agents to Seringapatam to study the political situation (saptāngadirava-ndrayvenendu gudhachdraram pranidhagahimam kalupuvimam), while Tirumala himself, having heard from the Niyogi (i.e., diplomatic representative) of Mysore a favourable account about Rāja Wodeyar, wished to make friends.


30. G. Vam., 8; also K. N. V., I I I, 17.


32. See C. Vam., 6.

33. Ibid., 6, 7-11; K. N. V., I.e.

34. Ibid., 2.

35. From Niyogah, employment, commission, appointment; any business committed to one's share; from it is derived Niyogin, appointed, employed, authorized; an officer, minister or functionary. The Niyogis were, during the times we are writing of, Brahmans by caste, who specialized in this sort of public duty. They are to-day known as Niyogi Brahmans. They are found widely distributed oyer Southern India, though only in scattered numbers,
with him. With this end in view, says the Chikka-
deveraraya-Vamsavali, he duly honoured the Niyogi, desiring him to communicate whether it would be possible for Rāja Wođeyar to pay him a visit in Seringapatam or whether he (Tirumala) himself should go to the latter. Subsequently, however, we are told, Tirumala, considering the presence of a neighbour like Rāja Wođeyar a source of anxiety, decided, in consultation with his councillors, to capture his person if he proceeded to Seringapatam agreeably to fair words, failing which, to plan an expedition against Mysore. Accordingly, he had palm-leaf letters addressed forthwith (olegalam kadu tavakadolatti) to the chiefs of different parts of his dominions, requiring them to bring in their forces to the capital on the pretext of the Mahanavami festival (Manomiyosageya nevadim).

Meanwhile, Rāja Wođeyar had been well posted by his agents about the course of affairs in Seringapatam. Agreeing with his half-brother, Devarāja, continues the Chikkadevaraya-Vamsavali, he thought it expedient to renew and establish cordial relations with Tirumala, having regard to the circumstance that the neighbouring chiefs, and not Tirumala, were hostile to Mysore (emmol kenama prabhugalgallade a rayangilla). Accordingly a letter was sent to the court of Seringapatam through the Niyōgi, communicating Rājā Wođeyar's proposed visit to Tirumala.

Shortly after, Rāja Wođeyar, accompanied by Devarāja, proceeded thither, prepared to pay a visit to the temple of Ranganātha also. Meantime Tirumala, on receipt of the letter, had crossed the southern branch of the Cauvery

and proceeded as far as the Pașehimavāhini river (tenkaņa poleyam dānti paduvange pariva kiruvelya taḍivaragur-meydi), sure of success in his project. Here he met Raja Wodeyar. As they went further, towards the camp intended for the latter, a friendly talk followed, in the course of which they agreed, on mutual oaths and promises (bāse nambugegalanittu), to enter into a firm alliance between themselves. Presently, however, as Tirumala was about to leave Raja Wodeyar's camp, one of the latter's attendants recited his titles including Birud-antembara-ganda, a distinctive appellation of the rulers of Mysore. This last-mentioned one gave so much offence to Triumala that he desired one of his ministers to communicate to Raja Wodeyar not to have it recited in his (Tirumala's) presence, as it belonged to his family also by long usage. Thereupon Devarāja (brother of Rāja Wodeyar) retorted, pointing out that the title Antembara-ganda belonged as a matter of right to the kings of Mysore from the time of his grandfather, Hiriya-Bettada-Chāmarāja Wodeyar. This having been communicated to Tirumala, he at once gave up all thoughts of an alliance with Rāja Wodeyar and deliberated with the assembled chiefs on a plot to seize his person while he was engaged in performing his devotions at the temple of Ranganātha. The plot was, however, promptly disclosed to Rāja Wodeyar by a faithful adherent of his (Somayaji). Whereupon, cautioning Devarāja, Rāja Wodeyar quietly effected his escape to Mysore by the Brahmapuri gate of Seringapatam. At this news

48. Vide Ch. I V, for details about the acquisition of this title.
44. C. Vam., 18-19, 23. 45. Ibid., 18-23.
46. Ibid., 23; also f.n. 47 infra.
47. Ibid; vide also Mys, Dho. Pur., I. 6-9, etc This Ms., however, as indicated already (vide f.n. 18 supra), loosely assigns this event to the reign of Boja-Chāmarāja Wodeyar (1672-1576), and Wilks also has adopted this view (I. 44). As pointed out above, it has been shifted on to the reign of Raja Wodeyar. Brahmapuri is an extant village in the Seringapatam taluk (see List of Villages 93),
Tirumala, in utter disappointment, proposed to lay siege to Mysore.\footnote{Ibid.} The chiefs, however, having brought home to him the futility of an attack on Mysore in the light of their past experience during the regime of his father, Rāma-Bājaiya,\footnote{Vide Ch. IV, for details.} it was decided that the fort of Kesare\footnote{An extant village in the Mysore taluk to the south-west of Seringapatam [Ibid, i.e.).} commanding Mysore should be "first blockaded."\footnote{C. Vam., 23-4.}

On August 18, 1596 (\textit{Durmukhi, Bhadrapada su. 5}), the siege of Kesare came off.\footnote{Mys. Dho. Pur., I. 24. Wilks (I. 47), on the authority of this Ms., speaks of the siege of Kesare, without, however, noticing the date of the event. The date 1596 appears corroborated by the internal evidence of the \textit{G. Vam.} also, according to which there is a clear gap of twenty years between the siege of Kesare and the last year of Rāja Wođeyar's rule (\textit{vide} 12, 81; also see f.n. 180 \textit{infra}). We know from other sources that the year 1616-1617 was the last year of Rāja Wođeyar's reign, his death taking place in June 1617. Deducting 20 from 1616 we arrive at 1596, the date of the siege of Kesare.} The siege lasted but a few days.\footnote{Ibid., I. 24-27 ; see also K. N. V., I I I ; C. Vam., 24-27; C. Vi., I I . For a critical estimate of these poetical works, in their chronological bearing on the siege of Kesare and other political events of Rāja Wođeyar's reign, \textit{vide} Appendix II—(2).} The investing forces consisted of about a lakh of foot, seven to twelve thousand horse and one to two hundred elephants, levied from chieftains in various parts of the Karnāṭaka country.\footnote{For the composition of Tirumala's army, etc., \textit{vide} Appendix II—(2).} A major portion\footnote{K. N. V., I I I , 44-46, 63-60; also C. Vam., 15, 24; C. Vi., I I , 41-48.} of Tirumala's army encircled Kesare, while a section of it, headed among others by the chiefs of Ummattur and Mügūr, halted in the neighbourhood of Kerehaṭṭi,\footnote{An extant village in the Nanjangud taluk (see \textit{List of Villages}, 110),} ostensibly with a view to deliver an eventual attack on Mysore. While Tirumala was directing preliminary operations before Kesare, Bettada-Chāmaraja Wođeyar and Channarāja Wođeyar, younger brothers of Rāja Wođeyar, were preparing for the emergency both in Mysore and Kesare. Grasping the reality of the situation, Bettada-Chāmaraja hit upon
causing a diversion. Having left Raja Wodeyar in charge of Mysore, he marched at once southwards and turned against the chief of Heggadḍēvaṅkōṭe (Kōṭe). Crossing the Kapini—near Nanjangūḍ (Garalapura)—at dead of night, he put to rout the forces of the enemy at Kereḥatṭi, plundering their camp (palayam) near Satyagala. Then, fording the Cauvery at Sōsale, he surprised the foe at Kirangur (Kiravangur) and marched back to Mysore. At this news, Tirumala hastened the siege of Kesare. The fort of Kesare was in a decadent state. It was commanded by only 30 olekars with 12 matchlocks (kovi). Nevertheless the inhabitants held out bravely against the besiegers, repulsing them and breaking up and plundering their ranks. At this juncture, Jakka, one of the chiefs in Tirumala's army, began to lay his hands on the village named Hancheya, belonging to Mysore. Thereupon Betṭāda-Chāmarāja Wodeyar, with Channarāja, proceeded thither at the head of his forces, while Raja Wodeyar, accompanied by Dēvarāja, marched on with a contingent towards Kesare. Jakka was seized and put to death, his troops being slaughtered largely, many losing their noses. At the same time, Rāja Wodeyar made headway in relieving the fort of Kesare and obliging most of the chiefs to retreat. He was soon joined by Bettāda-Chāmarāja and Channarāja who, marching by way of the fort of Sāṭagahalḷi, captured, among others, an elephant, a horse and a transport ox belonging to Tirumala. Rāja Wodeyar, however, we are told, sent back the elephant, significantly observing, "It is easy to satisfy 40 olekars rather than maintain one elephant."

57. Ditto in the Seringapatam taluk (Ibid, 98).
58. C. Vam., 24; C. Vi., II, 44.
60. Ibid; also K. N. V., 111, 60-61; O. Vam., I.e.; C. Vi., I I , 47.
61. K. N. V., 111, 62-74; also C. Vam., 24-25; C. Fi., I I , 44-48.
62. An extant village in the Mysore taluk (see List of Villages, 82).
63. Ditto.
65. Ibid., I. 26; of. Wilks, I. 47.
66. Ibid., 1. 26; of. Wilks, I. 47,
Then Raja Wodeyar held a review of his troops near the elevated ground in the neighbourhood of Bellavatta, and ordered a general attack on the chiefs (Palegars) who had encamped to the east of Kesare. Bettada-Chamaraja Woḍeyar and Channarāja Woḍeyar, at the head of the halēpaika warriors, put them to rout, pursuing them as far as Brahmapuri. Proceeding north, they met Rāja Woḍeyar; and the united forces of the brothers began to pursue Tirumala. Tirumala, however, in utter discomfiture, quietly retreated to Seringapatam, leaving his insignias on the field, which fell into the hands of his pursuers who returned with them in triumph to Mysore.

In 1597 (Hevilambi) Raja Woḍeyar acquired Hariharapura. Early in 1598, we find him paying a visit to the court of Tirumala and obtaining from him a grant of lands (yielding 100 khandugas of paddy) in Belagula. On October 24 (1598), demanded to pay the tribute due, Raja Woḍeyar is stated to have pleaded his inability to pay owing, it is said, to the alleged damage and destruction, caused by the officials of Tirumala, to his garden land. Whereupon, in lieu of the garden land, Tirumala granted him the village of Rangasamudra. Between 1598-1607 Raja Wodeyar, it would appear, systematically defied the authority of Tirumala, encroaching upon the latter's territorial limits.
in the north and the east. In March 1600, he took Arakere from Adhāṭa-Bāya, a general of Jagadeva-Bāya; in August 1606, he acquired Sōsale, and in January 1507, he took Bannūr, from Nanjarāja of Talakaḍ.

These activities of Raja Wodeyar considerably alarmed Tirumala who, about the middle of 1607 (Plavanga), made a fresh attempt on Raja Wodeyar's life. On this occasion, it is said, one Singappa Wodeyar of Beḷagula was secretly entrusted with the execution of the plot in Mysore. Accordingly Singappa Wodeyar, while paying an informal visit to Raja Wodeyar, drew out his dagger and was about to thrust it into Raja Wodeyar. Luckily, however, Deparaja Wodeyar of Yeleyuṛ, a nephew of Raja Wodeyar, who was lying concealed behind a pillar in the apartment of the palace, flung himself from behind and made short work of the assassin, thus promptly averting the dark deed. In January 1608, Raja Wodeyar took possession of Kannambadī—with its dependency of Bukankere—from Dodda-Hebbāruva.

During 1608, Tirumala, finding his position in the Viceroyalty more and more delicate, consequent on the steady encroachments of Raja Wodeyar, is said to have made overtures for a peace with his uncle Venkaṭa I, the reigning Vijayanagar sovereign, probably seeking his help also against Raja Wodeyar. About this time, it is said, a confederacy of Palegars, headed among

73. Ibid., I. 75 and Annals, I. 43; see also C. Vam., 8 and 9.
74. Ibid.; also C. Vam., 9-10.
75. Ibid.
77. Ibid., I. 76; Annals, I. 44; also G. Vam., 8.
79. Ibid., 18-19; also see and compare Annals, I, 22 and 44. According to the former source (19), Venkata I's attitude of indifference towards Tirumala, since 1596, was the chief cause of this combination. The K. N. V. (III, 51) only refers to the curbing of the chiefs of Belur and Hoje-Narasipur by Raja Wodeyar and Beftada-Chamaraja Wodeyar.
others by Krishṇappa Nāyaka of Belur, Viṅgarājaiya of Grama, Bāḷalochana Nāyaka of Mūgūr, Immaḷi-Bāmaraḷa Nāyaka of Yelandūr and Mallaṛājaiya of Ummattūr, assembled near Kunīgal, contemplating the acquisition of Seringapatam itself. On receipt of this news, Raja Woḍeyar, alarmed for the safety of Mysore, proceeded against them and put them to rout, acquiring Belur, Grama and other places. Meanwhile, Tirumala's overtures having been rejected by Venkata, he was, in 1609, returning in state to Seringapatam by way of Hoḷe-Narasipur (Narasinhapsura), with (Dalavai?) Bhadraiya and other officers, when he was captured by Lakshmappa Nāyaka, the local chief. Tirumala, hard pressed, earnestly sought Raja Woḍeyar's help, to save the situation. Raja Woḍeyar marched thither, attacked Lakshmappa Nāyaka and put him to flight, and, cutting off his nose, took possession of Hoḷe-Narasipur, releasing Bhadraiya and others. By this achievement, Raja Woḍeyar rose high in the favour of Venkata. Indeed Venkata is even said to have assigned to him (Raja Woḍeyar) in recognition of his services, as rent-free (umbali), the villages of Aladūr and Navilūr (in the Tāyūr-nādu of the Ummattūr-sīme) and Kṣṇagahāḷḷi, and other villages (belonging to Bannūr), communicating the same to Nanjarājaiya of Ummattūr.

Tirumala's political position in Seringapatam, in and after 1609, was by no means secure. As indicated, he went down in the estimation of Venkata I by the most humiliating circumstance that he had to be rescued by the very person (i.e., Raja Woḍeyar) against whom he had had to seek Venkata's help. Venkata himself, it would...
seem, was, with complacency, forestalling Tirumala's overthrow and downfall. Venkata, it is said, had even sent him an order, promising him assurance of protection (abhayahastada nirupā) and probably admonishing him also to retire from his charge of the Viceroyalty. Tirumala had been dissociated from his feudatories. Although Raja Woḍeyar had stood by him (Tirumala) at a critical moment, his aggressions were going on apace. Supplies to the capital were being cut off; stores were running short; Tirumala's officials were being harassed; there was considerable difficulty in meeting the cost of feeding elephants and horses and the allowances of the military; the ditches and moats of the fort were being wrecked; only Tirumala's palace had been spared by the Mysoreans; and, for his bare existence, he had to depend on the inhabitants of Brahmapuri, a suburb of Seringapatam. Tirumala's authority was, thus, fast dwindling away. Yet, we are told, he was ruling all these years (i.e., since the siege of Kesare) with considerable rigour (kattarasugeyyuttire), which seems nothing more than a mere poetical expression.

About the end of January 1610, some of the local chiefs (of Talakāḍ, Ammachavāḍi and other places), who had retreated with considerable loss during the siege of Kesare, hoping to stand by Tirumala to the last, prevailed upon him to join them against Raja Woḍeyar. To relieve Tirumala from his difficulties, they encamped to the north of Seringapatam with necessary supplies, arms and ammunition. This was an opportune moment for Raja Woḍeyar to strike. It was now that he resolved upon to drive out Tirumala from the Viceregal

82. Mys. Dho. Par., 1. 54-55; cf. Wilks, 1. 61-62; also Appendix II—(3).
83. C. Vam., 28.
84. C. Vi, I I, 64. The poet is, obviously, to be understood to be referring here to an hiatus between the siege of Kesare and Tirumala's final retreat from Seringapatam (1696-1610).
85. C. 7am., 27-28,
Forthwith, he despatched some forces under his eldest son, Narasaraja. A swift and decisive action followed, in which Narasaraja put the chiefs to rout, obliging them to retreat with considerable loss as far as Kodiyala (Kodala) about ten miles further north of Seringapatam. On the morrow of this reverse, Tirumala, alone and helpless, having lost all hope of succour from his allies and being obsessed by the fear of an impending siege of Seringapatam by Narasaraja (pattanamam vēḍhaipanendalki), quietly retreated towards Māḷangi (near Talakad), leaving his family behind. Immediately after receipt of this news, Raja Wodeyar proceeded towards Seringapatam accompanied by his younger brother, Bettada-Chamaraja Wodeyar. It was his first concern to arrange to send Queen Rangamma, the wife of Tirumala, to Māḷangi under a proper escort. That done, he entered and formally took possession of the city of Seringapatam on February 8, 1610 (Saumya, 86).
Thus passed into Mysore hands the old town of Seringapatam and the territory subordinate to it, which had been a Vijayanagar possession and subject to its direct rule for nearly a century and a half.

The acquisition of Seringapatam by Raja Wodeyar was thus an act of conquest. This fact is unanimously echoed and re-echoed, and finds the most significant expression, in the literary works and inscriptions of the seventeenth century. It was the culmination of a long course of affairs in the Viceroyalty of Seringapatam during a period of twenty-five years (1585-1610) and, more particularly, during a period of fourteen years from the siege of Kesare (1596-1610). It was, obviously, the outcome of an antagonism between the Viceroy Tirumala and his uncle, Venkaṭa I, on the one hand and of alternate rivalry and friendship as between Tirumala and Raja


95. Among writers other than Govinda-Vaidya and Tirumalaṭya, Chikkupādhyāya, in his Divya-Sūri-Charitṛ (I, 72), speaks of Raja Wodeyar tactfully conquering Tirumala and expelling him from Seringapatam, and taking possession of the place (Tirumala-Rajendranati-kusalopayayinde geldelchi Srirangapattanama-niradlldam). Other works of his, namely, Kamandaka-Niti (I, 54), Paichimaranga-Mahatmya (I, 34), Hastigiri-Mahatmya (I, 52), Venkatagiri-Mahatmya (I, 39) and Bhagavadgītā (Vīkrama 1, 36), likewise refer to Raja Wodeyar taking Seringapatam by wonderful tactics (atichitra-rachaneyim Srirangapattanama-noppōiti-kondo, matsaradinbīsī), etc. Timma-Kavi, in his Yadavagiri-Mahatmya (I, 88), speaks of Raja Wodeyar subduing Tirumala by his prowess (sauryadim geldu). Chidananda, in his Munivamsabhyudaya (II, 17), writes of Raja Wodeyar attempting the acquisition of Seringapatam after curbing Tirumala's pride (Tirumala-nripa hamma muridu Srirangapuravā sadhiradam), referring, obviously, to the "acquisition" following long after the siege of Kesare. Inscriptions of 1680, 1686, 1686-1690, among others, refer to Raja Wodeyar's conquest of Tirumala and his acquisition of Seringapatam from him (jitva Tirumala-Rajam hritva Srirangapattanam). (See E.C., Bangalore Dist. Suppl. Vol., Bn. 144, II. 9-10; I I I (1) Sr. 14,11. 17-18; Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol., My. 115,11. 29-30. For particulars about these sources, see Chs. XIII and XIV. In the light of these data, the versions in later writings, relating to Raja Wodeyar's acquisition of Seringapatam as an act of "conditional transfer," "gift," "bequest," etc., are not entitled to credence. For a detailed examination of these versions, vide Appendix II—(3).
Wodeyar on the other, a position which was quite in keeping with the general political conditions in the Karnataka during the half century following the battle of Baksas-Tagdi, (1565).

The year 1610 has thus to be reckoned an important landmark in the history of Mysore. With the conquest of Seringapatam, Raja Wodeyar evidently took formal possession of the Viceregal throne that had been long established there. This throne has been referred to as "the throne of Bhoja" (Bhoja-simhsana), and was generally known as "the throne of the south" (dakshina-simhasana) and "the jewelled throne" (ratna-simhasana). Raja Wodeyar is said to have actually inaugurated his rule in Seringapatam on March 21, 1610 (Sadharana, Chaitra su. 7), nearly a month and a half after his occupation of the place. He seated himself on the throne (simhasanamadhitisthan), holding his first durbar at Seringapatam at an auspicious moment (joyisaganitta nalvoltinol olagamirdu). This may be taken to definitely mark the assertion of independence on the part of Mysore rulers from Vijayanagar overlordship, though they formally acknowledge it in some of their grants for some years yet. Evidently diplomacy required such recognition. It is only on this footing that we can understand the acknowledgment of

97. E. C, I 1 I (1) TN. 54 (1669), 1. 10. See also inscriptions and literary works noticed and cited in Chs. VIII-XIV. One of these records, dated in 1680 (Ibid., Bangalore Dist. Suppl. Vol., Bn. 144, II. 16-17), in particular, speaks of the throne as "the jewelled throne of Sriranga-Rayya" (Sri-Ranga-Rayya manisobhita pitha), from which it seems possible that it was transferred for safety to Seringapatam during the troubulous years of Sri-Ranga II's rule in Penukonda (1574-1586). For a critical notice of Wilks's position regarding the "Mysore Throne," vide Ch. XI, f.n. 178.
98 Annals, I. 30.
99. E. C I I I (1) Sr. 14, 1. 18; Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol., My. 115, II. 30-31, etc.
100. C, Vam., 30.
Vijayanagar supremacy down to as late a period as 1668.  

Seringapatam became henceforward the capital of the kingdom of Mysore. The political centre of gravity shifted thither from the old town of Mysore. Narasarāja, the eldest son of Raja Woḍeyar, was designated Yuvaraja (Crown-prince). Raja Woḍeyar continued to rule the kingdom assisted by his younger brothers, one of whom, Bettada-Chamarāja Woḍeyar, appears to have held direct charge of the patrimony of Mysore. Narasarāja, however, died on September 7, 1610 (Sadharana, Bhadrapada ba. 30), and, it would seem, Bettada-Chamarāja Woḍeyar became the Yuvaraja thereafter.

Raja Woḍeyar's political position after his acquisition of Seringapatam is, perhaps, best reflected in a record, dated in 1612, referring to him as Sriman-Mahadhiraja, which points to him as a prominent feudatory of Venkata I of Vijayanagar (1586-1614). Indeed, Venkata seemed to regard Raja Woḍeyar's occupation of Seringapatam as the stepping in of a

---

101. See E. C., IV (2) Gu. 65. Kauthirava-Narasaraja I of Mysore is said to be the right-hand of the Vijayanagar sovereign in 1648—Ibid, Yd. 5. At the same time the Mysore kings make numerous grants on their own independent authority, one of the earliest that can be cited being of the date 1612—Ibid, Ch. 200; also see E. C, I I I (1) Sr. 160 (1617) and 117 (1625), T. N. 13 (1633), etc. For further particulars, vide Chs. VI, VIII-X.

102. Annals, I.c. 103. See K. N. V., 111, 100105.

104. Annals, I. 32; see also C. Vam., 31, referring to Narasaraja as having predeceased Raja Woḍeyar.

105. The K. N. V. (IV, 2) and the Munivam. (11, 18) speak of the joint rule of Raja Woḍeyar and Bettada-Chamarāja Woḍeyar (Bettada-Chamendra samasta bhutalava nagraja saha nalidu; agrajanujar dharanijanu taledu). The latter (11, 14) perhaps significantly refers to Raja Woḍeyar as Adhiraja and to Bettada-Chamarāja as Yuvaraja, (Rajodeyari-gadhiraja padavi, Yuvardja padavi Chamaraja tejōnīdhige).

106. E. C., IV (2), Ch, 200,1. 2.
powerful and loyal feudatory in place of Tirumala who, by his treacherous conduct at Madura—and later, possibly, by his refractory attitude—had alienated his sympathy from him, and whose ultimate retirement, as we have seen, he (Venkata) appears to have systematically planned. Venkata I, as the Chikkadevārđya-Vamśavālī\textsuperscript{107} puts it, was even pleased with Raja Wođeyar for having expelled his nephew from Seringapatam and taken possession of the place. Considering this, probably, as loyal service rendered to the cause of the Empire, he also, about the end of March 1612,\textsuperscript{108} it is said,\textsuperscript{109} sent through his minister, Gambhira-Raya-Virupanna, rutting elephants, horses, jewels and robes, by way of honouring Raja Wođeyar. Raja Wođeyar accepted these presents and duly honoured Virupanna, sending in return presents to Venkata I.

It was, further, on this occasion, that Raja Wođeyar, according to the Dalavai-Agraharam Plates I (1623),\textsuperscript{110} received from Venkata I, by means of an order of assurance (abhaya hasta nirupa purvakavagi), the grant of Ummattūr and Seringapatam as an hereditary possession (kananchiyagi). In keeping with this, the Melkote copper-plate grant\textsuperscript{111} of Raja Wođeyar himself, dated in 1614, refers to Seringapatam as a rent-free estate assigned to him by Venkata I (namage Venkatapatirayarinda.


\textsuperscript{108} See E. C., III (1), TN. 62 (1623), II. 36-44, referring to a grant of Venkata I to Raja Wođeyar on March 27, 1612 (Paridhavi, Chaitrasu. 5).

\textsuperscript{109} C. Vam., 31; also text supra.

\textsuperscript{110} E. C., III (1), TN. 62, I.c.

\textsuperscript{111} Ibid.,Sr. 167,11. 8-9.
umbaliyagi banda Srirangapattana). A lithie record, dated in 1615, refers to Bannûr also as a rent-free grant to Raja Wođeyar (umbaliyagi banda Bannûra sthala). Bannûr and Seringapatam, referred to in these records, were clearly conquests of Raja "Wođeyar made in 1607 and 1610. Raja Wođeyar evidently obtained formal confirmation of these conquests as rent-free grants at the hands of Venkaša I. In all these records we find him referring to the latter as his overlord, a sure sign of his loyalty to the Imperial house, though he had in fact wrested the Viceroyalty from its own scion.

Raja Wođeyar was thus, in theory, a feudatory of the ruling Vijayanagar Emperor. His actual political position in the eyes of the latter seems to have been that of a representative or an agent for the seat of imperial power in the south (dakshina-simhasana Srirangapattana (kartarada), as is significantly echoed in one of the later records. Seringapatam, though a distinct gain to the kingdom of Mysore from Raja Wodeyar's point of view, was, as we shall see, not completely lost to the Empire at least for another half a century or so. In actual practice, however, Raja Wodeyar was more or less

112. Ibid., TN. 116,1.17.
113. The earliest available record of the reign of Raja Wodeyar, mentioning the suzerainty of Venkata I, is, however, a lithic one dated in March 1598 (E. C, Mys. Diet. Suppl. Vol., Sr. 198,11. 3-4). The exceptions are E. C, I I I (1) My. 4 (1594) and Sr. 150 (1617), referring only to Raja Wodeyar's services in local temples. There is, thus, enough data pointing to Raja Wodeyar's loyalty to the Empire both before and after his acquisition of Seringapatam.

114. See, for instance, E. C, I I I (1) TN. 54 (1669), 11. 10-11. The expressions, dakshyna-simhasana Srirangapattana, literally mean southern throne of Seringapatam. Since Seringapatam had been a Viceroyalty under the Vijayanagar Empire, these expressions also seem to convey that it continued, in theory, as a seat of Imperial power in the south long after its conquest by Raja Wodeyar (in 1610). In keeping with this position is the "well-known tradition that the rulers of Mysore from Raja Wodeyar onwards were generally known as Kartar,
independent as a ruler of Mysore, steadily expanding his kingdom at the expense of the Pālegārs in different parts of the Viceroyalty.

In April 1610, Rāja Woḍeyar acquired Siriyūr from Nanjuṇḍa-Arasu of Piriyaṅpāṭaṇa. In July 1612, he took Saragur from Sri-kaṇṭha Woḍeyar. Early in 1614, Rāja Woḍeyar apparently found in Nanjarāja Woḍeyar of Hadināḍ Twenty Thousand country a serious competitor for the sovereignty of the Seringapatam province. At the head of a large army, levied from the chiefs of Ālambāḍi, Koḷeya, Yeḷandūr, Satyagāla and Madura (tanage Madhureyavariva kappada panadol kattida kalalgal), Nanjarāja began the offensive against Rāja Woḍeyar by walking away with the latter's horse (named Meghapushpa) stationed in Yeḍadore, a frontier fort of Mysore (Edadoreyemba gadi-gonte). Raja Woḍeyar decided upon hostilities and laid siege to Tāyūr. Nanjarāja was proceeding thither, with convoys, by way of Ammachavadi. Rāja Woḍeyar surprised him in the neighbourhood of the hill overlooking Vāṭahāḷu and Gaṇaganaṇūr, and began to obstruct his passage. A fierce fight ensued, in which Nanjarāja was, with considerable loss, slain, and his camp plundered. In February 1614, Terakanambi and Ummattur—with their dependencies—which had belonged to Nanjarāja, were annexed to Mysore. The Hadināḍ-sīme was, however, left in charge of Chandrasekhara Woḍeyar, younger brother of Nanjarāja.

Further territorial acquisition: Siriyūr Hadināḍ, Terakanambi and Ummattūr, 1610-1616.
In December 1614, Rāja Wodeyar acquired Hura, and in February 1615, Haradanahalli, from Srikantha Wodeyar and Nanjaraja Wodeyar (sons of Lingapādaiya) respectively. In February 1615, he also acquired, and exacted tribute from, Talakāḍ (from Somarajaiya), Hullahalli (from Srikantha Wodeyar), Kalale (from Karikāla-Mallarajaiya), Heggaḍevankšte (from Channarajaiya), Malalavāḍi (from Gopālarajaiya), Bilikere (from Santarajaiya), Kottagala and Ammachavāḍi. In March, Mūgūr from Basavaraja Wodeyar, and in November, Kikkeri and Hosaholalu from Jagadeva-Rāya, were taken. In February 1616, on the death of Chandrasekhara Wodeyar (in January), Ramasamudra, in Hadināḍ, was annexed.

In March 1617, Mavattur was acquired from Nanjunda-Arasu of Piriyapatna. By about the middle of 1617, Rāja Wodeyar had effectively established his sway over a greater portion of the present district of Mysore. He was evidently at the height of his power (mandaladhipatyadolire), as the Chikkadevaraja-Vijayam seems to indicate. The long series of Rāja Wodeyar's conquests, between 1584-1617, had resulted in the acquisition by him of a number of insignias, such, for instance, as Dharanivardha (boar crest), Garuda (eagle), Makara (crocodile), Sankha (conch), Sitatapatra (whiteumbrella)and Chakra (discus). These conquests were, again, important from the domestic point of view. Rāja Wodeyar, as we shall see, entered

122. Ibid., 1.79; Annals, I. 44.
123. Ibid ; Ibid.
124. Annals, I. 44-45; also G. Vi., I.e.
126. Ibid., I. 81-82; Annals, I.e.
127. Ibid., I. 45.
128. Ibid., I. 82; of. Annals, I. 44.
129. II, 29.
130. See Sriranga-Mahatmya (of Chikkunadhyaya), I, 24: Dhore dhoregala-niridirdottarisute dharanivaraha namamananta birudugalantam garuda makara sankha sitatapatra chakradigalam ||
into matrimonial relations with some of the more important local chiefs subdued by him.

The kingdom of Mysore, in 1617, extended from Seringapatam in the north to Ummattur and Terakaṇṭāmbi in the south, and from Bannūr in the east to Māvattur, Akkihebbālu and Hoḷe-Narasipur in the west and the north-west. Western Daṇḍayakankṣe, Rangasamudra, Vijayāpura, Naḷūr, Arakere, Yeleyur and Mangala, were among the important places within its sphere of influence. The kingdom, thus built up by Rāja Woḍeyar, was coterminous with the Channapaṭṭa Viceroyalty (under Jagadeśa-Raya) in the north and the territory of the Nāyaks of Madura in the south.

Rāja Woḍeyar was a pious ruler. His government was conducted in accordance with the ancient ideal of dharma (dharmadīnaḥ dhareyam palāsi), i.e., with due regard to the happiness and well-being of his subjects. The words, dharmadīnaḥ dhareyam palāsi, mean that he ruled the kingdom agreeably to the dharma. Here the word dharma has a wider, in fact a special, significance and indicates something more than mere conduct or religion. Indeed, according to Somadeva-Sūri, the author of Nītivākyamrita, who is better known by his Yasastilaka which he wrote in 959, dharma is a technical term in Hindu Politics and has a definite connotation attached to it. He defines it as that which promotes

131. C. Vam., 32. The places mentioned are villages in the T.-Narasipur, Gunglupet, Chamarajanagar, Seringapatam and Mandya taluks (see List of Villages, 87, 89, 92, 93 and 106).
132. R. Satyanatha Aiyar, on the authority of Taylor, speaks of a probable invasion of the Dindigal province by one "Mukilan," a general of Raja Woḍeyar (Nayaks of Madura, p. 105), for which there is no evidence. The reference here is, possibly, to a general of Nanjaraja of Hadinad, who, according to the C. Vam. (31), had levied tribute from Madura.
the greatest good of society. *Rajadharma* would thus be something in keeping with the good of the greatest number of the governed. This theory: whether it anticipated Bentham's great principle or not, made happiness of the governed the end of kingly rule and the test of royal virtue. A king's actions were right in proportion as they tended to promote happiness and wrong as they tended to promote the reverse. Judged from this high and exacting standard, Raja Wodeyar, who was uniformly kind to the cultivator and strict towards the feudatory, must be said to have been not only a great success but also one who governed according to the dharma. The rigour of his rule no doubt told heavily on the subordinate local chiefs (*Palegars*) but it must be held to have been in keeping with the requirements of the times.

In the conquered tracts, Raja Wodeyar, it is said, continued the land revenue settlement of the *Palegar* regime. To facilitate the collection and transmission of revenue dues, however, shrewd officials, closely acquainted with the details of the local administration of the units (*gadi*), were newly appointed, and under them were placed accountants (*karanika*) to maintain regular accounts. For the prevention of crimes and the maintenance of public peace in the local parts, officials like *Thanadars*, *Hoblidars* and *Olekars* were posted in suitable numbers.

Raja Wodeyar is reputed to have organised the *Mahanavami* (*Navaratri*) *Durbar* in Seringapatam, in continuation of the *Vijayanagar* traditions. We have an elaborate traditional account of how he first celebrated the *Navaratri* in 1610 (September 8-17), His eldest

---

134. Annals, I.c.; see also and compare *Raj. Kath.*, X I I . 467.
135. Annals, I . 33-40. For a contemporary reference to the Mahanavami festival, *vide* Ch, IX.
son, Narasarāja, having died in that year (September 7), Raja Wodeyar, in consultation with experts, is also said to have laid down the rule that, in future, the death even of the closest relatives of the Royal House should not interfere with the celebration of ceremonies connected with this feast.\textsuperscript{136}

In or about 1614 Raja Wodeyar, we note,\textsuperscript{137} keenly felt the need for a Dalavai (Commander-in-Chief), which appointment had been discontinued ever since the usurpation of Māra Nāyaka (1399). He had but an insufficient force with him, either to make fresh territorial acquisitions or to cope with opponents like Nanjarāja of Hadinaḍ. Accordingly, having deliberated with his councillors, Raja Wodeyar sought the assistance of his nephew, Karikāla-Mallarājaiya (son of Timmarāja Wodeyar I of Kalale Forty Thousand country),\textsuperscript{138} and concluded with him a solemn deed of promise (bhashapatra), to the effect that, while Rāja Wodeyar's descendants were to rule Seringapatam, Mysore, Kalale and other places annexed from time to time, the descendants of Mallarajaiya were to hold the office of Sarvadhikari (office of Chief Minister) and Dalavai (Commander-in-Chief) in Mysore. In pursuance of this agreement, Karikāla-Mallarājaiya was appointed the first Dalavai. Mallarajaiya, having accepted the office, went over to Kalale, but later sent in his resignation through

\textsuperscript{136} Ibid., I. 32-33.
\textsuperscript{137} Ibid. I. 46-47; Mys. Dho. Vam. Kaif., ff. 7-8 (compared). The word Dalavai literally means mouthpiece of the army (dala + vayi or bayi) and denotes a military officer of the rank of Commander-in-Chief. It is a colloquialism for Danda-nayaka or Danuayaka of the Vijayanagar inscriptions, and occurs for the first time in the seventeenth century records of the Wodeyars of Mysore, the earliest being E.C., I 111 (I) Sr. 36 (1620). (Vide also f.n. 6 to Ch. VI). The word is generally spelt as Dalavayi, Dalavoy, Dalavay and Dalavai, the last being conveniently followed in this work. Wilks's spelling, Dulwoy or Dulvoy, is obsolete.
\textsuperscript{138} Vide Table XIII. For further particulars about Karikāla-Mallarajaiya, see Ch. X.
his grandson, Nandithaiya. Thereupon Bettada-Arasu, a natural son of Bettada-Chamaraja Wodeyar (younger brother of Raja Wodeyar), was appointed Dalavai in January 1617. The latter, it is said, was of considerable assistance to Raja Wodeyar in the acquisition of Mavattur from Nanjunda-Arasu of Piriapatna (March 1617).

Raja Wodeyar, as depicted to us, was a devout Vaishnava, adoring God LakshmiKanta of Mysore, the tutelary deity of his family (tanna manedevarenipa), Narayana of Yadugiri, the deity of his race (tanna kuladevarenipa), and Ranganatha of Seringapatam. He was noted for the catholicity of his religious outlook. Numerous were his gifts and grants, alike to individuals and to Saiva and Vaishnava temples in the kingdom. Repairs and services to the temples of Ranganatha and Narayana in Seringapatam and Melkote, respectively, claimed his constant share of attention. In particular, he is said to have endowed the latter shrine with a jewelled crown known as Raja-mudi (named after himself), and the former with lands yielding 50 khandugas of paddy

---

141. Vide on this point C. Vam., 10, 19-28. See also In trod. Ch. in the works of Chikkipadhyaya, Timma-Kavi, etc.; of. Wilks, I. 52. There is no evidence in support of Wilks's statement that the cult of Vishnu was adopted by the Mysore Rulers only after Raja Wodeyar's acquisition of Seringapatam (1610). For the Vaishnava predilections of Raja Wodeyar before 1610, vide references infra.
142. See Mys. Raj. Ch., 20; Annals, I. 40-42, referring to Raja Wodeyar's grants of agharas to Brahmans, and his services in the temples at Chamundi Hills, Mysore, Seringapatam, Melkote, T.-Narasipur, Yadatore, Ramanathapur, etc. Devachandra (Raj. Kath., X 11. 465) even speaks of Raja Wodeyar as having made rent-free grants to the Adisvara-Basti at Seringapatam and to individual Jains, and got built a prakara to the Basti at Kanakagiri (Maleyur).
143. See, for instance, I. M. C., No. 18-16-20, pp. 28-24,26-27, referring to Raja Wodeyar's services to the temple of Ranganatha during 1600-1616; also C. Vom., 9, 15.
Bhakta-vigraha of Raja Wodeyar, now in the Lakshmi-Narayana (Lakshmīkāntasvāmi) Temple, Fort, Mysore.
Bhakta-vigraha of Raja Wodeyar in the Narayanasvami Temple, Melkoje.
under the tank of Kalastavādi enlarged by him. 145 He is also said 146 to have built the tower over the outer gate (mahd-dvdrā) of the Lakshmīkāntāsvāmi temple at Mysore, setting it with a golden pinnacle (suvarṇa kalasa). Among the extant-records of his reign, a lithic one, dated March 13, 1594, 147 refers to the construction of a Sankrānti-mantāpa to God Lakshmīkānta of Mysore. Another, dated March 31, 1598, 148 records a grant of lands for Ramānuja-kūta and a feeding house (chatra)ī in the precincts of the temple of Janārdanasvāmi at Beḷagulā. The Melkōte copper-plate grant, dated April 14, 1614, 149 registers a gift by Rāja Woḍeyar of the village of Muttigere (Nrisimhapura) divided into 50 shares, of which 49 were distributed among 28 Brāhmans and one was set apart to provide for the offering of the Garuḍa-vāhana in the temple of Chaluvarāyasvāmi (Nārāyaṇa) at Melkōte. Another record, a lithic one, dated April 3, 1615, 150 refers to a grant by him of the village of Bēvinahalli to God Bāmachandra of Vahnipura. A third, also lithic, dated February 5, 1617, 151 mentions a service of Raja Woḍeyar in the Srinivasasvāmi temple at Karlghatta.

A Bhakta-vigraha of Raja Woḍeyar, a bas-relief statue, one and a half feet high, standing with folded hands, with his name inscribed on the base, is found carved on one of the pillars of the navaranga of the Nārāyaṇasvāmi temple at Melkōte. 152 A similar statue of his, about two feet high, is also to be seen to the right in the prakara of the Prasanna-Krishnasvāmi temple at Mysore. 153

145. I. M. C. Ditto, p. 27 (1618).
147. M. O., I11 (1) My. 4: rf. 1616, Jaya, Chaitra su. 1.
149. Ibid., I11 (1) Sr. 157: 1, 1586, Inanda, Vaisakha su. 15.
150. Ibid., T.N. 116: s. 1587, Rakshasa, Chaitra su. 15. The week-day, Thursday, mentioned in the record, is apparently an error for Monday.
151. Ibid., Sr. 150: Nala, Magha su. 10,
152. See M. A. B., pp. 21 and 58, paraa 44 and 142.
Two miracles, said to have occurred during the reign of Raja Wođeyar, give us some insight into his piety. As already mentioned, early in his reign, Virarajaiya of Karugahalli, a cousin of Raja Wođeyar, plotted against his life; it is said, by administering poison into the holy water of God Lakshmīkanta (Lakshmimaranāsavadmi) at Mysore. Raja Wođeyar partook of the holy water from the priest of the temple, when the sediment of poison, contained therein, only remained, and became distinctly perceptible, on the palm of his own hand. Again, in February-March 1599 (Vilambi, Phalguna), a blind man (a Brahman by name Venkatesaiya) from Tirupati is stated to have got back his eye-sight at the temple of Lakshmīkantasvāmi in Mysore, under the influence of Raja Wođeyar's faith in that God.

The influence exerted by Sri-Vaishnavism during this reign is, perhaps, best illustrated by two Kannada works extant, assignable to the period of Raja Wođeyar. The earliest of these is the Sriranga-Mahatmya (c. 1600) by Singarāchārya who refers to himself as a teacher.

165. Sriranga-Mahatmya.
166. Mys. Dho. Pur., I. 29-32; also see and compare Annals, I. 20-21; G. Vam., 10; and Introd. Ch. in the works of Chikkupādhya etc. Some of the literary works (including, the C. Vam.) speak of the recipient of the eye-sight as a woman from Tirupati. The authority of the My8. Dho, Par., however, is preferred here as the more specific one.
167. Sriranga-Mahatmya.
Sri-Lakshmi-Narayana (Lakshmikautasvami) Temple, Fort, Mysore.
of Betṭṭada-Chāmarāja Wodeyar, younger brother of Rāja Wodeyar, and is possibly identical\textsuperscript{158} with Singaraiyangār I of Seringapatam, of Kauāika-gōtra, Àpastambha-sūtra and Yajus-sākhā. The work begins with invocations to God Ranganātha, Ranganāyaki and Râmānuja, and deals with the legendary history of Srīrangam in Kannada prose (in 10 chapters). The other work, \textit{Karna-Vrittānta-Kathe}\textsuperscript{159} (c. 1615), dealing with the episode of Karna in the \textit{Mahâbhârata}, is an incompleète poetical production (in 12 chapters), written in the popular Sāngatya mètre. The author's nanie is nowhere mentioned in the text, but there are indications\textsuperscript{160} in it that he was a èrī-Vaishnava Brâhman of Seringapatam living with his parents and a brother. The authorship, however, is attributed to one Tirumalārya, said to have been at first a preceptor, and afterwards Pradhâni (minister), of Rāja Wodeyar.\textsuperscript{161} If this Tirumalārya is presumed to have written the \textit{Karna-Vrittānta-Kathe}, then he is, perhaps, identical\textsuperscript{162} with Tirumalaiyangār I, eldest son of Singaraiyangār I of Seringapatam. The \textit{Kama-Vrittānta-Kathe} begins with an invocation to God Paâchima Ranganātha (the God at Seringapatam) and is pervaded by an essentially èrī-Vaishnava background.

Vīrāmbā (Vīrājamma), sister of Channarāja of Bommanahalli, was the principal consort of Rāja Wodeyar.\textsuperscript{163} Among other consorts of his were,\textsuperscript{164} Deçldamnia of Bilikere, Kempamma of Hura, Timmājamma of Bilugali and Muddamma of Tippūr. He had four sons,\textsuperscript{165} three by

\begin{flushleft}
\textbf{Domestic life.}
\end{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{158} Vide Table in Appendix II—(4).
\textsuperscript{160} See 1, 1-4, 28.
\textsuperscript{161} Vide Appendix II—(4), for a discussion of the évidence, etc.
\textsuperscript{162} Vide Table in Ditto.
\textsuperscript{163} K. N. V., 111, 12; see also and compare \textit{Mys. Dho, Pur.}, I. 60; \textit{Annals}, I. 18.
\textsuperscript{164} \textit{Mys. Dho. Pur.}, lo. ; cf. \textit{Annals}, l.c.
\textsuperscript{166} Ibid., I. 83; see also \textit{G. Vam.}, 81-82; cf. \textit{Annals}, I. 19; and Tables IV and IX.
Vīrāṃbā and the fourth and last by Timmājamma-Narasarāja, the eldest, was born in July 1579; Nanjarāja, the second, in September 1581; Beṭṭa Woḍeyar (Beṭṭada-iya), in 1583; and Immadi-Rāja Woḍeyar, the youngest, in May 1612. Narasarāja, as we have seen, was of active assistance to Rāja Woḍeyar, during the conquest of Seringapatam (1610). The Mākuballi copper-plate grant (February 1635) echoes his prowess.\textsuperscript{166}

Rāja Woḍeyar, as noted already,\textsuperscript{167} had a younger brother, Bettada-Chāmarāja Woḍeyar (6. 1554), and two half-brothers, also younger, Dēvarāja Woḍeyar (b. 1553)—afterwards known as Muppina-Dēvarāja Woḍeyar—and Channarāja Woḍeyar (b. 1555). Bettada-Chāmarāja Woḍeyar had two wives,\textsuperscript{168} Guruvāṃbā (Guruvajamma), daughter of Timmarāja of Hura, and Lingājamma of Bāgali. Dēvarāja Woḍeyar also had two,\textsuperscript{169} Dēvājamma and Kempamma (Kempamāmbā). Channarāja Woḍeyar, it would appear,\textsuperscript{170} predeceased Rāja Woḍeyar after the siège of Kesare (1596). Rāja Woḍeyar, as depicted to us,\textsuperscript{171} had the full co-operation of all his brothers, alike in times of war and peace. We have seen how faithfully they served him during the siège of Kesare. Bettada-Chāmarāja Woḍeyar, in particular, was of considerable assistance to Rāja Woḍeyar during 1595-1596. Inscriptions and literary works point to him as a gallant warrior.\textsuperscript{172} Indeed, there are indications\textsuperscript{173} of his having ruled Mysore jointly with Rāja Woḍeyar, both before and after the acquisition of Seringapatam (1610). We find him prominently

\textsuperscript{166.} M. A. R., 1924, p. 28, No. 6.
\textsuperscript{167.} Vide Ch. IV, f.n. 80 and text thereto.
\textsuperscript{168.} K, N. V., I I I, 13; Mys. Dho. Pūr., I. 61 ; also See and compare Annaig, I. 17, 65.
\textsuperscript{169.} Mya. Dho. Pur., I. 62-53, 61 ; Annula, I. 95 ; also Table II (compare).
\textsuperscript{170.} C. Vam., 31. 171. Ibid., 12-13.
\textsuperscript{172.} E. C., V (1) and (2) Ag. 64 (1647) ; I I I (1) Sr. 14 (1686) ; K. N. V., Ch. I I I ; C. Vom., 24-25.
\textsuperscript{173.} Vide K. N. F., Chs. I I I - I V ; see also f.n. 105 and 157.
mentioned in two lithic records, dated in March 1594 and 1598.\textsuperscript{174} In 1604 (Krôdhī), however, it would appear, some différences arose between Beṭṭada-Châmarâja Wodeyar and Râja Wodeyar, in connection with the acquisition of a village named Majjigepura.\textsuperscript{175} Whereupon Beṭṭada-Châmarâja Wodeyar, we learn,\textsuperscript{176} proceeded to Seringapatam and sought the friendship of Râmânujaiya, Dalavâi of Tirumala. In vain did Râja Wodeyar persuade him to return to Mysore. Beṭṭada-Châmarâja refused to move thither until he had taken Majjigepura. Râja Wodeyar, in turn, sent word to him that he would be captured if he persisted in his résolve. Heedless of this warning, Beṭṭada-Châmarâja, at the head of some forces, marched on from Seringapatam towards Majjigepura. On hearing this news, Râja Wodeyar despatched a contingent under his sons, Narasarâja Wodeyar and Beṭṭa Wodeyar (Beṭṭadaiya). Beṭṭada-Châmarâja had almost succeeded in taking Majjigepura when Narasarâja and Beṭṭa Wodeyar made a surprise attack from an ambuscade and captured him. Beṭṭada-Châma was taken to Mysore, where Râja Wodeyar, in brotherly affection, extended him a hearty embrace. Beṭṭada-Châmarâja, however, in great wrath, pushed him aside, only to find himself kept in honourable confinement in Mysore. Meanwhile, Narasarâja, ostensibly to win Râja Wodeyar's approbation, engagea a hireling to put out the eyes of his uncle. The plot was, however, promptly communicated to Râja Wodeyar by an adhèrent of his (Ranganâtha-Dîkshita). Râja Wodeyar was on his way to Tippûr. Cancelling his programme, he forthwith

\textsuperscript{174} Vide f.n. 147-148 supra.
\textsuperscript{175} An Inâm village in the Beḷaguja hôbji, Seringapatam taluk (see \textit{Liât of Villages}, 94). According to E. C. Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol., Sr. 198 (1698), 11. 18-16, Majjigepura was otherwise known as Sankarapura, and had been acquired by the Mysore Ruling House, by a deed of sale, from the inhabitants of the place. The village does not, however, appear to have been actually occupied by the rulers till 1604.
sent for Narasaràja and desired him to remove the eyes of his own younger brother, Nanjaràja. "What fault has my brother, Nanjaràja, committed that I should be asked to blind him with?" submitted Narasaràja. "And what fault has my brother, Betta-Chàmaràja, committed that you should thus plot to take off his eyes?" retorted Ràja Wođeyar. Narasaràja blushed; Betta-Chàmaràja was at once released and advised to reside in Eangasamudra.

The last days of Ràja Wođeyar were rather clouded by sorrow. As already referred to, his youngest brother, Channaràja, had pre-deceased him after the siège of Kesare (1596), while his eldest son, Narasaràja, had died in September 1610. And this was followed by the deaths of two other sons (Nanjaràja and Betta Wodeyar) of his.177 Ràja Wođeyar was considerably weighed down with this domestic affliction. Yet, so attached to him were the surviving younger brothers (of Ràja Wođeyar), Betta-Chàmaràja Wodeyar and Dèvaràja Wodeyar, that their company was in itself, it would seem, a solace to him.178 At the same time, the question of succession to the kingdom continued to engage his attention. His last son, Immadi-Ràja Wođeyar, was yet in his infancy, while Bettada-Chàmaràja and Dèvaràja were already sufficiently well advanced in âge. The only immédiate lineal descendant for the throne was his own grandson Chàmaràja (b. 1603), son of Narasaràja. Accordingly, in the last year of his reign, Ràja Wođeyar, in consultation with his brothers, nominated Chàmaràja as his successor, and made a provision for the members of the Royal family, assigning western Danàyakânkôte to Inimadi-Ràja Wođeyar; Eangasamudra, Nalûr and Vijayâpura to the sons of Bettada-Chàmaràja Wođeyar; and Arakere, Yeleyûr and Mângala to those of Dèvaràja Wođeyar.179

---

177. See C. Vam., 31. 178, Ibid., 31-32. 179..Ibid.,32;
Râja Wodeyar passed away on June 20, 1617, in his sixty-sixth year. At the time of his death, a weird spectacle is said to have been observed in the Nârâyaṇa-svânî temple at Mêlkôṭe, where Eâja Wodeyar, having entered the garbha-griha, was known to have become one with the deity.

An historical character like Râja Wodeyar, with an eventful record extending well nigh to four décades in the history of the Karnâtaka country in général and of Mysore in particular, could not but have exercised a profound influence over his contemporaries, although it is not possible to détermine the extent of that influence from the scanty records of his own period, available to us to-day. So fresh and so deep, indeed, appear to have been the memories of his rule and achievements to his own contemporaries and to those who foliowed them, that they left a lasting impression on the succeeding génération of writers in Mysore. The resuit was, as is often the case with historical celebrities, that s}owly, "


The G. Vam. (81-82) conveys to us a picture of Râja Wodeyar as an extremely old person (kadu-muppdgi) at the time of his death, and speaks of his having ruled for eighty years (enbattum barisam . . . dhareyam pâlisi). Again, according to this work (12), Râja Wodeyar had ruled for sixty years (aruvattum barisamutn bêlgodeya ne'alâvîrâdarinda) already about the time of the siège of Kesare (1596), so that there is, as already indioated (vide f.n. 62 supra), a clear gap of twenty years between that event and the last year of Râja Wodeyar's reign (1616-1617). Dêvachandra (See Raj. Kath., X I I. 467), relyingon the G. Vam., speaks of Râja Wcxjeyar's death in his eightieth year, on December 8, 1616 (Nala, Margasira eu. 10), evidently interpreting the passage from the C. Vam. as the life-period of Râja Wodeyar (Paramâyuzhyamâgi embhattu varusham kaliye). If the C. Vam., is to be literally interpreted, Râja Wodeyar's accession itself will have to bepushed back to 1586 and his date of birth perhaps even much earlier. If, on the other hand, Dêvachandra's interprétation be accepted, Râja Wo^eyar's date of birth would have to be fixed in 1586. In the absence, however, of conftrmatory évidence, the authority of the Mys. Dho. Pur. and the Annals is preferrèd hère as the more spécifie one and in keeping with the probabilities of historical fact.

181. C. Vam.,32; also see and compare Mys. Raj. Cha., 21 ; Annals, I. 49, etc.
within half a century from his death, Râja Wođeyar came to be looked upon as a deified warrior-king of Mysore with all the halo and glamour attaching to an epic personage, the only difference being that, in his case, the background is unmistakably historical. Thus, the Mâkuballi copper-plate grant (February 1635), already referred to, speaks of him "as the sun in dispelling the darkness, the host of hostile kings, whose courage was widely known and who was ever ready to do good deeds." To Gôvinda-Vaidya, the author of the Kanthîrava-Narasarâja-Vij ayant (1648), Kâja Wođeyar appears prominently as a warrior, building up the kingdom of Mysore assisted by his younger brother, Betâtâ-Châmâràja Wođeyar. To Tirumalârya, the author of the Chikkadëvarâya-Vamédoali (c. 1678-1680) and Chikkadëvarâja-Vijayam (c. 1682-1686), he is the establisher of the ruling dynasty of Mysore on a sound footing and is the first systematic builder of the Mysore kingdom by policy and prowess. In working out these aspects to their logical conclusion, Tirumalârya draws freely on the exubérance of his poetical imagination, adjusting the facts of history to the atmosphère of tradition. To the other writers, who were contemporaries of Tirumalârya, Bâja Wođeyar is essentially the conqueror of Tirumala, the Viceroy-nephew of Venkaṭa I. Inscriptions, dated in 1680, 1686-1690, etc., significantly écho his prowess and famé. The chronicles fix up, with a tolerable degree of certainty, the life-period of Râja Wođeyar and the events of his reign, not, however, unmixed with tradition.

Nevertheless, these materials enable us to form some estimate of Râja Wođeyar. In appearance he was evidently of an imposing stature, well-built and possessed of exceptional strength and vigour. Trained early in life in

---

182. Vide f.n. 95 mpra; see also E. C. I I I (1) Sr. 64 (1722), 11. 80-34; IV (2) Yd. 17 and 18 (1761), 11. 18-22, and 6-11, among the 18th century inscriptions, referring to Râja Wođeyar's rule.
the rigorous methods of warfare common to the times in which he was born, he was reputed to have been a successful warrior, fighting hard against heavy odds, with limited resources at his command, making dexterous use of his weapons. Of military tactics and diplomacy, he was, from all accounts, a past master. These, coupled with his own personal prowess, the spirit of co-operation and devotion he inspired in his followers and the good character and amiable disposition of his brothers, should have contributed in no small measure to his success as a military leader of the first rank.\(^{183}\) His rule appears to have been unquestionably popular, based as it was on the fundamental principle of the Dharma, a code of practical ethics which, as he is said to have defined,\(^{184}\) was to be observed by a ruler both in times of war and peace. It was an important feature of his rule that the revenues received from his subjects and the tribute collected from his feudatories were expended by him upon numerous daily gifts, charities and benefactions, only a portion of it being set apart for his own personal use, while the spoils in war were devoted exclusively to the service of Gods and their devotees, the Brâhmans.\(^{185}\) In his daily life, he adhered to a strict programme of morning ablutions, prayers and worship, and listening to the Purânâs and the epics.\(^{186}\) A devout yet tolerant Vaishnava, a chivalrous warrior, a kindly brother, a humane and magnanimous ruler, Eàja Wodeyar must be reckoned a typical character of his âge. His policy of political expansion of the kingdom of Mysore was in accord with his own environment and the conditions of his times. From this point of view, his conquest of Seringapatam (1610) was fully justified. Though it might have appeared at first sight a serious blow and a loss to

\(^{183}\) See C. Vam., 8, 9 and 12.

\(^{184}\) Ibid., 32: Puyila-nesaguvaliyum podaviyam porevalliym . . . dhar- 
mama-narayudu nadevudenu buddhi vêldu . . .

\(^{185}\) Ibid., 13.

\(^{186}\) Ibid., 12.
the Vijayanagar Empire and though Venkaṭa I seemed originally to regard it more as a temporary occupation than as a permanent acquisition by Râja Woḍeyar, yet his confirmation of the conquest shows that he had faith in Râja Woḍeyar and preferred him, a strong and trusty ruler, to his own nephew, who had proved himself treacherous at the siège of Madura and whom he cordially detested. Râja Woḍeyar's loyalty to the Empire, both before and after the mémorable occupation of Seringapatam, was undoubted. Viewed thus, Râja Woḍeyar has an abiding claim to greatness as the first "Maker of Mysore."

187. See Mys, Gaz., I I . iii. 2207.
PLATE XIV.

Chamaraja Wodeyar v, 1617-1637.
CHAPTER VI.

CHÀMARÂJA WODEYAR V, 1617-1637.


On July 3, 1617, twelve days after the death of Râja Wodeyar, Chàmarâja Wodeyar V succeeded to the throne of Mysore. He was the grandson of Râja Wodeyar and son of Narasarâja by Honnamâmbâ (Honnâjamma). Chàmarâja Wodeyar was born on April 21, 1603, and was in his fifteenth year at the time of his...
The earliest available lithic records of his reign refer to him as "Châmarâja Wodeyar, son of Narasarâja Wodeyar" and "Châmarâja Wodeyar of Mayisûr (Mysore) ruling in Seringapatam." 4

The years 1617-1620 marked the period of Châmarâja's minority. During this period, 5 arrangements had been made for his éducation and training in the palace at Seringapatam while the affairs of the kingdom were being actually administered by Beṭṭada-Arasu (Châmappa), 6 Dalavâï of Mysore since February 1617.

Châmarâja Wodeyar was a contemporary of Vïra-Râma-Dêva IV (1614-1630 ? 1633) of Vijaynagar. During the period covered by Châmarâja's minority, Vïra-Râma-Dêva had been securely éstablished on the throne at Penukoṇḍa. The Empire was slowly recovering from the disastrous effects of the civil war of 1616-1617. The menace of the Muhammadans of Bijâpur on the south was becoming more and more pronounced. Disruptive tendencies were slowly at work among the feudatories. Though there were signs of settled government, there was very little effective central control, particularly over the remote parts in the south. The gêneral political situation in the country was eminently suited for the steady and systematic expansion of a kingdom like

8. Mys. Dho. Pur., I. 43 : èôbhakrit, Vaiêakha ba. 6; cf. AnnaU. I. 49 : Parâbhava, Āshadhâ ba. 6 (July 15, 1606). The authority of the earlier Ms. is preferred here. Wilks (I. 64), following this Ms., states that Châmarâja was "a youth of fifteen" at the time of his aooession in 1617.

4. E. C., I I I (1) My. 17 (June 1620), II. 6-7: Narasarâja Wodeyara putardda Chamardja Wodêravaru ; IV (2) Hg. 21 (1624), I. 3 : Ėrirangapattana-vanûj/ua Mayisûra Chcimaraja Wadefyaru]. These two records are private grants.

5. Armais, I. 64-56.

6. See E. C., I I I (1) Sr. 36 (November 29, 1620), II. 5-6, referring to Châmappa as the Daiavâï of Châmarâja Wodeyar ( . . . Cjïdmarịjñïdeyaravaru Daâvayi Chamappanavaru). Châmappa of this lithic record is identical with Bettada-Arasu, the latter name being only a shortened fonn of Bettada-Châmappa or Bettada-Châme Urs. The Mys. Dho. Pur. (I. 66) refers to this name in its still shorter form, Beftappa,
Mysore. It was but natural that Dalavâi Beṭṭada-Arasu had first to direct his attention towards this objective. As indicated already, Mysore was, as it were, hemmed in by the dominions of Jagadēva-Râya of Channapaṭṭaṇa in the north, by the kingdom of Madura (under Muttu Vîrappa Nâyaka I, 1609-c. 1623) in the south, and by the principalities of local chieftains in the east and the west.

In 1618 (Kâlayuhti) Jagadēva-Bâya despatched an embassy to Seringapatam, with prè­sents (consisting of an éléphant named Bâmalinga and 3,000 varahas), seeking Châmarâja Wodeyar's assistance in connection with the acquisition of Chîknâyakanahalli. Châmarâja, however, desired Beṭṭada-Arasu to send back the présents and attempt the acquisition for Mysore of Nâgamangala, an important dependency of Jagadēva-Râya himself. Beṭṭada-Arasu marched on thither, at the head of his forces. At a village named Honne-madu, he was obstructed by Doddaiya, elder brother of Channaiya of Nâgamangala, an adhèrent of Jagadēva-Râya. A scuffle ensued, in which Doddaiya was slain. Proceeding further, Beṭṭada-Arasu laid siège to Nâgamangala. Thereupon Ankuéa-Raya, brother, and Prime minister, of Jagadēva-Râya,

---

7. Mys. Dho. Vam., tt. il-22; Armais, I. 52-58; see also G. Vam., 84; and G. Vi., I I , 73-75. Jagadēva-Râya is identical with "Jugdeo Row" and "Jugdeo Raj" of Wilks (I. 53-55). His actual naræ in its Telugu form was Jagadēva-Râyalu. Inscriptions and literary works (like the G. Vam.) spell the name in its Kannâcja form, Jagadēva-Râya. He was colloquially known as Jagadē-Râya, by which name he is referred to in the Mys. Dho. Pvr., Mys. Bâj. Gha. and Armais. The Mys. Dho. Vam. spells it in both the forms.

8. An extant village in the Manflya taluk (see List of Villages, 92). The chronicles speak of Honne-madu as situated in the Hirîsâve région (Hassan district), which is not identifiable. The former identification seems more probable, since the place commands the passage to Nâgamangala.

9. Jagadēva-Bdyana od-avutfidanddankaṭiéa-Ildya (G. Vam., 84); Anguëa-Rajam . . . Raya-vajiranemba piridum birudantidiramparilla-vewha . . . (G. Fi., I I , 78-74). In the light of the latter passage and the context (Ibid., I I , 74-75), the word vajira is to be taken in its two-fold sensë, viz., minister and cavalier. Evidently, as the Prime minister of Jagadēva-Râya, Anguëa-Râya seems to hâve been a reputed cavalier. ·
put up a stout opposition and raised the siège. Bettada-Arasu was obliged to retrace his steps to Seringapatam. But, on his way back, he found himself attacked by Gōpālarājaiya of Kannambâdi, a récalcitrant chieftain. Halting at Honne-mādu, Bettada-Arasu requisitioned for reinforcements from the capital and, on their arrivai, laid siège to Hosakōte, a fort belonging to Jagadēva-Bāya. He gave battle to Ankuéa-Rāya and Gōpālarājaiya, and put both of them to rout. Hosakōte was taken and among the spoils acquired were two éléphants (named Bhōjarāja and Chokkalika) and several insignias. These were sent to Seringapatam and Bettada-Arasu was about to re-attempt the acquisition of Nāgamangala.

At this juncture, affairs in the south seemed to call for Bettada-Arasu's immédi ate attention. News reached him that some différence had arisen as between the Pâlegâr of Daṇāyakankōte (below the ghâts) and the chiefs of the surrounding places. Western Daṇāyakan kōte was, as we have seen, the southern limit of the kingdom of Mysore, almost coterminous with the dominions of the Nâyak of Madura; and it had been assigned by Rāja Wođeyar to Immađī-Rāja Wođeyar as a rent-free estate (umbali). Any trouble, therefore, arising in the south-east of this limit, would naturally have its repercussion on, and threaten the safety of, the kingdom of Mysore. It was, therefore, in the fitness of things for Mysore to advance further and take possession of Daṇāyakankōte and other places in its neigbourhood, below the ghâts. Accordingly, Bettada-Arasu sent thither a contingent at the head of Mallarājaiya, a relation of his: Danāyakankōte was besieged. Mean-

10. An estant village in the Nāgamangala taluk (see List of Villages, 101). In the poetical language of the C. Vam. (l.o.) and C. Vi. (l.c), this event is made to appear as if it took place towards the latter part of Chēmarā ja's reign. But, as narrated above, it was connected with the affairs of 1618.
time the Pâlegâr of the place had sought the assistance of the Nâyak of Madura (Mutthu-Vîrappa Nâyaka I) who, through the médiation of his agent, Chikkappa-Seṭṭi, eventually concluded a trace with Mallarâjaiya, fixing on the Pâlegâr of Dânâyakankôte—an annual tribute of 12,000 varahas to Mysore. Whereupon the siège was raised; Chikkappa-Seṭṭi went back to Madura; and Mallarâjaiya returned to Seringapatam with the stipulated amount of tribute.

Thereafter, Bettada-Arasu, having temporarily relinquished his attempts at the acquisition of Nâgamangala, turned towards the other dependencies of Jagadêva-Râya. In November 1619, he took possession of Maddûr from Benîe-Honni-Vîthânîa who had, it is said, formerly received it as a rent-free gift from Nanjarâjaiya of Talakâd. This was followed by the acquisition by him from the same person of Keregôdu, in 1620 (Raudrî). Thèse activities resulted in the extension of the spîere of influence of Mysore in the direction of Channapatna, the seat of Jagadêva-Râya, in the north.

The power and influence of Betfada-Arasu and his adhérênts in the court of Seringapatam, during 1617-1620, appear to have been not inconsiderable, for, about this time, according to the Chikkadêvarâya-Vaméâvali, Bettada-Châmarâja Wodeyar and Muppina-Dëvarâja Wodeyar, the two surviving younger brothers of Râja Wodeyar and elderly members of the Royal House, had been away from Seringapatam on a pilgrimage to Mëlkôte, Tirupati, Kânchi, Kumbakônam, êrîrangam, Râmëévaram and other sacred places. In April 1620, however, Châmarâja attained his majority. This was, it would seem, a serious

blow to the prominence of Bettada-Arasu, while it proved a source of strength to the powerful court party. By way of counteracting their seductive influence, Bettada-Arasu ordered the removal of the personal servants of Châmarâja Wodeyar, including the latter's teacher (Ranganâtha-Dïkshita) and physician (Bommarasa-Pandita), appointing in their places men of his own choice. So influential, indeed, was the old court party, that the new servants were soon thrown out and Châmarâja was, as usual, being attended upon by his former attendants. To Bettada-Arasu, this state of affairs was the most humiliating, and he resented the flouting of his authority. At this turn of affairs, his younger brother, Dodda-Châmappa, and the latter's son, Chikka-Châmappa, to ensure their own prédominance and the continuity of office of Bettada-Arasu, conspired against Châmarâja's life, anticipating the sure installation in his place of Immadi-Râja Wodeyar, the youngest son of Râja Wodeyar. Their délibérations were, however, overheard by a chambermaid and promptly communicated to Châmarâja. An inquiry was instituted; Dodda-Châmappa and Chikka-Châmappa were found guilty of treason and capital punishment was inflicted on both of them. Bettada-Arasu, in view of his own safety, was about to leave Seringapatam. Early in 1621, however, he was sent for, lest he should join the insurgent Pâlegârs and foment trouble against Mysore; his eyes were put out and he was kept in confinement for the rest of his life. In March 1621, Linganna of Bannûr was appointed Dajavâi of Mysore in succession to Bettada-Arasu, and Châmarâja began his independent rule.

17. The latest available record referring to Bettada-Arasu (Châmappa) is, as already pointed out (vide l.n. 6 supra), dated in November 1620. Since, as we shall see, Linganna of Bannûr was appointed Dajavâi of Châmarâja in March 1621, it is possible that Bettada-Arasu was deprived of his office between these dates. Probably we would not be far wrong if we fix this event early in 1621.
The first act of Châmarâja Wodeyar, shortly after the fall of Dalavâi Beṇṭada-Arasu, was to inaugurate a series of campaigns with a view to expand the kingdom of Mysore in all eight directions (digjayangeyyalujjugisi). In October 1621, Dalavâi Linganna, under the direction of Châmarâja, marched towards the east, taking possession of Talakâd from Sômâraiya. In May 1623, he took Malavalli after a tough siège, putting to rout the army of Jagadëva-Râya (which had proceeded to the relief of the place) and promising assurance of protection to the inhabitants (ûrugarge kaval-nambugeyanittu). In December, Arikuthâra was taken from Bâlôji Nàyaka, son of Channâraja Nàyaka; and in May, Bûkankere and Sindhughatta were acquired from Jagadëva-Râya. In May 1625, Satyâglâla—formerly belonging to Nanjarâja of Hadinâd—was taken; and in July, Heggaddëvankôte was acquired from Channarâja Wodeyar. Early in January 1626, Dalavâi Linganna laid siège to Channapatna and, in the struggle which followed, was slain by Channaiya of Nâgamangala.

19. C. Vam., 33-34; C. Vi., I I, 64-82. In the poetical language of these works, the campaigns are mixed up and made to appear as having taken place in regular succession within a short space of time during the life-period of Châmarâja Wodeyar. But they actually took place at considerable intervals during different years of his reign. The gleanings from, and references to, these texts are, accordingly, to be understood in their chronological setting, with reference to the more specific authority of the chronicles compared with one another. See also and compare Wilks's List of Oonquests of Châmarâja (I. 55-66), which is based primarily on the Mys. Dho. Pur. Dèvachandra (Raj. Kath., XIII 468-469), in the main, closely follows the G. Yam., in detailing Châmarâja's conquests, Mys. Dho. Pur., II. 3; cf. Mys. Dho. Vam., I; C. Vam., 33; C. Vi., II, 64-66.


21. C. Vam., 33; C. Vi., 11, 65.


24. Ibid., I I. 8-4; Annals, l.o. 25. Ibid., I I. 4.

25. Ibid., I I. 4.

26. Ibid.,; see also and compare Wilks, I. 54-55.

On the fall of Lingaṇṇa, Basavalingaṇṇa was appointed to the office of Dalavâi.\textsuperscript{28} In March 1626, proceeding in the south, Basavalingaṇṇa took Honganûr and Amma-chavâdi which formerly belonged to iänjarâja of Hadinâd.\textsuperscript{29} In July, turning westwards, he acquired Hâdyâ from Nanjunḍa-Arasu of Piriya-patna (Piriya-patana), and Kätte-Malâlavâdi from Prabhû-hannarâja Woḍeyar.\textsuperscript{30} Marching towards Piriya-patna, Le next broke up, it is said, a combination of Channarâja Woḍeyar and Gôpâlarâjaiya, chiefs of Kätte-Malâlavâdi nd Kannambâdi, sending the former a captive to leringapatam.\textsuperscript{31} Then he laid siège to Piriya-patna which was defended by Bommarasaiya (a minister of Tanjunda-Arasu)\textsuperscript{32} assisted by Singala-Bâya of Ikkëri Keḷadi).\textsuperscript{83} Basavalingaṇṇa requisitioned for fresh reinforcements from Seringapatam under Niyôgi Bommarasaiya ; and with these pressed on the siège, putting his opponents to rout, cutting off the nose of Singala-Kâya and capturing an éléphant (named Bôlamalla) among the poils. Bommarasaiya of Piriya-patna was ultimately obliged to sue for peace with the Niyôgi of Mysore, agreeing to send annually to Seringapatam an éléphant and a cash contribution of 3,000 varaha$.$\textsuperscript{a} Dalavâi īsavalingaṇṇa followed up this victory by the acquisition of Hanasôge and Sâligrâma (dependencies of Piriya-patna) ;\textsuperscript{35} and returned to Seringapatam where, it is laid,\textsuperscript{38} he made Channarâja Woḍeyar (of Kätte-Malâlavâdi)
confess his fault and obtained for him the king's pardon. In July 1626, Tagaḍûr and Kottâgâla were acquired from Prabhudëva and Lingarâjaiya, respectively; and in December, ḽàdale was taken from Channarâjaiya of Heggaddēvankôte.38

In or about 1627, Basavalingaṇa proceeded against Ghatta-Mudaliâr (Ghatta-Madanârï), a récalcitrant chieftain in the south-east (âgnëyadol) of Mysore, below the ghâts. Ghaṭṭa-Mudaliâr was forced to submit and sue for peace with the Daḷavâi, tendering 3,000 varahas with an éléphant (named Chengodeya) and an ivory palankeen.39 Following closely on Basavalinganna's return, Ghatta-Mudaliâr, it is said, again proved troublesome to Mysore. About the end of 1627, Basavalingaṇa was sent against him a second time. Ghaṭṭa-Mudaliâr was thoroughly humbled and an annual tribute of 3,000 varahas settled on him. During the next three years the Daḷavâi stayed in Seringapatam and died in February 1630, just at a time when he was about to re-attempt the acquisition of Nâgamangala.41

In March 1630, Vikrama-Eâya, a brother of Betṭada- Arasu, was appointed Daḷavâi in succes­sion to Basavalingaṇa.42 Between April and October (1630), the attention of Chàmarâja Wodeyar and Daḷavâi Vikrama-Bâya seems to hâve been directed towards Ikkëri, in the north-west of the kingdom of Mysore. We hâve seen how Singala-Bâya of Ikkëri assisted the chief of Piriyâpaṭña (Nanjunda-Arasu) during the siège of that place by Daḷavâi Basavalingaṇa in July 1626 and

how he (Singāla-Bāya) sustained defeat and discomfiture at the hands of the latter. Singāla-Eāya appears to have been a general of Hiriya-Venkaṭappa Nāyaka I of Ikkēiī (1582-1629), whose object in proceeding thither was, ostensibly, the extension of the sphere of his influence in the direction of the kingdoms of the Changālavas and Mysore. In any case, the chastisement of Singāla-Bāya by Mysore, in 1626, seems to have formed the starting-point of hostility between her and Ikkēri. Already about the close of the reign of Hiriya-Venkaṭappa Nāyaka, a civil war had broken out between the two sons of Hiriya-Hanumappa Nāyaka of Tarikere on the question of partition of the latter's estate, and Mysore, along with the chiefs of Bēlūr, Chintanakal, Sīra (Sīrya) and other places, had, it is said, espoused the cause of the younger son of Hiriya-Hanumappa Nāyaka against the elder who was backed up by Venkaṭappa Nāyaka himself. The civil war, however, terminated in favour of the elder brother and all the adherents of the younger retired when Venkaṭappa Nāyaka appeared in person at the head of his army.

The hostility of Mysore towards Ikkēri, however, continued unabated during the reign of Virabhadra Nāyaka (1629-1645), successor of Hiriya-Venkaṭappa Nāyaka I, against whom there was a general combination of the chiefs of the south, Mysore not excepted. A Jesuit letter from Canara, dated in 1630, speaks of "the kings who are at war with this king in the upper ghats and also send help to the people of the lower ghats," and says, "The king of Bamguel has rebelled against the said king Virabadar Naique, and the king of Palpare and the king

Hostilities continued, 1630.

43. Ke. N. K. V. 83-84.
of Mayzur⁴⁶ (Mysore) are lending him aid. The following have also rebelled against the said king: the queen of Olala and the queen of Carnate . . . so that, from the Canhoroto to Batecalla everything is in revolt and the king Virabhadara Naique is no longer master of anything below the ghats and is in such straits that he will no more be able to recover his losses . . . " Evidently by about the close of 1630, it would appear, the crushing of Ikkēri had become a serious problem to Mysore.

Almost simultaneously, the conquest of the possessions of Jagadēva-Eāya continued to engage the attention of Châmarâja Wodeyar. In October 1630, he directed the sièges of Channapatna.⁴⁶ The place was taken by Daḷavâi Vikrama-Râya after a strenuous fight, and this was followed by the annexation of Kâṅkânhallî (Kâṅkâranahallî) and the sièges and acquisition of Nâgamangala (in December).⁴⁷ In March 1631, Bellūr, another dependency of Jagadēva-Râya—then in the possession of Parania-râvuta Guruvanna, a gêneral of the chief of Chiknâyakanahallî—was taken after a hard fight, in which Guruvanna was slain and his army put to rout.⁴⁸ This victory was followed by a truce concluded with Mysore by the chief of Chiknâyakanahallî, who, in token of his submission, sent to Châmarâja présents

----

⁴⁵. Cf. Kev. H. Heras (Ibid, p. 122) who writes: "*This seems to be the Râja of Mysore. Probably Venkatappa had encroached upon the Mysore territory, though no record of this fact is hitherto known." But, as we have seen above, there were relations between Mysore and Ikkēri as early as July 1626.

⁴⁶. Mys. Dho. Pur., I I . 7; Annate, I. 61 ; also C. Vam., 34.

⁴⁷. Ibid., I I . 7-8; Mya. Dho. Vain., ff. 25-26 ; Annals, 1.51,69; aee also C. Vam., l.c. ; and C. Vi., II, 77.

⁴⁸. Ibid., I I . 8; Mya. Dho. Vam., ff. 26; C. Vam., l.c. ; C. Vi., II, 78-82, Guruvanna was evidently a distinguished cavalier. All the authorities invariably mention him by his title (Parama-ravuta). Only the Mys. Dho. Vam. refers to both his titte and actual name. Wilks (I. 56) spells the name as " Peram Ra wata."
consisting of robes and jewels and an éléphant (named Râmalinga). 49

Between 1631-1634, Chàmaràja Wođeyar appears to have been engaged in a série of aggressions in the north-west of Mysore. About the close of 1631, marching against the chief of Hole-Narasipur (Lakshmappa Nâyaka), he inflicted a crushing defeat on him, accepting from him présents of gold and jewels and an éléphant (named Kanaka-Vasanta). 50 Proceeding further, Chàmaràja directed his campaign against the chief of Bêlûr (Venkatappa or Venkatâdri? Nâyaka), who had incurred his ill-will by his encroachments on the boundaries of Mysore. Chàmaràja successively defeated the army of Bêlûr in three pitched battles at Chôlênahalli (Chôleyanapalli), Ânekere and Yeleyûr, amidst great loss, putting to rout Bhaira Nâyaka, Sala Nâyaka and Pûvala-Hanumappa Nâyaka who had espoused the chief’s cause. In February 1634, Chàmaràja laid siège to and took possession of Kolatûr—otherwise known as Channaràyapatna—from Venkatappa Nâyaka of Bêlûr. 52 The place, it is said, had been formerly annexed from one Puttagiri-Hebbâruva by Lakshmappa Nâyaka of Hole-Narasipur, who had given it away as a rent-free village (umbali) to his son, Channa-râya. Channa-râya having built a fort there, the place became known as Channaràyapatna which had been later acquired by Venkatappa Nâyaka. The acquisition of Channaràyapatna by Chàmaràja, in 1634,
marked the culminating point of his advance in the north-west of Mysore.  

During the early years of his reign we find Châmarâja Wođeyar openly acknowledging the suzerainty of Vîra-Eâma Dēva IV of Vijayanagar. Literary works and inscriptions for the period c. 1625-1634 seem to point to Châmarâja as an almost independent local ruler, probably in keeping with the sérîes of his conquests. The last years of Châmarâja's reign syncronised with the early part of the reign of Venkata II of Vijayanagar (1633 ?-1642), of whom he appears to have been a loyal feudatory. Indeed, Mysore, under Châmarâja Wođeyar, figured prominently among the local powers represented at the court of Venkata (at Penukonda), on the occasion of his installation on January 13, 1635 (Bhava, Mâgha eu. 5),

54. Satyanatha Aiyar, on the authority of a Mackenzie Manuscript, refers to an invasion of Madura by Mysore under Harasura (Karâchûri?) Nandi-Râja, and a couûter-invasion of Mysore by Madura before 1638, during the early years of the reign of Tirumala Nâyaka of Madura (c. 1623-1669) and the latter part of the reign of Châmardja Wođeyar (Nâyaks of Madura, pp. 119-120). There is no évidence in support of this position, since Châmardja during 1630-1634 was, as we have seen above, engaged in a sérîes of local conquests in the north and north-west of Mysore ; nor had he a gênerai by name Harasura (or Karâchûri ?) Nandi-Râja. On the contrary, a further examination of the manuscript itself (Taylor, Or. Hist. Mss., I I. 169) would go to show that the events, referred to, took place "when Dēva-Râyer-Udiyar was reigninig Mysore." The "Dēva-Râyer-Udiyar" mentioned is, of course, identical with Dēvarâja Wođeyar of Mysore (1669-1673). It seems, therefore, open to question whether thesè events could not have happened during that reign. Vide f.n. 60 to Ch. X, for a further notice of this éference.

55. See E. C, I I I (1) My. 17 (1620) ; Sr. 36 (1620) ; and Md. 17 (1628) ; Mys. Dwt. Suppl. Vol., Md. 17 (revised) and 156 (1623).

56. Vide references cited in the section on Châmardja's titles.

57. Vide Venkaftaïya's Immadi-Tamma-Rdyâ-Kempa-Raya-Padagalu (1635) a P. L., Ms. (No. 18-8-1) in the Mad. Or. Lib., Chs. I - I I, ff. 1-41. Accoring to this contemporary Kannada poem, Immadi-Kempe-Gauga of Mâgaši (1669-1668) was the right-hand man of Venkata II (mandalapati Venkatad-Râyara bhujadanda) whom he seourely established on the throne of Vijayanagar (nârapatiya simhûsanava nilisi ; sthiradi Rayara simhasanava nilisi) by subjugating the récalcitrant chiefs of Dodballâpur, Kandikere, Srliva, Hantfe, Bijjavara, Kolâla, Dhûligote, Kundurupe and other places in the Karnâtak, and exacting tribute from them (kappagala terisi). Among the loyalists, said to have been assembled by
offering him présents which consisted of a rutting éléphant (named Ānimuttu), jewels (including a necklace set with precious stones) and robes.\textsuperscript{58} Again, we also find Châmarâja Woḍeyar referring to the overlordship of Venkaṭa, in the Mâkuballi copper-plate grant dated February 21, 1635 (Bhqâva, Phdlgânâ eu. 15).\textsuperscript{59}

The political position of Châmarâja Woḍeyar as the ruler of Mysore is, perhaps, best evidenced by the extant literary works and inscriptions of his reign referring to him as having been adorned by the following, among other, titles and insignias i\textsuperscript{60} - Birud-antembara-gânâ (champion over those who say they have such and such titles), Sṛimad-râjâdhiraja-râja-paramâévara (emperor of kings), Apratima-vîra (unparalleled hero), Kathâriya-sâlva (a daggered hawk to his enemies), Vairi-gaja-ganda-bhërunda (a double-headed eagle to the éléphants, hostile kings), Gaja-bêntekâra (hunter of éléphants), Châmarâja’s Royal titles.

Immaḍî-Kempe-Gauḍa on the occasion of Venkata’s installation (at Penukonda) in January 1635, were the rulers of Kereyûr, Hosakôte, Dêvanahalli, Chikballâpur, Mâsti, Bâgalûr and Mysore. For his meritorious services in the cause of the Empire, Immadi-Kempe-Gauda is said to have been duly honoured by Venkata with robes and jewels (such as pendants, medallions, etc.) and two rutting éléphants named Nila-kantha and Sômalinga (II, ff. 23-41, vv. 14-39). The earlier part of the poem throws a good deal of light on the general political conditions in the Karnaṭak during the years which followed the death of Vîra-Râma-Dêva IV of Vijayanagar (1614-1680? 1633) (I, ff. 1-16; I I, ff. 16-23). The value of the work for the history of the times of Immadi-Kempe-Gauda of Mâgadi, is not inconsiderable. The poet Venkataiyaa refers to himself as the son of Poramâva-Timmappaiya and dedicates the work to Chikka-Kuppakka (a consort of Immadi-Kempe-Gauda), on July 22, 1685 (Yuva, Sravana ba. 3) (I I, ff. 41). He not infrequently eulogises Immadi-Kempe-Gaufla, of whom he was evidently a protégé. Cf. Kar. Ka. Cha. (III. 298) which mentions this poem as an anonymous work, fixing it in c. 1650.

\textsuperscript{58} Ibid., I I, fl. 28, v. 22; . . . Maisfiravara karasi Bdyarige santôsha-dinddnimuttenipa madagajava kantimattàda urutara kanthamâle sara muntada bhûshanâmbarava kodisi.

\textsuperscript{59} M. A. B., 1924, pp. 22-28, No. 6.

\textsuperscript{60} Vide colophous to Asvasatra, Chamrajôkti-Vilasa and Brahmothtar-Khanda; also see E. C, II SB. 250 and 362 (1684); M. A. R., 1924, L.e. (1685). For details about the literary works, see under Literary activity.
Sakha (conch); Chakra (discus), Makara (crocodile), Matsya (fish), Sarabha (unicorn), Salva (hawk), Ganda-bhêrunda (double-headed eagle), Dharanî-Varâha (boar), Hanuma (monkey), Garuḍa (eagle), Ankusâ (hook), Kuthâra (axe) and Simha (lion). These titles and insignias were, as indicated above, significant from the local point of view. Among the titles, Birud-antembaraganda was, as we have seen, the distinctive appellation of the rulers of Mysore from the time of Hiriya-Bettada-Châmarâja Wodeyar I I I (1513-1553). Others, like Mahâ-râjâdhîrâja-râja-paramëêvara, Apratima-vîra, Ganda-bhêrunda, Gaja-bëntêkâra and Dharanî-Varâha, were distinct borrowals, mostly from Vijayanagar, and seem to convey ideas of universal conquest and imperialism. Most of the insignias had been, as already referred to, acquired by Râja Wodeyar during different years of his reign (1578-1617).

By 1637, the last year of Châmarâja’s reign, the political position of the kingdom of Mysore was as follows: On the north, it had been extended as far as Channa-pañâna and Nâgamangala; in the west and north-west, up to Piriyâpataṇa and Channarâyapaṭâna; and in the east and south-east, as far as Malavalli and Daṅâyakankôte. Indeed the Chikkadêvarâya-Vaniédvali does seem correctly to echo this position when it depicts that, towards the close of his reign, Châmarâja had finished his campaigns in all the directions, extended his favour to the rulers of Ikkëri, Bâṅavâr, Basavâpataṇa and other places—who had latterly acted in a friendly fashion towards him—and brought the entire Kannada country under his control (Kanṇada-nâdellamam basakke tandu). The référence to the friendly disposition of Ikkëri (mitrabhâvadol pattidirkëri . . . ), in particular, towards Mysore, is further significant. We have seen how there prevailed hostile relations between the two
kingdoms during 1626-1630 and how during 1630-1634 Chamarâja had extended his kingdom as far as parts of Bangalore and Hassan districts by the acquisition of places belonging to Jagadēva-Bāya and the chiefs of Chiknâyanakanahalli, Bēlur and Hoî-Narasipur. During 1634-1637, Vīrabhadra Nāyaka of Ikkeri, in view, apparently, of this stronger political position of Mysore, had probably found it expedient to move on friendly terms with Châmarâja Woḍeyar.

Although the earliest available record of the reign of Châmarâja Woḍeyar is dated in June 1620, the administration of Mysore, during the period of his minority (1617-1620), was actually in the hands of his first Dalavâi, Bettada-Arasu. To the latter, indeed, as we have seen, belongs the credit of maintaining the political integrity of the kingdom of Mysore and making a definite beginning in the policy of expansion in the north and the south. Bettada-Arasu appears to have continued in office for more than six months after Châmarâja attained his majority (in May 1620), as is borne out by a lithic record dated November 29, 1620, in which he makes a grant of the village of Ànevâla for God Mahâbalêåvara of the "Mysore hill" (Châmundi Hills), on the occasion of a lunar eclipse, for the merit of Châmarâja Woḍeyar. On the fall of Bettada-Arasu early in 1621, Châmarâja Woḍeyar was securely established in his personal rule.

The rule of Châmarâja Woḍeyar during 1620-1637 thoroughly bore the impress of his personality, The Honnalagere copper-plate grant (1623) speaks of him as having been ruling Mysore seated on the famous throne
of Bhôja in Seringapatam, and mentions also a minister of his, Râmâ[nu?]jaiya-Virûpâkshaiya-Gôvindaiya, son of Appâji-Paṇḍîta and grandson of Hiriyanna-Paṇḍîta (of Akajàpura), of Kâśyapa-gôtra, Æevalâyana-sûtra and Bikéâkhâ. Other records of Châmârajà Wodeyar point to his sovereignty of both Mysore and Seringapatam. In his conquests, Châmârajà Wodeyar was, as we have seen, considerably helped by Lingâņña of Bannûr (March 1621-January 1626), Basavalinganâna (January 1626-February 1630) and Vikrama-Kâya (March 1630-1637)—Dalavâis in succession to Betṭâda-Arasu. In the actual administration of the local parts, Châmârajà Wodeyar, it would seem, was assisted by agents (kârya-karta). Thus, we note, Basavalinganâna, son of Kempa Wodeyar, administered the affairs of Châmârajà at Talakâd, while Râjaiya was looking after the same in the Yeḍatore région.

Châmârajà Wodeyar is credited with having carefully brought in his acquisitions under the respective hôblîs of the administrative units igadi and maintained intact the régulations of îtàja Wodeyar. He is also, in 1626, reputed to have made elaborate arrangements with Channahârajà Wodeyar, chief of Kâṭṭe-Malalayâdi, for the catching, and purchase, of

Administrative and other measures:

(a) Settlement of conquered tracts.
(b) Organisation of elephant-hunting.
(c) Institution of the armoury.

65. Ibid., II. 13-16, 72 (Gôvindayâkhya-mantrinê) ; also Ibid., Md. 17 (revised) (January 1623), U. 6-9, etc. Cf. Wûks in Appendix III.
66. See E.O., II SB. 260 and 352(1634) : Maisûru-Patfamadhêvâra; Maisûru-Patcveña-puravadhdhêvâra. The référence hère is to Mysore and Seringapatam, Patfâna being a shortened form of Òrîrangapattana. The expressions are in keeping with the local position of Châmârajà Wodeyar at the height of his power after a série of conquests. See also sections on Châmârajà’a relations with Vijayanagar and his titles.
67. For a critioal notice of Wilka’s position regarding the early Dalavâis of Mysore, etc., vide Appendix III.
68. See E.C., I I I (1) T.N. 13 (1683). Basavalinganna of this lithic record appears to have been distinct from Dajavâi Basavalinganna who died in February 1680 (Annals, I. 69).
69. Ibid., IV (2) Yd. 15 (1633).
70. Annals, I. 61; See also Wilks, I. 55.
éléphants required for his army, and, in or about 1635, so have erected in Mysore an armoury (alagina-châvadi; 'alaguvanê), a substantial structure of three floors (imûneleya jagali), for the préservation of various kinds of weapons (taken from the Pâlegârs) and for the manufacture of new patterns.

Chàmaràja Woðeyar was, we note, an ardent Vaishnava, adoring his family God Lakshmikànta of Mysore and devoutly serving Trinayanëévara (of Mysore), Goddess Chàmunḍéévarî of the Mahâbalâchala hill and Visbñviéa. Toleration was the cardinal feature of his religion, èaivism and Vaishnavism seemed to claim his equal share of attention, while he was solicitous towards Jainism also. Of the Jains, in particular, we find he

71. Iaid, I. 58-59; see also Mjs. Dho. Vam., ff. 27-28. The catching of éléphants by ensnaring them into large-sized pits (kappu), seems to have been a very ancient practice in the southern and western parts of the présent district of Mysore. The price of éléphants thus captured—and subsequently trained—was, it is interesting to note, regulated by Chàmaràja Woðeyar as under: For an éléphant with tusks measuring one full cubit (moîa), 100 var alias; one span (ginu), 40 varahas; three-fourths of a span (chôfu-kombu), 30 varahas; for one, with tusks just sprouting up (mugulu-kombu), 25 varahas; for a female éléphant measuring 5 cubits in length, 60 varahas; 4 cubits, 40 varahas and 3 oubits, 30 varahas; for a youngling (mari), 15 varahas (See Annals, I. c). Evidently the title Gaja-bêntekdra (hunter of éléphants), ascribed to Ohâmarâja Woðeyar in the colophon to the Ghdmardjôkti-VUdsa already referred to (vide section on Chàmaràja's titles and f.n. 60 supra), seems very significant.


74. Vide références infra. Among the seconday sources, the Aimais (1. 56*57, 61-62) and the Mys. Raj. Cha. (22) speak of the services of Chàmaràja Woðeyar and his Dâjavâis (Linganna of Bannûr and Vikramâ-Râya), in the éaiva and Vaishnava temples ai'T.-Narasipur, Qargëévari, Nanjangud, Seringapatam and Mélkôfe. The Annals (1.60), in particular,
was a good friend, being referred to\textsuperscript{75} by them as Shad-
darécma-dharnta-sthâpanâchârya (lit. establisher of the
dharma of the six daréanas or schools of philosophy)
and Shad-dharma-Chakrêêvara (lit. emperor promoting
six kinds of dharma or religion). An interesting account
is preserved\textsuperscript{76} of how once, about the middle of 1631,
Châmarâja Wodeyar, while on a tour in the State, paid a
visit to éravana-Belagola, and how, on being grieved to
learn that the Jain guru of the place—Chârukïrti-Pandita-
Yôgïndra of the Dakshinâchârya family—had left it for
Bhallâtakï-pura in consequence of obstacles (to the
worship of Jina) caused during the régime of Jagadêva-
Bâya, he (Châmarâja Wodeyar) at once arrangea for the
recall of the guru from the latter place, and later accorded
him a fitting réception in Seringapatam, allowing him
every facility for the exercise of his religious avocations
in the Pontificate at éravana-Belagola.

Among the extant records of Châmarâja Wodeyar's
reign, the Honnalagere copper-plate
Gifts, grants, etc. \textit{grant}, dated January 31, 1623,\textsuperscript{77}
registers the gift by him of three
villages to his minister, Gôvindaiya, on the occasion of

\textsuperscript{75} See \textit{E.C.}, II SB. 250 and 852 (1684).
76. In the \textit{Munivamiabhyyudaya} (c. 1700) of Chidânanda (noticed in détail in
Ch. XIV), I 1, 90-65. This work (11, 20) speaks of Châmara\-jâ's visit to
Sravana-Belagoja, just at a time when he had finis h ed most of his
campaigns against the surrounding chiefs. The \textit{Annals} (1. 60) refers to
this visit as having taken place at the instance of Bommarasaiya, Niyôgi
of Châmara\-jâ Wodeyar ; and seems to place it shortly after Châmara\-jâ's
acquisition of Nagamangala and Bellûr (1680-1681). Since Bellûr was, as
we have seen, taken by Châmara\-jâ Wodeyar in March 1681 and since,
according to the \textit{Annals} (1. c), Châmara\-jâ was in Seringapatam by
October 1681, he appears to have visited éravana-Belagoj a about the
middle of that year (April-June).

\textsuperscript{77} \textit{E. C., Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol., Md. 156 (M. A. R., 1908, p. 28, para 76) :}
ed. 1544, Dundubhi, Magha su. 10. The grant bears the king's signature
as, 'Sri-Châmara\-jâ' (see 1,70).
ardhôdaya, for the merit of his parents. A lithic record (of the same date)\(^78\) refers to a rent-free grant by Châmarâja to the same donee, of additional villages situated in the Maddûr-sthaâla of the Keîale-nâdu in the Seriijgapatara country. The Dalavâi+Agrahâram plates I, dated March 6, 1623,\(^79\) record the formation of an agrahâra named Châmarâja-samudra (consisting of the villages of Àladûr and Navilûr in the Tayûr-nâdu of Mûgûr-sthaâla) and the grant of the same—divided into 41 shares, 40 being distributed among Brâhmans and one set apart for God Gunjâ-Nîrsimha—by Châmarâja Wodeyar, for the attainment of perpetuai bliss by his father, Narasarâja Wodeyar. A lithic record of c. 1630\(^80\) refers to a grant in perpetuity to Àne-linga in the Narasimhasvâmi temple at Maddûr, by Vikrama-Râya, Dalavâi of Châmarâja Wodeyar. An inscription from the Mackenzie Collection, dated February 21, 1632,\(^81\) speaks of Châmarâja Wodeyar as having restored the channels of the Cauvery in the neighbourhood of Seringapatam and of his having got constructed a bridge across the river (up to the junction of its branches), naming the area brought into cultivation thereunder as Hosa-bayalu (lit. new plain land). Another lithic record, dated May 22, 1633,\(^82\) refers to the grant of the village of êântapura, to the êivabhakta Basavalingadêva, by Ràjaiya, an agent of Châmarâja Wodeyar. Yet another, dated June 20, 1633,\(^83\) records the setting up of the image of Panchalinga to the west of God Vaidyêâvara of Gajâranya-kshêtra and the grant of lands at Talakâd and Pûrigâli to provide for the

\(^{78}. \text{Ibid., Md. 17 (revised): Ibid. See also and compare B. C, I I I (1) Md. 17 (original impression).}

\(^{79}. \text{E. C., I I I (1) TN. 62 : rf. 1544, DundubU, Phdlguna eu. 15.}

\(^{80}. \text{Ibid., Md. 4.}

\(^{81}. \text{Ms. No. 18-16-20, p. 80 : é. 1658, Prajotpatti, Phalguna eu. 11.}

\(^{82}. \text{E.C., IV (2) Yd. 16: s. 1740, èrlmukha, Vaiédkha ba. 10. The Èaha date, mentioned in this record, does not tally with the cyclic year èrlmukha which corresponds to 1668; it is apparently a scribal error for s. 1665.}

\(^{83}. \text{Ibid., I I I (1) TN. 13; à. 1555, èrlmukha, Jyestha ba. 10, Thursday,}
offerings of the God—by Basavalingaṇṇa, another agent of Chāmarāja. Two records (lithic and copper-plate), dated June 28, 1634, speak of Chāmarāja Woḍeyar as having instituted an inquiry into the management of the endowments at ēravāṇa-Belāgola and of his having caused grants to be made in the presence of God Gommaṭēśvara and Guru Chārūkīrti-Paṇḍita-Dēva, releasing the temple lands (of Sravana-Belagola) from nineteen mortgagees by discharging the long-standing mortgage debts and conferring on the Sthānikas perpetual use of the property for carrying on the worship of the God. The Mākuballi copper-plate grant, dated February 21; 1635, records the gift by Chāmarāja—free of all taxes, on the occasion of a lunar eclipse—of the village of Mākuballi surnamed Chānta-sāgara (or Chāma-samudra), to Bānichandra-Yajva, for the merit of his (Chāmarāja's) parents.

The court of Chāmarāja Woḍeyar was noted for its magnificence and was fully expressive of the tastes and culture of the times. Chāmarāja appears himself to have been an accomplished person, being referred to as an expert in the arts (chausasti-kalā-pravīṇa). He is depicted to have been systematically devoting himself to the practice of elephant-riding and horse-riding (āne-kuduregalanēri vaiyāśiya vilāsa), athletics (gartṭā, i-geytada-kai?ne), marksmanship (bilgane-gondu guriyisuvu kauēala) and music—particularly the lute (vīne-daledti banna-vādtçgalam bājipōje); to the appreciation of literature—including poetry, drama and rhetoric (kāvya-nātakālankāśi-puīiya-kathā-ēravanānurāga); and the listening to the sacred lore (Purāṇe-tihāsādi-puīiya-kathā-ēravanānurāga).

84. Ibid., II SB. 250 and 362: s. 1666, Bhāva, Āshadha su. 13, Saturday.
85. M. A. R., 1924, pp. 22-28, No. 6: i. 1665 expired, Bhāva, Ptolguna eu. 15. This record also bears the king's signature as Srī-QhāmardjaS 86. Vide colophon to the Chamrajokti-Vilasa.
87. C. tam., 84.
His court formed also the meeting-ground for Brâhmanical, Viśñeva, and Jaina religions, between whose adepts there were frequent disputations, in which Châmarâjâ Wodeyar appears to have taken a keen personal interest. In particular, we learn, Chenârya, son of Viśnârââdha, was able to defeat Râma-Dîkshita in the course of one such debate in the durbâr of Châmarâjâ. Another disputation (mantravâda-prasânga), it would seem, was conducted by the Jains in Châmârâja's court shortly after his visit to Erâvana-Belagola (1631) and, it is added, Chârukîrti-Pândita-Yogîndra of the erâvana-Belagola-math, himself a celebrated disputant (bandhura mantravâda-prasiddha-purusha), was invited to participate in it. If Dëvachandra is to be relied upon, it was probably on this occasion that Châmarâjâ Wodeyar had the Jain works, Bharatêivara-Charite (of Ratnâkara-Varni), Hari-Vamâ, Sanatkumâra-Shatpadi (of Bommarasa) and Chandraprabha-Charite (of Doddaiya of Piriyâpatna), recited in his court, eulogising Jainism, it is said, as a great religion (Jaina matam doddadendu prasamsegaidaru).

88. See Ckikkadêvarâja'Dharaniramandbhyidaya (c. 1700) (noticed in Ch. XIV), III, 16: antar-bahirmata-vivâda-viddm mukhêna tatvam, param kitnapi chêtasi niéchitdya (referring to Châmarâjâ Wodeyar V).
89. See Car. Ka Cha. (II. 877), quoting from Sánta-Vïra-lDêéika's (c. 1660) Éwaga^a-Ohâritra: Chamarajendra, sabheylu, tarkisuva \ Rmâ-Dîkshitana bhanjisida \ Srimad-Virandrâdhya tanuja guna \ Dhma Chennarya.

The poet, Sánta-Vïra-Dëéika, was the grandson of Viśnârââdha and son of Chenârya (Ibid. 877, 879).

92. See Baj. Kath., XI. 878, 876. Dëvachandra also speaks of Châmârâjâ Wodeyar as having got rendered from Sanskrit itktû Kannâ^a, the following five Jain works: Hari>Vamâ\ Prabhuxvnjana-Kathe\ térplàâ-Charîõar Jayakuméra'Parwardhindhashaf^ddî,khâ Samyakta-Kaumudi-Shatpadi (Ibid. 875).
Chàmarâja Wodeyar was a libéral patron of letters. The Honnalagere copper-plate grant (1623) speaks of his treasury as having been intended for the relief of poets and scholars (kavi-budhârtim yasya kôéasya pûrtijh)\(^{94}\) He is said to have also afforded shelter in his court to learned men from various quarters and reared up the tree of learning.\(^{94}\) Himself a person of taste, he was, we note,\(^{95}\) a connoisseur of literary merit, skilled in the appréciation of poetry.

Kannada literature flourished under Châniarâja's patronage. Eâmachandra, a protégé of his (Châmarâja-bhûvara-prôtsâhîta-nâda), wrote the Aéva-èâstra\(^{96}\) (c. 1625), a rendering, in colloquial Kannada, of èâlihôtra's treatise on horses. The work begins with invocation to Gañêéa, Krishña and Nàrâyaña. It is written in 18 chapters dealing with the physical constitution and the âge of horses, method of worshipping them during the Mahânavami festival and the treatment of their diseases. Another protégé of Chàmarâja Wodeyar, Padmana Pandita, son of Dêparasa, a Jain Àyurvëdic scholar (Àyurvëda-budha), wrote the Hayasâra-Samuchchaya\(^{m}\) (1627), a compendium of the science of horses. It is a-

\(^{94}\) Chikkadévardja-Dharaniramanabhhyudayah, I I I, 15 :
Digbhyo budhnapagatânanadhigatyadadyo
lidjâ cha samsadinijâsana-mâsasâdâ

Vidyâlata naiu vivrddhimupaitu . . . ||

\(^{95}\) Ibid., I I I, 17 :
Éabddrtha bhdvarachandguria vrtti riti
Vyangyddi vaibhava bhînna rasépi Jedyé
Sàrvasvatdmrtarasam rasikah, kaviltulm
Sangrahyasamsadirdjâsa rdjahamsah

also Kamaldchala-Mdhdtmya (c. 1680), I, 97: Sarasakalânipunate vettu.

poetical work, in 20 chapters, written in the Kannada kanda mètre (Karnâta kanda padyagalindam). It begins with invocation to Jina and treats, among others, of the shape and sex of horses and the treatment of their diseases. Ascribed to Châmarâja Wodeyar himself, are two works extant, namely, Brahmdttara-Khanda\(^98\) (c. 1630) and Ch'hmârâjôkti-Vilasa\(^TM\) (c. 1635). The Brahmdttara-Khanda—also known as Maniprakâsa-Vachana\(^100\)—is a prose work, in colloquial Kannada, in 22 chapters. It commences with invocation to ēambhu and deals with the philosophy and ritualism of Saivism—as expounded in the Skanda-Purâna—in the form of illustrative stories of a didactic character. The other work, Châmarâjôkti' Vilâsa—after Châmarâja Wodeyar—is a popular Hosa-gannada prose version, in 7 parts, of Valimki’s Râmâyana, and begins with invocation to Vishvakâna and Gaṅêsa. From a manuscript of this work, it would appear, Châmarâja Wodeyar got it written in his name by a scholar, named Virûpâksha, for the enduring benefit of mankind.\(^101\)

Among other contemporaries of Châmarâja Wodeyar we find mention made of Bommanna-kavi of ēravana-, Belagola, in a lithic record,\(^102\) although no works of his have so far come down to us. Nanjanâtha was a scholar of Châmarâja’s court, under whose direction Nrsimha, a pupil of his and son of Gajâranya-Nrsimha-Paurânika,

---

99. Pub. Rudrappa & Sons, Bangalore, 1894, 1895. See also Kar. Ka. Cha., I I. 360-361. A Ms. of this work (No. 65—P. L.; Mys. Or. Lib.), dealing with the Sundarakânda, is dated October 12, 1643 (Svabhanu, Kartikâ su. 10—see ff. 33), from which it would seem, either the writing of the work was extended over a number of years after Châmarâja’s death or a copy of a portion of it was made in 1643.
100. Ms. No. 18. 3-10—P. L.; Mad. Or. Lib.; see also Kar. Ka. Cha., I.o.
101. See Kar. Ka. Cha., II. 360, f.n. 1:

\[
\text{Vdlm.iki-rmûnd-prôktâraTnad-lidmdyaana8ya cha} \\
\text{Karnâtk-bhd8hayâ} \ \text{fikâm kdrayishyan nîrptôttama}h\। \\
\text{Lôkdhdmupakdrâya} \ \text{Virûpdksâna, dhîmât} \ \\
\text{Vidushd krtvân samyak pratijnûm Chamabhupati}h\।
\]
102. E. C, II SB. 250 (1634).
composed the *Honnalagere copper-plate grant* (January 1623), in Kannada and Sanskrit. What other works he wrote is not known.

Châmarâja Wođeyar had five queens, Muddâjamamma of Yeľandûr, Dijŷirâamma of Bilûgali, Siddâjamma of Mûgûr, Channâjamma of Mûdana-kôte and Dođdâjamma of Sindhuvalî. He is said to have had issues which, however, seem to have died in their infancy. At the instance of his principal queen, Muddâjamamma, Châmarâja Wođeyar, in 1633, is stated to have got constructed in her name a bathing-ghât in the pond at Mëlkôte, for the convenience of pilgrims during the Vaira-mûdi and Brahmôtsavam festivals.

Among other members of the Royal Family, Bettada-Châmarâja Wođeyar and Muppina-Dëvarâja Wođeyar, the two surviving younger brothers of Râja Wođeyar, seem to have been living in peace and quiet, with their sons, in GuṇḍluTerakanâmbi and Yeleyûr, respectively, during the greater part of Châmarâja's reign, especially after their pilgrimage to sacred places. A lithic record, dated July 31, 1625, refers to the érection of sacred places.

---


\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Gaj&arya'Nn&imhâkhya-Paurânika-autô likhit} & \\
\text{Nanjînd'tha-budhachchâ trô} & \\
\text{Nrsimha-stâmrasâdsanam} &
\end{align*}
\]

Nanjinâtha (Nanjanâthaiya), mentioned in the record, seem s to have belonged to the Royal Family.


105. See *Raj. Kath.* (XII. 469) which speaks of Châmarâja as having had sons, one of whom was named Dëvarâja (Dëvandjam modaldda kumdraram padedu). The Armais and the *Mys. Dho, Pur.* are silent on this point.

106. *Annals*, I. 60.


108. *E. C. I I I* (1) Sr. 117 : े. 1547, *Krõdhana, Sravana su.* 7. Dëvarâja is referred to in this record as the son of Châmarâja Wodeyar of Mysore, the latter being, of course, identical with Bôja-Châmarâja Wodeyar (1572-1576).

Châmarâj Wodeyar died on May 2, 1637, in his thirty-fifth year, his queens, it is said, committing sati.

It is, indeed, to the crédit of Châmarâja Wodeyar that he appears more prominently in the records of his own period of rule than does his predecessor, Râja Wodeyar. Cut off in the middle of a most promising career, his influence on the génération of writers immediately following his death, while not considérable, was not altogether negligible. Although unfortunately there is no référence to Châmarâja in the Kanthlrava-Narasarâja-Vijayam (1648), the memories of his court and rule are preserved in all their freshness in the other literary works of the seventeenth century. In particular, to Tirumalârya, in the Chïkkadëvarâya-Vamsâvali and the Chïkkadêvarâja-Vijayam, Châmarâja appears essentially as an epic hero with a record of uninterrupted course of military campaigns to his crédit. So impressed were Tirumalârya and his contemporaines (like Chikkupâdhyâya, Chidânanda, etc.) with Châmarâja's achievements and the dazzling splendour and culture of his court, that we find a strong contemporary flavour in their works while depicting them. Châmarâja Wodeyar's rule is further echoed in some of the inscriptions records

109. Mys. Dho. Pur., I. 44 and 55: Isvara, Vaisakha ba. 3. See also Annals, I. 62. Bhaskara (c. 1650), in his Behara-ganita, mentions the death of Châmarâja Wodeyar in s. 1559 (1637) (see Kar, Ka. Cha., I I . 375). Cf. Mya. Ra. Cha. (22) which places Châmarâja's death in lévara, Vaiédkha eu. 15 (April 28,1637). Wilks (I. 55) also dates the death in 1687. Of. Dévaohandra (Raj. Kath., X I I . 467-470), fixing ChâmarSja's death in December 1683 and the period of his raie between 1616-1688, which it is hard to accept ; nor is there any evidence for his statement (Ibid. 875) that there were hostile incursions, famines and other public calamities during the reign.

110. Annals. I.o.
pf the eighteenth century, while the chroniclers (of the 18th and 19th centuries) corroborate and supplement the earlier sources in regard to various aspects of his reign.

A study of these materials enables us to form some estimate of Chamaraja Wodeyar as an historical character. Young and energetic, with a fairly well developed constitution, Chamaraja Wodeyar thoroughly impressed his contemporaries as a warrior and as a ruler. Though he generally conducted his campaigns with the assistance of his Dalavai, there were also occasions when he appears to have personally led the army on the field. His conquests were, as a rule, guided by the policy of aggression—a policy which was a sheer necessity in the case of a kingdom like Mysore, in view of the unsettled political conditions of the times and the existence of hostile neighbours by whom Mysore was then surrounded. His loyalty to the Vijayanagar Empire was unshaken, although his local contemporaries seemed to regard the assumption of independence by him as eminently justified from a purely local point of view. Already, by the close of his reign, the kingdom of Mysore, so strenuously extended by him, was on the point of becoming a bulwark in the south against the powers hostile to the Vijayanagar Empire. Slowly and steadily, the political centre of gravity in the Karnatak was being shifted from Penukonda to Seringapatam. So that Seringapatam, though seemingly lost to the Empire in 1610, was fast becoming, though indirectly, a gain to the latter in her crisis. The conquests and annexations of Chamaraja Wodeyar, as Wilks observes, naturally meant distress

111. E. C., I, III (1) TN. 63 (1748) 11. 36-87; I V (2) yd. 17 (1761), 11, 22-28. Most of the inscriptions of the latter part of the 17th century and the earlier part of the 18th [Like E.C., I I I (1) Sr. 14 of 1686 and 64 of 1722] pay a good deal of attention to the tracing of the descent of Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar from the Une of Muppina-Deveraja Wodeyar. Hence they are conspicuous by the absence of any reference to the rulers who followed in the wake of Raja Wodeyar. We have noted the exceptions here.

112. I. 55.
and loss of independence to the neighbouring Pâlegârs, but at the same time they appear to have heralded a change for the better to the subjects who, freed from their vexatious régime, were brought under the more settled and orderly government of the Viceroy-king of Seringapatam and his agents.

The drastic punishment inflicted by Chàmarâja Wodeyar on Bettada-Arasu, his first Dalavâi, despite the latter's services to the cause of the kingdom during his (Chàmarâja's) minority, may not, perhaps, be viewed with favour by posterity. But it is to be remembered that Chàmarâja Wodeyar was not oblivious of the Dalavâi's services and that in awarding the punishment he seems to have been guided more by the larger political interests of the hour than personal spite or hatred.

The pious and tolerant ruler he was, Chàmarâja Wodeyar adhered strictly to the standards of Râja Wodeyar. The different religions (Brâhmanieal, Jaina and Vîraêaiva) flourished under him. As an accomplished scholar of his âge, he liberally encouraged learning and the arts. Particularly Kannada literature received a remarkable impetus from the keen personal interest he seems to have evinced in its development. Regarded alike from the political and cultural points of view, Chàmarâja Wodeyar is entitled to a unique place in history as a "Maker of Mysore."
PLATE XV.

Immadi-Haja Wodeyar, 1697-1698.
CHAPTER VII.

IMMAĎI RÂJA WODEYAR. 1637-1638.

Birth, accession and identity—Siege of Arkalgud, c. 1638—Immadi Raja Wodey Rule—Religion and domestic life—Death, October 8, 1638—Political position of Mysore, 1638.

On May 14, 1637, the thirteenth day after the death of Châmarâja Wodeyar, Immadi-Râja Wodeyar (Râja Wodeyar II), the youngest and last son of Râja Wodeyar, succeeded to the throne of Mysore. He was born on May 26, 1612, and was in his twenty-fifth year at the time of his accession. He is referred to in literary

1. See Mys. Dho. Pur. (I. 44 ; II. 66), referring to ìévara, Vaisakha ba. 80 as the date of Immadi-Râja Wodeyar’s accession. Cf. Mys. Raj. Cha. (22), placing the accession on the very day of Châmarâja’s death ; Raj. Kath. (XII. 470), fixing it in December 1688; AnnaU (1.62-68), according to which Immadi-Râja Wodeyar had been installed on the throne, by Châmarâja Wodeyar, on ìśvara, Vaisakha su. 15 (April 28,1637, i.e. three days before Châmarâja’s death). Wilks (I. 56) merely dates the accession of ” Immadee Raj “ in 1687. The authority of the earliest Ms. (i.e, Mys. Dho, Pur.) is to be preferred here as the more specific in regard to the date of accession, although it seems not impossible that Immadi-Râja Wodeyar had been formally desired, a few days before Châmarâja’s death, to succeed the latter.

2. Ibid., I. 83, 44 (compare) : Parldhâvi, Jyêśha eu. 7, Tuesday. See also C. Vam. (81-82), according to which Immadi-Râja Wodeyar, the fourth and last son (kiriyanugar) of Râja Wodeyar, was in his boyhood at the time of the latter’s death (1617). The Mys. Dho. Vam. (ff. 28) merely refers to Immači-Râja Wodeyar as the son of Râja Wodeyar and uncle of Châmarâja Wodeyar ; the Mys. Raj. Cha. (22) mentions, him as the son of Râja Wo4eyarby hisyoungest wife ; and the Raj. Kath. (XII. 470), as the son of Râja Wodeyar. Cf. Wilks (I. 66), referring to Immačli-Râja Wodeyar as ”the posthumous son of Râja Wodeyar," who asoended the Musnud in his 20th year on the death of bis nephew Cham Baj." The AnnaU (I. 49-50, 68) also speaks of Immadi-Râja Wodeyar as the posthumous son of Râja Wodeyar, fixing his birth on December 7, 1617 (Paingala, Margatira ba. 6), i.e., about six months after Râja Wôçeyar’s death. In the absence of positive evidence to the contrary, the authority of the earliest available sources (i.e. Mys. Dho, Pur. and C. Vam.) is preferred here.
works and inscriptions (17th-18th centuries) as 'Immaḍi-
-
-\--\-
-\--\-
-Bajarasa,' 'Immaḍi-Bâjodeyar,' 'Immaḍi-Râja' and
-\--\-
-\--\-
-'Immaḍi-Râjarât'/.

Daḷavâi Vikrama-Râya continued in office under
-\--\-
-\--\-
-\--\-
-\--\-
Immaḍi-Râja Wođeyar. Perhaps the
-\--\-
-\--\-
only political event of importance during
-\--\-
the reign was the siège of Arkalgûd in
-\--\-
or about 1638. The siège, it is said, was successfully
-\--\-
conducted by Vikrama-Râya who exacted tribute from
Krishnappa Nâyaka, the chief of the place, and returned
to Seringapatam with the spoils of war.

Immaḍi-Râja Wođeyar appears to have been a promising ruler. His prowess is echoed in
literary works and inscriptions. The short period of his rule was renaiarkable
for its popularity and vigour, and for the continued
maintenance of the traditions of his predecessors. As
a centre of culture, his court was reputed for its magni-

Immaḍi-Râja Wođeyar, as we find him depicted, was an ardent devotee of Vishnu, ever
engagea in listening to and enjoying
the devotional literature of the
Vaishnava faith. He had two queens, Venkatâjamma of
Heggadêvankôte (Kôte) and Nanjamma of Maddûr, by
whom he is said to have had no issue.

3. See C. Vam., 32, 36, C. Vi., I I , 86-86, referring to Immadi-Râja as
'Irmadi-Râja'; Kamald. Mahât., I, 98; Munivam., I I , 68: Rajôeyara
kiriycmugardfanmadirRdjodeyar; B.C., I I I (1) T.N. 63 (1749), 1. 38;
IV (2) Y d. 17 (1761), 1. 24, etc. See also Tables II and I I I .
Vam., ff. 28.
B. Vidé f.n. 3 supra.
6. C. Vam., 36; also Mys. Dho., Vam., ff. 28; Mys. Raj. Cha., 22-28; Annota,
1,68-64.
7, Mys, Raj. Cha. and Annals, I.c.
8. C. Vam., I.c.: Pencogurushano. charandarvinda-yandva-sandarstana-
sravana-kirtanādirbhvitirasa-paripdka-bheòtonam nichchanigegeydu,
Immadi-Raja Wodeyar died on October 8, 1638, in his twenty-seventh year, after a reign of nearly an year and a half, his queens, it is said, observing sati. His death is said to have been brought about by a poisonous mixture (visha-chûrna) administered to him—during his indisposition—by the court physician, under the influence of Dalavâi Vikrama-Bàya. There seems little doubt that the Dalavâi was led into the perpetration of this treacherous deed, perhaps by motives of usurpation or assertion of independence against his young, and probably too energetic, master.

Though Immadi-Râja Wodeyar was thus victimised by the Dalavâi's intrigue in the very prime of his life, it is to his crédit that he was able to leave behind him a powerful and compact kingdom—a rich political héritage to the next génération of rulers of Mysore.

11. *Annals*, i.e.
18. See also and compare *Wilks*, 1.67.
CHAPTER VIII.

KĂṬHĪRĀVA-NĀRĀSĀRĀJĀ WODEYAR I, 1638-1659.

Lineal descent—Birth and early life—Accession—Political situation—General course of affairs—Political Development: 

Kanthirava-Narasaraja Wodeyar I, 1638-1659.
General course of affairs—Relations with Madura, 1655-1659; Mysorean invasion of Madura, c. 1655-1657—Counter-invasion by Madura, c. 1657-1659—Orientalism of Proenza—Relations with Ikkeri, 1657-1659—Political position of Mysore, 1659.

On the death of Imma<jii-Bâja Wo<deyar without issue, direct descent in the line of Râja Wo<deyar came to an end. Reference has been made, in the preceding chapters, to Bettada-Châmarâja Wodeyar and Muppina-Dëvarâja Wodeyar, two of the surviving sons of Bôla-Châmaraja Wodeyar (1572-1576). Bettada-Châmarâjâ Wodeyar was, as we have seen, a younger brother of Râja Wodeyar; and Muppina-Dëvarâja Wodeyar was a half-brother (bhinnôdara sahôdara) of his. Bettada-Châmarâja is said to have had two sons, Timmarâja Wodeyar, by Lingâjamma of Bâgali, and Kanthirava-Narasârâja Wodeyar, by Guruvâjamma (Guruvâmbâ) of Hura; Muppina-Dëvarâja had five, Yeleyûr Dëparâja Wodeyar, by his first wife Dëvâjamma, and Doddâdëva-râja Wodeyar, Chikkadëvarâja-Wodeyar, Kempadëvarâja Wodeyar and Maridëvarâja Wodeyar, by the second, Kempamma (Kempamâmbâ). Bettada-Châmarâja and Muppina-Dëvarâja being in their old age, as already indicated, it was but in the natural order of things that the heirs of the former should first succeed to the throne of Mysore. Timmarâja Wodeyar, the first son of Bettada-Châmarâja Wodeyar, had, however, it would seem, predeceased his father, so that the next immediate claimant in the line of Bettada-Châmarâja was his second son, Kanthirava-Narasârâja Wodeyar.

1. Ante, Chs. IV and V; Vide also Tables II-IV.
3. Vide Appendix IV--(1) and Tables II-IV (compare).
4. Ante, Cha,V and VI.
Kanthirava-Narasaorâja Wodeyar was born on May 2, 1615, on the Nrsimha-Jayanti day, under the constellation Svâti.\(^5\) In his boyhood he was, we learn,\(^6\) brought up along with Nanjarâjaiya (Nanjëndra) and Lingarâjaiya (Lingëndra), sons of his maternal uncle, Kemparâjaiya (Kempa-Bhûpa) of Hura, and was trained with them in horse-riding, elephant-riding, archery (turaga dërâta, gajârdhana ... dhanurveda) and the use of various kinds of weapons, such as the spear, lance, dagger, club, sword and discus (sânga bhalleya baku hingade kathâri ... chakráyudha). Kanthirava is said to have passed his youth in Gundlu-Terakanâmbi with his father, Bettada-Châmarâja Wodeyar.\(^7\) During this period, he is reputed to have had a thrilling adventure. A pious Brâhman, while on his return journey from a pilgrimage to Râmëévaram, it is said,\(^8\) casually mentioned to him that there was a champion at the court of the chief of Trichinopoly, who, over-confident of his strength, had proclaimed a general challenge against all his antagonists. Kanthirava, with all the ardour of a young man, at once secretly proceeded thither, accompanied by the Brâhman. Disguised as a professional wrestler, he effected his entrance into the fort of Trichinopoly, whose chief welcomed him to an open combat with his champion. In the feat which followed, Kanthirava so adroitly conducted his movements that he was soon, without the knowledge of his spectators, able to outmanoeuvre his opponent and pierce his neck through with

---


8, Ibid., I, 66-67; see also and compare Wilks, I. 57-58.
his broad-sword Coamed Vijaya-Narasimha) which he had secreted in his waist. Meantime the entire court was watching with bated breath the issue of the contest; but were taken aback when they saw the head of the local champion roll down on its being merely touched by Kanthirava at the point of his staff. The chief of Trichinopoly was about to reward the victor of the day but Kanthirava, disdaining all honours, quietly left the place for Terakanambi the very same night, leaving a placard on the fort-wall to the effect that the feat of arms had been performed by some one from Mysore. On his return journey, Kanthirava is said to have come across a pillar of slate-stone and so dexterously cut it asunder that the sharpness of the blade of his broad-sword was by no means lost in the attempt. These exploits, apart from their traditional glamour, are quite in keeping with the early training of Kanthirava, and serve to give us some insight into his character and attainments on the eve of his accession.

Kanthirava-Narasaraja Wodeyar ascended the throne of Mysore on November 22, 1638, in his twenty-fourth year, a month and a half after the death of Immadi-Raja Wodeyar. During the intervening period Dalavai Vikrama-Raya is said to have actually usurped the State. There is a tradition that Kanthirava assumed the reins of office after the assassination of Dalavai Vikrama-Raya.

10. Mys. Dho, Pur., I. 51 : Bahudhnya, Kartika ba. 12, Thursday (November 22, 1638); see also Appendix IV — (2). Cf. Raj. Kath. (XII. 470), fixing Kanthirava’s accession in May 1635!; Annals, I. 65: Bahudhnya, Kartika su. 2 (October 28, 1638). The Annals (l.c.) speaks also of the adoption of Kanthirava by Timmamamma, the junior dowager queen of Raja Wodeyar, and his installation at Seringapatam, on one and the same day. Cf. also S. K. Aiyangar, Ancient India (p. 289), adopting this view. The authority of the earlier Ms. is, as usual, preferred here.
11. Ibid., I. 45-61; see also Appendix Ibid, for details.
12. Ibid; see also Mys, Dho. Vam., ff. 30; Raj, Kath., l.o. The Mys. Raj. Cha. is conspicuous by the absence of any reference to this tradition. Wilks closely follows the Mys. Dho. Pur. and he is accepted in the main by S. K. Aiyangar (see Appendix Ibid).
According to another tradition, Kanthîrava, shortly after his accession, deprived Dalavâi Vikrama-Râya of his office (for having brought about the death by poison, of Immadi-Râja Wodeyar) and inflicted capital punishment on him and his accomplices. Neither of these traditions has, however, so far been corroborated. On the other hand, from a lithic record on a pedestal in front of the monolithic bull (Dodda-Basava) in the Nanjundêévara temple at Nanjangûd, we find that on January 11, 1644, Dalavâi Vikrama-Râya, a son of Bettada-Châmârâja Wodeyar of Mysore, set up the pedestal thereto as a devotional offering. It seems obvious from this record, that Dalavâi Vikrama-Râya was actually alive as late as 1644. If, according to the traditionary accounts, he was slain or capital punishment had been inflicted on him in 1638, it becomes inconceivable how he could live on till 1644 to perform the service in the temple at Nanjangûd according to the indubitable evidence of the lithic inscription. It appears, therefore, probable that Vikrama-Râya was dismissed from service on the accession of

14. B.C., I 11 (1) Nj, 9: Text in the original, p. 315:
   1. Subhamastu svasti sri-vijayabhyu
   2. daya-Sâlivâhana-saka-varusa 1565 san
   3. da vartamanavada Svabhânu sam
   4. vatsarada Maga-suda 12 Guruvaradalu Mai
   5. sâra-Châmârâjâ-Wadoyaravara kumâra Da
   6. lavayi.Vikrama-Rayana sève

S. 1566, Svabhânu, Magha su. 12 corresponds to January 11, 1644. Perhaps by a slip, Rice, in transliterating and translating this inscription, refers to Dajavâi Vikrama-Râya as the son of 'Maisur-Râja-Vageyar' [Ibid., p. 184 (transliteration); p. 96 (translation)], and this seems tacitly accepted by S. K. Aiyangar in Ancient India, p. 288, f.n. 1. From the original text of the inscription, however, it is clear that Dajavâi Vikrama-Râya was the son of Châmârâja Wodeyar of Mysore, identical with Bettada-Châmârâja Wodeyar, younger brother of Râja Wodeyar. This would corroborate the Annals that Vikrama-Râya was a naturel son (gandharva-putra) of Bettada-Châmârâja Wogeyar (see Appendix III). The Annals (I. 61) also speaks of the setting up of the bull with an inscription on its pedestal by Vikrama-Râya, in January 1635, during the reign of Châmârâja Wodeyar V (1617-1637). But from the above document we note that the pedestal was actually put up by him in January 1644.
Kanthïrava in November 1638 and allowed to réside in some part of Mysore during the rest of his life, although it is not impossible that he continued to call himself by his former désignation of Dalavâi. In succession to Vikrama-Râya, Timmarâjaiya was appointed Dalavâi on November 26, 1638,¹⁵ and Kanthïrava began his rule in Seringapatam, the earliest record referring to him as king being the Gajjiganahalli copper-plate grant (April 1639),¹⁶

Kanthïrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar was a contemporary of Venkaṭa II (1633?-1642) and érî-Ranga VI (1642-1664?-1681) of Vijaya-nagar, Muhammad Adil Shah of Bijâpur (1627-1656), Vîrabhadra Nâyaka (1629-1645) and Šivappa Nâyaka I (1645-1660) of Îkkêri, Immaḍi-Kempe-Gauḍa of Mâgaḍi (1569-1655) and Tirumala Nâyaka of Madura (c. 1623-1659), among others. It was a critical period in the history of India in gênerai and of Karnâtâka in particular, when Kanthïrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar succeeded to the throne of Mysore. The Mughal Empire, gradually encroaching upon the south ever since the reign of Akbar, had already secured a foothold in that région by the consolidation of the conquered provinces into a viceroyalty under the désignation of "Deccan." Bijâpur and Gôlkoṇḍa, the two Shâhi kingdoms of the south,

¹⁵. Annals, I. 68; Mys. Dho. Pur., I. 66. The former mentions the name of the Dalavâi as Timmappa Nâyaka while the latter as Timmapparâjaiya. The Mys. Dho. Vam. (ff. 38), however, refers to the name as Timmarâjaiya, which reading is preferably followed hère. Cf. K. N. F., IV, 100-106. In the poetical language of this contemporary work (1648), Nanjarâjaiya of Hura is made to appear as having been appointed Dalavâi by Kanthïrava soon after his (Kanthïrava's) installation. The poem itself being, as we shall see, written at the instance of Dajavâi Nanjarâjaiya (1640-1647), the poet, Gôvinda-Vaidya, is to be understood to convey hère Nanjarâjaiya's succession to office in 1640 and not the appointment of the first Dalavâi of Kanthïrava. The poet also describes and eulogises Nanjarâjaiya's exploits early in the reign of Kanthïrava, i.e., 1639-1640, when he was not actually the Dajavâi. Obviously, while Timmarâjaiya was the first Dalavâi of Kanthïrava in succession to Vikrama-Râya, Nanjarâjaiya of Hura also seems to hâve played an active part in the events of the period, as the king's relation and right-hand man, till his own appointment as Dajavâi in 1640.

¹⁶. E.C., III (1) Nj. 198.
remained, however, unconquered. Between the Mughal Empire and these powers the Deccan formed, as it were, a debatable ground. In May-June 1636, Shah Jahân had concluded a partition treaty with Adil Shah and Qutb Shah, defining the boundaries of the respective powers. As a result of this, the advance of the Shâhi kingdoms further northwards was arrested, leaving them, however, unrestricted scope for expansion in the south and the east for a period extending nearly to two decades (1637-1656). Almost simultaneously, the European nations in India were progressing slowly but steadily in their commercial enterprise while the Empire of Vijaynagar, under Venkaṭa I, was already in the throes of dissolution due to the slackening of central control and the domestic and other difficulties of the ruling dynasty. Tirumala Nâyaka of Madura was asserting his independence; Vîrabhadra Nâyaka of Ikkëri was encroaching on the territories of the neighbouring Pâlegârs of Sôde, Bijigi and Tarikere; and Immaḍî-Kempe-Gauḍâ of Mâgadi, steadfast as ever in his loyalty to the Empire, was administering his principality, keeping at bay the insurgent chiefs in his neighbourhood. The situation was eminently suited for the ambitious schemes of Bijâpur and Gôlkonda, the central and southern Karnâṭak being the most promising field to the former and the eastern and south-eastern portions to the latter.¹⁷

Between December 1637-January 1638, encouraged by the petty différences between Vîrabhadra Nâyaka of Ikkëri and Pûvala-Hanumappa Nâyaka (Kenge Nâyak) of Basavâpaṭiṭa and incited by the latter's intrigues, the Bijâpur army, under Ranadhullâ Khân (Rustam-i-Zâmân), laid siège to and destroyed Ikkëri. Vîrabhadra Nâyaka sought refuge in Kaule-durga (Bhuvanagiri-durga) and

¹⁷ Mys. Gaz., I I . iii. 2869-2870; J. Sarkar's article, Shahji Bhônsle in Mysorey in the M.R., July 1929, pp. 7-12; Ke. N. F., VI. 96, 96, etc.
ultimately concluded a truce with Raṇḍullâ Khâñjìi: Having Hanumappa Nâyaka in the forefront and reinforced by the levies of local chieftains in the country, Raṇḍullâ Khân next proceeded with his army on a regular and well-organised campaign in the Kamâtâk. Sîra was taken by Afzal Khân and its chief, Kastûri-Ranga, put to death during an interview. Turuvêkere and Tumkûr were ravaged, the chief of the latter place taking to flight panic-stricken. The advancing army next entered the Morasa-nâdu, encamping near êivaganga. The fort of Bangalore was taken from Immađî-Kempe-Gauḍâ who retreated to Mâgađi leaving his son a hostages in the hands of Raṇḍullâ Khân. Placing Shàhji—father of êivàjì—a second in command, in charge of Bangalore, Raṇḍullâ Khân proceeded further south. Reinforced by the levies of the Morasa chief tains, he next took Râmagiri-durga where he held a review of his forces. About the end of 1638, he advanced towards Channapaţţa with eventual designs on Seringa patam. 18

The first event of importance early in the reign of Kanṭhörava-Narasarâja Woďeyar, hardly two months after his accession, was an invasion of Mysore and the siège of Seringapatam by the Bijàpur forces under Raṇḍullâ Khân. About the middle of January 1639, Raṇḍullâ Khân encamped near Seringapatam. 19 Although exaction of tribute from Mysore or annexation of Seringapatam to Bijâpur was, according to the gênerai programme, the

18. For the gênerai références on this section, see K. N. V., XI, 1-80; C. Vam., 85; C. Vi., I I , 90-100; Ke. N. V., V I. 96-98; Mys. Dho. Vam., ff. 38-36; Annals, I. 72; cf. Baj. Kath., X I I . 470. See also and compare Muhammad-Nâmdh used by Sarkar in Ibid., p. 9.

19. The Mys. Dho. Pur. (I. 52) places the event in January-February 1689: Bahudhdnya, Pushya-Mâgha ba. The Mys. Dho. Vam., (ff. 85-86) seems spécifïcally to date the siège itself between Bahudhanya, Pushya ba. 8 (Friday) and Pushya ba. 11 (Monday)., The tithis actually correspond to January 1649,1689 (Wednesday to Saturday), (Ind, Eph., V I. 80.) The
objective of the Khân's advance thither; the attention of Bijâpur towards Mysore had been, in the main, directed by the intrigues of Channaiya of Nâgamangala, a turbulent feudatory, who had, it is said, taken up service under Muhatnœad Adil Shah as a Mansabdâr of 200 horse and accompanied Raṇadullâ Khân to the south. Before commencing opérations, however, Ranadullâ Khân sent word to Kaṇṭhîrava-Narasarâja Woḍeyar, demanding payinent of tribute to Bijâpur. Kaṇṭhîrava stoutly refused to accède to the demand, sent back the Khân’s messengers and hastened the préparations for the defence of the capital. On this, Raṇadullâ Khân resolved upon the siège of Seringapatam. In vain did Kenge-Hanumappa Nâyaka remonstrate with hiin to give up his project and make peace. Heedless of the advice, Ranadullâ Khân persisted, and directed the commencement of the assault. While Kaṇṭhîrava ordered a général mobilisation of his forces and endeavoured to obstruct the passage of the enemy.

The investing army consisted of a miscellaneous rabble ranging from 40 to 50 thousand horse, 3 to 4 lakhs foot and between 500 to 1,000 éléphants. It was made up of week-days mentioned, however, correspond to January 18-21, 1639 (Ibid), which is preferred hère as the more probable date. As is well known, local ohronicles and mémoire hardly err in regard to week-days, though they are sometimes not exact in respect of tithis. The Anomal (I. 73-75) followi the Mys. Dho. Vam. The Muhammad-Namah places the event, roughly, in 1639 [vide Appendix IV—(3)]. Wilks (I. 59) merely dates it in the Örst year of Kaṇṭhîrava'B accession. Although the sièges itself took place between the 18th and 31st of January 1689, it was, as we shall see, preceded by certain préliminaries, for which an interval of 8-4 daya has to be allowed and the arrivai itself of Raṇadullâ Khân at Seringapatam fixed about the middle of January.

Composition of the Bijâpur and Mysore armies.

32. K. N. F., XI I , 89-99; see also X I , 111-180, referring to the préliminary arrangements for the défence of Seringapatam.
27. See K. N. V., XI, 11,107 ; XI I , 12, 69; X VI , 5 ; C. Vam., l.c. ; C. Vi., I I ,
28 (compare); see also and compare Annals, I. 78 ; Mys. Dho. Vam., ff. 30.
two divisions: the original Bijâpur army, under the direct command of Ranadullâ Khan himself, and the levies of Karnâjak chieftains led by Kenge-Hanumappa Nâyaka (of Basavâapatna). The Mysore army was mostly composed of the levies of the tributary chiefs of Hûra, Channapatna, Maddûr, Satyâgâla, Heggaddêvankôte, Channarâyapatna, Kikkëri, Bûkankere, Piriyapatna, Talakâød, Malavâlli and Nâgamangala, besides the forces raised by the officers in charge of Seringapatam and Mysore.

The major portion of the Karnâtak forces halted on the southern bank of the Cauvery, with Hanumappa Nâyaka at their head; the Morasas and the chief of Bëlûr, in particular, took up a convenient position on the northern

Position of the besieging army.

28. *Ibid.*, Chs. XI and XII: Among the générais, said to have commanded the different divisions of the main army under the Muslim generalissimo, were, Parât Khân, Kairiti Khân, Balavant Khân, Mustafâ Khân, Abdullâ (Afzal) Khân, Akalâs Khân, Ambar Khân, Siddirahima, Vedôji-Kâghava-Pangita, Ankuëa Khân, Siddi-Mallik Khân of Shôlâpur, Adam Khân, Jilahar Khân, Muhammad Khân and Futteh Khân [XI, 88-97; XI, 48-66 (compare)]. Among the Karnâtak ohiefs—under Hanumappa Nâyaka—who are said to have contributed their quota, were those of Harapanahalli, Sondûr, Guçligôtë, Râyadurga, Hatti (under Yellappa Nâyaka), Kunduruppe, Doddëri, Hiûryûr (under Bairâ Nâyaka), Turuvêkere, Bëlûr, Pâlupare, Nara sîmb apura (Hoje-Narapisur), Chikbajjâpur, Bijjavara, Kôlälâ, Hoavanahâtî, Bâvalûr, Hosûr, Hosakôfc, Sûrabâle, Kaggondi (Kangondi), Mâsti, Dévanahalli and Sidlaghatta (XI, 63-65, 99-106; X II, 67-68)—these levies alone, it is said, oomputed at a lakh (X II, 13). There were also, we are told, Mullukas, Gujarâtis, Kanaujis, Khorassânis, Pathâns, etc., (XI, 97-98; X II, 66)—the entire army of Bijâpur, with its equipment of civil and military stores and all the paraphernalia, presenting the spectacle of a moving camp as it were. The contemporary poet, Gôvinda-Vaidya, in dealing with the siège of Seringapatam and other évênts, writes partly from direct knowledge and partly from the information he had gathered from those who took part in those évênts. As a poet, however, he delineates the heroio and other sentiments and his accounts are not altogether free from exaggeration. The K. N. V. (1648) is made use of in this section, subject to these limitat离子s. For a detailed account and estimate of the work, see under Literary activity in Ch. IX.

29. *Ibid*, XI, 77-88; X III, 56-61. In one place (XI, 82) the chief of Turuvêkere (Turugere) is also mentioned as having takeft up the side of Kanthirava, but in another place (XI, 102) the poet speaks of the camp of Turuvêkere in the army of Banadullâ Khân. This seems obviously a contradiction. It appears probable that Turuvêkere was represented in the Khân’s army, having joined him during the latter’s march towarda Bangalore (XI, 16).
bank of the river; while the main army of Ranadullà Khân encamped in the other directions.  

On January 18, 1639, Raçadullâ Khân laid siège to Seringapatam. The siège lasted only three days, during which period Ranadullà Khân pushed on the blockade with vigour, although his deputies (Khâns and Viziers) had, in the very beginning, complained to hiin of the reverses they had sustained. At the same time, Kaçthïrava, personally leading his troops, directed the defence opérations and the commencement of hostilities. A section of his (Kanthïrava’s) army delivered a surprise night-attack on the Bijâpuris encamped at Arakere; another fell upon those who had halted at Hosaholalu; a third obstructed the passage of the enemy near Mëlîkôte (Yâdavâdri); and a fourth one surprised the vast array of the investing forces in the neighbourhood of the Châmundi Hills, Mysore—putting them to rout amidst great slaughter and cutting off the noses of several of their opponents. Despite the calamity which had thus attended his army, and the steady opposition his men met with from the besieged, Ranadullà Khân persisted in his résolve to take the fort. By successive attacks he had effected a breach and almost scaled the walls, when Kanthîrava brought together all the scattered éléments of his army and offered stout résistance. A severe

82. Ibid ; see also infra.  
88. K.N. V., XIII, 18-80; XIV and XV, XVI, 11-20; also E.C., III (1) Nj. 198 (April 1689), ii. 41-48; Sr. 108 (1647), ii. 38-89; 48-49—ochoing Kanthirava’s viotory over the Muhammadans of Bijâpur; C. Fom., 86-36; C. Vi., I I , 102-127—depioting the siège of Seringapatam by Eanadullà Khân and his repuise andtefcreat ; Mys. Raj. Cha., 28 ; M y s. Dho. Vam., S. 86; Armait* I. 72-76, speaking of the siège of Seringapatam and the défeat and repuise, etc., of Ranadullà Khân. The Raj. kath. (XII. 470-472), in detailing the siège and Kanfchirava’s conquests, etc., closely follows the G. Vam. Wilks (I. 69) refers to the siège of Seringapatam by "Rend Dhoola Khan" (Ranadullà Khân) and his repuise "with great slaughter," etc. Cf. also S. K. Aiyangar, Ancient India, pp. 292-298.
struggle followed, in which the besiegers were thoroughly beaten and repulsed with considerable loss (in killed and wounded) in their ranks. Raṇadullâ Khân was obliged to beat a hasty retreat from Seringapatam and Kanṭhirava's troops returned to the capital with immense spoils.

On the fourth day (January 21), Raṇadullâ Khân found it expedient to sue for peace. He had already received an express message from Bijâpur urging his return, and any attempt at prolonging the siège of Seringapatam seemed futile. Following the advice of Kenge-Hanumappa Nâyaka, he arranged for a truce with Kanṭhirava through two of the latter's agents (named Kâvēri-Hebbâruva and Minchu-Hebbâruva), stipulating that the territory to the south of the Cauvery was to remain in the undisturbed possession of the king of Mysore while the right to the revenues of the territory north of the river was to belong exclusively to the Adil Shah of Bijâpur, the same being made available to the latter after deducting the necessary expenses incidental to its management. The truce was agreed to by Kanṭhirava in view of its ensuring him the territorial integrity of Mysore and of its relieving him from the necessity of withstanding another possible siège and keeping his army engaged in the open field.

Accordingly, about the middle of February, Raṇadullâ Khân raised the siège of Seringapatam and retraced his steps to Bijâpur, placing some of his forces under Hanumappa Nâyaka for the protection of his intérêts under the truce.

84. Annals, I. 75-76; Mys. Dho. Vam., l.c.
85. Mys. Dho. Pûr., I. 52; and f.n. 19 supra; also see and compare Muhammad-Namah, in Appendix IV—(3).
86. Annals, I. 76; Mys. Dho. Vam., l.c.; also compare Muhammad-Namah, in Appendix Ibid.
The siège of Seringapatain by Bijâpur was a mémorable event in the history of Mysore. There is little doubt that Kanṭhrāva-Narasarâja Woḍeyar was able to win a complète victory over the invaders. Two causes appear to hâve accounted for his success: firstly, the efficiency of his army, though small in numbers, and its knowledge of local conditions—which stood it in good stead against the overwhelming odds of Bijâpur; secondly, the spécial features of the Mysorean warfare of the time, naraely, surprise night-attacks and the "cutting off noses." Àt the news of this victory, Betṭāda-Châmarâja Woḍeyar, father of Kanṭhrāva-Narasarâja Woḍeyar, is said to hâve sent him from Gundlu-Terakanâmbi his (Kanṭhrāva's) broad-sword, Vijaya-Nārasimha, as a mark of appréciation of his prowess. The prestige of Kanṭhrāva was enhanced locally. And the net resuit of the event of 1639 was that, while it left the kingdom of Mysore practically unsubdued by Bijâpur, it exposed her to the latter's recurring invasions from the north and prepared the way for the further advance of Mysore in that direction.

Early in 1640 affairs in the Karnâṭak detnanded the immédiate attention of Bijâpur. Vîrabhadra Nāyaka, on the siège and destruction of Ikkëri by the latter (1637-1638), had established his capital at Ḍednûr (Bidarûr or Vēṇupura) about 1639 and, with a view to revenging himself against Hanumappa Nāyaka of...
Basavâpatna, was negotiating with the Adil Shah.\footnote{Ke. N. V., V I. 98. According to this work, Niyôgi Rámakrishnaiya was entrusted with the diplomatie mission. The Mys. Dho. Vam. (ff. 84, 86) and the Armais (I. 83) mention two représentatives, Hûvaiya and Purushôttamaiya. See also f.n. 38 to Ch. VI, for a note on the transition of the capitals of Ikkëri.} By the approach of the rainy season of 1639, Ranadullà Khân had returned from his Karnâtak campaign.\footnote{Muhammad-Nanmah, in the M. R., July 1929, l.c.; see also Ibid., November 1929, p. 602.} Meanwhile, the revenues of Bijâpur territories in Mysore for the year 1639-1640 (Pramâthî), under the trace with Kanthïrava, fell into arrears.\footnote{Ibid.; also Mys. Dho. Vam., fit. 86-37. Thèse worksspeak of the dismissal of Ranadullà Khân and of the appointment of his successor, Khân Khân, who is referred to as having taken part in the éventa pf 1640. This is apparently an error for Ranadullà Khân who, according to the K. N. V., Ke. N. V. and Muhammad'Ndmdh, actually played a conspicuous part in those events. We accordingly follow the authority of the chronicles subject to slight correction.} Muhammad Adil Shah, agreeably with the représentatives (Niyôgis) from the court of Ikkëri, it is said,\footnote{Muhammad-Nanmah, in the M. R., July 1929, l.c.; see also Ibid., November 1929, p. 602.} sent four of his officervers vers to Kanthïrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar, renewing his demand for dues. Kanthïrava having refused to comply, Ranadullà Khân was desired to collect the amount and re-attempt the acquisition of Seringapatam. Before proceeding further, Ranadullà Khân sent Channaiya of Nâgamangala to Hanumappa Nâyaka of Basavâpatna demanding of him satisfaction of the terms of the truce of 1639, Hanumappa Nâyaka not only refused to accède but also, foreseeing his own future, fell upon Channaiya and slew him in a skirmish. By about the middlè of 1640, Hanumappa Nâyaka had thus rebelléd and there was a gênerai rising of the chieftains in the Karnâtak against Bijâpur.\footnote{Ibid.; X. N. V., X V I, 22-28; Ke. N. V., V I, 98-99,} Whereupon Ranadullà Khân, at the head of a well-equipped army, proceeded on a campaign against Hanumappa Nâyaka, accompanied by Vîrabhadra Nâyaka of Ikkëri.\footnote{Ibid; X. N. V., X V I, 22-28; Ke. N. V., V I, 98-99,} Crossing the river (Bhadrâ) at
Hebbe, he stood before the walls of Basavapatna and laid siège to it assisted by Afzal Khan, Shâhji, Mâdâji and other gênerais. Hanumappa Nâyaka, having in the meanwhile collected his forces (70,000 foot musketeers), gallantly defended the place. Ranadullâ Khan, however, eventually carried the siège to success, slaying "37,000 of the enemy;" Hanumappa Nâyaka submitted, "giving up the fort and 40 lakhs of hun" (hana). Hanumappa himself, according to some accounts, was slain at Dudda and, according to others, he and his brothers were captured, Ranadullâ Khan finally posting guards over Basavapatna. Ranadullâ Khan, accompanied by the levies of Ikkêri under évappa Nâyaka (uncle of Vîrabhadra Nâyaka) and Niysôgi Ramakrishnaiya, proceeded in the direction of Mysore, while a contingent of the Bijâpur army, sent in advance under Afzal Khân, succeeded in taking Chiknàyakanahalli, Bêlûr (from Venkatâdri Nâyaka), Tumkûr, Doûballâpur and Kunîgal.

About July-August 1640 (during Ranadullâ Khan's stay in Bangalore) Kanîrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar, alarmed by the activities of Bijâpur arms in the Kar-nâtak, despatched his forces to Râmâgiri-durga, then in the possession of Immadî-Kempe-G-auda of Mâgaṇî, a place commanding the route of the Bijâpur army to Mysore. The fort was taken after hard fighting. At Huliyûr-durga, Afzal Khân opposed the Mysore army but was obligea to retreat. Bàgûr was next taken by Kanumaîrava from Vêdôji-Pant, another

45. K. N. F., XVI, 24.
46. Muhammad-Namah, l.c.; see also Annals, I. 85; and Mya. Dho, Vam., ff. 87. Thèse works speafc of the siège of Tenje (Kenge ?) which, in the light of other sources, is identical with Basavapatna itself.
47. Ibid; Ibid.
48 My. Dho, Vam, l.c.; also see and compare Annals, l.c.
50. Ibid. 51. K. N. F., XVI, 62-53; also Muhammad-Namah, l.o.
Bijapur gênerai, after a strenuous fight; and this was allowed by the acquisition of Turuvëkere (Turugere), the Bijâpur troops being ultiinnately beaten off at Nonavinkere where they had encamped. The acquisitions practically meant the répudiation by Mysore of the trace of Bijâpur was prevented from having a permanent oothold in the immédiate northern limits of the Cauvery. Outside this fringe of debatable area lay her phere of influence, comprising Bangalore, Doğbâllâpur, Tumkûr, Kunigal, Chiknâyakanahalli and other places, Directly included in the subâh of Bijâpur under the nanagement of Shâhji.

In December 1640, Mustafâ Khân, who succeeded Ranadullâ Khân in the Bijâpur gênerai-ship, marched at the head of his forces, with fresh instructions to re-attempt the acquisition of Seringapatam from Kanthïrava. Dalavâi Timmarâjaiya was sent by the atter to arrest his advance on the capital. Mustafâ Khân halted near Chandanahalli in the neighbourhood of Bellûr. He sent word to Timmarâjaiya through Niyôgi Hûvaiya demanding payment of the dues under the truce of 1639 and, in default, threatened Seringapatam with a siège. Timmarâjaiya proved intractable, merely communicating to Kanthïrava, it is said, Mustafâ Khân's ultimatum. On the 24th, he (Timmarâjaiya) was removed from office and Nanjarâjaiya (of Hura) appointed Dalavâi. Accompanied by the latter, Kanthïrava marched forthwith and gave battle to the Bijâpur army, inflicting a crushing defeat on it and acquiring rich spoils.

52. Ibid., XVI, 32-91. According to this work, Kanthïrava, in the acquisition of these places, was assisted by Nanjarâjaiya and Lingarâjaiya of Hura, afterwards Dalavâis of his. See also Mys. Dho. Vam: (ff. 38), referring to the acquisition of Bâmagiri-durga.

53. Annals, I. 86-86; Mys. Dho. Pfir., I. 66; Mya. Dho. Vam., ff. 87-38. The AnnaU refers to the name of the village as Chandammanaha)ji; tho Mys. Dho. Vam., an earlier Ms., mentions it as Chandanahalli, which reading is preferred here. Moreover Chandanahalli is an extant village in the Nâgamangala taluk (see List of Villages, 102).
Mustafâ Khan returned to Bijâpur, having practically effected nothing. In Bijâpur, the réduction of Seringapatam became a problem to Muhammad Àdil Shah, Vêdôji-Pant was next sent thither with a contingent under Afzal Khan. Early in March 1641, Vêdôji, having first paid a visit to the shrines at Tirumakûdru and Nanjangûd, raided Tippûr, Hampâpura, Kannambâdi, Akkihebbâlu, G-anni, Nallûr, Mâdâmâpura, Kattarighatâ, Hosaholâlu and other places in the neighbourhood of Seringapatam. He soon found hi inself opposed by Dalavâi Nanjarâjaiya who, in a skirmish, completely put him to rout and returned to the capital with considerable spoils, losing, however, one éléphant which died on the way (at Sindhuhaatâ) from a bullet-shot. Vêdôji returned to Bijâpur by way of Turuvêkere, putting to death the chief of the latter place and placing Afzal Khan in charge of it. Excepting this re-occupation of Turuvêkere by Bijâpur, her campaigns (of 1640-1641) against Seringapatam thus ended in failure.

Meantime, affairs in the south of Mysore were moving in a différent manner. Dañâyakankôte, as we have seen, had been the southern limit of the kingdom of Mysore, already by the close of the reign of Châmarâja Wodeyar. In its neighbourhood lay the principality (Pâlayam) of Sâmballi bordering on the kingdom of Madura in the south. Any aggression from the southern chiefs in the direction of Dañâyakankôte would, naturally, be deemed a blow aimed at Mysore. While the safeguarding of this frontier oommanding the passes was thus an important problem to Kanthirava-Narasarâja Wodeyar, Tirumâla Nâyaka of

---

54. Ibid., I. 86; Mys. Dho. Vam., ff. 87.
56. Ibid., I. 86-87; Ibid., ff. 38-89 (compare). Vêdôji-Pant’s name is spelt in these sources as ‘Vêmaji-Pant,’ ‘Vemôji-Pant’ and ‘Vêdôjî-Pant’. Cf. 8. K. Àiyangar, Ancient India (p. 394), referring to the name as "Hêmaji Pandit,"
Madura, apparently taking advantage of Kanthïrava's difficultés with thé Muhammadans of Bijapur, began the offensive by inciting Patthédaïya, the eldest son of Ghaṭṭa-Mudaliâr, the Kongu chief of Sâmballi, to encroach on the boundaries of Mysore. That chief, it is also said, had become inordinately proud by putting down the neighbouring pâlegârs and acquiring the title Vanangâ-rmtpi (the unbendable chief or the unconquerable hero). About the middle of March 1641, Kaṇthïrava directed a campaign against him. Dalavâi Nanjarâjaiya began opérations by laying siège to Màraṭâhâlli, a dependency of Sâmballi. The chief held himself out at the head of his vast army (consisting, it is said, of a lakh of forces, including those of Madura). Nanjarâjaiya, however, was able to put him to flight and take possession of Màraṭâhâlli and Sâmballi, returning to Seringapatam with éléphants and horses captured during the siège.

Early in 1642, the chief of Sâmballi retaliated. Assembling his scattered forces, he seized Âlambâdi, belonging to Mysore, and encamped there. Nanjarâjaiya marched against him and, in a swift and décisive action,

56. K. N. V., XVII, 2, 8: Madhureyavana baluhinda nammolage kadanava gantikki konda Modalariya suta . . . Pattadayya piridu garvisi yelle-gattige Maisûra doreyolu dhravmesagida . . . ; Modaldriya hiriya tanaJA Pattadayya . . .

58. K. N. V., XVII, 8-10 ; see also f.n. 61 infra.
59. Ibid, 11-21 ; Mya. Dho. Vam., ff. 88-40 ; also f.n. 61 infra.
60. Ibid, 22-82 ; Mya. Dho. Vam., ]o. ; Mya. Raj. Cha., 28 ; see also C. Vam., (86-87) and C. Vi. (II, 181-188), referring to Kaṇthïrava's victory over Tirumala Nâyaka of Madura and Ghafta-MudaliSr, the acquisition of Sâmballi, etc. Tirumalârya, in these works (C. Vam., l.c, C. Vi. I I , 127-189), depicts the campaigns of Kanthïrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar in all the eight directions (desegalam gelalvijjugi; desegella velasi). As indicated in the preceding chapters, the poetical order followed by him is to be understood in its ochronological setting, with référence to the more spécifie authority of the chronicles compared with one anotber.
forced him to retreat with considerable loss, capturing, among others, Ponnumalai-Gauda, Puli-Gauda, Chinna-Venkataramana and erinivasa—chieftains who had espoused his cause. This success was followed up by the acquisition by Nanjarâjaiya of Singânallûr and Daŋṭahalî (March 1642). He finally halted at Tôleya. Meanwhile, the chief of Sâmballî, having sought the aid of Tirumala Nâyaka of Madtira, proceeded to the defence of Sâmballî, with a large army (consisting, it is said, of 4 to 5 thousand horse, a lakh of foot and hundreds of éléphants). In the engagement which followed, Nanjarâjaiya was able to cause confusion and panic in the ranks of the enemy, repulsing them with considerable loss (in killed and wounded). Sâmballî was retaken by Nanjarâjaiya, who returned to Seringapatam after posting guards over the place. Stunned was Tirumala Nâyaka of Madura, at the news of this victory for Mysore. Forthwith he proceeded himself, at the head of his main forces, for the recovery of Sâmballî. Whereupon Nanjarâjaiya, making rapid marches, set out for its relief. Nanjarâjaiya put up a stout opposition against Tirumala Nâyaka and fought so dexteçously that he was soon able to overcome and repulse his opponents, capturing the insignias of the Nâyaka and plundering his camp. The siège was raised and Nanjarâjaiya returned to Seringapatam after carrying his victorious arms up to Tiruvanñâmalai, Tiruchangûḍ and Trichinopoly (Tiruchanâpuri) in the far south.

The Raj. Kath. (XII, 471-472), as already noted, closely follows the C. Vam. On the Madura aide, there is, so far, no référence to these affairs.

Alambâdi:—In the present Kollegâl taluk, Coimbatore district, 42 miles east of Kollegal, on the right bank of the Cauvery; an important place in the 17th century, garrisoned by British troops in 1768, but relinquished on advance of Haidar's army; contains a ruined éiva temple, well-sculptured but wrecked by Muhammadans. There is an old fort here. In the bed of the Cauvery here is the smoking rock. The place gives its name to a well-known breed of cattle. Alambâdi seems to have been absorbed in the kingdom of Mysore after the fall of Nanjarâjaof Hadindag (1614). Its chief was originally a feudatory of Hadind Vide text of f.n., 117 to Ch, V,
These activities practically resulted in the acquisition of Sāmballī; Daṇṭahallī, Singānallūr, Kāvēripuram, Tōleya, Changappāḍī and Māraṭṭahallī in the south and the south-east between March 1641 and July 1642, while there were already indications of Mysore having an eye on Trichinopoly as the farthest limit of any projected scheme of her expansion southwards.

Though the political development of Mysore thus far had been rendered possible by the aggressions of Bijāpur in the north and Madura in the south, Kanthīrava-Narasarāja Wodeyar, we find, remained loyal to the Vijayanagar Empire under Venkata II. In the Gajjiganahalli copper-plate grant, dated in April 1639, he acknowledges the suzerainty of Venkata "seated on the throne of Ghanāēaîla" (Penukonda). Further, it is interesting to note, he calls himself, in this record, a Mahāmandalēvāra (Viceroy), in keeping with the old position of Tirumala I I ; and makes the grant, "having informed his lord, Venkata, of the same." In a lithic record, dated in December 1640, he styles himself as "the great ruler of Mysore" (èrïmart-mahā-Maisūra-adhipa), indicating his prominent position in Mysore, and refers to Terakanāmbi as a grant made to him in perpetuity by Venkata II (namma doretanakke Bāyarinda namage pālisida Terakanāmbi), whose overlordship he thus clearly acknowledges. In another record, also lithic, dated in March 1642, Kanthīrava merely refers to himself as "Kanthīrava-Narasarāja Wodeyar of

63. Ibid., 11. 85-87:
Sriman,maha-mandalēsō- Narasa-kshiūi-chandramah | Vijnapya svaminē Vira-Venkafākshhdhujê tatah ||
64. Ibid., IV (2) Gu. 10,11. 2-6, 8.
In 1642, Venkata II died and was succeeded on the throne of Penukomja by Sri-Ranga VI, of whom Kanthirava, it would appear, continued to be a loyal feudatory. The earliest record pointing to Kanthirava's loyalty to Sri-Ranga is a lithic one, dated in March 1643, in which he acknowledges the latter's suzerainty.

This document is of particular importance from the point of view of Kanthirava's own political position in relation to the Vijayanagar Empire. For, in it he refers to himself as taddakshanabhujadanda-nâda, which literally means that he was the prop or support of Sri-Ranga in the south and conveys that he was "the righthand man of Sri-Ranga." These expressions are not, however, mere literary flourishes. Considered with reference to Kanthirava's achievements, they must be termed significant. During 1689-1642, Kanthirava, as a loyal feudatory of the Empire, had, as we have seen, actually saved the south of Vijayanagar by successfully stemming the tide of Muhammadan advance in that direction and stood as an effective barrier to the aggressions of Madura and other powers in the south. By 1643, Kanthirava had not only succeeded in maintaining the integrity of Mysore as a kingdom but also, in a wider sense, rendered a signal service to the cause of the Vijayanagar Empire. Indeed he had "enjoyed the implicit confidence of the Emperor and reciprocated wholeheartedly the trust laid in him." Hence the expressions.

Yet the general political position in the country—particularly in the north and the northwest of Mysore—during 1642-1644, was insecure. In May 1642, shortly after his return from the southern campaign, Dalavai Nanjarajaiya had marched against

---

65. Ibid, V (l) and (3) On. 168.
66. Ibid, IV (2) Yd. 5, 1. 6.
67. Ibid, 1. 6. Here read dakshina for dakshana.
68. See Mys. Gaz., I I, iii. 2884, noticing this document.
Turuvēkere and retaken it with Àne-Bâgùr from Afzal Khân, among the spoils acquired being 40 horses and an éléphant by name Bokkalika. This success tended to restrict the sphère of influence of Bijâpur to the east, west and north of Turuvēkere which, however, remained a bone of contention between Mysore and Bijâpur. On the ottier side, in Ikkêri, Vîrabhadra Nâyaka, though well disposed towards Mysore about the close of the reign of Châroarâja Wođeyar, was by no means friendly during the reign of Kanthïrava, allied as he was with Bijâpur. Ever since the sièège of Seringapatam (1639), Ikkêri, it would appear, had been so thoroughly impressed with the methods of Mysorean warfare and the development of the kingdom of Mysore, that she had begun to call the latter's army by the epithet Mâyâvis, Mâyâvâdis (i.e., deluders, diplomatists), political jealousy probably accounting, in a large measure, for such a description. Eeference has also been made in the earlier pages to Vîrabhadra Nâyaka sending a contingent of his army in the direction of Mysore during Bariadullâ Khân's march on Bangalore in 1640. On this occasion, it is said, Vîrabhadra Nâyaka conducted the entire course of Bijâpur affairs in Mysore through êivappa Nâyaka and Niyogi Bâma­krishñaiya, although the actual détails of the diplomacy hâve not corne down to us. It seems, however, possible that Ikkêri, after the subjugation and death of Hanumappa Nâyaka of Basavâpatna, attempted without success to press the Bijâpur demands on Mysore. There was thus evidently a combination between Bijâpur and Ikkêri. The town of Ikkêri itself, since 1638, was, it would seem, in the possession of Bijâpur, being guarded by a contingent of the latter. Any disturbance in the political equilibrium in the country, in such a state of affairs,
would have meant a threat to the safety of the kingdom of Mysore.

In 1644, Narasimha Nâyaka of Hoâle-Narasipur, who had been subdued towards the close of Châmaraâja Woçeyar's reign, failed to pay the tribute to Mysore, being backed up by the local Bijâpur forces. He insulted the messengers of Kanthîrava, sent to demand the dues. Kanthîrava despatched a force against him under Dalavâi Nanjarâjaiya, with instructions to reduce the place. In April (1644), Nanjarâjaiya stormed Hoâle-Narasipur and opened a tremendous fire against it, blowing up the bastions of the fort. The Bijâpur contingent—consisting of 4 to 8 thousand horse—proceeded to the relief of the town, only to retreat panic-stricken. Narasimha Nâyaka submitted, and paid up the tribute. Nanjarâjaiya returned to Seringapatam after annexing Hampâpura belonging to him.73

No sooner was one trouble overcome than another presented itself. Nanjunûda-Bâja(Nanjunda-Arasu), the Changâlva chief of Piriýâpatna, who had agreed during the reign of Châmaraâja Woçeyar to pay an annual tribute of 3,000 varahas to Mysore, was in arrears for some years past. Early in January 1645 Kanthîrava-Narasarâja Woçeyar sent Dalavâi Nanjarâjaiya demanding payment of the dues. Nanjunda-Râja not only refused to comply but also, in alliance with Bijâpur, proved refractory. Whereupon Kanthîrava directed Dalavâi Nanjarâjaiya to proceed against him. Nanjarâjaiya began operations by laying siege to Pàlupare, a fort commanding the Changâlva kingdom. The place was reduced without much effort and guards stationed over it.74

73 K.N.V.XVIII.1-18; Mys. Dho. Pûr.,II. 18-14; Annals, I. 69; of Wilks, 1.64.
74 Ibid, 20-52; Mys. Dho. Pur., I I. 14; Annals, I. 69, 71; also Mys. Dho, Vam., ff. 40-43. Nanjunda-Raja of Piriýapatna appears to have been otherwise known as Mallarâja, by which name he is mentioned in the C. Vam. (37). Cf. Rice [E. C, IV (2) Introduction, pp. 17-18], making Virarajaiya of Piriýapatna (1619-1688) a contemporary of Kanthîrava, for which there it no evidence.
Proceeding further, Nanjarâjaiya stood before the walls of Piriyâpatna itself, the capital of Nanjunda-Râja. It was an impregnable fort, well-equipped in every particular. Nanjarâjaiya made elaborate préparations for its siège and assault. In the north and north-east of the fort, he and his brother, Lingarâjaiya, raised huge piles from which to commence the attack; in the other directions rose the structures put up by the chiefs of Channarâya-patna, Turuvêkere, Haradanahalli and other places, who had accompanied Nanjarâjaiya. The fort was bombarded from all sides, while the garrison within opened fire putting up a stout defence. Nanjunda-Râja was actively supported by a Bijâpur contingent from Ikkëri (consisting, it is said, of 8,000 horse and 15,000 foot). Among the gênerals who took part in the relief of Piriyâpatna were Vêdôji, Ambar Khân, Malik Rahîm (Muluka Eahima) and Ankué Khân (Ankusa Khân). Thèse encamped at Bettadapura. The siège was tough and trying to a degree. A fierce fight followed between the Bijâpur and Mysore forces, the former, divided into five to six detachments, having been posted in all the directions. Nanjarâjaiya closed in upon them, splitting up his own ranks into six or seven convenient divisions, and fought dexterously against his opponents, the halepaika Nâyaks tinder him, in particular, playing a very prominent part. There was heavy slaughter on both sides and utter confusion prevailed among the enemy, several of whom lost their noses at the hands of the warriors of Mysore. The Bijâpur forces were ultimately forced to give way and retreat with great loss, hotly pursued by the Mysore army to a distance of nearly five miles. Meanwhile, Nanjun^a-Râja's army in the town of Piriyâpatna held itself out against the besieging forces; his sôns and relatives lost their lives during the defence, and, overwhelmed with grief and anxiety, he was almost at his
wit's end. In vain did his consort counsel him to yield up the fort and submit to Kaṇṭhīrava. Deaf to all talk of peace, Nanjunḍa-Rāja stubbornly prolonged the defence, while Nanjarājaiya pressed on the siège with vigour. At length the latter encircled the fort and began to batter the walls, blowing down the bastions and effecting a breach amidst considerable slaughter. Forthwith was the outer fort taken and this was followed by the onrush of éléphants (decked with weapons) and the forcible entrance of the invading forces into the interior of the fort. Vīra-Rāja, one of the sons of Nanjunda-Rāja, brandishing his sword, desperately opposed the advancing armies, piercing through their ranks to the right and the left and repulsing them; and, eventually, being himself wounded, fell dead on the scene. Nanjarājaiya took possession of the fort, capturing Nanjunda-Rāja and the members of his family. At the news of this victory, Kaṇṭhīrava himself paid a visit to Piriyāpatna and returned to Seringapatam, after arranging for the safeguarding of the place.

On October 7, 1645, Piriyāpatna, after a long siège of nearly nine months, was annexed to Mysore. In the meanwhile, however, Nanjunḍa-Rāja having made good his escape to Beftadapura, Kaṇṭhīrava proceeded in person against him and took that place on the 24th. Hotly pursued by Kaṇṭhīrava, Nanjunḍa-Rāja passed through

76. R. N. 7., XVIII, 62-182; C. Vam., 87; C. Vi. 11., 135-186; also see and compare Mya. Dho, Vam., Le.; Mya. Raj. Cha., 28; Wilks, l.c.; Annals, I. 71. Among those who took part in the siège on the Mysore side were, Doddaiya (Doddēndra), chief of Channarāyapatna, Doddaiya (also named Doddēndra) of Haradanahalji (Haradapura), Hampaiya (Hampēndra) of Turuvēkere, Linge-Gauda and Timmarājaiya (Timmarājēndra) (K. N. F., XVIII, 71-72). The chief of Turuvēkere, referred to, seems obviously, to be the successor of the one who was slain in 1641.

76. Mya. Dho. Pur., I I . 14: Porthiva, Asvīja ba. 13 (October 7, 1646) ; cf. Mys. Dho. Vam., I. c; Wilks, l.o.; An fials, I. 69, 71; cf. also Rice ['E. C., IV (2) Ibid, p. 18], placing the event in 1641, for which there is no evidence.
Rudrapatna, Kannâgâla and Kittûr which were successively annexed to Mysore during November-December. At length Nanjunda-Râja retired to Nanjarâyapatañça (in Coorg) seeking refuge of the Koôlagas; Early in December, Kaçṭhîrava marched on Nanjarâyapatna and fought strenuously for seven days. Nanjuçda-Râja was eventually slain on the field and Nanjarâyapatañça was taken possession of (December 13). Having accomplished this, Kaçṭhîrava returned to Seringapatam with the spoils of war. The fall of Nanjuçda-Râja thus marks an important stage in the expansion of the kingdom of Mysore in the west, in the direction of Coorg. These activities were followed up by the annexation by Ka$ṭhîrava of Kallûr (in April 1646) and Kañaba and Mâyâsamudra (in April and June 1646), places belonging to Pratâpa Nâyaka and Bhairappa Nâyaka, from whom they had been taken by the Muhammadans of Bijâpur. Meanwhile êivappa Nâyaka I (uncle of Vïrabhadra Nâyaka of Ikkëri) had wrested the fort of Ikkëri "from its careless, indolent, pleasure-loving Adil-Shahi commandant." In 1644, Khân Muhammad, the Bijâpur gênerai, recovered it from him together with Sâgar, and by October-November 1645 he had won a series of victories in the uplands of the Karnâtak. In November 1645, êivappa Nâyaka I, having treacherously removed Vïrabhadra Nâyaka, had succeeded to the kingdom of Ikkëri, With his capital at Bednûr. At the same time,

81. Ke. N. V., V I I. 106; Parthiva, Margaêira su. 12; C. Vam., 190: Sivappa Nayakam tannalldanappa Virabhadra Nayakanol drôhamanenai, avanam kavadiñol madupi. Of this alleged treachery there is not even a whisper, either in the Ke.N. V., (c. 1800) or in the âivatattva-ñattîdkawa (1709). There seems, however, no doubt about ite actual
Muhammad Adil Shah had been closely watching the trend of affaire in the Karnâtak ever since the reverses successively sustained by the Bijâpur arms in Mysore and her neighborhood (1639-1642). In particular, Kanthirava's occupation of Piriya-patna in 1645 is said to have roused his attention towards the growing kingdom of Mysore and made the Adil Shah resolve to bring her down, Mustafâ Khân having once again offered his services to achieve this end. In June 1646, Mustafâ Khân was despatched from Bijâpur, with instructions to subdue the Karnâtâka country. He proceeded by way of Gadag and Lakshméevar to Honnâli and thence to Sakrepatna, his army being reinforced by the contingent of évappa Nâyaka I of Ikkëri, Dodda Nâyaka of Harapanahalli and Bâlâji Haibat Rao, among others (October). Before directing his marches to the rich plains of the east—which were the common objective of both Bijâpur and Gôlkorida—Mustafâ Khân seems to have turned his attention to the recovery of Turuvëkere, the northern limit of the kingdom of Mysore, which had been lost to Bijâpur in May 1642. Towards the close of 1646, he encamped with his forces in the enclosure of a tank about five to six miles from Turuvëkere.
On receipt of this news, Kanthïrava-Nârasarâja Wodeyar sent Dalavâi Nanjarâjaiya to grapple with the situation, while Mustafâ Khân prepared to meet the Mysoreans, posting his cavalry in all the four directions (the numbers varying from two to eight thousand) and splitting up the infantry into four to five divisions. On the other side, Nanjarâjaiya, dividing his forces into nine convenient squadrons, proceeded against his opponents. The onslaught began: the Mysoreans opened up fire and, in the tumult that ensued, rushed against the enemy, making dexterous use of spears and arrows and causing great havoc in their camp. A swift and decisive action followed. Nanjarâjaiya so manoeuvred as to bring together the entire Mysore cavalry (numbering 10,000) in one spot and completely surprise and encircle the Bijâpuris. At this, Mustafâ Khân performed a volteface. But, before he could effectively direct the counter-attack, he was so thoroughly overpowered by Nanjarâjaiya's men that he was soon repulsed with considerable slaughter in his ranks and obliged to retrace his steps from Turuvêkere. It was a complete victory for Mysore but her loss was equally great, for, in the confusion which followed the attack, Dalavâi Nanjarâjaiya, fighting desperately against heavy odds, was himself slain on the field of battle (early in January 1647). 87

In January 1647, Lingarâjaiya of Hura, younger brother of Nanjarâjaiya, was appointed Dalavâi in succession to the latter. 88

In May 1647, Kanthïrava acquired

87. Ibid, 18-94. The Muhammad-Nâmah (l.c.) maintains a disinterested silence on this affair. Since, however, it speaks of the successive marches of Mustafâ Khân in the Karnâfck between October 1646 and January 1647, we may approximately fix the action at Turuvêkere in c. December 1646-January 1647. Cf. Annah (I. 88), referring to the removal from service of Dalavâi Nanjarâjaiya by Kanthïrava in January 1647, on a charge of neglect of duty, etc. The Mys. Dho. Pur. (I. 66) only assigns a period of six years of office to Dalavâi Nanjarâjaiya. 88. See itmok, l.c; also Mys. Dho. Pûr., I. 67; K. N. V XIX 95-100.
from Krishçappa Nâyaka (of Arkalgùd), Basavâpatpa, a former dependency of Nanjunçe-Râja of Piriyâpafoia. 88

By September 1647, Kanthïrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar was at the height of his power, securely established on the throne of Mysore. 90 It was during the Mahânavami célébrations of this year that éivappa Nâyaka I of Ikkëri—seeking probably a friendly alliance with Mysore—sent an embassy to the court of Kaçthïrava, with présents of robes and cash. Kanthïrava, in view of the accession by treachery of éivappa Nâyaka, it is said, rejected the offer, sending back the envoy. 91

Meanwhile, political affairs in Southern India, ever since êrï-Ranga VI's accession to the Vijayanagar Empire, had been tending towards a crisis. The dominions of êrï-Ranga were hemmed in, as it were, by the invading forces of Bijâpur and Gôlkoroçda in the east and the west. Already in 1644, êrï-Ranga had successfully beaten off an invasion from Gôlkoroçda and was ruling from Penukonda (his recognised capital till about 1649). In the far south, Tirumala Nâyaka of Madura had been asserting his independence, showing signs of disaffection towards the Empire; the Nâyakas of Gingee and Tanjore were likewise displaying the same tendency, while éivappa Nâyaka I of Ikkëri was, by force of circumstances, in alliance with Bijâpur. Successively foiled in her attempts to maintain a foothold in the northern limits of Mysore, Bijâpur was obliged to restrict the sphère of her influence to parts of Bangalore

90. See K. N. F., XX-XXV; see also under Social life—Mahânavami festival, in Ch. IX.
91. C. Vam., 190: tanutn pâvudamam kankegalam kalupuvinam, avana tappuffeymegalunenïsi nïkarisï banda guirividisñdatn bandante kalupalvdtn. See also f.n. 81 supra. Ikkëri was among the distant power» représenté! at the court of Kanthïrava during the Mahânavami festivities of 1047 in Seringapatam—vide section on Mahânavami festival (1647), in Ditto; }
and Tumkur districts (including Sira) and further north and westwards. The attention of Bijapur was, therefore, directed to the eastern dominions of Sri-Ranga. After the action at Turuvëkere (December-January 1646-1647), Mustafâ Khân resumed his march in this direction, passing through Sivaganga. At this stage, hard pressed by necessity, Sri-Ranga began negotiations with Mustafâ through his (Sri-Ranga's) envoy, Venkaiya-Sômâyâji (Somaji of the Persian text), with a view to dissuade him (Mustafâ) from invading "the Rayal's country." Almost simultaneously, Tirumala Nâyaka of Madura and the chiefs of G-INGEE and Tanjore had sent in their envoys to Mustafâ Khân tendering their submission to the Bijapur government, and Sri-Ranga had set out with his army (consisting, it is said, of "12,000 cavalry and 3 lakhs of infantry") against these feudatories who persisted in their rebellious attitude. After a tortuous diplomacy (in which Venkaiya-Sômâyâji is said to have at first undertaken to induce Sri-Ranga to withdraw from the field but subsequently advised him to prepare for war), Mustafâ Khân entered Sri-Ranga's territory, taking Krishnagiri, Vîrabhadranâ-durga and Dêva-durga, finally reaching Vellore in February 1647. Meantime, the Gôlkonda forces under Mîr Jumla also proceeded thither. Between Bijapur and Gôlkonda it had been agreed that "Sri Ranga Rayal's territory and treasures were to be conquered and divided in the proportion of two to one, two-thirds of them falling to Adil Shah and one-third to Qutb Shah." In February, Vellore was besieged and taken from Sri-Ranga—after a decisive battle—by the combined forces of Bijapur and Gôlkonda. In March, Mustafâ Khân left Vellore, taking possession of Âmbûr, Tirupattûr, Kâvēripattanami, Hassan, Râyadurga, Kanakagiri, Ratnagiri, Mêlígiri, Arjunkô$e and Dhûlikôttê—belonging to Sri-Ranga. He returned to Bijapur, leaving Asad Khân, Shâhji and other officers in charge of the conquered country. In November 1648,
Mustafâ Khân died and in December 1649 Khân Muhammad (Khân-i-Khanan), his successor in office, captured the impregnable fort of Gingee from Srî-Ranga. The siège was a protracted one and was accompanied by the mutual rivalries of Gôlkonda and Bijâpur (over the division of the spoils) and the intrigues of Shâhji, for which the latter was arrested and confined at Bijâpur but subsequently released. The capture of Gingee was followed by the submission of the Nâyakas of Madura and Tanjore to the Muhammadans. During these systematic conquests of Bijâpur and Gôlkonda, Srî-Ranga, depending on the shifting alliance of his southern feudatories (i.e. the Nâyakas of Madura, Gingee and Tanjore), had taken refuge with them and spent more than a year "in the midst of festivities, feasts and pleasures." Rejected again by the Nâyakas and abandoned by his courtiers, Srî-Ranga "established his court in the forests of Thieves (Kallans), lying to the north of Tanjore, where he spent four months, a prey to all discomforts," till about 1650.

We have seen how Kaṇṭhirava-Narasarâja Woḍeyar, as early as 1643, had been a loyal feudatory of Srî-Ranga. His records, during subsequent years, are, however, conspicuous by the absence of the name of his suzerain. They generally point to Kaṇṭhirava as a prominent local ruler. Kačthīrava seems evidently to have continued to be loyal to Srî-Ranga, although he

92. For the general references on this section, see Mys. Gaz., I I. iii. 2351; Muhammad-Namah, in the M. R., for July 1929, pp. 10-12; Nayaks of Madura, pp. 264-266; La Mission Du Madurè—Proenza to Nikel Trichinopoly, 1669. Though this letter is dated in 1659, it reflects the general course of events in Southern India during c. 1647-1659 and, used with caution, is an invaluable authority, particularly for the latter part (C. 1660-1659) of the reign of Kaṇṭhirava-Narasarâja Woḍeyar.

93. See K. C., V (1) and (2) On. 168,160,165; Ag. 64; I I I (1) Sr. 108; IV (2) Ch. 42; IX Op. 28; M. 4. R., 1914-1915, p. 68, para 107, etc., (1647-1650). There are, so far, no epigraphical records of Kaṇṭhirava, for the years 1644-1646.
was aiming at independence from a local point of view. He remained aloof from the general coalition of the southern feudatories against Śrī-Banga (1647), while the tendency towards independence on his part had manifested itself in the issue of coins, named after himself, in April 1645. Kaičithīrava's local prestige was, as we have seen, enhanced by the events of 1645-1646, and in and after 1647 (down to 1650) he was at the zenith of his power. In the imperial crisis of 1647-1650, he appears to have remained neutral, having much to do in maintaining the political integrity of Mysore and safeguarding her frontiers against further attacks by Bijāpur. In particular, certain lithic records refer incidentally to the building of a stone fort (kallu hôte) and bastion for cannons (pirangi-mata) at Channarāyapatna by Doddaiya, a feudatory of Kanṭhīrava, in 1647-1648, probably in preparation for a war with Bijāpur, whose arms were active in this tract during the period (1647-1650).

The only event of some importance for Mysore during c. 1648-1650 was the siege of Māgadi and the acquisition by Kanṭhīrava, in April 1650, of Hebbūr from Immaḍi-Kempe-Gauda, after inflicting a severe defeat on his son, Chikka-Kempe-Gauda (Mammaḍi-Kempe-Gauda),

94. Vide section on Coinage and Currency, in Ch. IX.
95. E.C., V (1) and (2) On. 168, 159, 160 and 165 (1647-1648).
96. The expressions, Turuka-rdjaktīryadaM, Vijayapurada Patsahanavara rajakaryadalli, in Cn. 160 and 166 supra, would merely mean "Politics of Bijāpur " and, with reference to the context, imply defensive measures by way of arresting the advance of Bijāpur arms on Mysore. Cf. Bioe who literally renders these expressions as, "in the service of the Turukardja," "in the royal business of the Padshah of Bijapur." He also writes, "the building of this fort at Channarāyapatna in 1648 must have been in accordance with some agreement or treaty with Bijāpur, though I am not aware that raja-karya has this meaning. It more properly signifies that the fort was built for the Bijāpur Pādshah, but the Mysore Rāja was evidently in possession of the place. Hence some mutual understanding must be assumed, (to have been) entered into for the greater security of both dominions." [B.C., V (1) Introduction p. XXXV]. There is, however, no evidence in support of this position, since, as we shall see, hostilities between Mysore and Bijāpur continued unabated till 1654, Cf, also H.I.S.I., p. 279,
in an action in the Yelahanka-nâdu, and exacting his submission. This further marked the tendency on the part of Mysore to advance northwards in the direction of the Bijapur-belt of territory in the Karnâtak. Ali through the period (1647-1650) Kanthîrava was being successively served by Lingarâjaiya of Hura (1647-1648), Kempaiya (1648-1649) and Linge-Gauda (1649-1650), Dajavâis in succession to Nahjarajaiya. About the middle of 1650, the Emperor Sri-Ranga, foiled in his attempts, to regain his possessions, left the territory of the Kallans and "was forced to beg for help from the king of Mysore."" Sri-Ranga, according to Proenza, received from Kanṭhīrava-Narasarāja Wodeyar an invitation to choose for his stay, a province more


\[
\text{Yoșau Maisûri Kanṭhīrava-Narasa-mahlpda durvara nana } \\
\text{sënd jimûta, janjhanila kuliagatirvîrûtö bhvddharinydm} \\
\] (IV, 41).

With référence to the oontext, this passage is to be understood to écho an action between Kanṭhīrava and Mummaçli-Kempa (or Chikka-Kempe-Gauda), son of Immadi-Kempe-Gauda, during the reign of the latter (i.e., Immadi-Kempa). For the identifications, etc., of the Macadi chiefs and the relations between Kanṭhīrava and Immagi-Kempe-Gauda in 1647, *vidé f .n. 178 infra* and text thereto. For the genealogy of the Kempe-Gauga family, see Table XVIII.

98. *Annals*, I. 88-89; *Mys. Dho. Pûr.*, I. 66-67; see also under *Ministers, Dalavais*, etc. Dalavâi Lingarâjaiya of Hura, who, according to the *K. N*, V, (IV, 76), was the second son of Kempa-Bhûpa of Hura and who, according to the *Annals* (I. 88), died in July 1648, appears to have been quite distinct from Dalavâi Lingarâjaiya, son of Madhava Nayaka of Hura, referred to in a lithic record dated in March 1665 [E.C., IV (2) Hg. 49]. Could the latter be identical with Linge-Gatuja who, according to the *K. N. F.* (XXV, 66), was at first Mayor of Seringapatam and who, according to the *Annals* (I. 88-89), twice held the office of Dalavâi (1649-1660,1659-1666) under Kanṭhīrava?

agreeable to him and assurance of a brilliant tratnjent worthy of his rank; eagerly accepted the offer so obliging and found a hospitality which even surpassed the promises made to his ambassadors. The Hague Transcripts\textsuperscript{101} speak of Srí-Ranga having "taken refuge with the Nayak of Mysore" (Kaṇṭhinra), while the Mysūru-Rājara-Charitre,\textsuperscript{102} on the Mysore side, tells us that Kaṇṭhinra promised assurance of safety to ēri-Ranga who had appeared before him (Srī-Ranga-Rāyanu kānisikkollalâgi atanige abhayavittu). It is not, however, known in what part of the kingdom of Mysore Srī-Ranga stayed. The probabilities are in favour of his having taken up his résidence either in Seringapatam or in its neighbourhood, most of the other tracts, including Bēlūr in the north-west, having been, as we hâve seen, in the possession of Bijāpur since 1639-1640.\textsuperscript{103} In any case, between 1650-1652, Srī-Ranga, "encouraged by the good réception of the king of Mysore," took advantage of the absence of Khân Muhammad in the Karnātak, "to recover his kingdom."\textsuperscript{104} Accordingly," says Proenza,\textsuperscript{105} "with an army of Mysoreans, he entered the field, reconquered a part of his provinces and repulsed the army of Golkonda, which advanced to attack him." In 1652, however, Bijāpur and Golkonda continued the war in the Karnātak as strenuously as before.\textsuperscript{106} Khân Muhammad lâid siège to Penukonda mastering it finally in March 1653. He also sought the permission

\textsuperscript{101} Referred to by William Foster in The English Factories in Itidia (1661-1664), Introduction, p. XXV.

\textsuperscript{102} P. 24; see also Raj. Kath., l.c.; cf. S. K. Aiyangar, in Ndyaka of Mojlura, p. 133, f.n. 60.

\textsuperscript{103} Cf, Mys. Gaz., II. iii. 2372-2374, 2886.

\textsuperscript{104} Proenza's letter, in Ibid, p. 207.

\textsuperscript{105} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{106} See The Hague Tramcripts, cited in t.u. 101 supra, pp. XXV, XXXIII. Robert Orme places the war between 1662-1666 (Historical Fragments, p. 62). J. Sarkar, using the Muhammad-Namah, writes of the Bijāpur campaigns about 1660 (see M. R., July 1929, p. 12; November 1929, p. 602). In the light of other sources cited below, however, we are in a position to assign the events narrated in the Muhammad-Namah, to the period 1662-1654.
ôf Gôlkonda tò pass through the districts held by the latter's troops, on his way to Gingee. Mîr Jumla, the Gôlkonda général, however, alarmed at the success of the Bijàpur troops, was making overtures to èrî-Ranga. Towards the close of 1653, Khân Muhammad marched on Vellore. And Ôrî-Ranga, relying on Mîr Jumla's promises—having finally left Mysore—"returned to Vellote and raised a large army hoping to drive the Bijapuris out of the country." About April 1654, Khân Muhammad, after a long siège, captured Vellore and concluded a treaty with èrî-Ranga, by which "Chandragiri was left to the latter with the revenues ôf certain districts."\(^\text{107}\)

During 1650-1652, Kanthîrava's loyalty to Srî-Ranga as a prominent feudatory of his was undoubted. The available inscriptions\(^\text{108}\) of his reign, for these years, would also indicate the same position, although they are not in conflict with the assumption of independence by him from a local point of vieW, as already noticed. In August 1650, Linge-Gauḍa, Dalavâi of Kanthîrava, was succeeded by Hamparâjaiya of Kârugahalli.\(^\text{109}\) Hamparâjaiya continued in office till September 1651, in which year Kanthîrava is said to have acquired from the Muhammadans, Sûlekere-durga, Nâyakavâdi State, Yelahanka-nâdu, Ghannagiri and Basavâpatna, and from the Changâlva chief, Tunga, Ganni, Mâdâpura and Kattarighatta.\(^\text{110}\) Dalavâi

\(^{107}\) *Ibid,* p. XXXIII. See also Muhammad-Namah, in the *M. R,* November 1929, p. 602, referring to the siège of Penukonga, etc. The *C. Vam.* (190) also speaks of the siege of Vellore, Chandragirî, etc., by the Muhammadans.

\(^{108}\) *B.C.,* V (1) and (2) Cn. 171, 186 and 202; 111 (1) Nj. 106 (1660-1662). These records merely refer to Kanthîrava as a local ruler. The absence in them of the name of his suzerain (Srî-Ranga VI) does not mean that he had thrown off his allegiance to him.


\(^{110}\) *Ibid,* I. 70. These acquisitions are, however, not enumerated in the *Mys. Dho, Pur.,* nor does Wilks allude to them.
Hamparâjaiya was succeeded by Dâsarâjaiya of Kalale (father-in-law of Kanthïrava),\textsuperscript{111} who held the office till October 1653.\textsuperscript{112}

During 1652-1653, Kanthïrava was "at war with Bijâpur."\textsuperscript{113} According to the Muhammad-Nâmâh,\textsuperscript{114} while Khân Muhammad was proceeding with the opérations of the siège of Penukoçida, "Siddi Baihan's sons in Sera(Sïra) rebelled against Adil Shah and won over to their side the Bajahs of the neighbourhood," and were instîgating "the Rajah of Mysore (Kanthïrava), who was the master of four lakhs of infantry and forty thousand good éléphants," to encroach upon the Bijâpur possessions in the Karnâṭak. Kanthïrava, accordingly, says the memoir,\textsuperscript{115} "wrested all the forts in the Jagdev country, which Mustafâ Khan had conquered with so much effort." In particular, between November 1652 and January 1653, Kanthïrava acquired in rapid succession Batnagiri, Vïrabhadrana-durga, Kengere-kôte, Pennâgara, Ŭñkaṇîkōṭe and Dharmapuri\textsuperscript{116}—forts said to have been in the possession of one " Yatibala Bao,\textsuperscript{117} a Bijâpur gênerai, perhaps identical with Bålâji Haibat Baq of the Muhammad-Nâmâh. Almost simultaneously Mîr Jumla of Gôlkonda was animating Kanthïrava against Bijâpur.\textsuperscript{118} Thèse activities of Kanthïrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar attracted the attention of Khân Muhammad. The sons of Siddi Raihan having submitted to Bijâpur by March 1653, "Khan Muhammad marched into the Jagdev country to chastise the Rajah of Mysore,"

\textsuperscript{112} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{113} See The Hague Transcripts, cited in f.n. 106 supra; see also f.n. 116 infra.  
\textsuperscript{114} See M.B., cited in f.n. 107 supra.  
\textsuperscript{115} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{116} See M.B., cited in f.n. 107 supra.  
\textsuperscript{117} See M.B., cited in f.n. 107 supra.  
\textsuperscript{118} See The Hague Transcripts, cited in f.n. 107 supra.
and succeeded in recovering, after a severe fight, Krishçagiri and four other forts in his territory. About October 1653, Khân Muhammad, on his way to Vellore, was obliged to abandon the forts recently conquered by him in Mysore. Meanwhile, he received news that Ka$shirava had sent Da$lvâi Dâsarâjaiya (Das-raj of the Persian text) "with a numberless force to the frontier of fort Kaveripatan" (Kâvërîpattañam), À detachment under Siddi Masaud was despatched by Khân Muhammad against Dâsarâjaiya. A battle took place near Kâvërîpañthañam, in which, says the memoir, Dâsarâjaiya was slain (October 1658). Linge-Gauda was re-appointed Da$lvâi of Mysore in succession to Dâsarâjaiya, In March 1654, Kanthirava, alarmed by the progress of Bijâpur arms as far as Kâvërîpañthañam, marched towards the south acquiring from Venkañâdri Nâyaka, Satya-mangalam and Danâyakankôte, places guarding the passes in the south of Mysore. In April (1654), he took from Chandraéëkhara Nâyaka, Hosûr in the south-east of Mysore.

Meanwhile Khân Muhammad, victorious at Vellore, demanded tribute from Tirumala Nâyaka of Madura. Indeed, this was an opportune moment for Tirumala Nâyaka to strike, for, by making common cause with the Nâyakas of Gingee and Tanjore and with Kanthirava of Bijâpur and Madura vs. Mysore, 1664.

119. Muhammad-Namth, cited in Ibid.
120. Ibid. Sarkar’s identification of "DcM-ra;" with "Des-raj" is incorrect in the light of other sources.
121. Ibid ; of. Annals (I. 89) referring to the removal from service of Dajavâi Dâsarâjaiya by Kanthiravain November 1663, on the ground of old âge. The Mys. Dho. Pur. (II. 67), an earlier Ms., refers, however, only to the two years' period of office of Dalavâi Dâsarâjaiya. In the absence of fuller details on the Mysore side, the authority of the Muhammad' Namah is to be preferred here.
125. Muhammad-Namth, I.c.
Mysore; he could have not only successfully chosen the common enemy (i.e., Bijapur and Grolkonda) but also have settled the affairs of Sri-Ranga and re-established the latter's suzerainty in the country. These larger interests, however, were, perhaps, overshadowed by Tirumala Nāyaka's long-standing prejudices and latterly by his misapprehension of an invasion of his dominions by Mysore, while, in fact, Kanthirava was, as we have seen, only attempting to maintain the status quo in the south and the south-east against the Muhammadans. Accordingly, about the middle of 1654, Tirumala Nāyaka negotiated with Khān Muhammad, urging him "to declare war against the king of Mysore" (Kanthirava) and begging him "to expel the invading Mysore troops from his dominions." By this ruinous and short-sighted policy, Tirumala only brought about an event which marked, though indirectly, the climax in the relations between Bijapur and Mysore. What followed is thus stated in the Muhammad-Nāmāh: "The Khan marched out of Vellore... pillaged and burnt Mysore territory down 'to a heap of ashes'... Balaji Haibat Rao, who had left Adil-Shahi service for that of Mysore, was now sent by Kanti Rai against Khan Muhammad. The Khan despatched Siddi Masaud with his vanguard to meet this army. In the battle that followed, Balaji was beheaded and his army routed. At this the Rajah of Mysore in mortal terror sent his envoy to the victorious Khan Muhammad, with an offer of submission, asking pardon for his offences and praying for safety. He promised to pay 'treasurebeyonddcalculation' as an offering to Adil Shah and regularly deliver tribute (baj-wa-Kharaj) every year. By order of Adil Shah, Khan Muhammad left the Mysore Rajah's devastated kingdom

127. Muhammad-Namah, l.c.
128. Ibid. The sources on the Mysore side maintain a discreet silence in regard to this reverse.
to him. . . . The Peshkash was realized by Khan Muhammad." Nor was Tirumala Nâyaka himself immune from Bijâpur attack, for, as Proenza tells us, 198 Khân Muhammad " did not wish to leave the country without levying ransom on Tanjore and Madura; he raised large contributions and returned to Bijâpur full of riches." About this time, Srî-Ranga, "betrayed a second time by his vassals " (Nâyakas of Madura, Tanjore and Girigee) and probably realising also the serious predicament of Mysore caused by the ravages of the Bijâpur invasion, " was obliged to seek refuge on the confines of his kingdom, in the forests where he led an miserable life." 130

The wars of Bijâpur and Gôlkonda in the Karnâtak were practically over about the monsoon season of 1654, the two powers finally accomplishing the division of their conquests in 1656. 131

The Bijâpur-belt of territory to the north of the kingdom of Mysore, comprising Bangalore, Hoskôte, Kôlâr, Dchwjballâpur and Sîra, went under the designation of Karnâtak-Bijapur-Bâlaghât while the territory below the ghâts, almost coterminous with the south-eastern frontier of Mysore, under the designation of Karnâtak-Bijâpur-Pâyanghât, Shâhji being continued in charge of the entire tract. The Gôlkonda possessions lay further east of this area, in the rich eastern plains of Madras comprising Chittoor, Gooty, Gurramkoçda, Chandragiri, Gandîkôte; Conjeevaram and other places, with a governor (Hazrat Anâr Sâhib) under the Qutb Shah.

In the very year of the division of these conquests, 129. See Nayaks of Madura, l.c.
130. Ibid. The exile of Srî-Ranga would correspond to the period c. 1654-1666, for, from the C. Vam. and Ke. N. F., as we shall see, he appears to have been in Bednûr between c. 16664669. Of. Satyanatha Aiyar in Nayaka of Madura, p. 132. His statement that Kanthirava " entertained him (Srî-Ranga) for some time and seeing that he was the source of further troubles, seems to have left him to his own fate about 1668," is not borne out by the materials on record for the years 1660-1664.
Muhammad Adil Shah died. Almost simultaneously, Abdullà Qutb Shah was recalled to his capital by a Mughal invasion. Bijâpur and Gôlkondà during the succeeding years were so much engrossed in their death-struggle with Aurangzïb (Mughal Viceroy in the Deccân) that they had little time to effectively look after their conquered tracts in the south, except depending on the local governors thereof.\textsuperscript{132} This, no doubt, proved to be an advantage to other powers in the Kamnâtâk. In particular, Šivappa Nâyaka I of Ikkëri (1645-1660) had already succeeded in acquiring Vasudhâre, Sakrepatna and other places from Bijâpur between 1647-1652.\textsuperscript{133} Shortly after the death of Muhammad Adil Shah, however, he systematically carried on his aggressions, taking the forts of Ikkëri, Soraba, Udugâni, Mahadëvapura, etc., then in the possession of the European trading powers (Tâmramukhar) ; and successfully opposed the chief of Sôde, acquiring from him Sirase (Sirsi), Herûr, Bôlûr and other places.\textsuperscript{134} About the same time (1656), it would appear, Šivappa Nâyaka, according to the \textit{Chikkadëvarâya-Vamsâvaliy}\textsuperscript{135} inquired after the whereabouts of, and traced out, the fugitive Emperor Srî-Ranga VI, paid his homage to him and afforded him an asylum. Between c. 1656-1659, Srî-Banga appears to have stayed in Bednûr (capital of Šivappa Nâyaka) after his long sojourn in Drâvida and Mysore.\textsuperscript{136}

\textsuperscript{132} \textit{Mys. Gaz.}, I I . iv. 2428; I I . iii. 2852—(see also inscriptions cited).
\textsuperscript{133} Ke. N. V., V I I . 108. 134. \textit{Ibid.} 110.
\textsuperscript{134} Pp. 190-191 : \textit{Srî-Ranga-Râya-nenisuvam} . . . \textit{ettalum nelegànadire yavanaranasi kandu kalgeragi-yodagondu bandu} . . .
\textsuperscript{186} \textit{C. Vam.}, 191 ; also Ke. N. V., V I I . 114. 'From these texts, Srî-Ranga, it seems obvious, was under the shelter of Šivappa Nâyaka I of Ikkëri before his (Srî-Ranga's) own establishment at Hassan and Bêlûr by the latter in 1669. In the light of these sources, we have to allow a fair interval of at least three years (c. 1666-1669) for Srî-Banga's asylum in Bednur, and push back the period of his exile itself by another two years (c. 1664-1666), in the light of the \textit{Hague Transcripts} and Proenza, cited above. Cf. Wilks (1.79), placing Srî-Ranga's flight to Bednûr in 1646; Rice (\textit{Mys. Gaz.}, I. 356), in 1644 (or 1646); S. K. Aiyangar (in \textit{Nayaks of Madura}, pp. 133-134, f.n. 60), after 1666 ; Satyanatha Aiyar (\textit{Ibid}, p. 132), after 1663 ; and \textit{Mys. Gaz.} (New Edn. I I . iii. 2370-2374, 2881-2888), in 1646 and 1656—all which require révision.
Meanwhile, in Mysore, Hamparajaiya (Hampaiya) of Kârugahalli had been reappointed Dalavâi by Kanthirava, in May 1655, in succession to Linge-Gauda. Kanthirava's first act after Khân Muhammad's pillaging expedition of 1654 was, according to Proenza, the despatch of an army to the Satyamangalam province of Tirumala Nâyaka of Madura, with a view to "punish him for his disloyal conduct, wreak just vengeance and compensate himself for the cost of the war," Dalavâi Hamparâjaiya was entrusted with the operations of the campaign which seems to have begun about the latter part of 1655. Without encountering much opposition Hamparâjaiya advanced on Madura "where he found considerable booty." He was soon before the walls of Madura itself, causing consternation to Tirumala Nâyaka who would have taken to his heels but for the unexpected help of the Marayas. Raghunâtha-Sêtupati, the Marava chief, proceeded thither with 25,000 men. With these and his own army of 35,000 men, Tirumala Nâyaka prepared himself for the onslaught. In the meanwhile Dalavâi Hamparâjaiya, in the words of Proenza, "too weak to hazard a general action and informed of the approaching arrival of reinforcements which his king (Kanthîrava) had sent him, temporised and, by his présents, won the Brahman commander of the Madura forces. The traitor sought to repress the ardour of his soldiers and put off, from day to day, the time of attack. But the

138. See Nayaks of Madura, p. 267 (Proenza's letter).
139. See M. E. R., No. 170 of 1910-11, dated in 1666 (Manmatha)—a damaged Kannada lithio record from Erôde, mentioning Dalavâi Hamparâjaiya (Hampaiya) and Madura (Madhura). Evidently the record seems to reflect a campaign of Mysore in the Madura country. Since only the cyclic year is mentioned in the record and since we know Hamparâjaiya succeeded to the office of Dalavâi in May 1666, we may fix the beginning of the campaign about the latter part of 1655.
Màravàs, impatient at the delay, conceived suspicions, cried treason, threw the Brahman into a dungeon, pounced on the enemies, and cut them to pieces. The remains of the defeated army took refuge in a neighbouring fortress, where, after some days, the expected reinforcements of twenty thousand men joined them. The combat again began with such fury that each army left nearly twelve thousand dead on the battlefield."

Nor was this all. "The advantage," continues Proenza, "remained with the Nâyak who utilised his superiority to retort to the Mysoreans the evils which they had inflicted on his kingdom, and transport the théâtre of this bloody war to their provinces. A spécial circumstance characterised its ferocity. The king of Mysore had ordered to cut off the nose of all the prisoners; his soldiers, to distinguish themselves, executed this barbarous order on all those who fell into their hands, men, women and children, and sent to Mysore sacks full of noses, as so many glorious trophies. The Nâyak, resenting this procédure, which, in the opinion of the Indians, added the most humiliating outrage to cruelty, ordered reprisals; and his troops burst out into the provinces of Mysore, seeking not enemies to fight, but noses to cut. It is this which has given to this inhuman war the name of 'hunt for noses.' The king of Mysore, the first conferrer of this barbarity, himself lost his own nose, and thus suffered the penalty which he deserved." This counter-invasion of Madura is referred to in certain Mackemie Manuscripts, according to which the Madura forces hotly pursued the retiring Mysore army into its own territories, as far as Nanjangûd (Nanjankudi).

142. Taylor, Or. Hist. Mas., I I. 182-183; see also and compare Nayaks of Madura, pp. 186-137.
From the letter of Proenza, it would seem that the invasion and counter-invasion narrated above were completed by the close of 1658 and the beginning of 1659.¹⁴³ There is, however, no information on the Mysore side regarding these events. Proenza's account, on the other hand, however trustworthy in regard to the main trend of transactions, does seem to exaggerate the "cutting off noses in war." Indeed to a foreign observer like Proenza such a mode of fighting could not but appear as novel and grotesque. In fact, as we have seen in the preceding pages, "nose cutting" was a habitual feature of Mysorean warfare and this was not the only occasion when the Mysore army resorted to it, as Proenza seems to imagine. Nor is it likely that Kacṭhīrava-Narasarāja Woḍeyar himself ever took part in the war and sustained loss of his own nose, as Proenza makes us believe. Hence this part of the account cannot be literally accepted as a correct statement of facts. It seems, however, possible that the general or his deputy in charge of the Mysore army was one of those who lost their noses during the retaliatory game adopted by the Madura forces. No doubt Kacṭhīrava had desired to mark his displeasure of Tirumala's rebellion against his sovereign (Srī-Ranga) by ordering the infliction of this punishment on certain of his leading officials, a direction which was either carried to excess in its execution or grossly misrepresented as a regular "hunt for noses." The whole life and character of Kacṭhīrava seem to be against the ascription of such a barbarity to him by way of a general measure.¹⁴⁴ The obvious effect of these

¹⁴³. Tirumala Nāyaka of Madura died in February 1669 (Nayaks of Madura pp. 148-149). Since Proenza speaks of the Nāyaka's death shortly after his victory in the counter-invasion (Ibid, p. 269), the wars between Mysore and Madura appear to have practically come to a close in December 1668 or January 1669, although hostilities in the south continued during subsequent years.

¹⁴⁴. Mys. Gaz., I I . iii. 2869-2890; see also and compare S. K. Aiyangar in Nayaks of Madura, pp. 136-137, f.n. 78. For details about the "oose-putting," vide Appendihc IX.
invasions during the last years of the reign of Kânthïrava-Narasarâja Woḍeyar was that the relations between Mysore and Madura became embittered to a degree.

Almost simultaneously Sivappa Nâyaka I of Ikkërï, smarting under the rejection of the offer of his alliance by Kânthïrava (in September 1647), had begun to show signs of an aggressive attitude towards Mysore, on the plea of restoring to his suzerainty Sîrî-Ranga VI who was under his (Sivappa Nâyaka's) protection since c. 1656. In 1657 (Hëvilambi) he marched southwards and laid siège to Hassan and Bëlûr, then in the possession of the Muhammadans of Bijâpur. He began a regular blockade of the latter place and soon reduced it to subtoission slaying large numbers of the enemy, It was also on this occasion that, according to the Keladi-

145. C. Vam., 190-191; Ke. N. F., V I I . 108-109,114. Although, according to the Ke. N. V. and Sivatattvaratnakâra (cited in fra), it was sheer loyalty to the Empire which induced éivappa Nâyaka I of Ikkëri to espouse the cause of Sîrî-Ranga V I, his real motive, according to the earlier work, C. Vam., was nothing but self-interest. Indeed, by courting on his side the support of Emperbr Sîrî-Ranga and by attempting to give to the ruined fortunes of the latter the advantage of his power and influence, Sivappa Nâyaka evidently hoped not only to establish Sîrî-Ranga in his suzerainty of the Karnâtaka country but also to retaliate, and carry on his aggression, against Mysore, at whose rejection of his embassy (in September 1647) he had been offended. Sivappa Nâyaka's offer of an asylum to Sîrî-Ranga VI between c. 1666-1659 cannot, therefore, be better understood except on this footing. See Ch. X, for further détails.

146. Ke. N. F., V I I . 109; see also Sivatattvaratnakara in S. K. Aiyangar's Sources, pp. 366-367. Both these texts are, obviously, to be understood as referring to the siège of Bëlûr in the Hassan district, "Vēlapura" of the latter text being only the Sanskritised form of Bëlûr and not "Vejlore" in the Madras Presidency as identified in the Sources (p. 347), Nâyaks of Madura (p. 133, f.n. 60) and the Mys. Gaz. (11. iii. 2372-2373). See also B.C., V (1) and (2) Bl. 3, 14, 56, 68, etc., mentioning Vēlapura as the old name for Bëlûr. "Vellore" had been, as we have seen above, twice lost by Sîrî-Ranga in 1647 and 1654, while "Bëlûr" was also in the possession of Bijâpur (since 1640), so that it was but in the ftness of things for éivappa Nâyaka I of Ikkëri to recover both Bëlûr and Hassan for Ôri-Ranga in 1657, as an ostensibly loyal feuda tory of his.

147. Sivatattvaratnakara, l.c.
Krislmappa Nâyaka of Bëlûr and Árkalgûḍ opposed Ėivappa Nâyaka at the head of vast forces (bahusaniyâ sahitidirehida). Alarmed, probably, by the latter's activities, Kanthîrava himself, it would appear, substantially assisted his feudatory, Krishijappa Nâyaka, against the latter (mayavadigaladhika sahayade); Sivappa Nâyaka, however, succeeded in thoroughly defeating Krishnappa Nâyaka on the field of battle and took his son, Venkaṭâdri Nâyaka, prisoner. Though these activities of Ikkêrî tended to restrict the sphere of influence of Mysore up to Bëlûr in the north-west, they resulted in improving the position of Srî-Ranga by 1659 (Vikari), in which year Sivappa Nâyaka established the latter at Hassan and Bëlûr and is said to have been duly honoured by him with titles like Râmabâna, Paravârana-Vdrana and presents, including a costly ear-ornament of sapphire, a very costly pearl, the emblems of the conch and the discus, an ùmbrella called the Jagajhampa and the head of the enemy slain.

In 1659, the last year of the reign of Kanthîrava-Narasarâja Woḍeyar, the political position of the kingdom of Mysore was as follows: On the north it had been extended up to Channapatna and Turuvâkere, coterminous with the Karnâtak-Bijâpur-Bâlaghât, while Channarâyapatna, overlooking Hassan and Bëlûr, had become its north-western limit; in the south it ran up to Ḍânâyakankôte and Ṣatyamangalam and in the south-east up to Kâvërâptaçam, co-extensive with the Karnâtak-Bijâpur-Pâyanghât; in the east it practically covered the whole of the territory of Jagadéva-Râya, while in the west it had been extended up to Coorg absorbing a major portion of the kingdom of the Changâlyas (including Nanjarâyapatría). The tendency

148. V I I . 1 0 . 149. Ibid. 150, Ke. N. V., V I I . 114; C. Vatn., 191 ; Sivatattavaratnakara, p. 357.
on the part of Mysore to advance further in the north and the north-west while maintaining her integrity in the south and the south-east as against Madura and other powers, had already begun to manifest itself towards the close of the reign.
CHAPTER IX.

KANTHIRAVA-NARASARAJA WODEYAR I,

1638-1659—(contd.)


The rule of Kanthirava-Narasaraja Wodeyar bore the impress of his personality to a greater extent, perhaps, than that of his predecessors, on the administration of the country he ruled over. Inscriptions and other sources speak of him as ruling in Seringapatam seated on the jewelled throne (ratna-simhâsana).
His government was conducted along traditional lines and was in keeping with the general course of political development the kingdom underwent. Timmarasa was the minister-in-chief (mantrīsa) of Kanthīrava, well versed in political counsel, accounts and the arts;¹ Lappavarasa was his minister of finance (sakala rājyake lekkabvanu baredōduva);² Basavaiya was an officer in charge of the treasury (bokkasa);³ Narasimha-Upādhyāya—identical with Nrsimhārya mentioned in the Gajjiganahalli copper-plate grant (April 1639)—was the king's scribe (rāyasadolu jāna);⁴ and Linge-Gauda was the Mayor of Seringapatam (Pattanadā-adhikārī),⁵ the capital city (till July 1649). Among other officers, Kottūraiya was an agent of Kanthīrava (Narasaraja Wadeyarāvara kūryakke kartarāda) at Sāligrāma.⁶ Among the Dalavāis of the reign, already referred to,⁷ were Timmarājaiya (November 1638-December 1640), Nanjarājaiya of Hura (December 1640-January 1647), Lingarājaiya of Hura (January 1647-June 1648), Kempaiya (June 1648-July 1649), Linge-Gauda (July 1649-August 1650), Hamparājaiya (Hampaīya) of Kārugahalli (August 1650-September 1651) and Dāsarājaiya (Dās-rāj) of Kalale, father-in-law of Kanthīrava (September 1651-October 1653)—Linge-Gaudā and Hamparājaiya holding the office a second time between October 1655-May 1655 and May 1655-1659, respectively. The short tenure of office usually allowed by Kanthīrava to each of his Dalavāis points to the active

---

2. Ibid, 82.
3. Ibid, 74.
4. Ibid, 86.
5. Ibid, 56.
6. E.C., V (1) and (2) Cn. 185 (1650).
personal influence exerted by him in military as in civil administration.

Defence was perhaps the foremost problem that engaged the attention of Kanthîrava-Narasarâja Wodeyâr in the early years of his reign. The fort of Seringapatam having sustained serious damages during the siege of 1699, Kanthîrava took a keen personal interest in the work of improving and extending it, with a view to make it more impregnable and self-sufficient. Huge flat stones were made use of in enlarging and strengthening the ramparts, bastions and ditches. And magazines and armouries were extensively laid out, together with large stores of fodder and provisions of every description. The fort of Mysore was likewise improved and strengthened, and arrangements made for storing in provisions, arms and ammunition.

The next measure of importance was the establishment by Kanthîrava, for the first time, of a mint (tenkasâle) in Seringapatam and the reorganization of currency and coinage. The tendencies underlying this measure were of a political, administrative and religious character: firstly, by 1645, Kapthîrava was, as we have seen, sufficiently well established on the throne of Mysore (having successfully beaten off the Bijâpur invasion and counteracted the aggressions of Tirumala Nâyaka of Madura).

8. The Annals (1. 88-89) refers to inefficiency, corruption, neglect of duty, assertiveness, etc., on the part of the Dalavai as the cause of his dismissal and the appointment of his successor. The Mys. Dho. Pur. (1.66-67) merely mentions the period of office of each Dalavai. Whatever might have been the real cause for the removal from office of a Dajavâi, Kanthîrava appears to have been the first ruler to realise the evils of excessive concentration of power in the Dalavai. He appears to have kept his Dalavais thoroughly under control generally by allowing them only a short tenure of office; unless any of them proved himself aman of exceptional capacity like Nanjarâjaiya of Hura. See also and compare S. K. Aiyangar, Ancient India, pp. 290-292.

9. Anhalé, 1. 79-80, 03. For détails about arms and ammunition, vide Appendix IX,
and was aiming at independence from a local point of view; secondly, the innumerable estampages on the gold coins in the country—belonging to the Pâjegàr régime—had led to confusion and it was found absolutely necessary to have a uniform seal for all gold coins; thirdly, Karîjhîrava's prédilection "for Vaishjiavism, perhaps most significantly echoed in a litthic record of his, was also prominently at work. The first coins were, accordingly, struck in Kanthîrava's nâmé, on the 26th of April 1645. These are gold ones, variously known as Kanthîrâya-hana, Kanthîrava-Râya and Kanthîrava-Râya-ravi, and are impressed with the figure of God Lâkshmî-Narasimha on the obverse and some dots on the reverse. Another species of gold coins, issued probably about the same time or slightly later, was the Kanthîrâya-varaha. Not only were these coins issued but their circulation all over the country was also provided for, 10 hanams being equivalent to one Kanthîrâya-varaha and the weight of nine hanams being equivalent to the weight of one varaha (Kantherâyi), the two dénominations being ordered to be used in connection with the account and cash transactions, respectively, of the State. Kanthîrava appears to have

10. Ibid., I. 90.
11. E.C., V (2) Ag. 64 (April 1647), p. 706 (Text); see also under Religion.
12. I. M. C., No. 18-15-20, pp. 36-37:

Śatishanahana-saka-varga 1687 vendâ vastamnadavada
Pârthîravâ nama samavatwarda
Valâksha-s. 11 [Text gone] naktihadallu
Kantherâya-Narasaraja Wodeyararapunavanu somma pesarimalli
Lâkshmî-Narasimha-mudre-mâyavanamu lokini
i nangalke Kantherâiva-Bayâmendu pesaru koʃtu
grîna-kakîrava[|nu samarpitida viʃva]

Cf. Annals (I. 91), placing this event in April 1648; Wilks (I. 61), merely referring to the establishment of the mint and the issue of "Cantyral hoons and vans" by Kantherâva; also M. A. R., 1922, p. 81, referring to the issue of the coins "some time after 1646."

13. Annals, l.c.; see also Appendix IV—(4).
14. Vide f.n. 12 supra—Text.
16. See Appendix Ibid., for details.
17. Ibid.
18. Annals, I. 90-91; also Mys. Raj. Oha., l.c.
issued a series of copper coins also, known as Ānekāsu,\textsuperscript{19} to serve the purposes of a token currency.

In the localities annexed by him from the feudatories, Kaŋṭhīrava-Narasarāja Wodeyar, it is said,\textsuperscript{20} settled the land revenue dues according to the status and condition of each tract. The refractory Pālegārs and turbulent ryots in the local parts were allowed just enough means to enable them to sustain themselves, a major portion of their income being confiscated to the State. To promote local peace and facilitate the transmission of revenue collections from the countryside to the central exchequer at Seringapatam, officiais like Subēdar, Thānādār, Karanikas and Gumāstas were also appointed.

Among the local feudatories of Kaŋṭhīrava-Narasarāja Wodeyar—at the height of his power, i.e.\textsuperscript{r} during c. 1647-1650—were the following:\textsuperscript{21} Doḍḍaiya (Doḍḍēndra) of Haradanahalli, Kempaiya (Kempēndra) of Satyāgāla, Timmarāja (Timmēndra) of Heggaḍdēvankōte, Doḍḍaiya of Channarāyapatpa, Hampaiya of Turuvēkere, Chāmāiya of Channapatnā, Hampaiya of Maddūr, Muddaiya of Nāgamangala, Nanjarma of Malavalli, Rājaiya of Terakaṇāmbi, Guruvāṇḍa of Kannambādi, Kottūraiya of Kikkēri, Chiwa-Gauda of Pālupare, Muddaiya of Kāṅkānhalli, Honnaŋḍa of Katte-Malalavādi, Sangaiya of Ummattūr, Channaiya of Hosaholalu, Dāsiya, chief of Ballodeyar (?), Lingarājaiya (Lingarājēndra) of Yelāndūr (Yelavandūr), and the chiefs of Hullahallī (Hullanahallī), Nilusūge, Kulagāṇṭa, Kōte-kere (Kōṭeya-kere), Hemmarar-

\textsuperscript{19} Vide Appendix \textit{Ibid.}.

\textsuperscript{20} Annals, I. 89; also Wilks, I. 60-61.

\textsuperscript{21} K. N. V., XXV, 47-55, 57-59, 61-71. Most of the feudatories, referred to, are stated to have been present in Seringapatam during the festivities of 1647, noted under \textit{Social life}. Kottūraiya of Kikkēri, mentioned, is further to be indentified with the one referred to as an ‘agent of Kanthirava at Sāligrāma (see f.n. 6 supra and text thereto).
gala, Bilikere, Talakâd, Sôsale and Rangaśamudrâ. Some of these feudatories were, as we shall see, in the personal service of Kan̄ṭhīrava-Narasarâja Wođeyar himself. Among the feudatories in friendly alliance with Kan̄ṭhīrava were i82 Bangappa Nâyaka of Holê-Narasipur (Narasimhapûra), Kṛishṇappa Nâyaka of Bëlûr, Dođda-Kempe-Gauda of Kuṇīgal and Chikka-Gauda23 of Mâgâdi, Virupaṇa Nâyaka of Açâlmâdi and the sons of the chief of Nanjarâyapatna and Pûvala-Hanuniappa Nâyaka (of Basavâpatna and Tarîkefe). Tanjore, Madura and Gingee (Ohenje)24 were among the distant powers represented by their ministers at the court of Kan̄ṭhīrava during the period.

The period of Kan̄ṭhīrava's rule witnessed an important stage in the development of érī-Vaishṇavism in South India in general and Mysore in particular. Already Mêlkôtê had become a prominent centre of érī-Vaishṇavism25 and no less important was Seringapatam, the capital city.26 More significant still, perhaps, was the influence of Vaishṇava tradition that was being continually exerted on the Mysore Royal House from the early years of the seventeenth century. We have seen how Râja Wođeyar, Châmarâja Wođeyar and Immaḍî-Râja Wođeyar were staunch Vaishṇavaites. Bettada-Châmarâja Wođeyar, father of Kan̄ṭhīrava-

23. Dodda-Kempe-Gauda here is to be identified with Immadi-Kempe-Gauda II of Mâgâdi (1569-1668) and Chikka-Gauda with Chikka-Kempe-Gauda (son of Immadi-Kempe-Gauda), afterwards Mummađi-Kempe-Gauda I I I (1668-1678). Perhaps during the period, of which we are writing (c. 1647-1650), both father and son were governing the Yelahanka-nâgu, the former from Kuṇīgal, the latter from Mâgâdi, and both were present during the festivities of 1647 in Seringapatam. For the relations between Kan̄ṭhīrava and Immadi-Kempe-Gauda about 1648-1660, see f.n. 97 in Ch. VIII and text thereat. For the genealogy of the Yelahanka (Mâgâfli) chief s, vide Tabje XV I I.
26. See C. Vam., 113; C. Vi., I I I, 78; also i.n. 85 infra.
26. K. N. V., VII, 96; V., I I I I, etc.
Narasarâja Wodeyar, was himself an earnest devotee of Vishnu, adôrifying God Nrsimha. An inscription records of him as having none to equal him alike in respect of bathing in holy rivers, making gifts, winning victory on the field and offering worship to Vishnu. The Chikkadëvarâya-Vamsâvali, already referred to, makes mention of his pilgrimage to Mêlkôте, Tirupati, ērîrangâm and other sacred places, accompanied by his half-brother, Muppina-Dëvarâja Wodeyar, during the early years of the reign of Châmaràja Wodeyar. Under Kanthïrava-Narasâraja Wodeyar, the Vaishnava predilections of the Mysore Royal Family became more and more marked. Kanthïrava was celebrated for his ardent devotion to Vishnu (atiéaya Vishnu-bhakti) and for his scrupulous observance of the characteristic features of the creed, namely, Vaishnava-Dïkshâ (leaving the head unshaved for long periods), Bhâgavata-Purâna-Prasanga (listening to the Bhâgavata-Purânam), Ekâdasi-Vratam and Dvâdasi-Vratam (fasting on the eleventh day of every fortnight and breaking the fast on the twelfth), Hari-pûje, Hari-dhyâna (worship and contemplation of Vishnu), Nitya-dàna (daily gifts), Kshirâmbudhi (distribution of milk) and Brindâvana-sêve (offering devotional worship to Brindâvanam, the abode of the Lord). A lithic record speaks of him as having placed his burdens at the feet of God Nrâ hari (Lakshmî-Nrsimha). Indeed so profound was the impression produced by his faith in Vaishnavism that he was deified.

27. Ibid, IV, 4-10.
28. E. C., I I I (I) Sr. 108 (April 1647), 11. 28-29:
Snañîcha dûmcha jayëcha Vishnoh
Pûjâ-vidhau tatsadrsô na-kaschît
29, Ante, Ch VI.
30 K. N. F., XXVI, 3.
31. Ibid, 4-16; V I I, 63; also Mys. Raj. Cha., 26; Annals, I. 92-93.
32. E.C., V (2) Ag. 34 (April 1647), p. 767 (Text); Srî-Nrharipadayugâ nyasta sarvasva bhârû ; see also C. Vam. (37), depicting Kanthïrava as having been engaged in the contemplation and adoration of Vishnu (Nrsimhana.
by his subjects! Nor can there be any doubt that he aimed at perpetuating the cult of Vishnu among his people by the issue of coins bearing the figure of God Lakshmi-Narasimha and by inducing them to worship that God and observe the rite of fasting (Ekadasi-Vrata) on the eleventh day of every fortnight. Thus, the record, mentioned above, says: "The king Kanthirava was taken by the people for God Nrsimha. Seeing that from love of money the people had forgotten Vishnu, the wise king Kanthirava made from that money Nrsari and preserved the people ... Inquiring into the sayings of the Veda and Smriti and ascertaining the meaning of all sastras, in accordance with the intentions of both, he caused all to worship Lakshmi-Nrsari's two feet on Ekadasi and also to perform that (Ekadasi) Vrata like Ambarisha and other kings." It was, we are told, his sincere conviction that salvation was only to be attained by absolute devotion to Vishnu; and this perhaps found its lasting expression in the construction by him (between 1645-1648) of a temple to God Lakshmi-Narasimha, to the right of his Palace at Seringapatam, for the spiritual benefit of his people (tannanti-logarellaum bardunkugendu).

33. Ibid, p. 763 (Text):
Kanthirava-mahipalan Nrsimham mnrnt jana||
Vittchezha paripidetena manasa Vishpum sadva vimmpan ||
Lokan vihinya dayaparoti-chaturalah Kunthirava-kshmapatih ||
Tuvidi Njharim vihinya ahasa kurvan urpmi palanam ||

Veda-Smrtiydha uskym savachana-cadran narsa-kshtra viharya
Sriman Kanthirava-Sri-narapatir-nichayithvartha-yugnam |
Bhadayam su-Lakshmi-Njharis-padyugardhamad lad-vrasancha
Vijolanannamariya-kshlra-narapatinam-adhipam-bhakara ||

34. C. Vam., i.e.: nitya-sukhama-nehari tatvevam-andraydu Purushottamana
bhakti-veda-inukti-yanugojadendu nishchayiti. See also C. V., II,
140. According to Tirumalikya, the reference to tattva in the above
passage is to the Sri-Vaishnava doctrines of trust in God's grace and
surrender.

35. Ibid; C. VI., II, 141; also K. N. V. (1648), VII, 76-81, 114, referring to the
temple (Sri-Narasimha-devana nitya); Annala, I, 90; Mys. Maj. Cha.,
94 (compare). For further references to this extant temple, see under
Gifts, Grants and Social life.
was a prominent feature of Kanthirava's religion. He was devoted as much to Vishnu as to Siva (Hari-Hara-
hakkiyoliruva),\textsuperscript{36} while he worshipped his family deities Lakshmikânta, Châmundësvari and Trinësvara\textsuperscript{37} with no têss fefcvour. He is also said to hâve observed the Saiva cîtes (Saiva-Vrata) as well.\textsuperscript{38} In his capital there not only flourished Vaishnava and Saiva institutions (temples and maths)\textsuperscript{30} but also adhérents of différent créëds and sects (such as the Bhâgavatas, Vîra-Vaishnavas, Mathâ-
dhipatis, Sivabhaktas, Jôgis and Jangamas), who lived side by side in friendly rivalry.\textsuperscript{40}

Numerous were the gifts of Kaçthirava-Narasaràja Woçïeyar to institutions and individuals, both in and outside his kingdom. Services in the temple of God Lakshmi-
Narasimha at Seringapatam engaged his constant attention. That temple, it is said,\textsuperscript{41} was provided by him with a lofty enclosure-wall of stone (ëlttarada kallapågalu), an extensive verandah (bittarada kaisâle), a seven-
storeyed tower (ëlneleya gòpura), mantapas, navaranga, abodes for minor gods (parivåra-dëvatålayangalum) and a garbha-grha (gabbavane), besides a sacrificial pavilion (yåga-såle) and a spring festival pond (Vasanta-kola). In the temple thus furnished, Kanthirava, it is added,\textsuperscript{43} set up the image of Nrsimha with Nâchyârs and the processional image of the God, together with minor deities and Âlvârs, according to the Pâncharâtra and other âgarrias. He richly endowed this shrine with ornaments of precious stones—including a jewelled crown

\textsuperscript{36} K. N. F., VII, 68. \textsuperscript{37} Ibid, I V, 96. \textsuperscript{38} Annals, I. 98. \textsuperscript{39} K. N. V., V I I, 78-114. For détails, vide section on Social life—Cities and towns. \textsuperscript{40}Ibid, V I, 53, 62 ; X X, 46-47 ; X X I, 118, etc. \textsuperscript{41} C. Vam., 37 ; (7, Vi., I I, 141-142; Annals, I. 89-90; Mys. Raj. Cha., l.c.; see also under Social life, l.c. \textsuperscript{42} Annals, I. 90; Mys. Raj. Cha., l.c.; also C. Vam. and C. Vi., l.c.; M, A, R., 1918, p. 68, para 130 [E. C. Bangalore Dist. Suppl Vol., Bn. 144 (1680), 11.14-16].
named Kanthirava-mudi—silken fabrics, plates, cups, utensils and vahanams; and arrange for the conduct of daily, fortnightly, monthly and yearly services to the presiding deity, setting apart the revenues of fertile village for the purpose. As part and parcel of his religion (Vrata-dharma), Kanthirava, we learn, also established agrahāras at Seringapatam (Paéchimaranga), Karighafta (Karigiri), Melkôte (Yâdavâdri), érï-éailam, Benares (Kâéi), érïrangam and Ramësvaram (Setu), with arrangements for the feeding of Brâhmans and the payment of annuities to deserving familier and provided for the worship of God Bindu-Mâdhava and Viévanâtha at Benares and for the conduct of a Ràmanuja-kûta (assembly of the followers of Râmânujâchârya) at Srîrangam. He also set up feeding-houses (anna-satra) throughout his kingdom and performed innumerable deeds of charity (such as the célébration of marriages, thread cérémonies, etc.) in aid of the poor and the needy. Among the acts of piety Kanthirava-Nasaràja Wodeyar is credited with are:

44. the formation of a lake (named Kanthirava-sarôvara)'in the Suka-tïrtha at Seringapatam, for use during the function of Gajëndra-Môksha conducted for God Ranganâtha; the establishment of an agrahâra named Kanthirava-pura to the north of the Cauvery in Seringapatâm, with vrittis (shares) to the three sects of Brâhmans; the construction of an extensive tank named Narasâmbudhi by damming the Kaundinï river, to raise crops for services to God Nanjundësvâra of Nanjangûd; the extending of the towers, mantapas and outer and inner enclosure-walls of the temple of Ranganâtha and the présentation of a jewelled crown named Vaikuntha-mudi to that God; the extending of the tower of the

48. B.C., III (1)Sr .103 (1647); 11. 49-53; K. N. V., XXVI, 31-39; see also f.n. 68 infra and text thereto.

44. Annale, I. 79, 83-88, 90-98; Mys. Raj. Cha., 24-26. Dévaohandra tpeaks also of granta of lands by Kanthirava to the Jain Basti at Sravana-Bejagola (Gommatapurâ) and rent-free gifts (umbali) to the Jain Brahmans, etc., (Raj.Kath.,XII.472).
temple of Gangâdharësvara in Seringapatam and the setting up of the Panchalinga in that temple; the exécution of repairs to the temple of Venkatârama at Kârîghatta and the érection of steps to that hill; the rénovation of the Gautama-ratha at the temple of Sûrîkanthësvara at Nanjangûd; the laying out a garden (named éringâra-tôta), near the waste weir of the old tank in Mysore, on the spot where his grandfather, Bôla-Châmarâja Woqeyar, had been cremated; the construction of a large pond (named éringâra-tôtada-kola), with bathing-ghâts, to the south of the Tri#éévara temple; the addition of a verandah to the latter temple, with the images of Châmûndëévarî, Panchalinga, Dakshinâmûrti and other gods set up therein, and the érection of a spacious kalyâna-mantapa (marriage pavilion) behind the temple of Lakshmîrâmaçiasvâmi at Mysore; the provision of gifts and endowments to Goddesses Châmûndësvarî of the Châmûndi Hills and Jvâlâmukhi-Âmma of Uttanahalli, and to the éaiva and Vaishnava temples at Nanjangûd, Tirupati, Mèlkôte and other sacred places, according to the status of each of these temples; the construction of a tank at Arikuthara in the name of his father-in-law, Doddê Urs, and the laying out of a new water-course—extant as Bangâradoddi-kâlve—near Seringapatam, and naming it after Doddâjamma, a favourite consort of his (gândharva-patni).

This last-mentioned act was, we are told, the outcome of a scheme to provide traffic facilities to the public over the Cauvery when it is in floods and, ordinarily, for the supply of water to the inhabitants of the capital city. The Cauvery, flowing to the south-west and the north-west of the fort of Seringapatam, was, it is said, bridged at convenient points; then the river was dammed near Chandra-vana, to the south of Gautama-kshëtra (where it

---

45. Annals, I. 91.  
46. Ibid.
divides itself into two branches), and the water thus stored in was led to the capital city by means of the canal running from the bridge in the south-west. Kanthïrava is further said to have laid down that the crops raised under the new scheme were to be set apart for services in the temple of God Ranganâtha of Seringapatam.\(^{47}\) In keeping with this account of the scheme is the contemporary reference\(^{48}\) to the bridge adjoining both branches of the Cauvery and the new canal surrounding the city of Seringapatam, from which it seems obvious that these monuments of Kanthïrava's rule were conspicuous in Seringapatam already between c. 1645-1648.

Among the extant records of the reign of Kanthïrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar, the Gajjiganahalli copper-plate grant, dated April 7, 1639,\(^{49}\) registers the gift by him of the village of Gajjiganahalli—under the name of Narasarâtpura (divided into 24 shares)—to Vëdic Brâhmans, for the eternal benefit of his father (Bettada-Châmarâja Wodeyar) and as an offering to God Prasimha. A lithic record, dated December 7, 1640,\(^{50}\) refers to the grant by Kanthïrava, as rent-free, of the village of Put$sanapura in the Hangala-sthala of the Terakanâmbi-sïme, for the offerings to God Hanumanta (newly set up, with a mantapa in the central street of Terakanâmbi, by one Kempa-Narasimha Setti) and for the maintenance of a feeding-house for the daily distribution of food to Brâhmans (nitya-kattaleya . . . Brâhmana-satra). Another, dated March 15, 1642,\(^{51}\) speaks of the setting

\(^{47}\) Ibid.


\(^{49}\) E. C7, I I I (1) Nj. 198: i. 1561, P straightforward, Chaitra, ev. 15. This record is impresscd with the Boar seal (Varaha-mudre), Vide, on this point, f.n. 56 infra.

\(^{50}\) Ibid, IV (2) Gu. 10: A. 1662, Vikrama, Pushyaëu. 6, Monday. This record also bears the emblem of sovereignty of the world ( Vamana-mudre, see 1.11).

\(^{51}\) E. C., V (1) and (2) Cn, 168 : Vishu Phalguna ba. 10, Tuesday. Cf. H. I. S. 1., p. 278
up of God Basavësvara and the érection of a mantapa at Channarâyapatna by Channa Wodeyar, son of Doddaiya, Prabhu of Kânkànhaḷḷi, a feudatory of Kapthïrava. A third, dated March 10, 1643,\(^2\) records the grant by Kanthïrava, as an agrahāra (of 50 shares) to Purõhit Lingā-Bhaṭṭa and other Brâhmans, of the village of Mârachahallī—otherwise called Narasarāja-pura—with its eight hamlets, wet and dry lands, on the occasion of a solar éclipse. An inscription from the Mackenzie Collection, dated April 26, 1645,\(^3\) registers the gift by Kanthïrava of lands in six tributary villages (kaigānikeya grāmagalu), on the occasion of the striking of the Kanthïrāya-hanams. A lithic record, dated April 27, 1647,\(^4\) mentions the formation by Kanthïrava of the agrahāra of Mattigōdu (south-east of Bāmanāthapura)—named after himself—and the grant of the same tō selected Brâhmans, divided into 13 shares, as an offering to God Narasimha (ārī-Narasimhāya namah). A copper-plate inscription from Toçda-nûr, of the same date,\(^5\) refers to the grant by Kanthïrava of the village of Sukadore to the north of Mēlkôṭe (Yādavēdri), together with its seven hamlets, to Śrī-Vaishriava Brâhmans, as an agrahāra under the name of Kanthïrava'Narasa-Nrpâmbôdhi. This record, it is interesting, bears the king's signature as Śrī-Kanthïrava-Narasarāju and is impressed with the Boar seal (VARĀHAMUDRE).\(^6\) A lithic record, dated September 23,
1647,\textsuperscript{51} refers to the construction of a pond and a stone math in Channarâyapatna by Kempanna-Gauda of Kasulagere, an agent of Doddaiya of Kânkânhalli, feudatory of Kanthïrava. Between c. September 1647 and April 1648, we have lithic records,\textsuperscript{58} referring, among other things, to the construction of a temple (of three ankañams) to Gadde-Bâmëévara, a pond, a well and an evening math (sandhyâ-mathâ), at Channarâyapatna, by Doddaiya himself. Another record, a lithic one, dated December 8, 1647,\textsuperscript{50} speaks of the grant by Kanthïrava of the village of Balakuli to Brâhmans of various gôttras and sûtras. A nirupa of Kanthïrava, dated March 14, 1649 and addressed to Channaiya of the Pattana-hôbli-vichâra,\textsuperscript{60} refers to the setting up of a stone slab (silâpratisthebagye) in Tirumalasâgara, and communicates an order to the effect that the boundaries of villages under Tirumalasâgara-agrahâra should be fixed up and that the supply of water thereto from the tank of Tonnûr (Tondanûr) should, as usual, be conducted in perfect security. The nirûpa, it was further ordered, was to be got copied in the kadita of the Châvadikaranika and returned. A lithic record, dated October 21, 1650,\textsuperscript{61} refers to the érection of a navaranga-pattasâle and an enclosure-wall—for God Vepugôpàla set up in Àne-Bâgûr—and the promotion of a work of merit by Kottiiraiya, Kaçithïrava's agent at Sâligrâma. This
document further records that the erection of the temple was begun by Hngaiya of Yelandûr (Yajavandûr), that the navaranga, enclosure-wall, pattasale and other items of work were actually carried out by Nanjaiya, son of Kôttûraiya, and that, in the entire undertaking, he was assisted by the local êânabhôgs (Sënabhôga), Nariyapaiya and Chikkarasaiya, as well as by the Palace êânabhôgs, Mailaraiya and Gôvindaiya, while the temple itself was finished by one Basavaiya. A much worn out lithic record, in front of the Ànjanêya temple at Màdâpura, belonging to c. 1650, mentions the grant by Kanthîrava of thirteen villages for services to God Narasimha. Another, of about the same time, is a stone charter of Kaçthîrava granting in perpetuity the village of Honganûr— with the adjoining villages—in the Hadinâd-sîme, to provide for the continuance of his works of merit in Benares (Kàsi) through his Purôhit, Lingâ-Bhatta, the items of works, enumerated in the record, being as follows: charities, anointment of Viévëévara and other Gods, illuminations with Sahasra-nâma (reciting of onethousand names of the deity), offerings and rites at all the Parvas, bathing-gifts during the three months of Mâgha, Vaii&kha and Kârtïka (January-February, April-May and October-November), feeding 100 Brâhmans daily, annual allowance to God Kâéînâtha and bathing in Mâgha at Prayâga. Another lithic record, dated February 10, 1651, registérs the setting up of God Sômêâvara at Anati village, during the régime of Doddaiya, feudatory of Kanthîrava, in Channarâyapatna. Another, dated May, 24, 1651, refers to the setting up of Nâga-bhaktaiya and the building of a mantapa at the temple of Isvara, in the Dindagûru village, by Doddaiya himself. We hâve also

63. B. O., IV (3) Ch. 43; see also text of f.n. 48 supra and M. A. R., 1981, No. 56, p. 106, referring to 'Kâd-dharmada grama.'
64. Ibid. 7 (1) and 53 Ch. 202. 4. 1872, Vîkritî. Mâgha bu. 14, Monday. Cf. H. I. S. I., p. 287.
65. Ibid. Ch. 171. 4. 1879, Èkara, ¥agha bu. 16, Saturday.
Narasimhaswami Temple, Seringapatam.
a lithic record, dated Marché 19, 1655, in which Dalavâî Lingarâjaiya (Linge-Gauḍa?) is said to have made a grant of lands belonging to Narasîpura, attached to the Sāragūr-ethala, for the décorations, festivals, offerings and illuminations of G-od Narasimha. Another, a damaged oûe, dated 1655, seems to refer to a service of Dalavai Hamparîñjaiya (Hampaiya) in, the Ārdra-Kapâlēévara temple at Ėrôde. A third one, dated March 1657, speaks of Kanthîrava as having caused to be made the image of God Arkēévara for the Antarahalli agrahāra.

An authentic statue of Kanthîrava, a Bhakta-vigraha— with his name in Kannada (Kanthirava-Narasarâja Wadayaravaru) inscribed on the pedestal—is to be seen in a room to the left of the Ranga-mantapa of the temple of Narasimhasvâmi at Seringapatam. It is a magnificent figure of Kanthîrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar, about three and a half feet high, standing on a high pedestal with folded hands. Kanthîrava is represented as wearing a long robe, girt with a sword, shield and dagger on the left side, and with large ear-rings and Vïra-pendeya (hero's insignia) on the right foot. Altogether a beautifully carved statue, presenting in life-like fashion the majestic bearing of Kanthîrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar as a warrior-devotee. A similar statue of his is to be seen in a pavilion of the temple of Trinayanēsvara in the Mysore fort.

During the reign of Kanthîrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar— especially in the earlier part of it—the capital city of Seringapatam was an important centre of social life. It was a beautiful and flourishing city, with its well-furnished aûd well-guarded fort (kôte) adorned...
with lofty ramparts (alveri), bastions (kottala), spikes (tene), flag-staffs (denkani), trenches (agalu) and guardrooms at the entrances (bdgila sejje); with its broad main streets (visāla vidhigalu), named after the Sun and the Moon (Ravi-Sasi vidhi), lined with the storeyed mansions (harmya; upparige) of princes, nobles and chiefs; with its minor streets (kēri), wherein resided poets, scholars, ministers, courtiers, people following different trades and professions (including the courtезans), merchants and the military, among others; and with its principal gates (namely, the Eastern Gāte, the Mysore Gāte and the Bijāpur Gāte) lined with horse-stables (asvagala lāya) and elephant-stables (gajada sālegalu), containing horses and éléphants captured in war (with Bijāpur and Tirumala Nāyaka of Madura, etc.) and sent in as tribute by the Changālvas and by the chiefs of Koḍāgu (Coorg), Konkāna, Kongu, Maleyāḷa and other places. 70}

70. K. N. V. (1569), VI, 5-74, 91, 93, 193; VII, 1-3. Compare the general topography of Seringapatam, described here, with the topography of Vijayanagar as given by Domingo Paes (1520) (Sewell, A Forgotten Empire, pp. 264-269). The two accounts are not identical but the similarity in respect of outlines of planning is rather striking from the point of view of influence of Vijayanagar traditions on Mysore. See also i.n. 71 infra. Among the various classes of people depicted in the K. N. V., as residing in Seringapatam during the reign of Kaṇṭhārava were: the nobility (dora manuyāyar), poets and scholars (kawigaḷa, vidussera), connoisseurs of arts (kalka-konidaru), ministers (mantri-gaḷa), accountants (karambha), physicians (vaidya), songsters (gayaḥ), actors, buffoons and confidants (nāṭa-māyaṇa, parahaska, vinoḍaṇa), Brāhmana, Vokkaliga, Śivābhaktas, Vīra-Vaishnavas, courtisans (sāleṣṭri, sāle-vaṭṭa, vṛṣṭa-vaṭṭa), dancers (natyaviga), perfumers (gandiga), metal workers (bōgra), oil-mongers (tilgāṭaka), copper-smiths (tama-mardaṇa), painters (caṭrifta), weavers (dēṭaṇa), barbers (nagindra), tailors (chippigaḷa), cobblers (mucchigaḷa), athletes (maḷaḷa), conjurers (jālāgari), merchants (kārappeda gṛhaṇa), torchbearers (dāvaṭgāra), cattle-keepers (kollageyara), mahouts (gajōr-bakaḷa), royal cavaliers (rāya-vastula), foot-soldiers skilled in handling weapons (baṭṭaśravahala mahāḥgraṇa), heads of the military (vōṭrīgāra nāyakaṇa) and menials (śiggadāruṇa) (VI, 5-74, 91, 93, 193; VII, 1-9, etc.). For details of arms, ammunition, etc., stored in the Seringapatam fort, see Appendix IX. The K. N. V. is mainly drawn upon throughout this section, making due allowance for the prevailing exotic sentiment (Arhyagore) and the literary devices employed by the contemporary poet, Gōvinda-Vaidya. For a detailed account and estimate of the work, see under Literary activity.
the city was the king's Palace (àramane), with its superbly sculptured masonry walls (bhitti), exquisitely carved storeys (nelevâda, upparigé) and the most artistically decorated pavillons and apartments, namely, Hiriya-hajâra (principal or Durbâr Hall), Lakshmi-vilâsa, Saundaryâ-vilâsa, Madana-vilâsa, Durgâ-maṇṭapa, Sâradâ-maṇṭapa, Bhuvanesvari, Indirâ-mandira, Ban-gâra-chaukiy Vijaya-bhavana, Chitra-sâle (picture-gallery), Âyudha-sâle (armoury), Nâtaka-sâle (théâtre), Majjana-sâle (batb-room), Nâma-tîrtha-bhavana (Nâma-tîrtha pavilion), Bhôjana-sâle (dining-hall), Bokkasa . . . bhândâra (treasury vaults), etc. Conspicuous also in the city were the temples of Lakshmi-Narasimha (newly constructed, with prâkâra, pillars, capitals, richly ornamented canopy, tower with pinnacle, brindâvanam, dîpa-mâlâ pillar, maṇṭapas, vâhanams, garbha-grha, etc.) and Ranganâtha (with the prâkâra, dîpa-mâlâ pillar, maṇṭapas, tapestried canopy, sculptured figures of éléphants at the gâtes, dvârapâlakas, the images of Varadarâja, Mannâr-Narasimha, Vênugôpâla, shrines of Ranganâtha and the goddesses, images of Emberumannâr

71. Ibid., VII, 21-38; XXII, 56-60. The Palace at Seringapatam, above referred to, no longer exists. The extensive site where it was located (i.e., to the right of the temple of Ranganâtha) is now marked by a commemorative maṇḍap—pointing to the birthplace of H. H. Šri Krishnarâja Wôjeyar III—put up by H. H. Šri Krishnarâja Wôjeyar IV on July 1, 1918 (see Myâ. Gas., II, iv, 8144). It is, however, interesting to note that the present Palace at Mysore corresponds, in respect of principal chambers and apartments, with the old Palace at Seringapatam. This is, perhaps, an indication of how the Vijayanâgar idea has persisted through centuries. Seringapatam having been, for long, the seat of the southern (or Karnâṭaka) viceregal, there seems little doubt that the Palace there was closely modelled after the Vijayanâgar one and improvements effected thereto from time to time by the rulers of Mysore. For a connected account of the influence of Vijayanâgar traditions on Mysore, vide Appendix IX.

Compare the description of the interior of the Palace at Vijayanâgar as given by Fâes (Sewall, Ibid., l.c). Although Fâes, being a foreign observer, could not be expected to mention the exact names of all the apartments in that Palace, yet the description left by him would seem to correspond, in respect of the principal items, with the account of the Palace at Seringapatam. The similarity is thus significant.
and the Àlvârs, etc.): 73 Among other temples in different parts of the city were those of Tiruvenkatēsvara (in the Agarada-kēri, i.e., agrahâra), Tirumalēévara and Bēte-Râya (in the Akkiya-kēri, i.e., street where rice was bought and sold), Gangâdhârâévara, Virēsa, Morâdiya-Tirumalâ-Raya, Narasimha-Mûrti and Bâgila-Venkatēsvara (situated in the Hora-kēri, i.e., outskirts of the city). 78 Among the maths in the city were Doddâ'Hâmpaiyâna-matha, Mûleya-matha, Viraktara-matha and Dâsôhada-matha 74

Another flourishing city during the reign was Mysore, with its well-equipped and equally well-guarded fort adorned with the newly constructed spirals (nûtana tene), ramparts, bastions, flag-staffs and the moat; with its main streets and minor streets—lined with storeyed mansions and houses inhabited by princes, courtiers, poets, scholars and professional people (including courtezans); with its éléphant and horse stables and the armoury (jina-êâle); with its Palace, containing the Durbâr Hall (ôlaga-sâle, kiriya-hajâra, hajårâda-totti), council-chamber (mantana-grha), picture-gallery (chitrada-châvadi), théâtre (nàtaka-sâle), dining-hall (bhôjana-sâle), bed-chamber (sejjeya sadana), chandra-sâle, nàmatirthâ pavilion (nàmatîrtha-chauki), front verandah (moga-sâleya totti) and abode of worship (aramaneya dēgula); and with its temples of Trinayana (Trînësvara), Lakshmi-kânta, Bagila-Hanuma and Bhôgi-Bhûshana and Kâla-Bhairava (on the tank-bund, tatakadēriyali). 75

76. Ibid, 11,36-82, 107, 109-111; see also C. Vam., 45-46; Annals, I. 79-80.
The planning of the town of Mysore and of the Palace there seems to have been distinctly after the Vijayanagar modela at Seringapatam (see f.n. 70 and 71 supra). Among the various classes of people depicted in the K. N. V. as residing in Mysore during the reign of Kanthirava were: members of the Royal Family (Râjaputraru), poets, scholars and disputants (karani karu, Vîda-sastra-sampannaru, tarkikaru), musicians, including lutists (gayakaru, nadavidaru, vainikaru)," danoers (nâtuviça), libertines, jesters and confidants (vīt a vidushaka nagarika pîthama/rdana)," courtezans (Sûfâgēriy vēēya-vî^a)
Among the towns, Mêlkôṭe was, ris already teterred tô, a prominent centre of Sri-Vaishnâvism, with its main gâte (perbâgilu), principal street (Srî-vïdhi), Srî-gôpura-dvâra, pond (katyâmi), temple of Tirunârâyanâsâvâmi (with the images of the God and the Goddess and the Sri-Vaishnava saints, the Ranga-mantâpa, etc.) and the Palace (aramane), with the inner pavilion (ola-chauki) and the nâmatîrtha pavilion (nàmatîrthada chauki). 76

The gêneral conditions of living during the period, particularly in the cities of Seringapatam and Mysore, are perhaps best reflected in the références77 to the storeyed mansions (harmya, upparige, karumâda) of the richer classes; houses—with flat roofs (mâlige) and plastered pavements (kuṭṭima)—of the middle classes; and the ordinary dwellings (mane) of the humbler folk. The market-place (angadi-këri)78 in thèse cities was an index of the growing wealth of the times, which is further evidenced by the marked taste for luxuries that was being exhibited by the people of the higher strata of society—particularly in their use of silken and lace fabrics (patte, paithâni, dukûlì, chînâmbara, pîtâmbara, jaratâri)79 and ornaments of various descriptions as, for instance, ear, finger and nose rings (chaukuli, ôle, ungura mûguti), bangles, wristlets, bracelets and anklets (bale, kadaga, kankana, nêvura or nûpura) and strings, necklaces, medallions and tassels (sara, hâra, padaka,  

athletes (martâris) and people of different castes and creada (nâmâ-varga janâra) (II, 66-74, 82, 107). For details of arms, ammunition, etc., stored in the Mysore fort, vîde Appendix IX. The Annals (I. 79) refers to jëna-tale for ëna-tale, a colloquial form. See also f.n. 70 supra.

76. C. Vam., 117, 191, 195-183, 188, 147, 149, 169, 166, etc.; see also f.n. 56 infra.

77. K. X. V., II, 66-70, 74-75, 86-89; VI, 56-60, 48-46, 51, 54-62, etc.

78. Ibid., II, 82; VI, 63-74.

79. Ibid., VI, 55, 70; VIII, 82; IX, 71; X, 21; XXI, 112; XXII, 19, 58, 72; XXIII, 60-66; XXIV, 44; XXV, 56, 73, 88, 100-101, 184, etc.
 Sacred and secular lore alike flourished in their pristine purity and vigour. We have reference to Brāhmanical scholars, "experts in six Sāstras, four Vēdas and the Purānas," in Seringapatam and Mysore; to Śrī-Vaishnava Brihmanas, teaching, expounding and studying the Vēdas, the Draviḍa-Prabandha, poetry (kāvya), logic (tarka), Dharma-sāstras, grammar (sābda), Mīmāṃsa, Vēdānta and the Pāṇcharātrāgama, in Mēlkōte; and to oblations to fire (agnihōtradājyāhuti, hōmadhūma) in these places.

Gōvinda-Vaidya, author of the Kanṭhirava-Narasarāja-Vijayam, was himself, as he says, a devoted student of the Vēdas and Sāstras (adhyayanādi sakalamantra-icistrava vēdyavenisi). Alāsingarārya (Singaraiyangār II of Kausika-gōtra, also known as Nṛsimha-Sūri), a typical Śrī-Vaishnava scholar of the time, was, as he is depicted to us, a master of two Systems of philosophy (Udbhaya-Vēdānta), of the texts of Śrī-Bhāṣya and Sruta-Prakāśike, grammar and rhetoric (Pada . . . Vākya), Smriti, Itihāsa, Purāṇas (including the Gīta), Vēda and Vēdānta (including the Upanishads) and the thirty-two Brahma-Vidyas. He is further depicted as wearing a head-dress of red-coloured silken cloth (mudiyol dharisida raktapattōsnīsamum) with projecting and fluttering black and yellow borders (kāla-karbatteya sērangkanālam), having on his forehead the characteristic Śrī-Vaishnava marks (ūrdhva-pundra and sṛī-chūrṇa-tilaka), with earrings (chaukuli), the sacred thread (yajnopāvīta), strings of pearls (muttinekkasara) and of tulasi and tāvare rosaries.

80. Ibid., II, 91-96, 98-99; VI, 66-69, 102-104; IX, 71-73; X, 20-21; XXI, 14-17; XXIII, 81; XXIV, 18-26; XXV, 73-83, 90-91, 101, etc.
81. Ibid., VI, 41; IX, 72; C. Vam., 115, 152-158; see also f.n. 85 infra.
82. C. Vam., 46-48. References from this work are, chronologically, applicable to the reign of Kanṭhirava-Narasarāja Wōgēyar, of whom both Alāsingarārya and his friend, Doḍḍadēvarāja, were contemporaries, vide Appendix V—(3); see also under Domestic life.
83. Ibid., 42.
84. Ibid., I, 11.
85. Ibid., 46-48.
(tolasidâvare-manigala, sarangalum), and as having covered his entire body with a pair of white-coloured garments of silk (meyyol podedutta dhavala-pattâm-Suka-yugalamum). Vedic students at Mêlkôte are described as holding in their hands the palâsa staff (pidida palâsa-dandamum), wearing white garments (utta belvatte), the thread of maunji grass thrice surrounding their waists (mûrum balasum suttida maunjiyum) and the sacred thread (yajnôpavîta), and covering their bodies with the antelope's skin (podeda krishnâjinamum) and the ûrdhva-pundra marks. Scholars reciting the Prabandha are referred to as having a serene countenance (éânti-rasam tumbi) and wearing the Srî-Vaishnava marks on their bodies and red-coloured garments and strings of tulasi and tâvare beads (podedutta talirgâviydegalum dharisida tulasi-tâvare-inaî-gala-malsarangalum). The Epies and the Purânas Were, we find, popular with the folk. Among secular subjects, poetry, music and dancing occupied a prominent place in the fashionable society of the time. Women generally appear depicted as cultured and accomplished.

In contrast with the peace and studied quiet normally prevailing at Mêlkôte, daily life in the capital city, and to some extent in Mysore city also, appears to have been, ordinarily, full of bustle and excitement. This was due to the fact that these places were as much of military as of civil importance. We have references to scènes of horses

---

87. Ibid, 152. 88. Ibid. 89. K. At. F., V, 5-60; VIII, 86; XVIII, 143-148; XI, 118, 122; O. Vam., 160, etc. 90. Ibid, 11, 72-73; V I, 42, 48,56,176-177; VIII, 19, 83-36, 66-69; XI, 64-88, 108-116, 118-122, etc. Références to Bharatâchirya and the technique of dancing as described in his Natya-Sastra are significant. Dancing, as an art, appears to have attained a high standard of technical perfection during the period. 91. Ibid, VII, 44; VIII, 70-76, 81; XXIV, 4-6, 16, etc.; seealsof.n. 100 infra. 92. Ibid, I I , 66-66 ; V I, 83, 68.
and éléphants passing through the streets to and from the watering-places and to royal cavaliers (râya-râvutaru) riding through the city. Of perhaps greater interest are scènes\(^93\) of princes and sons of the nobles (râjaputraru, arasu-makkalu), in the public streets of the city, engagea inprancing the horses (tëjigalanu kunisuvaru), riding the young éléphants at will (kalabhavanu bïdivarisuva) and taking an active interest in witnessing ram-fights (tagara jagala), bull-fights (gûli-kâlagagala), c o c k - f i g h t s (kukkutagala kâdipa) and fights of wagtails and other birds (sipale, gaujala, etc.) ; of the sons of chiefs (doregala kuvararu) returning from the gymnasium (garadi) with weapons in their hands ; of princesses passing through, seated in palankeens (pallakkiyëri) ; of fashionable people (sogasugâraru) walking along the prominent parts of the city ; and of watersheds (aravattigé) where water was being distributed to thirsty wayfarers. Dice (pagade) and chess (chadurunga) seem to hâve formed the common items of amusements in the polite society of the period.\(^94\)

More impressive still was the court culture of the period : the Palace at Seringapatam, no less at Mysore,\(^95\) with the richly tapestried and ornamented halls and chambers, adorned by architraves (bôdige)y pillars (kamba), roofings (love), canopies (melkattugalu) and fissures and lattices (bhittigalû, jâlândra), was itself a scène of great attraction. Indeed it was another index of the wealth of the capital city ; the tastes of the times found adéquate expression hère. Among the items of dress and personal adornment of Kanthïrava-Narasarâja Wođeyar, generally, Were\(^96\) garments overlaid with high class pearls (kattâni-nrnttu-tetidisudige-y olalavatt . . u-mereda-duppâlade),

\(^{93}\) Ibid, I I , 76-77 ; VII, 10-20; I I , 54 ; VI, 75-80, 197.
\(^{94}\) Ibid, I I , 76, 96-97 ; VI, 117-120, 197.
\(^{96}\) Ibid, VII, 90-43, 96. Ibid, XXIV, 61-74; XXII, 60.
ornamented coatee (navaratna-khachitada . . . kalli), filigreed turban (misuniya rummālu) set with a crest of diamonds (divya vajrada mirupa turāyi, sirpēsh turāyi), tīkā of musk on his forehead (nosalige katturi-tīlaka), ear-rings of pearls and sapphkes (muttina chaukuli, nilada bāvuli), necklaces, medallions (kāṇṭha-māle, padaka) and rings of precious stones (nava-ratna), wristlets and bracelets (kāḍaga, kankaṇa, tōla-bhāpuri) set with pearls, waistbands (kāṭi-sūtra), badges for the feet (charana-penḍeyagalu), set with, it is said, precious stones from the crowns of supplicant chiefs (ēarāṇāgata-rāda doregalā mukutā-ratnagalā), and ornamented sandals (ratnada hàvuge). On cérémonial occasions Kaṇṭhīrava is depicted as wearing an outer silken garment (patṭeya dhōṭra), upper cloth (bahirvāsa) and a coloured head-dress (rcmgu māṇikada kulāyi), with the usual tīkā of musk (katturi-nāma) on the forehead. Prominent courtiers like the Dalavāi, ministers (mantri-ēaru) and chiefs (maṇḍalikas) are mentioned as wearing silken garments (pairāne duppāta, paītaṇe ya dukāla), lace turbans (jaratāra rummālu, munḍāsu) and ear-rings, necklaces and medallions. The royal cavaliers (rāya-rāvutaru), military oflicers (nāyakaru), prominent warriors (subhataru), officials of the king's body-guard (maigāvalūligadavaru) and the attendants in the king's Personal service (sammukhadūligadavaru) are referred to as wearing close-collared long coats (dagale), silken waistbands or sashes (patṭeya datti), red-coloured loin cloth (kunkuma-gāēē), upper garment (uttarige), ear-rings, bracelets, wristlets, etc. The accomplished ladies of the court (kōviâeyaru), including the queens (rāniyaru), appear depicted as wearing silken and lace garments (patte, pītāmbarā, chināmbarā) of variegated colours and

98. Ibid, XXII, 82; XXIII, 79-81, 88; XXV, 79, 88, 86, 100, 102, etc.
99. Ibid, XXIII, 84-89.
pattens \( (\text{chandragâvi}, \ \text{poppuli}, \ \text{bombeya-barahada-patte}, \ \text{etc}) \), and ornaments of various kinds.\(^{100}\)

Among the personal servants of Kaçṭhîrava, as already indicated, were some of the subjugated feudatories themselves. Thus, Muddaiya of Nàgamangala was the bearer of the king's pouch \( (\text{hadapa}) \); Nanjanna of Malavalli was a menial \( (\text{sanchi}) \); Râjaiya of Terakanâmbi was the bearer of the spittoon \( (\text{kâlanji}) \); Guruvanna of Kannambâdi, of the goblet \( (\text{chambu}) \), and Kottûraiya of Kikkëri, of the cérémonial garments \( (\text{pavadè})\)\(^{101}\). Other officials in the personal service of Kaçṭhîrava were\(^ {102} \): Basavaiya, bearer of his sword \( (\text{Narasarâjendrana kattiya pididiha}) \); Vîranna, head of the Avasarada-hôbli \( (\text{uvasaradadhika Viranna}) \) department (a service attending to urgent calls in the Palace); Venkaţâpati-Jêtî, personal attendant of the king \( (\text{bhûpana charanâbja-vididiha}) \); Dhafcvôjaiya, furnisher of ornaments \( (\text{âbharanava tandlva}) \); Krishnâiya, lute-player \( (\text{vîneya}) \); Bhârati-Nanja, poet \( (\text{kavi}) \); and Sangaiya, jester \( (\text{hâsyada}) \). He had also servants to hold mirrors \( (\text{kcmnadiyavanu}) \), chowries \( (\text{kuncha}) \) and fans \( (\text{bîsanige}) \), besides the Huzûr minister \( (\text{râyara sammukhada mantri})\).\(^ {103}\)

The daily Durbâr \( (\text{nityôtsavadôlaga}) \) of Kaçṭhîrava, during the period, was noted for its magnificence and was fully expressive of the spirit of the times. Ordinarily

\(^{100}\) Ibíd, XXIV, 5, 15, 18-48, etc.; see also f.n. 79 and 60 supra and text there; the ladies of the court are frequently referred to as having been well-versed in astrology, poetry, drama, music and \text{astras} \( (\text{gyôbîsa kavya nafaka \text{astras} sangita-riti kôvideyaru; nanda bago vidyadabala-yaru; arma \text{astras} kôvideyaru—Ibíd, VII, 44; VIII, 31 and XXIV, 5, etc.)\). See the accounts of Pess and Nunis for similar contemporary references to the culture of court ladies (their costume, personal adornment, etc.), particularly at the court of Vîjeyanagar (Sewell, Ibíd, pp. 271-274, 283, etc.; also Mys. Gaz., II, iii. 1906-1907).

\(^{101}\) Ibíd, XXV, 54-55, 57-59.

\(^{102}\) Ibíd, 76-77, 80, 86-87, 92.

\(^{103}\) Ibíd, 79, 89.
Kanthïrava used to hold the Durbâr during night, in the Lakshmi-vilasa chamber of his Palace at Seringapatam, seated on the jewelled and richly ornamented throne, "served by twice-eight fair ones, holding chowries: in their hands," and honoured with the emblems in gold of the fish, crocodile, conch and discus. Among those who used to attend his Durbâr were musicians (gâya-karu), poets Qcavigalu, Vedic scholars (Vêda-vidaru), Bhâratis (reciters of the Bhârata), disputants (târkika-rur), intimate ministers (âpta-mantrigalu), accountants (karatiêkairu), the Commander-in-Chief (dalapati), royal cavaliers (râya-râvutaru), feudatories and chiefs (manneya'mcmêdlikaru), and ambassadors from foreign courts (dikku-dikkina doregalâ râyabhùrigalu). Dancing (nâtya) and music of the guitar (tumbura) and the luté (vîna); learned disputations of scholars in Bhûràta, Purânas, dramaturgy (nâtaka), politics (nitiriâstra), logic (tarka) and grammar (éabda), recitation and expounding of the Epics (Bhûrata-Râniyana-pûnya-katheya sâratarade . . . ödi); submission of reports by the ministers, Dalavâi, feudatories and others; and the honouring of the Durbârîs with bêtel and clothes (vîleya, tidêgoré)—these were among the principal items of the programme of the Durbâr, at the end of which Kanthïrava used to retire to his apartment in the Palace.\[104\] Among the local titles by which Kanthïrava

104. E. C., V (1) and (2) Ag. 64. See text on p. 787 of V (2):

Śrî-Hangêlapurê svakîya bhavanê Lakshmi-vilâsa vadâ
Nând chitrê viçitrê manilasaat simhâ-tandâmîhitaâ
Charuvakâraya-chûmarînchika-karun kundâjanâsêvitâk
Sauvamâray jhâsa-sankha-chakra-makavāi sat-kitaâbhî gojitaâ||

K. N. V., VIII, 1-95; see also ibid., XI, 126; XV, 119; XXV, 11, etc., referring to Kanthïrava being served by chamber-maids. Cf. Fae's account referring to the king's daily routine, dancing, chamber-maids, etc., in the Palace at Vijayanagar (Wecoll, ibid., pp. 249, 265-279; also Mya. Gare., II. iii., 1807). Wilks (I. 61) speaks of Kanthïrava as having been "noted as the author of a new and more respectful etiquette at his court" (Italics ours)—a position confirmed and supplemented by the account given above.
was addressed during the Durbârs of the period were: 105 Karnâta-ka-Chakrêêvara (Emperor of the Karnâta country); Andhra-bala-sangha-karikula (herd of éléphants to the forces of the Andhra chiefs), Aryândhra-nripa-garva-parvata kuliéâyudha (thunderbolt to the mountain, the proud Andhra kings); Tirumala-Nâyaka-chêçiturangabala-vallari-lavitra (sickle to the bunch, the four-fold army of Tirumala Nâyaka); Parabala-mêghânîla (gale to the clouds in the form of armies of hostile kings); Ripurâya-nikara-éarabha-bhërrunda (double-headed eagle to the assemblage of enemy kings); Samastórvîéamakuta-manigana-ranjita-pâda-padma (with the assemblage of precious stones from the crowns of various chiefs, shining at his feet); Sangara-vijaya-vadhûtïia (lord of the goddess of victory on the field of battle); and Kôte-kôlâhala (occupier of forts amidst great uproar). These titles, literary flourishes apart, are indicative of the profound impression created by Kaçithîrava's political position on his local contemporaries during c1642-1648.

By far the most characteristic expression of contemporary life is discernible in the public festivals celebrated during the period. These attracted not only the local populace but people from far and near. All classes of people appear freely participating in them. The birthday (Tirunakshatram) of èrî-Kâmânujâchâryar, annually celebrated at Mëlkôte under the constellation of Aridrâ in the month of Ghâttra (March-April), was, according to the 106 Chikkadëvarâya-Vaméâvali, a great festival (piriyukkevam), attended by Srî-Vaishnava celebrities.

105. K. N. V., I, 21-22, 26-27; XII, 85, 89; XIV, 49, 111; XVIII, 174; XIX, 66; XXI, 126; XXV, 18, etc. Cf. inscriptions of Kaçithîrava, only some of which mention his usual titles, namely, Bûrû-antimâbha-yañña, Rajâkhêrâya-paramêhâra, Srî-Virupâtâpa [See E. O., III (1) Sr. 108; V (1) and (2) Cn. 160, 165; IV (3) Ch. 429; Hg. 49, for the years 1642-1655.]

106. p. 119.
from different countries (palavum divya-dësangalin-dey-
tarpa dësika-sàrtha). Doddadëvaràja Wodeyar (eldest
son of Muppina-Dëvaràja Wođeyar and cousin brother of
Kanthïrava-Narasaràja Wodeyar) from Mysore, it woud
appear,\textsuperscript{107} also paid a visit to Mëlkôṭe on one such
occasion (c. 1643-1644), accompanied by his friend and
preceptor, Alasingarârya, At Seringapatam, the Vasan-
èotsava\textsuperscript{108} (spring festival) and the Dindina-utsava,\textsuperscript{109}
annually conducted for God Ranganàtha during the
bright half of Chaïtra, were evidently very popular; and
Kanthïrava-Narasaràja Wodeyar himself is depicted\textsuperscript{110}
to have once personally witnessed them, accompanied by
his ministers, chiefs and courtiers. Next in importance
and popularity were the Gajëndra-Tirunàl\textsuperscript{111} (Gajëndra*
Mòksha) and the car festival\textsuperscript{112} (rathôtsava) of God
Ranganàtha at Seringapatam. We have an elaborate
account\textsuperscript{113} of these as conducted about February
1647, when\textsuperscript{114} Lingarâjaiya (Lingarâjëndra) was
the Dalavài of Karithïrava in succession to Nanja-
râjaiya, and when Linge-Gauda was the Mayor of
the capital city. The Gajëndra-Tirunàl formed
part of the programme of the car festival of Ranga-
nàtha and was preceded by the initiatory ceremony
(ankuràrpana) and the flag-hoisting ceremony
(dhvaja-
patârôhana) and by such processions of the God as the
Pušhpakôtsava, Sêshôtsava and Garudôtsava.\textsuperscript{115} It was
conducted on the sixth day at the Tirunàl-maritapa\textsuperscript{116} (in
the Suka-tûrtha of the Kanthirava-sarôvara, newly
constructed during the early years of Kanthirava's reign)

\textsuperscript{107} See O. Pâm., 110, 159-160; see also under Domestic life and f.n. 107
infra.
\textsuperscript{108} K. N. V., VII, 110; IX, 56; also see Mys. Gaz., II. iii. 1906 (citing
S. K. Aiyangar's Sources, pp. 142-148, and referring to the popularity
of the Chaïtra festival in Vijayanagar).
\textsuperscript{109} Ibid, IX, 59.
\textsuperscript{110} Ibid, 56, 59, 67, 98-100, etc.
\textsuperscript{111} Ibid, VII, 110; XXIII, 22-29, 51-58.
\textsuperscript{112} Ibid, VII, 109; see also Chs. XXII-XXV.
\textsuperscript{113} Ibid, Chs. XXIII-XXV.;
\textsuperscript{114} Ibid, XXIII, 21-29; XXV, 44, 56.
\textsuperscript{115} Ibid, XXIII, 41-60.
\textsuperscript{116} Ibid, 51-59.
and was followed by the car festival of Ranganātha and the 
Asvārōhanōtsava, Jalakridōtsava, the Pushpahōtsava 
and other items of services.117 The capital city of 
Seringapatam was tastefully decorated on the occasion, 
it presenting a gay and festive appearance. And there 
was a huge concourse of people (including, it is said, 
the Telugas, Tīguḷas, Konkaças, Maleyālas and the 
Karoātas) assembled to witness the festivities.118 We 
hâve not only a spectacle119 of KaçLṭhūrava himself wit-
nessing the Gajēridra-Tirunāl-Utsavam but also a 
picturesque scène120 in which he is depicted as proceeding 
to take part in the car festival of Eanganātha, seated on 
the state horse (divyāēva) and accompanied by his Dalāvāi, 
ministers, feudatories, courtiers and others and ail the 
insignias, and as returning to the Palace after perform-
ing his dévotion to the God.

Of greater popularity and significance in the social and 
public life of the capital city was the 
Mahānavami (Navarātri)121 festival. It 
used to be celebrated with considérable 
grandeur by Kaṇṭhūrava-Narasarāja Woḍeyar in the

117. Ibid, XXIII, 64-74; XXV, 106-118, etc.
118. Ibid, XXIII, 24-49, 76-77. 
119. Ibid, 55, 56.
120. Ibid, XXIV, 49-57; XXIII, 76-107; XXV, 1-118.
121. The Mahānavami (or Navarātri), according to the Kaḷṭhū-Puraṇa, is a 
festival celebrated during the first nine days of the bright half of 
Āśvina (September-October) of every year in honour of the 
manifestations of Durgā or Chaṇḍikā (Chaṇḍikā-Navardī), the consort 
of Śiva. Its actual conclusion with the functions of the tenth day 
(Vijayākātam), however, endows it with the character of a ten days' 
festival, whence it is now familiarly known as Desara (from Desarē in 
Mhr.). For an account of Desara in its traditional and Paurāṇic 
aspects, see late Mr. B. Ramakrishna Rao’s article on the subject (in 
the C. J. M. S., Vol. XI, pp. 301-313). In respect of the main items of 
the programme, Desara, as observed nowadays in Mysore, differs but little 
from the festival as conducted in Seringapatam during historical times. 
The similarity is striking to a degree. Compare also the Mahānavami 
festival in Viṣṇujyāner as described by Fass (Sewell, Ibid, pp. 265-279). 
The similarity becomes more striking still—another indication of the 
influence of Viṣṇujyāner traditions on Mysore. An important point 
in regard to Desara as celebrated in Seringapatam is that, as we shall 
see, we have an accurate and exhaustive account of it by a local 
contemporary who adds considerably to our knowledge of the subject,
autumn (September-October) of every year, in keeping with the traditions set up by his predecessors and with his own local position and status. During the first eight days of the festival Kaçthîrava used to hold the public Durbâr (oddôlaga) in his Palace. On the ninth day, he would worship the weapons (in the armoury) and horses and éléphants, and on the tenth, he would proceed in state to perform the Sami-pujâ outside the capital city. The Kanthïrava-Narasarâja- Vijayam of Gôvinda-Vaidya contains an elaborate contemporary picture of the entire course of the Mahânâvami festival as conducted by Kaçthîrava in September 1647 when he had reached the summit of his power. The following is an account of it as gleaned from the poeni.

At the approach of autumn, Kanthïrava, in consultation with the astrologers, fixed up the programme of the Mahânavami. Dalâvâi Lingarajaïya was desired to look after the necessary preliminaries. Linge-Gauda, the Mayor of the capital city, under instructions from the Dalâvâi, attended to the beautification of Seringapatam and the Palace, including the Durbâr Hall (Olagâ-sâle, Asthâna-mantapa), Chandra-sâle, armoury (Āyudha-sâle), stores

for which we had, hitherto, to rely solely on the account of Pass applicable only to Vijayanagar. Wilks (p. 61) refers to Kanthïrava as noted for his "having first celebrated with suitable splendour the feast of the Mahanomi or Dossara" [Italics ours]. Although, as indicated in an earlier chapter, Raja Wodeyar is reputed to have inaugurated the festival in Mysore, Wilks's position, so far as Kaçthîrava is concerned, is more than confirmed and supplemented by the authentic account given here. Cf. S. K. Aiyangar, Ancient India, p. 290.

122. Chs. XX-XXII.
123. Since the writing of the K. N. V. was completed on May 22, 1643 (see section on Literary activity) and since Lingarajaïya of Hura (Lingarajendra) is stated to have been the Dalavai of Kaçthîrava (XX, 61, 66), and Linge-Gauda is mentioned as the Mayor of Seringapatam (XX, 60), at the time of the Mahânâvami festival described in the work, we cannot but place the event in September 1647, Lingarajaïya himself having succeeded to the office of Dalâvai in January 1647 (vide section on Ministers, Officers and Dalavais). Aditya Pr. 1-10 (the period of the Mahânâvami festival) in 1647 fell between 19-28th September (see Ind. Ep., VI. 97).
(Ulupeya-māne, Ugrāṇa), cisterns of curds, ghee and oil (Dadhi-ghṛita-taila-vdpī) and wardrobe (Uḍugoregala-bōkkaśada-grha). Presently the stables of horses and éléphants and the streets of Seringapatam kept up a gay appearance. Camps (bīḍāra) were laid out for the lodging of kings and chiefs from different places (dese-deseyinda . . . baha vasumatiēara) and of other visitors from outside (namely, scholars, reciters, athlètes, acrobats, courtezans, músieians, actors, conjurers, etc.), while kitchens and feeding-houses (pākada-grha, bhōjana-sāle, dāsōhada-grha) were put up (for the learned, Vīra-Vaishēvas, Śrī-Vaishnavas, elderly Mahantas, Mathādhipatis, Jōgis, Jangamas, the indigent and the détectives).

Kanthīrava next got addressed palm-leaf letters (uttaragalāṇu, ōleya barisida) to the ruling chiefs and feudatories, inviting them to the festival. The chiefs of Narasimhapura (Hole-Narasipur), Bēlūr, Kuriigal, Māgadi, Nanjarāyapaṇṭa, the Bēḍa chief and the Koḍagu, Maleyāḷa, Konkaṇa and Tujuva chiefs went over to Seringapatam with presents (kānike), while the local feudatories of Kanthīrava proceeded thither with tribute and large supplies in addition (balu vulupe kānike kappa sahita). Ikkēri, Tanjore (Tanjāvūru), Madura (Madhure) and Gingee (Tenje, Tenji, Chenje) were among the distant powers represented. Among other invitées were scholars (sūrigalu, vidvāmsaru), functionaries (viniyōgigalu), celebrities (prasiddha-purusharu), experts in éàstras (siddhāntigalu), musicians (gāyakaru), reciters (pātha-karu) and the élite of the city (nāgarika . . . ēringāra-purusharu). The capital city was soon overcrowded with people from various places (nānā-dēēada jana-jāla-vaitandu Pattanake . . . kikkiridiha).

125. Ibid, XX, 52-75 ; XXI, 58-54. For the names of chiefs, feudatories, etc., see under Feudatorieī.
On the first day of the bright half of Āvijdy the Brâhmans performed the purificatory cérémonies (Punyârchane, hôma) over the Durbâr Hall, the horse and éléphant stables and the armoury. The nine days* festival in honour of Chañdîkâ and her sister deities [Ghandikâmbike (yard) navarâtriya pûje] was inaugu-rated by the solemn propitiation of Goddess Bettada-Châmunḍî, the tutelary deity (maneya-dêvate) of the Mysore Boyal Family. This was followed by the sumptuous feeding of Brâhmans and ail classes of people in the city. Large crowds from the city, the townships and villages and distant places (purajana, parijana, nânâ-dêêada-jana), men, women and children dressed and adorned according to différent tastes and fashions, witnessed the daily Durbâr of Kanthîrava during the first eight day s of the festival.196 Every day Kanthîrava used to hold his Durbâr (Mahânavami oddôlagôtsava) during morning and night. At an auspicious moment (subha-muhûrtada vêleyali). the images of Gods Banganâtha and Lakshmî-Narasimha used to be taken in procession to the Durbâr Hall and placed on the jewelled seats (ratna-pitha). Then Dalavâi Lingarâjaiya, dressed in state, would proceed to welcome the king to the Durbâr Hall, accompanied by the courtiers, ministers, chiefs and karanikas and with ail the insignias and military honours. Meanwhile, Kanthîrava, having adorned his person, would hâve left his apartment, Venkatapati-Jetti most respectfully leading him. Seated in the palânkeen (pallakkiyanëri), he would proceed towards the Durbâr Hall under the shade of the pearl umbrella (muttina sattigeya nelalinali), accompanied by instra- mental music, the recitations of the panegyrists and by the emblems (like the chowries and fans, the makara banner, éankha, chakra, etc.)—evidently a picturesque scène

witnessed with considérable interest by the spectators. Àt the Durbâr Hall, Kanthîrava would alight the palankeen, the Daḍavâi most ceremoniously leading him. Performing obeisance to Gods Banganàtha and Narasimha, he would next occupy the jewelled throne (navaratnada gaddugeyali manḍiśi). In the meantime, the Palace officiais (of the Avasarada-hôbli départaient) would be actively engagea in assigning seats in the Durbâr Hall to the ministers, chiefs, scholars and others according to their respective ranks and status (irisidaru . , . attaravaritru). There used to be regular rows (sâlu-sâlu) of chiefs and feudatories (manneya-manḍalikara), of royal cavaliers (râya-râvutara), of courtezans (sûleyarugala) from différent places, of reciters (pàthakara), of experts in wonderful arts from various countries (chappanna-ctëêada chôdyâ-vidyâdhikara), and of spectators in gênerai (nôtaka-jana)—ail systematically arranged in the interior of the Durbâr Hall (tappade sâlaridantardntara dola-goppavittaru) 127.

The daily Durbâr, during the festival, was regulated in the following manner: The chiefs, feudatories and représentatives of the powers would first pay their homage to the king, tendering their présents (consisting of éléphants, horses and gold). This would be followed by the respectful obeisance of the mahouts, cavaliers, warriors, military officers (Nâyakas) and others. Then there would be thrilling boxing feats of athlètes (mallara hôrâta, kâlaga), arranged in pairs (jôdu-jôdali . , . jättigalu . . . panthade nnîdaru), exciting acrobatie performances of various types (dombarugalu . . . bage-bageyâtava fôrt),ram-fights (tagara kalaga) ,fights of rutting éléphants (madakarigala hôrâta) , and fights of daring men with tigers and bears let loose (puli-karådigala bigînmaparidu kâduva vîmra motta).128 At night, the splendour of the

Durbâr of Kanthirava used to be enhanced by the illuminations (dipa-kântigalu, dîvatigegalu), and the programme would consist of the following items: dancing (nâtya), including kôlâtam (a play of sticks in alternate motions); display of feats by conjurers (indrajâlava tôruva mandi); mimicry and comic (bairûpa-dîtagaλa hâsyâ-rasagalinda); enactment of Daêâvatâras of Vishîm by the Bhâravatas (Hariya-Daêâvatârada-nâtakava tôri mereva Bâgavatara); vocal music and music of the lute (gânava pâduva viâvâmsarugalu, viñeya vâdîpa vidvâmsarugalu); display of skill in poetical composition (lakshya-lakshaṇa kâvyâ nâṭaka alankâra éôbhitate balu padya krti bandhava naďnutajâna kavigalu) and the musical recitation of the Mahâbhârata and the Bâmâyana by the Bhâratis (Bhârata-Râmdyana, sangîta-sûradolage ôdi vaibhavadinda. . . . Bhâratigalu ranjisidaru).

There would also be a display of crackers and fireworks (birîsu bânagalu), such as the chakrabâna, sùtragambha, etc., adding to the beauty of the scene. Then the Durbâris would be duly honoured with bêtel and clothes (vîleya udugoregala) according to their status (antaravaridittu), after which Kanthirava would bring the day’s Durbâr to a close. Adoring Vishru and partaking of the holy water and offerings (Harige vandisi tîrtha prasâdana kondu), he would finally retire to his apartment.

On the ninth day (Mahanavami), the Saundarya-vilâsa chamber of the Palace was beautified and preparations made for the worship of the weapons (which included the sword, lance, bow, cutlass, dagger, knife and the collections from the armoury) and éléphants and horses (âyudha-gajâéva-pûje). Thèse, after being cleaned and washed, were taken in procession to the Âyurfha-mantapa, where
Kapṭbïrava performed their worship. This was followed by the observance by him of the Durgâ-japamâjïd by the elaborate propitiation by the Brâhmans of Goddess Chajjdï and all her manifestations; while in the quadraûgle of the māntapa (āyudha-māṭitapada divyângâṇadoṣage) various items of services (such as music, dance, etc.) were gone through in honour of the occasion.\textsuperscript{130}

On the morning of the tenth day (Vijayadasami), Kapṭbïrava, having finished the daily rites (i.e., washing, bathing, nāma-tïrtham, worship of Vishnu, gifts, acceptance of holy water and offerings, and the bénédic­tions of the Brâhmans), got through the second worship of Chandikâ (mampûjeya Chandikâṁbikege mâdiṣi) and broke into pièces the kûshmânda (pumpkin).\textsuperscript{181} This was the day of the public procession of the king to conduct the éamî-pwjâ which was to take place in the evening. Linge-Gauda (Mayor of Seringapatam) attended to the décoration of the Samï-mantapa, situated to the east, outside the capital city (purada bahirbhâgada pûrva-dêsada). The main street of the city (pura-vïdhi), from the gate of the Palace as far as the mantapa (aramane-bagilim jambisâri-mantapa pariyanta), a distance of nearly three miles (yôjana pariyanta), was befittingly beautified. The entire distance was crowded to the full by spectators from far and near (chaudeseya-dêsada nôtaka­jana), to witness the grandeur of the king's procession ijambï-savâri). Then, at an auspicious moment, the shrines of Gods Banganâtha and Narasimha were taken in procession to the Samï-mantapa. Presently, at the striking of the drum, the army (consisting of gorgeously caparisoned éléphants, horses, chariots and foot) started on its march, and Kapṭbïrava, having suitably adorned his person (smsgaragaidu), proceeded in state, on horse-back (uttamâivavanëri nadedanu), amidst the

\textsuperscript{130} Ibid. XXII, 1-36. \textsuperscript{131} Ibid, 55-69.
resounding notes of the recitations of panegyrists and of musical instruments. He was accompanied by the Dalavâi, ministers, karânjikas, -courtiers, chiefs and feûdatories; by all the emblems of sovereignty, including the pearl umbrella (muttina sattige), the makara banner (makara-tekke) and the fan (âlavatta); and by regular rows of servants (ûligadavaru) holding in their hands the pouch (hâdapa), chowries (châmara), tasselled fan (kuncha), spittoon (kâlânji) and ceremonial clothes (pavade). The Dalavâi, ministers, karânjikas, -courtiers, chiefs and feûdatories; by all the emblems of sovereignty, including the pearl umbrella (muttina sattige), the makara banner (makara-tekke) and the fan (âlavatta); and by regular rows of servants (ûligadavaru) holding in their hands the pouch (hâdapa), chowries (châmara), tasselled fan (kuncha), spittoon (kâlânji) and ceremonial clothes (pavade). The Dalavâi, ministers, karânjikas, -courtiers, chiefs and feûdatories; by all the emblems of sovereignty, including the pearl umbrella (muttina sattige), the makara banner (makara-tekke) and the fan (âlavatta); and by regular rows of servants (ûligadavaru) holding in their hands the pouch (hâdapa), chowries (châmara), tasselled fan (kuncha), spittoon (kâlânji) and ceremonial clothes (pavade).

At the Sami-mantapa, a picturesque scene followed, in which Kanthîrava, having alighted his horse, was seen displaying his skill in archery (singâdiya tegedu ambugalanalavadisi) and in riding at will the state éléphant (pattada âneya sirake langhisi . . . bïdi varisi . . . ). The occasion was also marked by ram-fights (tagara kâdisi) and athletic contests (mallara kâlaga). These amusements were followed by the king's worship of the Sami (the tree Prosopis spicigera Lin.) and his return to the Palace at night, seated on the state éléphant (pattadâne), amidst illuminations of countless torches (lekkavillada . . . divatigegalu) and the resounding noise of crackers and fireworks (bânabirisu). The functions of the tenth day having been completed by the performance of the waving of the lighted camphor (ârati) in the Palace, the Dalavâi dispersed the army and returned to his abode.

Next day the Dalavâi and the karânjikas, under the orders of Karithîrava, made gifts to the needy and duly honoured the chiefs and feûdatories, musicians, scholars, athletes, jesters and others with presents of gold, jewels and clothes. Thus was brought to a conclusion the grand Mahanavami festival conducted by Karîthîrava when he had been established in the sovereignty (sthîra-sâfhrâjyaadolu) of the kingdom of Mysore.

Gifts and présents.

That the time-honoured social idéal of Varnāsrama-dharma was being rigorously enforced by the king and followed by his subjects is amply evidenced by the sources. But side by side with the growth of wealth and luxury, and underlying the gaiety and splendour of city life (particularly in Mysore and Seringapatam), are pictures—though largely idealised and even imaginative to some extent, they cannot but have been entirely divorced from the actualities—depicting prostitution as a growing vice eating slowly into the vitals of contemporary society and indirectly hinting at the idéal of modération as the sine qua non of social and cultural progress. In striking contrast with life in cities was the even tenor of corporate life in the rural parts, of which we have traces during the period.

Kanṭhīrava-Narasarāja Woḍeyar was noted for his patronage of learning. He is said to have been a source of support to scholars (sakala-vidyagjanādāra), providing them all with a living (samasta vibhuḥaērmī-samujjīvanam). He appears himself to have been a person of taste, trained to the appréciation of poetry, music and literature. The titles, Sarasa-vidyā-viēārada, Sangīta-sāhitya-ēāstra-viēārada, ascribed to him cannot be altogether devoid of foundation or significance.

Sanskrit and Kannāḍa literature alike flourished during the reign. While the kāvya style was still adhered to by writers in Sanskrit, Halāgannadā, as a médium of literary expression in Kannāḍa, continued to

---

135. See K. N. V. I, 11; II, 74, 109; IV, 100, 107; V, 50, 52-57; VI, 41, 50-52; IX, 8; XXVI, 80, 82, 84, 86, 89; C. Fum., 87-88, 152-158, 160-161; E. C., III (1) Sr. 108; Nj. 198; IV (2) Yd. 6; V (1) and (2) Ag. 64, etc.
136. Ibid., II, 83-107; VI, 77-188; also Chs. IX and X.
137. See E. C., IV (2) Gr. 10; III (1) Sr. 103; Nj. 108; V (1) and (2) Ag. Cn. 160, 163, 165, etc.; see also under Grants and other records.
139. E. C., V (3) Ag. 64, p. 783 (Text).
140. K. N. V., I, 26; XXV, 1o.
hold its own side by aide with Hosagannada, and the
tendericy of the latter towards displacing the former is
also, to some extent, noticeable in the literary productions
of the period. The poet Nṛhari, son of Narasimhārya,
composed in Sanskrit the Gajjiganahalli copper-plate
inscription\(^{141}\) of Kanthīrava, dated April 7, 1639. Narasimha-Sūri,
son of Śrīnivāsa of Kauēika-gōtra, wrote the
copper-plate grant\(^{142}\) from Tondanūr—also in
Sanskrit—dated April 27, 1647. He seems to have also
composed the Mattigōdu lithic grant\(^{143}\) of Kanthīrava,
another record in Sanskrit of the same date, judging
from the similarity in language of both the records.
Among Kannada writers, Bhāskara (Bāchirāja), son of
Śrī-Varadēva and Lakshmīdēvi, was the author of
Bēhāra-Ganita\(^{144}\) (Vyavahāra-Ganita), a mathematical
work. He refers to himself as a poet (sarasam satkavi-
vallabham) and appears to have had the titles, Ėāradē-
guvara, Ganita-vilāsā. The Bēhāra-Ganita (c.1645-1650)
is written in eight chapters in a mixture of old and new
Kannada—poetry (of the kanda mètre) and prose—each
sūtra being followed by comment and examples. Among
the topics dealt with are compound interest (chahra-
baddi), square measure (mattada-sūtra), chain measure
(birūdīna-lekka?), index numbers or tables (padakada
sūtra), problems in mint mathematics (tenkasaleyalli
kattuva ichchā varnakke sūtra). The work, besides,
contains references to Seringapatam (Rangapura),

\(^{141}\) E. C., III (1) Nj, 198, II. 127-128:
Rad的年轻人Verbose
Karas Śrī-Narasimhārya-nandana Nṛhariṁ kaviḥ

\(^{142}\) Ibid, Sr., 108, II. 163-167:
Śrīmad-Kauēika-nama . . . Śrīnāvāsambaḍēḥ
Purābh Śrī-Narasimha-sūri . . . Kanthīrava-
Kehāpālina niḥdākhatāḥ krīdānām tāschākṣarāmyskārīt

\(^{143}\) Ibid, V (1) and (2) Ag. 64. See also f.n. 84 and 86 supra.

work, entitled Bhāskara-Ganita, contains reference to Rājaditya, a
mathematician, and deals with arithmetic and astrology. It differs,
however, from the Ms. noticed in the Kar. Ka. Och.
Chamarāja and Kanthirava-Naïasa (Narasabhûpa). 145 Timmarasa wrote the Mārkandēya-Rāmāyana146 (c. 1645-1650), a, Halāgannadā poetical work in the Vârdhika-shaipadi mètre, in 30 chapters and 1,000 stanzaa. The poet rēfers to himself as the son of Karaṇika Bulla of Pâlkurike, of the Kannadiga-vaméa, Bhāradvāja-gōtra, Ásvalāyana-sūtra and Rig-Vēda. He arefers also to Yadugiri (Mēlkōte) Nārāyaṇa and Yadugiri Narasimha. Although th'ere are no further particulars about him in the work, he seems identical with Timma-ṭasa, ministe-r-in-chief of Kanthirava-Narasarâja Wodeyar, who is said to hâve been well versed in the arts (suvidya), inclûding, perhaps, poetry also. 147 Bhārati-Nanja was, as already mentioned, a poet at the court of Kanthirava. iīe is referred to148 as Srîngâra-kavh, Bâla-kavi, and as -having been highly proficient in rausic also (sangîta-duttunganenipa). He appears to hâve been very influential at the court, although no works of his havé so far corne down to us. 149

By far the most important writer during the period, however, was Gövinda-Vaidya, author of the Kanthirava-Narasarâja- Vijayam150 (1648). He was the son of Srînivâsa- Paññita151 and appears to hâve been a Sfnârtha Brâhman of Seringapatam, well read in the Vēdas, Mantra-sâstras and literary and poetical lore.152

145. Íbid., II. 376-377.
147. See K. N. V., XXV, 84; also f.n. 1 supra.
148. Íbid., XXV, 87; also I, 26 and XXVI (colophon on p. 496), referring to Bhârati-Nanja who seems to have been a young man of poetical talents and musical attainments.
149. Cf. Kâr. Ka. Cha. (II. 179), which, ambiguously enough, assigns the authorship of the K. N. V. to Bhārati-Nanja, besides indicating that Gövinda-Vaidya also was the author of it! As we shall see, it was not Bhārati-Nanja but Gövinda-Vaidya who actually wrote that work. Íde also f.n. 168 infra.
151. K. N. V., XXVI, p. 496 (colophon).
152. Íbid., I, 11, 13.
He speaks\textsuperscript{153} of his having written the poem at the instance of Dalavâi Nanjarâjaiya of Hura (1640-1647). The writing of the work seems to have been begun not earlier than 1641 and not later than 1645 and, according to the colophon\textsuperscript{154} at the end, was actually completed on May 22, 1648 (s. 1570, Sarvadhâri, Jyêstha su. 11, Chandruvâra—Monday). Gôvinda-Vaidya, it would appear, was a protégé of Bhârati-Nanja who had, it is said,\textsuperscript{155} previously related the subject-matter of the work (namely, the exploits of Kanthïrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar) in the court of Kanthïrava. This was, perhaps, the reason why Gôvinda-Vaidya, as he himself says,\textsuperscript{156} wrote the poem favoured by Bhârati-Nanja (Bhârati-Nanja-nolidu), and also why, when it was completed in May 1648, he had it read out by the tatter in the court of Kaçthïrava-Narasa according to the colophon.\textsuperscript{157} In any case, Gôvinda-Vaidya seems to have been indebted to Bhârati-Nanja for the subject-matter of the poem, although there is no evidence in favour of the ascription of its authorship to the latter.\textsuperscript{158} The Kanthïrava-Narasarâja-Vijayam is, in the main, written in the Hosagannada, sângatya mètre. Lucid and intelligible, it undoubtedly is an index of the popularity of sângatya as a form of poetical expression in Mysore in the middle of the seventeenth century. The thème of the work is centred

\textsuperscript{153} Ibid, I, 26: Daïswayi Nanjurâjendrâ tannoreyanu kâryadîgaya . . . charitoyadigi . . . pêlîsidannu.

\textsuperscript{154} Ibid, XXVI, p. 498.

\textsuperscript{155} Ibid, I, 26: Doreraya Narasarajendrana chariteyanoreda Bhârati-Nanja.

\textsuperscript{156} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{157} Ibid, XXVI, l.c.: Gôvinda-Vaidyanu Kanthïrava-Narasarâja-Vijayamnu vîrachii . . . Bhârati-Nanja na mukhadinda vachii râjasthânadalî niśtradîsiddu.

\textsuperscript{158} Wilson (Desc. Cat. MacK. Ms., p. 381) ascribes the authorship of the K. N. V. to Nanja-Kavi (Bhârati-Nanja) and the Kur. Ka. Cha. also, apparently following him, assigns it to Bhârati-Nanja (see l. n. 149 nigra). This seems due to a misunderstanding of the text and is not borne out by internal evidence. A detailed examination of the palm-leaf Ms. of this work (No. 110 of the Mad. Or. Lib.) shows that it closely agrees with the text of the poem as now published.
round the rise and fortunes of Kanthïrava-Naraisarâja Wôdeyâr,, as is clearly indicated by the poet at the end of each chapter (sandhi). The entire ground is covered by him in twenty-six chapters. The poem begins with invocation to Paschima-Ranga, Lakshmï-Narasimha, Lakshmïkãnta, Trinayana (of Mysore), Channa-Nanjugäda, Ganësa, Sarasvati and Bettada-Châmundi, indicating the scope of the work by way of introduction (Chapter I). Then we have a descriptive account of the Karnàtaka country and of the city of Mysore (Chapter II). This is followed by an account of the pedigree and family history of Kanthïrava-Narasaràja Wôdeyar (Chapter III), and of his birth, éducation and training (Chapter IV). Next we have the legendary history (Mâhâtmya) of Seringapatam (Chapter V); a descriptive account of the city of Seringapatam (including the Palace, temples and other buildings therein) under Kanthïrava (Chapters VI and VII); a picture of the daily Durbâr of Kanthïrava (Chapter VIII); and erotic scènes (Chapters IX and X). Then follows a detailed account of the advent of Rana-dullà Khân (of Bijâpur) to the Karnàtaka, his siège of Seringapatam and his final repuise by Kapthïrava (Chapters XI-XV). The subséquent relations of Mysore with Bijâpur (Chapter XVI); Kanthïrava's siège and acquisition of Sàmbalâji and Piriyâpaṭâna (Chapters XVII and XVIII); the action against Mustafâ Khân and Dalavâi Nanjarâjaiya's death at Turuvëkere (Chapter XIX)—thèse are treated next, and are succeeded by descriptive accounts of the beautification of Seringapatam on the occasion of the Mahânavami festival (Chapter XX), Kanthïrava's daily Durbâr during the festival and his procession-in-state on the tenth (Vijayadaéami) day of the feast (Chapters XXI and XXII), and the Gajëndra-Tirunâl festival and the car festival of Banganâtha at Seringapatam (Chapters XXIII-XXV). The poem concludes with a picture of Kanthïrava's religion
(Chapter XXVI). Throughout, Gôvinda-Vaidya writes essentially as a poet, freely employing all the literary devices (i.e., ornate descriptions, imagery, epigram, simile, allitération, etc.) to add to the beauty of the poem, and brings out prominently the greatness of its hero, namely, Kanthïrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar. He delineates to a considérable extent the heroic (vïra) and erotic (sringâra) sentiments (Chapters III, IV, XI-XIX, XXVI; I, V-X, XXXV), and pays particular attention to minute détails in describing nature (i.e. seasons, ri vers, gardens, hills, paddy fields, etc., as in Chapters I, V and XX). From a purely literary point of view, therefore, the Kanthïrava-Narcisarâja-Vijayam answers to the description of an epic poem (mahâ-kâvya), the pervading style being Drâkshâ-pâka.\textsuperscript{159} As a local contemporary, on the other hand, Gôvinda-Vaidya prominently reflects his personality in almost every chapter of the work. In regard to political events, we find him giving expression to what he has himself either actually witnessed or gathered from those who participated in those events (Chapters III, XI-XIX). In delineating the social background, in gênerai, he seems to hâve been fairly acquainted with the well-known standards of earlier writers as, for instance, Vâtsyâyana.\textsuperscript{160} In depicting the society and culture of his times (Chapters I, V-X, XX-XXV), in particular, he does show a thorough

\textsuperscript{159} See also \textit{Editorial Introduction} to the work, p. v.

\textsuperscript{160} \textit{References to and descriptions of such items as the social order, trades and professions, costumes and personal adornment, arts and sciences, festivals, amusements, Palace, court life and culture, courtiers and prostitution (in Chapters II, V-X, XX-XXV) correspond, in a remarkable measure, with the general background of social life depicted by Vâtsyâyana (see pp. 54, 55-57, 60-63, 212-219, 228-232 and 213-220 of the Kâma-Śêtra of Vâtsyâyana, translated by H. S. Gombrich, Third edition, Amritsar, 1952). \textit{We have, again, a direct reference to Bari-Śêtra (VI, 197), and have also noticed the references to Bharatâshârāya (vide f.n. 90 sugra). All these point to the influence of ancient ideas and ideals on contemporary life and literature.}
acquaintance with the realities of life; so thorough, indeed, that even when he presents, or rather attempts to present, idealised and veiled pictures (Chapters IX and X), he cannot but be understood as conveying the deeper under-currents of thought and feeling which he, as a contemporary observer, could not easily disassociate himself from. Viewed as a whole, the Kanthirava-Narasaraja Vijayam, making due allowance for poetical fancy and literary flourishes, and subject to comparison with other sources wherever necessary, holds a unique place among the literary productions of the period, as a mirror of the political and social history of the earlier part of the reign of Kasthirava-Narasaraja Wodeyar in Mysore (1638-1648).

Āyamma, daughter of Huchcha-Timmarajaiya of Bīługuli, and Lakshamma, daughter of Dāsarājaiya of Kalale, were the principal queens of Kanthirava-Narasaraja Wodeyar. Only by the former, the seniormost queen, Kāthirava had a son (named Chāraaraja Wodeyar) who, however, it is said, died in his sixth year (c. 1653-1654).

Among other members of the Mysore Royal Family, Bettada-Chāmaraja Wodeyar, father of Kanthirava-Narasaraja Wodeyar, passed away at Guriḍlu, at the age of 85, in

161. The Annals (I. 65-66) mentions in all ten queens of Kanthirava, the first two, referred to above, being married by him in April 1639 and the next eight (avata-makārīyaru) in the Avka, as distinct from the Gandharva, form in April 1640. Those eight queens were daughters of the chiefs of Narunelli, Arikuthira, Yejandur, Bāgali, Haṭṭi, Tippār and Malagāṭi. The Mys. Dho. Per. (I. 62) mentions only nine.

162. Annals, I. 66. According to the K. N. V. (XXVI, 49), Kanthirava had an issue (pirdu, vankānava, pāḍedu) by 1648. The child must have preceeded him subsequent to that date. Cl. Rāj. Kath., loc.
March 1639.  Muppina-Dévarâja Wodeyar, the last surviving younger brother of Râja Wodeyar and uncle of Kaçthïrava, is said to have been living with his family in Gundlu during the greater part of the reign, and appears to have died in the Palace at Hangâïa (near Gundlu), in or about 1656, at the age of 103.

163. The Annals (I. 78) refers to Pramâthi, Chaitra bu. 2 (April 9, 1639) as the date of Beôṭâda-Châmârâja Wodeyar’s death. The Mys. Dho. Van. (ff. 38) refers to Pramâthi (1639), the portion relating to further details about the date being worn out. But from the Gajjganaballâ copper-plate grant (B. C. III (1) Nj. 190), issued on Pramâthi, Chaitra bu. 15 (April 7, 1639), we note that Beôṭâda-Châmârâja Wodeyar had passed away before that date, and the grant itself was made for the eternal merit of Beôṭâda-Châmârâja Wodeyar (ibid., I. 88: Pituk addhatimamsiâñchân), probably on the day of his attainment of Vaîkusítha. Accordingly we have to fix his death on or before Pramâthi, Chaitra bu. 2 (March 26, 1639), two months after Ranadâllâ Khân’s siege of Seringesapatam and his repulse. See also f.n. 165 infra.


165. See M. A. R., 1900, No. 25, pp. 163-165. This record alludes to the diamantling—by Dâvarâja Wodeyar, under the orders of Venkaṭa II—of the Palace at Hangâla, where the Arasu had formerly lived, and to the spot in that Palace, where Râjodâs had attained his beatitude (II. 6-10: Venkaṭapati-rayaranara nirupadindu . . . Dâvarâju-Viṭëru Hanguladlekha draniravu yida drañunjanyali veôdali Râjodâs nuñkuturâda baliya). It further refers to the construction of a stone mâsî (kata-masta) and the setting up of a linga on that spot (linga-sârayava mâśi), etc., by Amritamma (queen of Doôḍâdârâja Wodeyar). The reference to the “Arasu” in this record seems obviously to Beôṭâda-Châmârâja Wodeyar who, as we have seen, lived in Gundlu and who died in March 1639. It seems not impossible that he had also a Palace at Hangâla in the neighbourhood of Gundlu, which was dismantled about 1640, shortly after his death. Again, Râjodâs, mentioned in the record, appears to be a shortened form of Muppina-Dévarâja Wodeyar, who is also said to have lived in Gundlu and whose death in the Hangâla Palace, according to the context, was perhaps intended to be commemorated by his eldest son, Doôḍâdârâja Wodeyar, and his daughter-in-law, Amritamma, in May 1638. The document thus enables us to fix the probable date of Muppina-Dévarâja’s death in or about 1656. We know that he was born in 1638 (see Chs. IV and V). He was, accordingly, 100 years of age at the time of his death, which is in keeping with Muppina (old) prefixed to his name. See also and compare the Editorial note in M. A. R., Ditto, pp. 163-166. For further reference to this record, see f.n. 163 and 165 infra.
Of the four sons of Muppina-Dëvarāja Woḍeyar by his second wife Kempamma, Doddadēvarāja Woḍeyar, the eldest (born February 18, 1622), it would seem, was holding charge of the city of Mysore (tanna Mahisûra-nagara) under Kaṇṭhirava, and for some time resided in Seringapatam also, possibly ruling jointly with the latter (arasu-geyyuttire) from about 1644 onwards. A lifehic record, dated December 8, 1644, registers a grant by Doddadēvarāja of the village of Sāvantanahalli to provide for the midday offering of God Chaluvarāyasvāmi of Mēlkōṭe. Another, dated May 12, 1656, referring to the construction of a stone math, etc., in Hangala by Amritamma (queen of Doddadēvarāja Woḍeyar), specifically mentions him as the lord of Mysore (Maisūradhipa), distinguished by the title Antembaraganda. The record, it is further significant, refers also to Emperor Srī-Ranga VI of Vijayanagar. Evidently Doddadēvarāja Woḍeyar, as a prominent member of the Mysore Royal Family, seems to have continued to rule in the city of Mysore in an almost independent capacity, during the latter part of Kaṇṭhirava's reign, formally

166. See C. Vom., 138, 160; also C. Vi., III, 129, and Appendix IV—(1) and V—(3).
167. E. C., V (1) and (2) Hn. 120: Tāraka, Maragatāra ba. 5. “Dēvarāja Woḍeyar,” mentioned in this record, is identical with Doddadēvarāja Woḍeyar, eldest son of Muppina-Dēvarāja Woḍeyar. All the sons of Muppina-Dēvarāja, as we shall see in Ch. X (f.n. 9), are generally referred to in some inscriptions as Dēvarāja, although, according to other sources, they had distinct prefixes (i.e., Doḷja, Chikka, etc.), with which their actual names commenced. The present grant appears to have been made by Doddadēvarāja by way of commemorating his visit to Mēlkōṭe in c. 1643-1644 (see under Social Life—Festivals).
168. M. A. R., 1920, No. 26: 1, 1578, Durmukhi, Vaidākha ba. 12, Monday—see II. 7-8. In view of what is stated in the above f.n., “Dēvarāja Woḍeyar,” mentioned in this record, is identical with Doddadēvarāja Woḍeyar, eldest son of Muppina-Dēvarāja Woḍeyar. Moreover, as we shall see from other sources also, “Amritamma,” mentioned in this record, was the queen of Doddadēvarāja. Vide also f.n. 186 supra and Ch. X, for further reference to this document and to Amritamma.
169. Ibid., II. 8-6.
acknowledging the suzerainty of Śrī-Ranga. Dodda-dēvarāja was also known as "Dodda-Ārasinavaru." and "Dodḍadēvaiya-Ārasu." He is depicted to have been an idéal ruler, and is said to have established an agrahāra named after himself.

The last days of Kanthīrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar (particularly during the period 1653-1659) seem to have been rather unhappy. His domestic felicity suffered considerably by the death of his only son (c. 1653-1654), and his political position itself was seriously threatened by the calamitous invasion of his territories by Khàn Muhammad of Bijâpur, by the war with Madura and by the rise to political prominence of ēivappa Nâyaka I of Ikkëri. The daftcizing splendour of the earlier part of Kanthīrava's reign appears, indeed, in striking contrast with the serious set-back in his fortunes during its latter part.

On July 31, 1659 passed away Kanthīrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar, in his forty-fifth year, his queens, it is said, observing sati. His death, July 31, 1669.

An estimate of Kanthirava-Narasaraja Wodeyar.

In appearance he was, as depicted to us

170. Cf. Ibid, p. 166, where Dr. M. H. Krishna, assuming Dodḍadēvarāja (of this record) to be identical with the successor of Kanthīrava-Narasa, holds that the record was issued by the former "before he became king, though royal titles are applied to him out of courtesy." There is no evidence in support of this position. For the identification of the successor of Kanthīrava-Narasaraja Wodeyar, vide Ch. X and Appendix V—(1) and (3).
172. C. Vam., 180-181; C. Vi., III, 128-145, etc.; see also Appendix V—(3).
173. E. O., l.c.; namma Doddā-ārasinavaru mādida Dēvarāja āgrahāra.
175. Annālē, l.c.
by contemporary writers, a stalwart figure, possessed of an exceptionally robust constitution and handsome and attractive features. Clad in a superbly wrought suit of arniour (muttina dagale, vajrada jodu), with the helmet of lead on his head (siradali . sīṣakada pustanga), the shining yellow-coloured cloth girt round his loins (miruguva misuniya datti katiyol) and the jewelled dagger attached thereto (ratnda bāku), and brandishing his sharp-edged sword (oreyanugida khādgavīdīdu) in his hand, he appears with all the life and vigour of a true warrior on the field of battle.

**As a warrior.**

Among the titles ascribed to him as a warrior were Ēkāṅga-vira, Dhuradhīra, Sangara-sūra, etc.

Kanṭhīrava-Narasarāja Wodēyar was a prominent character of Southern India during the greater part of the first half of the seventeenth century. His prominence, perhaps, to be accounted for by the fact that he strenuously worked for and moulded the destiny of the kingdom of Mysore during a critical period in the history of the Karnāṭaka country. Despite the reverses sustained by him during the later years of his reign, he may, broadly speaking, be said to have achieved a fair measure of success in his two-fold objective of stemming the tide of advance of Bijāpur arms on Mysore and of maintaining the political integrity of the kingdom of Mysore in the southern frontier, besides effecting a series of local conquests in all the directions. The net result of his policy was that he was able to bequeath to his successor a kingdom compact and progressive and yet with the semblance of its position as an intégral part of the once powerful but latterly décadent Empire of Vijāyānagar. It is, nadeed, to the crédit of Kanṭhīrava that, in evolving

---

176. See, for instance; K.N. V, IX. 46, 55, 65, 98-117 ; X, 9, 17, etc.
178. Ibid i. 21 ; XII, 41.91 ; XV, 110 ; XVIII, 67,174, etc.
this position, he showed from the beginning of his reign a rare consistency of purpose and loyalty to the cause of the Empire (under Venkata II and Sri-Ranga VI), which appear in refreshing contrast with the disloyal, ruinous and suicidal course of conduct pursued by the rest of the rulers of South India contemporaneous with him, particularly by Tirumala Nāyaka of Madura. Expediency and self-interest, it is true, were the governing principles of the South Indian powers in the complex conditions of the period, but, in the case of Kanthīrava, these appear to have been tempered by larger considerations than the immediate political interests of the hour. There seems little doubt that, in arresting the progress of Bijāpur arms in the south and in standing as an effective barrier to the encroachments of Madura and her allies on Mysore in the early years of his reign, Kanthīrava rendered a signal service to the cause of the Empire to justify his claim to be "the right-hand man of Emperor ēri-Ranga in the south" (taddakṣhīna-bhujaḍanḍa-iiāda) in 1643. The striking of coins (Kanthīrāya-hanams) by him in 1645 and his neutrality during the siege of Vellore by Bijāpur and Gōlkonda in 1647 were due to circumstances and causes purely local and not dictated by any selfish interests; nor does the former event, in particular, indicate "an open disavowal of imperial authority" on the part of Kanthīrava, as has been conjectured by some. Indeed Kanthīrava, from the materials before us, appears prominently as a local ruler (particularly during 1645-1650) and as a loyal feudatory of the Empire, a position which must be given its due weight in any estimate of him as an historical character. From the beginning of his reign, there are, further, as many documents of Kanthīrava mentioning his suzerain as there are others not mentioning him as such, but the latter circumstance, far from pointing to "a sure sign of

179. See, for instance, S. K. Aiyangar in Nayaks of Madura, p.133.i.n. 60.
assumption of independence " as has been suggested, serves, to a considerable extent, to enhance his prestige as the ruler of Mysore, particularly after the siège of Piriyâpaṭṭia in 1645, another outstanding event of his reign. This aspect of his position, again, tends to appear in greater relief when he, during the troublous years of Śrī-Ranga (c. 1650-1653), afforded him shelter and hospitality, denied to him by the other feudatories of his, and helped him to recover a part of his dominions as well. There is neither truth nor justice in the statement hazarded that "there is nothing to indicate that it was loyalty to the Empire which induced Mysore . . . to receive Śrī-Ranga." For it surely ignores the available evidence as to Kanthīrava's loyalty to the Empire before 1650 and the influence exercised by him on his local contemporaries during 1639-1646. The same undercurrent of loyalty is discernible in the attitude of Kanthīrava towards ērī-Eanga during the latter part of his reign also. Kanthīrava suffered considerably from the course of policy pursued by Tirumala Nāyaka of Madura during the period. It has been further held that Tirumala Nāyaka was justified in proceeding against Mysore, having himself suffered from the "repeated aggressions" of the latter, and having been "threatened by the new understanding between the Emperor and the king of Mysore," The first cause alleged is, as we shall point out, wholly untenable, while the second, though claimed to be based on a "reading between the lines of the Jesuit account," is not borne out by it as our examination of the latter in the light of other sources would show. Śrī-Ranga had left Mysore in or about 1653, so that the alleged "understanding" between him and Mysore to threaten Madura with an invasion (in 1655) lacks foundation. Again, the first definite advance of

Mysore arms on the south (as far as Trichinopoly) was, as we have seen, due to Tirumala Nâyaka himself inciting his feudatory (the chief of Sâmbalî) to encroach on the southern frontier of Mysore, and even taking an active part in the movement. Tirumala had to eat the humble pie for this act of his, being promptly curbed for it by Kaţhîrava. We have also seen how Madura, with Gingee and Tanjore, was represented at the court of Mysore in 1647. If this position is appreciated, we would be enabled to follow the subsequent relations of Kaţhîrava with Madura. It was the desire to maintain the *status quo ante* in Mysore against Bijâpur, which had advanced as far as the Kâvëripattanam frontier by 1653, which appears to have induced Kaţhîrava to proceed to the acquisition of Satyamangalam and Dhanaayakankôte, guarding the south, in 1654. This objective of Kaţhîrava seems to have been thoroughly misunderstood by Tirumala Nâyaka as a direct attempt of Mysore to invade his own dominions. This, coupled with the memory of the serious reverses sustained by Tirumala in the early years of Kaţhîrava's reign, was obviously responsible, in the main, for the calamitous attack of Bijâpur brought about by him (Tirumala Nâyaka) on Mysore, which eventually recoiled on Madura itself. It was, therefore, in the fitness of things that Kaţhîrava, as a loyal feudatory of Srî-Banga on the one hand and, on the other, with a view "to wreak just vengeance," waged the war against Tirumala Nâyaka during the last years of his reign (c. 1655-1659) when Srî-Ranga was, by force of circumstances, actually in Ikkêri (especially from c. 1656). Without sacrificing local independence, the Mysore Boyal House seems to have continued its allegiance to the Empire even during these years, for, as we have seen, we have a record of the dynasty, dated in as late as 1656, formally acknowledging the suzerainty of Srî-Ranga. If this position, again, is rightly understood, the
sweeping assertion of the contemporary Proenza,\textsuperscript{184} that "Mysore had long ago withdrawn herself from subordination to the same monarch" (Sri-Ranga), cannot be taken as a correct statement of fact. For, in this part of his account, Proenza refers only to the general political situation of Southern India (during 1656-1659), and does not write from a direct knowledge of the actual position of Mysore.

As a ruler, Kañṭhīrava-Narasarāja Woḍeyar was very popular and impressed his contemporaries to the extent of idealisation and déification by them. An inscription\textsuperscript{185} speaks of him as having been renowned alike for his victory in war and liberality in times of peace. Another\textsuperscript{186} refers to his rule thus: "While he ruled, the lord of the Gods sent good rains; the earth brought forth full fruit; all points of the compass were unclouded; the respective orders were diligent in their several rites; all the people were free from disease; the country was free from trouble; the women were devoted to their husbands; and all the world was prosperous." A third\textsuperscript{187} mentions him as having been adored by his subjects (jana-vandyasya). In keeping with these, the Kanthirava-Narasarāja-Vijayam\textsuperscript{188} also points to the beneficence of his rule and the happiness and contentment of his subjects. His government was deeply rooted in the ancient ideal of Dharma,\textsuperscript{189} in so far

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Ibid.}, p. 293 (Proenza's letter).
\item \textit{G. C.}, III (1) Nj. 198 (1891), II. 46-48.
\item \textit{Ibid.}, Sr. 106 (1847), II. 40-43.
\item \textit{Ibid.}, V (1) and (2) Ag. 64 (1647); see text on p. 707.
\item I, 17-19; IV, 86-88; VI, 72; VII, 68-67; XXVI, 1, 30-39, etc.;
\item K. N. V., I, 20, 24; IV, 107; IX, 3; XX, 1; XXVI, 40; B. C., V (1) and (2) Ag. 64: I.c. The expressions, dharmadīrava, śhīra-dharmamandagadage, svadharmasa tvādhu, dharmatihaut, etc., are significant.
\item Cf. Wilks, I. 62-63. His estimate of Kanthirava as "the idol of his Brahmin historians," etc., appears to ignore the fundamental principles of Hindu government. No doubt, as Wilks writes (Ibid., 62-63), Kanthirava was rather harsh in his treatment of the refractory Pālegārs and turbulent ryots but this measure was more than
\end{enumerate}
as it was conducive to the greatest good of the greatest number, and was inseparable from religion. Countless were his gifts, benefactions and deeds of charity. The staunch Vaishnava that he was, his tolerance of other faiths and creeds was of a high order. Seringapatam, the capital city, was, during his reign, bustling with life, being a centre of attraction to people from far and near both in ordinary times and on festive occasions, conspicuously during the Mahânavami festival. His court, with a galaxy of ministers, officers, feudatories and others, was noted for the splendour of his daily Durbar and had evidently touched the acme of contemporary taste and culture—a place where learning and literature flourished and were liberally encouraged.

In private life, Kanthirava was of regular and abstemious habits and his filial piety was of the noble type.

Impressive as a warrior, consistent and loyal as a political builder, popular and pious as a ruler, Kanthírava-Narasarâja Wodeyar appears to us in all the glory of a truly great historical character and a "Maker of Mysore." The most enduring monuments of his rule extant are the Narasinihasvâmi temple at Seringapatam and the Bangâradoddi canal in its neighbourhood.

Perhaps what is of greater importance still is that Kanthírava Narasarâja Wodeyar figures as prominently in tradition as he does in history. Numerous stories have been current testifying to his personal prowess and

---

190 The Annâla (I. 77-78), for instance, records how, shortly after Hinduâli Khan's unsuccessful siege of Seringapatam in 1689, Kanthírava was, by the might of his arms, single-handed, to overcome an organised attack on his person (in the Seringapatam Palace) by twenty-five hirelings sent by the chief of Trichinopoly, and how Kanthírava defeated the latter's plot against his life, etc.
Ilibérality. He evidently created such a profound impression on a génération of writers (like Tirumalârya, Chidânanda and others), during the latter half of the seventeenth century, that they see and depict him almost exactly as did his own contemporaries. Among later records, it is further interesting to note, inscriptions\(^{191}\) of the eighteenth century speak of him as a ruler belôved by all people and specially refer to his coining of the fanams (Kanṭhkrâya-hana) and his dévotion to Nr̥hari.

He has, again, captured the imagination of posterity as a celebrated warrior (rana-dhīra) and his is a household name in Mysore whenever there is talk of chivalry, exploit or piety.

\(^{191}\) See R. C. 2(II)

Dēvarāja Wodeyar, 1659-1673.
CHAPTER X.

DEVARÂJA WODEYAR, 1659-1673.


With the death of Châmarâja Wodeyar, the only infant son of Kanthîrava-Narasarâja Wođeyar, towards the close of the latter's reign, direct descent in the line of Bettada-Châmârâja Wođeyar ceased. The succession

1. Ante, Ch. IX.
accordingly devolved on the descendants of Muppina-Dēvarāja Woḍeyar. Of the members of this branch of the Royal Family, once before referred to, the eldest was Yeleyûr Dēparāja Woḍeyar, son of Muppina-Dēvarāja Woḍeyar by his first wife Dēvājamma. Little is known of him subsequent to 1607. As regards the other four sons of Muppina-Dēvarāja by his junior wife Kempamma, Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar (Chikkadēvaiya), the second, had predeceased his brothers, and Doḍđadēvarāja Woḍeyar (Doḍđadēvaiya), the eldest, had by 1659 renounced his charge of the city of Mysore in favour of his next younger brother, Kempadēvarāja Woḍeyar (Kempadēvaiya), leaving under the latter's care and protection Maridēvarāja Woḍeyar (Maridēvaiya), the last son of Muppina-Dēvarāja Woḍeyar, and his own two minor sons, Chikkadēvarāja (6. 1645) and Kanṭhīravaiya (b. 1647). Kempadēvarāja Woḍeyar or, as he was more familiarly known, Dēvarāja Woḍeyar, the third son of Muppina-Dēvarāja Woḍeyar, was then the nearest heir to the throne of Mysore, and he is said to have been sent for from Gundlu and formally adopted by Kanṭhīrava-Narasarāja Woḍeyar on July 28, 1659 (i.e., three days before Kanṭhīrava's death) to succeed him.

Dēvarāja Woḍeyar ascended the throne of Mysore on August 19, 1659, eighteen days after the death of Kaṅṭhīrava-Narasarāja Woḍeyar. He was born on May 25, 1627, and was in his thirty-third year at the time of his

2. Ibid. Ch. VIII; vide also Appendix IV—(2) and Tables II-IV (compare).
8. Vide Appendix V—(3); see also under Domestic Life, for further particulars about Doḍđadēvarāja Woḍeyar; cf. Wilks. I. 67-68; S. K. Aiyangar, Anciunt India, p. 295; and Appendix V—(1).
4. Annals, I. 98; see also and compare the authorities in Appendix V—(1).
6. Ibid. I. 62, II. 55 (compared): Prabhava, Jyeṣṭha 6u. 5, Friday; Annals, I.c.; see also Appendix IV—(1).
accession. He is identical with "Dêvarâja Vodeya," "Dêvarâja Wodeyar," "Dêvarâja Wadeyaraiya," "Mysùru Dêvarâja Wodeyar," "Dêva-Bhûpâla or Mahi-pâla" and "Dêvarâja-Kshitiéah"—referred to as the son of Dêpa or Dêvarâja Wodeyar (Muppina-DêVarâja) and grandson of Châmarâja Wodeyar (Bôla-Châmaràja), in lithic and copper-plate inscriptions ranging successively from 1659 to 1673. Some of these documents, we find, are also issued under his own signature in Kannâda, as Sri-Dêvarâju, Sri-Dêvarâja, and Sri-Dêvarâja Wadeyaraiyanavaru, while the Hâlagere and Bhêrya copper-plate grants (dated in 1663 and 1666 respectively) specifically mention him as the third son of (Muppina) Dêvarâja Wodeyar by Kempamâmbâ (Kempamma). Contemporary literary works (c. 1670) refer to him as "Dêvarâjêndra," son of Dêparâja (Muppina-Dêvarâja Wodeyar). In keeping with these sources are the literary

7. Vide references cited under Grants and other records and Domestic life. For the identification of the successor of Kañthirâya-Narâsa I in later writings and modern works, see Appendix V—(1).

8. See, for instance, texts of E. C., Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol., My. 114; XII Kg. 37; TN. 28 (1669); IV (2) Yd. 54 (1665) and 43 (1667); Hg. 115 and 120 (1670).

9. E. C., XII Kg. 37, ll. 41-46: Trâtiyâdêrita-jana surabhajó Dêvarâja-Kshitiêak . . . rakhati dharom . . . dharâtalam práthathi; IV (2) Yd. 54, p. 156 (Text):

Śri-Dêvarâja-mapa mukaja manahi Kempamâmbâ-darâbâhau Vishnâramâna jataka . . . Dêvarâja-Kshitiêakā| Kga. 37 refers, in a general way, to all the four sons of [Muppina] Dêvarâja (Dêparâja) being known as Dêvarâja (Dêparâja), vide ll. 36-38:

. . . . . . Dêpa-dharadhinarâkah | Châtârâgya kamârah . . . sarv Śri-Dêparâja nâmanah| E. C., IV (2) Ch. 92 (1675) also speaks of them in a similar manner, vide ll. 18-19:

Asya Śri-Dêvarâja-sya Dêvarâjêndra námâkah | Châtârâja jagrâtih . . . nânánah| But we know their actual names (i.e., Dödpâdêvarâja, Chikkadêvarâja, Kompâdêvarâja and Maridêvarâja) from the C. Vam., C. Vi., E. C. III (1) Sr. 14 (1666), Mys. Dho. Pâr., etc. See also Appendix IV—(1) and Tables I-IV.

10. See Dêvarâja-Sangatya, 1, 31-38; Chauzadâda-Pustaka, ll. 1, v. 3, 12. For particulars about these works, vide section on Literary progress.
Works and inscriptions of the period c. 1676-1722, which invariably speak of the rule of Dēvarāja Wodeyar (third son of Muppina-Dēvarāja Wodeyar and younger brother of Doḍḍadēvarāja Wodeyar) in succession to Karṇṭhīrava-Narasārāja Wodeyar, while some of the works (c. 1676-1680) of Chikkupādhyāya and Timma-Kavi, in particular, more definitely assign him a period of fourteen years' rule.

Dēvarāja Wodeyar began his reign in Seringapatam just at a time when Bijāpur and Gōlkonda, at the end of their southern campaigns, had been involved in their death-struggle with Aurangzib in the Deccan, leaving

11. See Śvē Māhat. (of Mallikārjuna), II, 28; Kāmaṇḍ. Nī., I, 64; Bhag. Gī. Tī., I, 47; Passch. Māhat., I, 49; Kāmail. Māhat., I, 105; Munivana., II, 76-77, etc. The actual expressions used are: pītaṃ negaṭe vēṭa Doḍḍadēvarājanānasa manna Dēvarājam . . . dhāriṇiyam pari-patiyam; Doḍḍadēvarājya-ninanuyānam . . . Dēva-janapālam . . .; Dēvarāja-mahīyam dhārayam . . . Kanṭhīrava-nantaradol tāledu; Doḍḍadēva-npatiyam rādārava Dēvarāja-janapām . . . mēdīsināyānādā; Doḍḍadēvarājyanāyānam Dēvarājendrā . . . iḍā samvam-bhamam tālīdadu; Kanṭhīrava-Narasā-vīpettanāma kalantyadolu . . . Dēvarājadēyarāgī . . . padaviya paṭiya . . ., etc. For particulars about these works, vide Ch. XIX. The kingly designation ascribed to Doḍḍadēvarāja in these passages is, of course, to be understood as implying his joint rule with and under Kanṭhīrava I [vide Ch. IX and Appendix V.—(2)]. Tirumālīrāya, in the C. Vam. (188-191) and C. V. (V-VI), also refers to the rule of Dēvarāja Wodeyar, younger brother (anužātan) of Doḍḍadēvarāja. For a further examination and explanation of his position on this subject, see Appendix Ibid. Among inscriptions, E. C., III (1) Sr. 14 (1886) and 64 (1722), Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol., My. 115, etc., merely repeat the lines from E. C., XII Kṛ. 97 (1899) referring to the rule of Dēvarāja, third son of Muppina-Dēvarāja and younger brother of Doḍḍadēvarāja. Some of the inscriptions of the reign of Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar (1673-1704), in particular, only mention his direct descent from Muppina-Dēvarāja and Doḍḍadēvarāja [see, for instance, E. C., IV (2) Ch. 22 (1675) and III (1) My. 7 (1856)], while one record (E. C., Bangalora Dist. Suppl. Vol., Bo. 114 (1860), I. 17) refers to Dēvarāja, the predecessor of Chikkadēvarāja, as “Doḍḍa-Dēvarāya” (Doḍḍa-Dēvarāya), perhaps by way of distinguishing the two rulers, without, however, specifying the exact relationship between them.

12. See Kāmaṇḍ. Nī., I, 68; Yud. Māhat., II, 49; Passch. Māhat., I, 49. The actual expressions used are: Dēva-janapālam . . . chaturdāvargam . . . poreda mahīyam; Dēva-nypanuṇi . . . alaman . . . chaturdāvargam-nurvyam; paṇḍīnlka-varṣa-mīlayam . . . afās.
their Karnâtak possessions under their deputies (particulary Shàhji in Bangalore) ; when Ikkêri, in the north-west of Mysore, had become prominent under èivappa Nâyaka I (1645-1660) ; when Emperor érë-Kanga VI of Vijayanagar (1642-1664 ?-1681) had been established by Ŝivappa Nâyaka at Haßan and Bëlûr ; and when Chokkanâtha Nâyaka (1659-1682), grandson of Tirumala Nâyaka, had succeeded to the kingdom of Madura. Troubles were still brewing in the southern frontier, consequent on the war between Mysore and Madura during the last years of the reigns of Kanthirava-Narasarâja Wodeyar and Tirumala Nâyaka. Dalâvâi Hampârâjaiya, whose lot it had been to take part in that disastrous enterprise, continued to hold office early in the reign of Dëvaràja, when he was called upon to face a new situation.

For, shortly after the accession of Dëvaràja Wodeyar to the throne of Mysore (August 1659), Ŝivappa Nâyaka I of Ikkêri proceeded on an expédition to Seringapatam.13

First Phase: 1659-1660. Mysore and Ikkêri.

Political Development:

Ever since the rejection of the offer of his alliance by Kanthirava-Narasarâja Wodeyar I (in September1647), referred to in an earlier chapter, Sivappa Nâyaka, it would appear, was waiting for an opportunity to proceed against, and wreak his vengeance on, Mysore.14 With this object in view he had sought assistance from influential quarters.

13. C. Vam., 191. This work, as it has come down to us, stops abruptly at this point. For further particulars, we have to rely on other sources of information cited below. Ŝivappa Nâyaka's expedition to and siege of Seringapatam is dated in Vikâri (1659), in the Ke. N. V. (VII. 114-115). Since the event is further said to have taken place in the very year of the accession of Dëvaràja Wodeyar and during the period of office of Dalâvâi Hampârâjaiya, we would not be far wrong in fixing it between c. September 1658-January 1660. Cf. Ancient India, p. 297 ; Sources, p. 21 ; and Nâyaka of Madura, p. 172, which fail to note the contemporaneity of the rulers of Mysore and Ikkêri and place the event in the latter part of Dëvaràja's reign or early in the reign of Chikkadëvarâja, for which there is absolutely no evidence.

14. C. Vi., V. 18: . . . antha dinadim Mahâviravanana samagadoñ padibhavanemibhu.
and we have seen how, espousing the cause of Śrī-Ranga V I, he had, on the plea of restoring the suzerainty of Vijayanagar (Rāya-samsthānavanuddharisalvēlkendu), acquired Hassan and Bēlūr from Bijāpur in 1657 and how he had succeeded in establishing Śrī-Ranga (nelegolisi nilisi) at those places in 1659. These activities of Sivappa Nāyaka on the north-western frontiers of the kingdom of Mysore had been viewed with considerable alarm by Ka$hīrava-Narasa towards the close of his reign. And the situation became more serious about the latter part of 1659. Ėivappa Nāyaka, ostensibly to safeguard the interests of the Vijayanagar Empire but really in furtherance of his own scheme of aggrandizement, had reinforced his army by quotas drawn from the Pālegârs of Sôde, Bijigi, Tarīkere, Harapanahalli, Chintanakal, Maddagiri and Giduga, and by the levies raised by the chiefs of Tûlu, Konkana, Kodagu and Maleyâla; and had encamped in the neighbourhood of Grâma, on his way to Seringapatam.

Dēvarâja Woḍeyar despatched a large force under Daḷavâi Hamparâjaiya (Hanîpa-varya), with instructions to oppose Sivappa Nāyaka. In the action which followed (c. September 1659), Ėivappa Nāyaka is said to have won a brilliant victory, capturing Hamparâjaiya with sixteen officers (shôdasa sankhyā dhîra gurikâram) and several warriors, éléphants and horses belonging to the Mysore army. He is also said to have taken possession of Grâma. Accompanied by Lakshmappa Nāyaka of

---

15. C. Vam., 180.
17. Ke. N. V., l.c.: Paṭṭapada mukhakke daṇḍam tervâlaiḍi Grâmada samipanam evdu palseyamijjîrâl. Grâma is an extant village, the head-quarters of a hōdi of that name in the Hassan taluk (see List of villages, 116).
Hole-Narasipur (who had turned hostile towards Mysore and who, it is said, had intrigued with êivappa Nâyaka) and other turbulent Pâlegârs, Sivappa Nâyaka next marched against Seringapatam itself. Bridging up the Cauvery, he crossed the river and, encamping near the fort, commenced a regular blockade of the place (c. October 1659).

The siège went on apace. Meanwhile, the authorities in Seringapatam, helpless and unable to withstand the attack, it is said, were obligea to seek the support of a Bijâpur contingent under Bahlûl Khân. Sivappa Nâyaka was, however, by a diplomatie move (mantramukhadinda), able to make him retire (pindegesi), and was about to take possession of the fort. At this juncture, we are told, the besieged, being disheartened, won over by bribe the officers and agents of êivappa Nâyaka and had recourse to certain counteracting rites and cérémonies, in conséquence of which êivappa Nâyaka became indisposed, and, finding it inadvisable to prolong his stay in the enemy's country, raised the siège of Seringapatam and retraced his steps to Bednûr.

---

21. Ibid, v. 45: yuddâka-mukhadol nittarimalammas tamma sahâyakke Vijápuradiñm saiyum verau Badala Khánansam teralchi tarañ. The power of Bijâpur in the Karnâk being on the wane about this time, it is not unlikely her generals took part in local politics espousing the cause of one power against another.
22. Ibid, Lc.
23. Ibid: konñeyam vêkhaisidu gurîmanisuryam maitam kelambar niyogi-gelgam pariddhâna naattu mavidabhihara homa muntada dushkri-yangala nodarchal. Wilks (I. 88) also refers to the employment of bribery in inducing the Îkkeî army to raise the siege. There is nothing improbable in this, seeing that the Mysore army was away and Dévaraja had to oppose the enemy single-handed, almost immediately after his accession.
24. Ibid: dêhadolâjyam putal, intâppa kaladol latru simâ sannibbâ-dola vilipudanamukhamandu bageèu ... muttige degeri ... saiyum verau Vêypuramanam sûbru.
The retirement of Sivappa Nâyaka was attended with results disastrous to himself. Dëvarâja Wođeyar, assisted by the inhabitants of Seringapatam, hotly pursued the retreating enemy and in doing so laid waste Lakshmappa Nâyaka's territory as well. Dalavâi Hamparâjaiya, having in the meanwhile recovered his lost ground, it would seem, joined in the pursuit and continued it, cutting off the noses of several men in Sivappa Nâyaka's army and returning to Seringapatam with considérable spoils (consisting of horses, éléphants and insignias).

Sivappa Nâyaka's attempt on Seringapatam was thus foiled. He did not long survive his return home. He died on September 25, 1660, almost at a time when the relations between Mysore and Ikkëri had become thoroughly embittered.

Meanwhile, in Seringapatam, Dalavâi Hamparâjaiya had been succeeded by Mallarâjaiya of Kaḻale (in April 1660), and he was in turn followed by Muddaiya (July 1660-September 1661), Nanjanâthaiya (September 1661-February 1662) and Kàntaiya (February 1662-April 1662) of Kaḻale, Nanjanâthaiya holding the office a second time (between April 1662-April 1667).

In Ikkëri, Sivappa Nâyaka I was succeeded by his younger brother, Venkatappa Nâyaka I I. Venkatappa Nâyaka ruled till August 1661 and was followed by Bhadrappa Nâyaka (1661-1664) and Hiriya-Sômaéêkhara Nâyaka I (1664-1671), the eldest and younger sons, respectively, of Sivappa Nâyaka I.
Prospects of war and counter-war between Mysore and Ikkēri, evêr since Sivappa Nāyaka's retreat from Seringapatam: (c. Januàry 1660), continued to be imminent. Venkatappa Nāyaka II (of Ikkēri); by way of checking the encroachments of Mysore (Pattanadavar mērevarïde-yyādantu), had stationed on the frontier of his dominions (gadimukhadol) an army under the charge of ēivalīnga Nāyaka (Sivalīngaiya), son-in-law of Sivappa Nāyaka. True to the expectations of Venkaṭappa Nāyaka, towards the close of 1661, it would seem, the Mysore army resumed hostilities against Ikkēri by laying siège to thé fort of Hebbâle. Early in 1662, Bhadrappa Nāyaka (successor of Venkatappa Nāyaka II) despatched the Ikkēri contingent under ēivalīnga Nāyaka, against Mysore. Sivalīnga Nāyaka marched on towards Bēlūr, Hère, it is said, he met Emperor Śrī-Rāg̱am and, reinforced by the forces of the latter (Bēlūr-gāidi Rāyaram sandhisi tatsuīnīyam verasu), proceeded towards Hebbâle and raised its siège (Hebbâle-kōnteyam, niuttīgē-degēsi), Marching further, ēivalīnga Nāyaka laid siège to Hole-Narasipur (Narasimhapura) itself, then in the possession of Mysore. The Mysoreans, by way of retaliation, invested and took possession of the fort of Kopanûr (Konanûr-kōnteyam tegedukolal). Whereupon the forces of Ikkēri marched on thither and were preparing to bombard and retake the place. At this juncture, Dēvarāja Wodeyar despatched reinforcements under his Dalavâi, Kântaiya of Kaiale. In or about March 1662, kântaiya, making rapid marches, encamped near the slope

21. Ibid, VIII. 118, v. 2. Hebbâle is an extant sara-mānya village in the Arkalgūḍ talûk (see List of villages, 131).
22. Ibid. Konanûr, another extant village in the Arkalgūḍ talûk (Ibid, 123).
overlooking Kanagala (Kanagâlileyol paleyavaniliya). Here, we are told, an action took place between Mysore and Ikkëri, in which both sides fought desperately. At length, however, Dalavâi Kântaiya sustained reverses and was forced to retreat, while at the same time Sivalinga Nâyaka himself, struck by an arrow from the Mysore side, fell dead on the field of battle.

Nevertheless Bhadrappa Nâyaka vigorously prosecuted the war, taking possession of Honnavalli, Chiknâyakanahalli, Kandikere, Budi-vâla and other places on the outskirts of the kingdom of Mysore. Dalavâi Kântaiya of Kalale having been succeeded by Nanjanâthaiya in April 1662, the latter resumed operations against Ikkëri towards the close of 1662. The power of Bijâpur and Gôlkoçda in the Karnâtak-Bijâpur-Bàlaghât was fast dwindling away since 1656, so that, when Nanjanâthaiya directed hostilities principally against Ikkëri, important places belonging to these Shâhi kingdoms fell in regular succession. Thus, in January 1663, he acquired Chêlûr, Bidare and Sampige, and in March, Chiknâyakanahalji (which had lately been taken by Ikkëri). Proceeding further, Nanjanâthaiya strenuously pushed through the

33. Ibid, v. 8. Kapagala, a village probably identical with the estate saram-samay Kaligala in the Arkalgud taluk (Ibid, 168). Parts of the present district of Hampi, it is to be remembered, formed the bone of contention between Mysore and Ikkëri, early in the reign of Dêvarâja W osayar.
34. Ibid, 119, v. 4-6.
35. Mys. Des. Dér., II. 91-95; Mys. Raj. Oka., 96; Annals, I. 97; also Wilks, I. 70 (List of conquests). Wilks's statement (Ibid, 69), however, that the Mysoreans "appear to have received from the royal pagenit (Sri-Ranga) forced grants of conquered districts, during this (1663) and the four subsequent years," is hardly borne out by the sources. See also C. Vî., V. 96. The references to Dêvarâja's conquests, etc., in this work, are to be understood in their chronological setting, with reference to the more specific authority of the chronicles compared with one another. Among other sources, the Hasti, Mahâst. (I, 67) and inscriptions of 1663 (R. O., III (1) TN. 99, I. 10; XII Eg. 37, U. 72-74; Mys. Des. Suppl. Vol., My. 114, II. 94-95) refer to and echo Dêvarâja's victory over the Turukhas (Turukhâr allâh asmar; mahahâr allâh, etc.), obviously pointing to the activities of Mysore in the Karnâtak-Bijâpur-Bàlaghât in 1662-1663.
war with Ikkēri, capturing the éléphant named Ganga-
dhara and taking possession of the celebrated and
impregnable fortresses of Hassan (Hasana) and
Sakrepatpa (Sakkarepattana) —with their dependencies
of Vastâre (Vasudhârê) and Honnavalli—in December
(1663).*

In February JL664, Bhadrappa Nâyaka of Ikkēri wa»
succeeded by Hiriya-Somasēkhara

Advance on Ikkēri, Nâyaka I, younger son of éivappa
Nâyaka I. 38 Shortly after his accession,
Hiriya-Sômaēkhara Nâyaka, it would seem, retaliated
against Mysore, resuming possession of Bekkôdu,
Belagôdu, Kaṇatûr, Abbiça and Bëlûr." Dalâvâi
Nanjanâthaiya pushed on the opérations against Ikkēri,
carrying fire and sword into the Malnâd, passing through
Kalasa, Khânde, Dânivàsa, Hebbe, Jâgara, Bednûr
(Bidarû) and Honnûr (Ponnûr), and thrashing Ikkēri
itself (IkJêriya-nokkalikkisi). 40 Thèse activities on the
Mysore side appear to hâve been continued up to about
the latter part of 1664, for, from a lithic record dated
October 11 (1664), we learn how Dalâvâi Nanjanâthaiya
(Nandinâthaiya) was sent against Ikkēri and how he
was able to win a victory against it. 41

Thoroughly overpowered, SômaēkharaNâyaka, towards
the close of 1664—shortly after Dalâvâi Nanjanâthaiya's
return to Mysore—seems to hâve found
it expédient to sue for peace, sendihg
his ambassador, Purushôtamaiya, to
the court of Seringapatam with présents (consisting of

37. Ibid, II. 26, dating the acquisition in Œbhakriti, Margâsira tu. 18
(December 2, 1663); Annex, l.o.; Mys. Raj. Oca., l.o; see also C. Vî.,
V, 95; E. C., III (1) Ex. 14 (1886), H. 39-41, referring to Dêvâjiva's
conquests from Ikkēri: Ct. Wilks, I. 71 (List of conquests); Añient
India, p. 297; Sources, p. 21; Nâyaka of Mysura, p. 173.
41. See E. C., XII Kg. 16, H. 18-17: Dalâvâi Nandinâthaiyanu samâra-
sannâhara māḍī Têkireyavara-mêlana-karyaka kajûhevallì . . .
ś kâryavu namago bhujâvyevagalaṇi.
éléphants, horses, robes and jewels) and an offer of submission to Dêvarâja Wodeyar.\(^{42}\) Hostilities ceased on the grant of a letter of assurance by Dêvarâja.\(^{43}\) The net result of this five years' war (1659-1664) was that by 1665 the sphere of influence of Mysore was extended as far as Chiknâyakanahalli, Hâssan, Sakrepat^a and Vastâre in the north and the north-west, in which région perfect security was established.\(^{44}\)

We have seen how in 1659 êrï-Banga V I, the Vijayanagar Emperor, was established in Bëlûr by Sivappa Nâyaka I of Ikkëri. However temporising the policy of the latter towards his suzerain, there seems little doubt that Srî-Ranga himself was fully confident of the powers and abilities of Sivappa Nâyaka, especially after the death of Kanthhirava-Narasarâja Wodeyar. The failure of êivappa Nâyaka to take Seringapatam by siège (in 1659) and the death of êivappa himself in September 1660 proved, however, serious blows to Srî-Ranga. So strident, indeed, were his hopes of impérial restoration and so thoroughly had he been won over by Sivappa's assurances, that he had even begun to view with disfavour the policy of Dêvarâja Wodeyar towards Ikkëri and had, in 1662, actively lent his support to the Ikkëri général, êivalinga Nâyaka, against Mysore. What little hope from Ikkëri Srî-Ranga had—especially after the death of êivappa Nâyaka—was blasted for ever by the successes achieved by Dalavài Nanjanâthaiya during January-March 1663. With Ikkëri, his sole supporter (since c. 1656), growing weaker and weaker, and Mysore rapidly absorbing the possessions of Sivappa Nâyaka, Srî-Ranga's position in Bëlûr in 1663 became critical to a degree: to dépend

\(^{42}\) O. Vr., V, 27-30; see also Hastî. Mahat., I, 87, referring to Dêvarâja's victory over the Ikkëri (Ksaḍë) chief.

\(^{43}\) Ibid, 81: nambuṣeyam peliṣṭi.

\(^{44}\) Ibid, 81: pâṣuṣadhyaṃ paduṣam balini.
any longer on Ikkëri seemed unsafe; to turn again for help to Mysore, having lately distrusted her, would be humiliating in the extreme. Such was the predicament in which ēfī-Banga found himself placed about April 1663, when he appears to have finally left Bēlūr for the south.\textsuperscript{45}

The position of Dēvarāja Wodeyar in Seringapatam, during 1659-1664, appears in significant contrast to that of Srī-Ranga. In the earliest inscriptive records of Dēvarāja's reign (belonging to the years 1659-1660),\textsuperscript{46} we find his name mentioned without any titles. In his lithic records, dated in March 1662,\textsuperscript{47} he is styled a Mahamandalēsavara ruling in Seringapatam (Srangapattanavāluva), while in another record, also lithic, dated in November,\textsuperscript{48} he refers to himself as Srimad-rājādhirāja Mysūra Dēvarāja Vadēraiyanavaru (Dēvarāja Wodeyar of Mysore, Emperor of kings). In the next series of records—lithic and copper-plate—ranging from April 1663 down to March 1664,\textsuperscript{49} Dēvarāja Wodeyar appears with a number of titles implying

\textsuperscript{45} We have inscriptions of Srī-Ranga from Bēlūr, ranging from 1659 to 1669, if not 1664 [see Mys. Gaz., II. iii. 2862-2868, 2865-2867, 2886; Nayaka of Madura, p. 897, No. 160; also E. C., V (1) and (2) Hn. 33 and Mj. 21]. In the light of the Mys. Dho. Par. (cited in fn. 86 and 87 supra), Srī-Ranga appears to have finally left Bēlūr for the south not later than 9 April 1663, although grants continued to be issued in his name till 1664. For particulars about Srī-Ranga after 1663, vide section on Mysore and the South (down to 1667).

\textsuperscript{46} See M. E. R., 1910, No. 20 (1666); J. M. O., No. 19-1-62 (1660). In the former record, mention is made of Srī-Ranga-Kāya and "Dēvarāja Voḍeyar" (Dēvarāja Wodeyar of Mysore). It seems to have been issued by Dēvarāja during the sojourn of Srī-Ranga VI in Bēlūr and would afford the earliest indication of his acknowledgment of the latter's suzerainty in the very first year of his (Dēvarāja's) reign. For further particulars about these records and those cited infra, see under Grants and other records and Domestic life.

\textsuperscript{47} E. C., III (1) Nj. 56 and 81, ll. 3-4.

\textsuperscript{48} E. C., IX Ks. 94, ll. 5-8.

\textsuperscript{49} E. C., IX Ks. 94, ll. 5-8.
impérial ideas, among the most significant being Mûrii-nuinmyara-ganda (champion over three chiefs), Para-râya-bhayankara (dreaded by enemy kings), Hindu-râya-suratrâna (Sultan of Hindu kings), Nânâvarña-makuta-nwendalikara-gmçfa (champion over chiefs of many-coloured crowns), ChatussamudrâdhUvara or Chattissamudra-paryanta-bhûmandalâdhiévara (lord of the world as far as the four oceans) and Dharam-Varâha (sovereign of the world). The use of the Boar seal is also in evidence in some of these records, while there is a marked tendency on the part of Dëvarâja to claim impérial raie from the throne in Seringapatam. Ali thesè documents are, again, conspicuous by the absence of the name of his suzerain, i.e., the Emperor of Vijayanagar. Evidently, Dëvarâja Wodeyar, during this period, gradually rose to prominence from the position of a feudatory of the Vijayanagar Empire to that of a ruler of an independent Mysore, who laid claim to impérial sovereignty. His achievements against Ikkëri and his activities in the Karnâtak-Bijâpur-Bâlaghât and the south of Mysore during 1659-1663 were no doubt such as to enhance his réputation and prestige. His progress in those directions was possibly facilitated also by the unsettled conditions of the times and the critical position of Srî-Ranga at Bëlûr. Srî-Ranga himself having probably left the latter place about April 1663, Dëvarâja Wodeyar appears more conspicuously—in his records (of 1663-1664)—with the impérial titles, referred tp, which are distinctly reminiscent of Vijayanagar. In particular,

50. See, for instance, B. C., XII Eg. 37 (1660), l. 240; Bhû-Varâha-mudrâvâcha vîraîtâm; III (1) TN. 26 (1668), l. 73-79: Bhû-Varâha-mudrâvâcha prôvîtaîtâm.

51. B. C., Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol., My. 114, II. 43-49; XII Eg. 33, l. 19; 37, l. 99-99; M. A. R., 1917, l.c.; E. C., IV (9) Kr. 57, l. 12-13; III (1) TN. 26, l. 18; My. 114, l. 9 (of 1668); and Sr. 16 (1664), l. 8. The actual expressions used are: Mysuru-sîrunga-simhasandhirâ; Sîrungasimhasandhirâ; Padma-ranga-simhasandhirâ; Mysuru simhasandhirâtra; etc.
The Palace Copper-plates (dated April 9, 1683), while eulogizing Dēvaraja's prowess and claiming for him the sovereignty of the Karnātaka country, are ever found to contain verses which seem to correspond with those from the Śri-Sāilam Plates (1465) of Virūpāksha III of Vijayanagar (1465-1485). Thus, apparently seceding from the decadent Vijayanagar Empire but really stepping into its shoes, Mysore, during the early years of the reign of Dēvarāja Woḍeyar, had reached an important stage in the evolution of her independence as a kingdom. The arrival at about this time (April 1663) of the celebrated Tātāchārya family of ēri-Vaishnava royal preceptors from the court of Vijayanagar, and their settlement in Seringapatam, probably contributed no little to confirm in the Royal House of Mysore the vanishing glories of Vijayanagar imperialism.

By January 1665, Dēvarāja Woḍeyar had reached the height of his power, as is perhaps obvious from the title Emperor (Samrāt) actually ascribed to him. In July 1666, Daḷavāi Nanjanāthaiya acquired

---

53. See E. C., Ibid., I, 18-27, 34-36:

Nīja-pratipadaḥjātya rājam
Samasta bhagfood pariṣṭhikānatam | Khaḍgāgrataḥ sarva rājān viṣītya
Pratimārtha vīra-vīlana-duḥṣṭāḥ ||
Karnātaka-Lakshmiḥ sarvaṁ sarvāṅgaṁ
Yamīn mahiśī mahanīgaṁ kīrtau |
Bhāmi-sthākariyāsāmsundharaṁ
Sthīrīti nāma prathamam gunaugaṁḥ |
Pratipo-vahna pariṣṭhakānam
Śuḥkā-stutuśākhyāajanāyanāṇaṁ |
Ropu-śhītindravaha nirata dhairyah |
Kanṭarā-valmika kṛṣṭiṁ vahah ||

... ... Dēvarāja-kṣhitēvarah ||
... ... Bengaḥkāmaḥ-puruśānāṁ |
Piyāṁ simhitam sampanaṁ prāpya pālāyamavānminimām ||

54. Vide section on Social life.

---

52. See E. C., Ibid., I, 11-27, 34-36:


Samrāṭ samasta-nṛpa-mañji-mañji-prabudhakar
Nāṭhī́jośī vējayaś bhūte Dēvarājaḥ ||
Sâratavalli from Annajaiya, and in November, Hole-Narasipur from Narasimha Nâyaka, In April 1667, Nanjanâthaiya was succeeded by Kumâraiya of Kañale.

The hostile relations between Madura and Mysore, so much in evidence during the last years of the reigns of Tirumala Nâyaka and Kanthirava-Narasarâja Wodeyar, appear to have been prolonged in some form or other during the earlier parts of the reigns of Chokkanâtha Nâyaka and Dêvarâja Wodeyar. A lithic record from Singânallûr, dated in the very first year of DêvarâjVs reign, possibly points to the renewed activities of the Mysore army in the neighbourhood of the passes. Other records, dated in 1668," refer to Dêvarâja as " destroyer of the Pândy king," " skillful in cutting down the strong-armed Pândya " (Chanda-bâhu-balôddanda Pândya-khandana-panditah), etc. Evidently by 1663 Mysore seems to have achieved a distinct victory over Madura, advancing, it is said, as far as Dîndigal. The political

57. Ibid., II. 97-98; see also C.V., V. 94.
58. See Annals, I. 97; also Mys. Dho. Pâr., I. 68, and section on Ministers, Dalavasis, etc.
61. Ov. Hist. Sri., II. 169, 171-176. This Ms., from the Mackenzie Collection, refers to an invasion of Madura by "Cara sous Nandi Raja," during the reign of Dêvarâja Wodeyar of Mysore, but speaks of the details as it connected with the reign of Tirumala Nâyaka, contemporaneous of Kanthirava-Narasea I (1636-1659), for which there is no evidence. It seems, however, possible that the hostilities between Mysore and Madura, begun during the latter part of the reigns of Kañghirava and Tirumala Nâyaka, continued unabated in the early part of the reigns of Dêvarâja Wodeyar and Chokkanâtha Nâyaka (i.e., c. 1659-1669), Mysore ultimately coming out successful. "Carasura Nandi Raja," referred to, is probably identical with Dalavâi Nanjarajająya I of Kañale, who appears to have been entrusted with the southern campaigns of Dêvarâja (see under Domestic life—Rise of the Kañale Family; also Table XIII). The Ms., being a later compilation, seems loosely to refer to him as "Carasura" (Kârkhâri), which was, however, the distinctive epithet of Dalavâi Nanjarajâyaji II of Kañale (1730-1769). (See Vol. II of this work.) For a critical notice of the position of the author of the Nâyaka of Madura on the subject, see f.n. 54 in Ch. VI.
ambitions of Mysore from 1663 onwards continued to be a source of concern to the southern powers, particularly Madura. The situation assumed an important aspect by the policy and attitude of érï-Ranga VI, the Vijayanagar Emperor, during the period. As indicated already, Srï-Ranga appears to have finally left Bêlûr about April 1663. That he was in the south in 1663 seems obvious from a grant of Chokkanâtha Nâyaka dated in that year, though the latter formally refers in it to Srï-Ranga’s rule at Ghanagiri (Penukoçda); that he was away from Bêlûr before 1664 is borne out by the resumption of Bêlûr itself—along with other places—by Hiriya-Sômaéékha Nâyaka I of Ikkëri, early in 1664. During 1663-1667, érï-Ranga, it would appear, resided in the dominions of Chokkanâtha Nâyaka of Madura, and continued to work out his plan of impérial restoration, directing his attention particularly against the rapidly rising kingdom of Mysore, towards which he was, as we have seen, by no means well disposed since 1659. To Chokkanâtha, however, the présence of érï-Ranga in the south seemed eminently advantageous, to further his own ends against Mysore.

About this time Ghaṭṭa-Mudaliâr of Sâmballi, backed up as usual by Madura, appeared to remain an obstacle to the projected expansion of Mysore in all the directions (dese-gelalendu). About January 1667, Dêvarâja Wodeyar

Siege of Érôde, c. January-June 1667.

51. See Nâyaka of Madura, p. 356, No. 157; Mys. Gaz., II. iii. 2962-2967, No. 12, citing from Sewell’s Lists of Antiquities. Sebhakrit, the date of the record, corresponds to 1666, the Saka date 1664, mentioned, being an expired year.

62. Vide n. 39 supra and text thereto.

63. See C. Vi. (V, 81), where Chokkanâtha (Chokkalinga) is made to refer to Srï-Ranga as “his Srî-Ranga” (tmna Srîraṇga-Raya). Evidently Srî-Ranga had gone over from Bêlûr to Madura in the vain hope of recovering his position by an alliance with Chokkanâtha and other southern feudatories hostile to Mysore. See also inscriptions of Chokkanâtha during 1660-1667, in which he acknowledges the servility of Srî-Ranga (Nâyaka of Madura, pp. 356-356, Nos. 157, 165-166; Mys. Gaz., II. iii. 2962-2967, No. 19, 31-26).
directed opérations against him, defeating him and putting the Kongas to flight. At this reverse, Chokkanātha Nāyaka (Chokkalinga of Madura) himself marched forth towards Êrôde, at the head of a vast army (consisting, it is said, of a lakh of foot, a hundred éléphants and several horses) and a confederacy made up of the fugitive Emperor ērī-Ranga of Vijayanagar, Vēdōji-Paṇḍita, a Vizier of Bijāpur (then in charge of Gingee), Ananta-Paṇḍita (Anantōji) of Gingee (Chenji, Tenjii), a Bijāpur gênerai, and Dâmarlaiyappa Nāyaka (Dâmarlaiyapēndra). There were also, in his ranks, the Velama-Kammes, Telugas, Baçajigas and artillery-men (tupâkadavar), the last under the command of Lingama Nāyaka, the artillery-officer (tupâkada Lingama Nāyaka). Chokkanātha, with his main army (tanna mûlabalamum) and the forces of the confederates, encircled the fort of Êrôde and was preparing to lay siège to it. At this news Dēvarâja Woḍeyar deliberated with his councillors in Seringapatam as to how best to meet the situation. Some of the councillors spoke of the advisability of collecting a large army and carefully proceeding against the enemy; others touched upon the vain frivolity and laxity prevailing in the ranks of the confederate forces (despite their being numerically strong and well-equipped) and the ease with which the combination could be broken down; others, again, stressed the need for diplomacy (rāyabhâriya'nesaguvudti Usembudum). At this juncture, the Crown-prince, Chikkadēvarâja (nephew of Dēvarâja Woḍeyar)—now in his twenty-second year—offered, with rare courage, to lead the Mysore army against the coalition, and sought his uncle's permission to march on to Êrôde. Dēvarâja having apparently acquiesced in his request, letters were despatched forthwith to the commanders of various local forts, ordering a gênerai mobilisation of their troops for

64. Identical with Aiyeppa of Poonaamalli (brother of Dāmarla-Venkaṭādri), founder of Chennapâṭṭuva or Madras in the name of his father, Chenna. See Sources and Mys. Gaz., referred to in fn. 63 infra.
the campaign. In the course of these preparations, Chokkanatha's representative \(\text{niyögi-gurivânisam}\) at Seringapatam—probably under the influence of Dëvarâja's own courtiers\(^65\)—hastened to send him a report \(\text{binnavattale}\), acquainting him with the weakness of his (Chokkanatha's) position and the intended advance of Chikkadëvarâja, and hinting at the latter's might and prowess. Whereupon Chokkanatha retired in strict privacy to Trichinopoly and was followed thither by Śrí-Ranga also. In vain did Dâmarlaiyappa Nâyaka and the artillery-men at Ėrôde write to Chokkanatha assuring him of their steadfastness and of the support of the cavalry force of Gingee. Meanwhile, in Seringapatam, Dëvarâja Wodeyar, on hearing of this turn in the course of affairs, found it expédient, in agreement with Chikkadëvarâja, to send his army only under the Dalavâi, to engage the remnant of the confederacy. Accordingly, about June 1667, Dalavâi Kumâraiya (who had lately succeeded Nanjanâthaiya) left Seringapatam. Making rapid and uninterrupted marches, he entered the camp of the enemy at Ėrôde causing great havoc. A short and swift action followed, in which the Kongas were thoroughly defeated and put to rout; Dâmarlaiyappa Nâyaka was slain; Ananta-Pandita put to flight; the éléphant named \(\text{Kulaëêkhara}\) captured and the entire Tigula-nâdu plunged in consternation \(\text{Tigula-nâdanitum tabbibbugole}\).

\(^65\) There seems some reason to suspect the accuracy of this part of the \(C. \text{Vi.,}\) cited in \(f.n. \text{66 infra}\). It is a question whether Chokkanatha's agent at Seringapatam would not have been prevailed upon by Dëvarâja's courtiers to effectually detach his master from the confederacy. Some diplomacy must have been at work, in keeping with the mature deliberations at Dëvarâja's court and in view of the risk involved in entrusting young Chikkadëvarâja with the responsibility of leading the Mysoore army against a formidable combination. See also and compare S. K. Aiyangar, \textit{Ancient India,}\ p. 287, for a similar view.

\(^66\) \textit{C. \text{Vi., V,} 33-39; E. C., \text{III (1)} \text{Sr.} 14 (1668), II. 38-39; and \textit{Hasti. Mâhat,}, I, 67—detailing, and referring to, the siege of Ėrôde and Dëvarâja's victory over the Nâyak of Madura and the Kongas. The siege of Ėrôde is to be dated c. January-June 1667, in the light of the \textit{Mys. Dho. Pûr.} and inscriptions cited \textit{infra.} See also and compare \textit{Wilks,} I. 69-70; \textit{Ancient India,} pp. 266-267; \textit{Sources,} p. 31; \textit{Nâyak of Madura,} pp. 36, 171-178; and \textit{Mys. Gas., II. ill.} 2394-2396.
It was a distinct victory for Mysore. In June 1667, Dalaväi Kumâraiya took possession of Érode; in November, Dhârâpuram; and in February 1668, Vâmalûr and the dependencies of Kâmalûr and Sâmballi-pura—from Ghatta-Mudaliar. The Mysore army, we are told, proceeded as far as Trichinopoly, forcing Chokkanâtha to submit and accepting from him presents consisting of several horses, cash and costly jewels. Thèse activities of Dévaraja Wodeyar are confirmed in an ample measure by records referring to his grants, found in what are now parts of Salem and Coimbatore districts, ranging from 1667 onwards.

Among other events of importance from a local point of view were the acquisition of Huliyûr-durga in December 1667, and of Kunigal in January 1668, from Mum-madi-Kempe-Gauda of Mâgadi (1658-1678).

We hâve seen how Sri-Ranga VI, the Vijayanagar Emperor, was in the dominions of Chokkanâtha Nâyaka of Madura during 1663-1667 and how he left for Trichinopoly, about the middle of 1667, during the siège of Érôde. Sri-Ranga's last hopes of impérial restoration vanished with the break-down of the confederacy at Érôde and the victory

---

67. See Mys. Dho. Pûr., II. 38-39, specifically dating these acquisitions in Plasana, Abhâsha sa. 15 (June 25, 1667); Margadâsa sa. 10 (November 16, 1667) and Phalgunâ sa. 10 (February 12, 1668); Amnâla, I. 97; also Mys. Hâj. Chô, l.c.; C. Vî, V, 21, and H. O., III (1) Sr. 14, II. 62-63, referring to Dévaraja's conquests in the south-east of Mysore. Cf. Wilks, I. 71 (List of conquests); Nâyaka of Madura, pp. 161-163.


69. I.M.C., No. 18-18-20, p. 48 (June 22, 1667), referring to Dévaraja's conquest of Tiguûnâya; I.M.P., I. 951-953, Ch. 305, 306 and 309 (1668 and 1671). For further particulars about these records, see under Grants and other records. Cf. Nâyaka of Madura, pp. 161-166, 171.

achieved by Mysore against them (June 1667). Successively foiled at Mysore, Ikkëri and Madura during a period extending well nigh to two décades (c. 1650-1667), Śrī-Ranga, in or about 1668, appears to have left Trichinopoly for Penukonda, from where, it would seem, he continued to rule, with his authority much reduced, till about 1681, if not 1692. In a lithic record, dated in October 1664, Dēvarâja Wodeyar acknowledges the suzerainty of Dēva-Dēva-Mahârâya. The sérries of Dēvarâja's records, ranging successively from 1665 down to 1673, are generally conspicuous by the absence of the name of the Vijayanagar Emperor. In only two of these records, however, dated in April 1665 and May 1668 respectively, does Dēvarâja Wodeyar acknowledge the suzerainty of Vïra-Venkata-patirâya-raiya (Venkata V). Most of the records, from 1664 down to 1673, refer to Dēvarâja with or without

71. See Nâyaka of Madura, pp. 360, 362, Nos. 183 and 186; also Mys. Gaz., II. iii. 2967 (Nos. 26 and 26), 2406-2407, citing documents and correcting S. K. Aiyangar and other authorities.
72. See Table XIV; also records cited infra.
73. E. C., XII Kg. 46, II. 6-9. For details about this and other documents cited infra, see under Grants and other records and Domestic life.
74. Vide references cited under Ibid.
75. E. C., IV (2) Gu. 84, II. 8-9; 86, II. 6-10.
76. Among the records mentioning the imperial titles, etc., of Dēvarâja are E. C., Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol., My. 116 (1665), II. 8-10; Ml. 147 (1669), II. 4-5; IV (3) Gu. 84 and 88 (1666), II. 9-11; Ha. 199 (1669), II. 7-9; 22 (1672), II. 8-9; Yd. 58 and 64 (1666), II. 5-7 and pp. 166-167 (Text); 43 (1667), II. 10-22; Kg. 119 (1670), II. 6-7; and 57 (1672), II. 5-7; III (1) Ml. 86 and 88 (1672), II. 7-9 and 8-9; Nj. 191 (1672), II. 10-18; TN. 54 (1670), II. 9-11; IX Cp. 53 (1696), II. 5-7; M. A. R., 1931, No. 38 (1668), II. 5-6; XII Kg. 4 (1671), II. 7-8; and Tp. 108 (1673), II. 4-6. Among the records not mentioning the titles of Dēvarâja are E. C., XII Kg. 46 (1666), Tp. 72 (1669), 70 (1671), Kg. 5 (1671); XI Kn. 96 (1671); V (1) and (2) Gu. 216 (1665), 155 (1670), 278 (1672), etc., Ha. 8 (1666); II SB. 401 (1672); IV (2) Gu. 26 (1666), Ng. 44 (1669), Kg. 120 (1670) and 107 (1672); III (1) Md. 81 (1667); M. E. R., 1928, No. 6 (1665); J. M. P., I. 551-562 (1669, 1671), etc.
impérial titiès, etc., thèse being generally identical with \textit{those} occurring in the earlier documents (down to 1664). \textbf{Among} the additions, however, are \textit{Karnâta-simhâsana-madhïévarah} (Lord of the throne of the Karnâṭaka country), \textit{Vîra-pratâpaéâli-Chakravarti} (Emperor) and \textit{Dakshina-simhasana-Srirangapattanakke-kartarâda} (Agent or Deputy to the seat of southern power—lit. throne), mentioned in lithic documents dated in December 1667\textsuperscript{77} and January 1673.\textsuperscript{78} The use of the Boar seal is also, as usual, in évidence.\textsuperscript{79} In one document, dated in November 1672,\textsuperscript{80} the earlier désignation of Dêvarâja, \textit{i.e.}, \textit{Mahâmandalévara}, appears side by side with the impérial titiès of his. Other records\textsuperscript{81} bear out, in an increasing measure, his claim to impérial rule from the throne at Seringapatam. One record\textsuperscript{82} even speaks of Dêvarâja as seated on a secure throne. From another,\textsuperscript{83} we learn that he had been established on the jewelled

\textsuperscript{77} E.C., IV (2) Yd. 48, II. 10-11. \textsuperscript{78} Ibid, III (1) TN. 54, II. 9-11. \textsuperscript{79} See, for instance, E.C., IV (2) Yd. 49, II. 168-169: Bhû-Vardha-mudrayâcha virджitam. \textsuperscript{80} E.C., III (1) Nj. 101, II. 10-11. \textsuperscript{81} See E.C., IV (2) Yd. 58, II. 6-7; Hs. 169, I. 8; Hg. 119, I. 7; IX Cp. 66, I. 7; Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol., Ml. 147, II. 4-5; also IV (2) Gu. 64, II. 9-10; 65, II. 10-11; III (1) Ml. 95, II. 9-10 (revised with a fresh transcript obtained from the Mysore Archæological Office); 63, II. 4-5; V (1) and (2) Gu. 219, II. 14-15—referring to the throne as Srîrangapattanâda simhâsana and Pâchehina-rangadâhi simhâsana, and to Dêvarâja Wojejay as Srîrangapattanâda simhâsanâdâhitarkë, Mysëru-simhâsanâdâhitë, Mysëru-simhâsanâdâhitë, Mysëru-simhâsanâdâhitë, etc. \textsuperscript{82} E.C., IV (2) Yd. 54 (1666), p. 156 (Text): Bhûdra-pîthâhitëhitë. The word Bhûdra-pîthâ generally means throne. Rice’s rendering of the expression as “seated on a secure throne,” is quite in keeping with the context. \textsuperscript{83} Ibid, Bangalore Dist. Suppl. Vol., Bu. 144 (1694), II. 16-18: 

\textit{Srî-Ranga-Báya-mahi-dëhîta-pîtha-sametha}  
\textit{Srî-ràna-vihih-viâyâyam Doâra-Dêvârayâh} ||  
\textit{Râjaad-Rangapure surendra-mahît samrajya-simhasane}  
\textit{Sahând-Telâhuriva Srîya-Vasudhâpita-samâdhamanâh prabhûkh}||

The reference to \textit{Srî-Ranga-Báya} in this record is to \textit{Srî-Ranga II} (see f.n. \textit{97} in Ch. V). The record being a grant of the reign of Chikka-\textit{dëravarjya} Wojejay (1672-1704), \textit{Dêvarâja} Wojejay is referred to here as “Doâra (Doâra)-Dêva-Báya,” perhaps by way of distinguishing him from his nephew and successor (see also f.n. \textit{11 supra}).
thron of Srí-Ranga Raya and was wielding the sceptre of impérial sovereignty from Seringapatam. All this points to how the Vijayanagar Empire was fast decaying and how the earlier tendency on the part of Dëvarâja Woḍeyar to step into the latter's sovereign status as its political heir—while retaining his theoretical designation of Karta and Mahâmandalêvêvara of Seringapatam—continued to manifest itself in a more pronounced manner during the latter part of his reign.

Side by side with this tendency towards the open assertion of impérial power was the local position of Dëvarâja Woḍeyar himself. Already by 1665, he was, as we have seen, at the height of his power. The events of 1667-1668 added considerably to his réputation and prestige. And, during 1668-1673, he was ruling Mysore in absolute peace and security, impressing his contemporaries with his might and prowess by the trophy of a pair of sandals (pâda-chûdam), which he is said to have got prepared out of the precious stones received as tribute from the powers subdued by him. 84

By 1673, the last year of Dëvarâja Woḍeyar's reign, the kingdom of Mysore, powerful and practically independent, had been extended as far as Hassan and Sakrepaṭna in the west, Salem in the east, Chiknâyakana-halli in the north and Ėrôde and Dhârâpuram in the south. 85

Inscriptions of Dëvarâja Woḍeyar point to his rule from the capital city of Seringapatam, seated on the jewelled throne. The influence of his personality thoroughly made itself felt in civil as in military matters. The

---

Footnotes:
85. See E. C., I I I (1) Sr. 14 (1686), 11. 40-48, which enables us to determine the précise limita of the kingdom of Mysore in 1678.
administration was, as usual, conducted in the traditional manner, due regard being paid to the précepte of dharma laid down in the Smrti.\textsuperscript{36}

The ministera and officers of Kañthārava's reign, it would seem, continued in office under Dēvarāja Woḍeyar, with the possible exception of the royal scribe, to which office Lakshmipati, a Jain, appears to have succeeded.\textsuperscript{87} Among the Dalavāis of Dēvarāja, already referred to, Hamparājaiya of Kârugahalli continued in office till April 1660, when he was, it is said, removed from service on a charge of defrauding the state revenues. He was succeeded by Mallarājaiya of Kalale (April-July 1660), Muddaiya (July 1660-September 1661), Nanjanâthaiya (September1661-February 1662) and Kântaiya of Kalale (February 1662-April 1662). Nanjanâthaiya was re-appointed in April 1662 and was followed in April 1667 by Kumâraiya of Kalale, who remained in office during the rest of the reign.\textsuperscript{58} Among the feudatories, Doddaiya of Channarâyapatna, having died about 1660, had been succeeded by his son, Basavaiya, mentioned in records dated in the years 1661, 1669 and 1670.\textsuperscript{80}

Dēvarāja Woḍeyar is credited with having thoroughly studied the character and conduct of his feudatories (Pâlegârs) and regulated his relations with them, granting rent-free lands (umbali) to some and quit-rent villages (jôdi) to

\textsuperscript{36} See Padsh. Mâhât. (of Timma-Kavi), I, 43: Smrtiyukta-dharmadindâlita.
\textsuperscript{87} Vide prose passage at the end of the Ms. copy (1663) of Rana’s Ajitamathâ-Purasâ, p. 190: Mysûra-Chikkaya-Rayana rayasada Lakshmipati. The reference to “Chikkaya-Ray” here is to Dēvarājâ-Woḍeyar of Mysore. See also under Literary progress and Domestic life, for further notice of this Ms.
\textsuperscript{58} Amulas, I, 96-97; also Mys. Dho. Fér., I, 67-68. Dalavâ: Nanjanâthaiya is identical with the one mentioned in N. C., III (1) Nj. 56 and 61 (March 14, 1662, ll. 5 and 6), and with “Dalavâyi Nandinâthaiya” mentioned in N. C., XII Kg. 46 (October 11, 1664, l. 18). For further particulars about the Dalavâs of the Kalale Family, see section on Domestic life—Rise of the Kalale Family, and Table XIII.
\textsuperscript{80} Vide references cited under Grants and other records.
others and settling cash contributions (khaṇḍāṇeṇa hana) with the rest.\textsuperscript{90}

Dēvarâja was, like his predecessor, an ardent Vaishnava.\textsuperscript{91}

The \textit{Palace Copper-plates},\textsuperscript{32} in particular, speak of his devotion to God Ranganâtha of Seringapatam. From other records,\textsuperscript{93} we learn that he used daily to rise at dawn, contemplate and worship the lotus feet of Vishṇu repeating without omission His thousand names, then perform oblations to fire, and, having bestowed gifts of cows and money on the Brâhmans, listen to the récital of the \textit{Purânas} and sacred stories. In keeping with this, we have the contemporary work, \textit{Ghaupadada-Pustaka} (c. 1670)\textsuperscript{94} generally depicting Dēvarâja Wodeyar as getting up at dawn, taking his bath, wearing shining silken garments, putting the tikâ of musk on his forehead and performing the morning rites. Toleration was, as usual, a prominent feature of Dēvarâja's religion. He

\textsuperscript{90} Annals, I. 102.
\textsuperscript{91} See E. C., XII Kg. 37 and III (1) TN. 23 (1669), I, 97-98 and 16-16: Śrī Nârâyana pādâ-pânceâjâyâgâ vînâsâ vishvâgabhraḥ; IV (2) Yd. 54 (1666), p. 156 (Text): Sūtâ Hari-pârâyâṇâ hâdi-nimingâ Nârâyânaḥ.
\textsuperscript{93} Ibid., XII Kg. 37 (1669), I. 66-70:

\begin{quote}
Kalîye prabālāya kamâl-sa-râma-ânâghri-yugam
Dhâyo-bhâgîjyâni niyamâñcâ suhurra-nânañcâ
Hûvâ hruânamadhikam vasugam pilañcâ
Prâjyâni vigra-nîvalâñcâ dêdâti nîyam||
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{94} See III (1) Sr. 14 (1669), I, 43-48:

\begin{quote}
Kalîye . . . . . . . vasugam dvijâbhâyô
Dêdâ senityam ibhâsa kathâ bûnâtî||
\end{quote}

See also Mys. Raj. Ota., 28; Annals, I. 102.

\textsuperscript{94} See ff. 1:

\begin{quote}
Mysâra Dēvarâjindra . . . ðînaspâ-nûdayâdâlî |
Majjanaâma-nuvâkñi |
Suruchirâ dukuâloka maîyîâlim-bîṣṭî |
Perâ nosâlîmâloge kartirâ-silakâñcî |
Vînta sindhyâdî satkarñauvamu vâchissî||
\end{quote}

The verses in this part of the poem are not numbered in the original. For a notice of the work, see under Literary progress.
was a great friend and patron of Brâhmanism as known to those days. He is indeed referred to\textsuperscript{95} as having taken a vow to govern the kingdom, to protect and establish Gods and deserving Brâhmans. The Bhêrya copper-plate grant\textsuperscript{96} (1666) further speaks of him as having divided his kingdom into four parts, giving the first to the Brâhmans, the second to the Gods, the third to charity, and reserving the fourth for his own use. He paid equal attention to Saivism and Vaishriavism and respected equally the three sects of Brâhmans, especially in the matter of making grants and bestowing on the latter, shares (vrittis) in the agrahâras formed in his own name (Dëvarâjapura).\textsuperscript{97} Equally solicitous was he towards the Jains and Vïra-éaivas in the kingdom.\textsuperscript{96} Maintenance and upkeep of temples, maths and satras (feeding-houses) for all classes and creeds was, as we shall see, the object underlying most of his grants and other records.

Gifts, acts of piety and public utility were a normal feature of Dëvarâja's activities as a ruler. Thus, we learn," he conducted the Vâjapëya and other sacrifices to Gods (Vâjapëya-nuikhânëka-makha-nikhila . . . . ; yajnâ dëvâécha dharmâh); made the sixteen great gifts (shôdaêa mahâ-dâna) described in Hëmâdri and other works (gifts namely, hirânya-garbha, brahmânda,
saptâmbudhi, tulâ-purtcsha, gô-sahasra, kalpavalli, kâmadhênu, ratna, gô-svarna-bhû-svarna-garbha, pan-
cha-hala or /langala, kalpa-vriksha, kanakarathi-bhûdêva
and viêva-chakra); bestowed difficult, varied and
innumerable gifts (vividhân amànushân dharmân; amitâ
yasya dharmâh), at Srîrangam, Tirupati (Venkataiaila),
Mêlkôte (Yâdavagiri), Kânchi (Hastigiri), Râmëévaram
(Sëtu), the banks of the Gautamï (or Gôdâvarï), Àllahâbâd
(Prayâga), Benares (Vâranâsi), Gaya and Seringapatam
(Pure Rangadhâ?nnah); constructed wells, ponds, tanks
and temples (vâpï-kûpa-tatâkân... déva-grhân; dêvasthânâni);
established groves, watersheds and
feeding-houses from road to road (mârgë-mârgë sadvanâni
prapâêcha; mârgë-mârgë prapâêcha satrânî), furnishing
each village with a feeding-house for the free distribution
of food (grâmë-grâmë bhûri-wirçtâna-satram); and
arrangea for the conduct of daily festivals in the temples,
bestowing villages as donations therefor (Dëvasthânân-
yûtsavân-tëçu-nityam... tadartham datvà grâmân).
He is further referred to as utilising the spoils of war for
making gifts to Brâhmans, for rewarding his friends and
for providing ornaments to his queens.100 The popularity
of his rule and the extent of his kingdom are indicated by
a record of 1686101 mentioning the establishment by him
of feeding-houses (satra) at a distance of every nine miles
(yôjana) on every road throughout the length and breadth
of his dominions, to the east from Sakrepatna (Sakhare-
pattana), to the west from Salem (èëlayapura), to
the south from Chiknâyakanahalli (Chikkanâyaka-
pura), and to the north from Dhârâpur (Dhârâpura).
Among other acts of piety Dëvarâja is credited
with are: the laying of a thousand steps to the
Chêmundi Hill at Mysore and the setting up of an
exquisitely sculptured monolithic Bull midway
there to (1664); the construction of a tank named

100. C.Fi.,1.0. 101. E,C., I I I (1) Sr. 14,11. 41-43.
Dëvâmbudhi in Mysore (March 1666) besides provision for daily services, with gifts, to the holy shrine at Tirupati and endowments to the Goddess Châmundësvari and to the Saiva and Vaishçava temples at Nanjangûd, Mysore, Seringapatam, Mêlkôte and other places; and the extension of the temple of Triñëévara at Mysore, adding a stone mançtpam of twenty-seven ankanams, a stone pillar and a seven-storeyed tower over its Mahå-dvâra, and setting up the images of twenty-five éaiva deities in the pavilions of the temple.

Among the extant records of the reign of Dëvarâja Wodeyar, a damaged lithic inscription, dated in 1659, seems to register a service to the Basavëévara temple at Singânallûr, Kollëgâl taluk. A nirûpa, dated in 1660, refers to his grant of lands rent-free (umbali) to Gange-Basave-Gauda of Hangala. A third, dated November 25, 1661, refers to a service by Basavaiya (son of Doçdaiya) of ChannarâyapatçLa, a feudatory of Dëvarâja, in the temple of Jakkëévara-svâmi in the village of Jambûr. A stone charter of Dëvarâja, dated November 15, 1662, directs the local officials of the gadis of the Kânkânhallî-sîme (i.e., Gurikârs, Pârupatyagdrs, Sunka-manëgârs, Sènabhôgas, Râvutas, Bânûves and Simka-kârkûm, etc.) to make annual cash contributions to the treasury of God Mahadëévara of Moçagâla, for the offerings, illuminations, car festival and services to the

---

108. See Annaî, I. 99-101; Mys. Raj. Chh. 27; also É.C., III (1) Sr. 14, I. 93-94 (referring to the construction of the tank in Mysore); Wilks, I., 76 (referring to the Bull); cf. Raj. Kuth., XII. 479 (referring to the setting up of the Bull in the reign of Rayûbra). 109. M.H.R., 1910, No. 90 (I.M.P., I. 558, Ch. 845): 4. 1561, Vikâri; see also n. 46 supra. 104. I.M.C., No. 19, 89, Hangala-Raja-Âkhe, p. 10: Sâivrni. 105. É.C., V (1) and (2) Ch. 258: 4. 1564, Plava, Margâñira su. 15, Monday; 4. 1564, in this record, is a slight error for 4. 1563. 106. Íd., IX En. 94: 4. 1601, Subhaikri, Margâñira su. 15, Saturday; 4. 1561, in this record, is an error for 4. 1564 (Subhaikri).
God. The *Palace Copper-plates*, dated April 9, 1663,\(^\text{107}\) register a rent-free grant by Dēvarāja Wodeyar, for the merit of his parents, of the village of Chandakavāḍī (with six hanilets) in the Rāmasamudra hōbli in the Hadinâq-sīme, to Mantra-mūrti Rāja-Rājēndra-Bhārati-Svāmi, as a *māṭh* endowment (*māṭha-svāsthya*). A lithic record, dated May 6, 1663,\(^\text{108}\) refers to the building of a temple to God Chandraēkhara at Channarāyapatna and the performance of the consécration service therein by Doddāiya. The record also refers to the érection by him of a temple to Kāḍa-Basavēvara. We hâve next a number of records of Dēvarāja Wodeyar, dated July 6, 1663 (*Sōbhakrit, Ashādha eu. 12, Monday*): oneof thèse, a copper-plate grant from the Rāghavēndrasvāmi *māṭh* at Nanjangūḍ,\(^\text{109}\) registers the gift by him of the village of Nallūr—surnamed Dēuarājapura (of the annual revenue of 100 *dinārs*)—in the Saragūr-sthala, to Rāghavēndra-tīrtha-Sripāda-Svāmi, son of Sudhindra-tīrtha-Sripāda (spiritual son of Vijayēndra-tīrtha-ērīpāda), to provide for God's worship and the feeding of the Brāhmans. Others record, respectively, the establishment and grant of an *agrahāra* (named Dēvarājapura) of fifty shares for Brāhmans at Malagūr and its seven hamlets in the Bāchahalli-sthala and the Nāgamangala hōbli of the Hoysala-nādu;\(^\text{110}\) the grant, for the merit of Dēvarāja's parents and ancestors, of the village of Tūbinakere in the Amritūr-sthala, to Venkata-Varadāchārya of Yēdūr or Ettūr—of Satāmarshana-gōtra, Āpastambha-sūtra and Yajussākhā—son of Kōti-Kanyādānām Lakshmīkumāra-

---

\(^{107}\) E.C., *Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol., My. 114 (M.A.R., 1909, p. 36): t. 1663, *Sōbhakrit, (Nīja) Chaītra eu. 12*. There was an intersalary *Chaītra* in *Sōbhakrit* and the grant appears to have been made in *Nīja-Chaītra*, April 9, 1663, as indicated above.

\(^{108}\) Ibid., V (1) and (9) Cr. 188: *Sōbhakrit, Vaīṣākha eu. 10*, Wednesday.

\(^{109}\) *M.A.R.*, 1913, pp. 55-69, para 145, *Sōbhakrit, Ashādha eu. 11*, Monday, of this record, actually corresponds to July 6, 1663, on which day there was both *Ekādāsa* and *Dvādaśa* (see *Ind. Epk., VI.* 129), the former being evidently observed by the *Vaishnava māṭh*, the done.

\(^{110}\) E. C., IV (3) Kr. 67.
Tâtôçhârya and grandson of Immadi-Tiramala-Tâtâchârya of Srî-Saila Vaméa, after making the laksharhôma, svêtâéva and other gifts; another grant to the same donee of the village of Hallîkere, in the Nâgamangala-sthala, and of the agrahâra of Nûlapura (named Ikkëri), containing sixty-four shares; the establishment of an agrahâra (named Dêvarâjapura) in the Manîkarnîkà-kshêtra, north-east of Seringapatam, and the grant to the three sects of Brâhmans, i.e., Smârthas, àri-Vaishñavas and Tatva-vâdins (Màdhvas), of the village of Hâlagere (with its hamlets and two other villages)—also in the Amritnr-sthaja and yielding 500 dinars—divided into fifty shares; the gift of the village of Âgatûr, in the Saragûr-sthala, to a priest, as an offering to Lord Krishna; and a grant to an agrahâra established at the village of Kaudale (otherwise called Dêvarâjapura).

A nirâpa of Dêvarâja, dated in 1663, records the grant of the villages of Horakëri-Bachahalli and Hosahalli to the newly constructed stone math at Hangâla (Rangâlaballi hosadâgi kattista kalmaṭakke).

111. Ibid., XII Kg. 88. For further particulars about the donees, see under Social life.

112. Ibid., III (1) TN. 28. See also f.n. 162 and 169 infra.

113. Ibid., XII Kg. 97: the Hâlagere Plates; also 88; III (1) Sr. 14 (1663), li. 54-55; and M. A. R., 1910-11, pp. 55-56, paras 132-133. See also under Learning and culture. Rice places Kg. 97 in 1663 but Şobhâkrit, the actual date of the record, corresponds to 1663.

114. Ibid., IV (9) Kg. 66.

115. E. O., III (1) Md. 114 (revised with the fresh transcript obtained from the Mysore Archaeological Office). See also M. A. R. 1933, No. 49, pp. 263-266.

116. I. M. C., No. 19-1-59, Hangâla-Bêyya-Rêkke, p. 19: Şobhâkrit. This record is almost identical with M. A. R., 1930, No. 24 (pp. 161-163), regarded by Dr. M. H. Krishna, on chronological grounds, to be spurious (Ibid., p. 163). In the light of the earlier copy (c. 1500) from the I. M. C., the latter (i.e., No. 24) must be taken to be an interpolation of a document originally dated in 1663 (Şobhâkrit)—vide also Appendix V—(1). The stone math, referred to in the record, is the same as the one mentioned in M. A. R., 1930, No. 25 (1663), pp. 162-163, and noticed in Ch. XX, fn. 145. For further reference to it, see under Domestic life in this Ch.
A lithic record, dated October 11, 1664, refers to the grant by Devaraja Wodeyar, on the occasion of Tulā-Sankaramaipam, of the village of Kaggere in the Kunigalsthala, for the service of Kaggere-Tōntada-Siddēsvara-Svāmi, a deified Vīra-Saiva saint. The grant, it is said, was made in commemoration of the success achieved by the Mysore army (under Dalavāi Nanjanāthaiya) against Ikkēri, for which they had offered prayers to the svāmi.

A copper-plate inscription, dated January 6, 1665, registers the grant by Devarāja of the village of Lakkūr, in the Terakanāmbi-sthala, to Lakkappa-Jyōtisha (son of Banadaniia-Jyōtisha, of Jāmadagni-gōtra, Àévalāyana-sūtra and Rk-Sākhā), at the time of performing the gift of svarna-tulā (weighing oneself against gold), on the occasion of the solar eclipse. A lithic record; dated April 10, 1665, speaks of Devarāja Wodeyar as having caused the virakta-matha to be newly erected in the Mallana's corner (Mallana-müleyallî), to the north of God Nanjundēévara at the junction of the Kapinī and Kaundinī, and made a grant of the villages of Hukunda and Dēsipura to the Virakta-svāmi Prapamappa-channāvira-Dēvaraiya Wadēr, in order that all the Vīra-Māhēāvaras might find refuge in ēiva. Another, dated December 7, 1665, is a charter registering a grant of Devarāja to the God of Bhaktarahalli. A copper-plate inscription, dated December 29, 1665, records the gift of three villages (one belonging to the Srīrangapattana division and the other two to Hassan) —on the occasion of Makara-Sankrānti—

117. E. C., XII Kg. 48: 4. 1585 expired, Krōdhi, Kārtika m. 2; see also text of f.n. 41 supra.
119. E. C., IV (2) Gu. 64: Vīrāvēaru, Vīrākṣa m. 6, Monday.
120. Ibid., V (1) and (2) Gu. 218: 4. 1686 expired, Vīrāvēaru, Mārgasaḷa m. 10.
121. M. B. R., 1929, No. 6: 4. 1687, Vīrāvēaru, Pushya m. 8, Friday. See also Nos. 9 and 10 (copies of No. 9). The donor, Dhanḍaiya, in this record, seems to be identical with Dhanvēraiya who used to furnish ornaments to Kaśṭhiraya-Narasaraja Wodeyar I (see Ch. IX).
by Dhanvojaiya (Dhanôjaiya, son of Sivaiya and grandson of Nânaga, of Lambakarnagôtra and Ásvalâyanasûtra), an officer of Dëvarâja Wodeyar (?), for the célébration of the car festival in the temple of 8ubrahmanya at Kukke and for the maintenance of an anna-satra there. A lithic record, dated February 22, 1666,\textsuperscript{198} refers to the grant of some villages by Dëvarâja Wodeyar to the agrahara of G arakahalli (named Dëvarâjapura), on the occasion of Sivarâtri. An epigraph, dated June 24, 1666,\textsuperscript{188} records a cash grant to the temple treasury (bhandâra) of Àdïévara of Seringapatam, by Pâyañña (a disciple of Chârukîrti-Panditâchârya of êravana-Belagola), for the Astâhniika-Dharma. A lithic record, dated June 29, 1666,\textsuperscript{134} registers the grant of the village of Gâvunahalli as rent-free (sarva-mânyavâgi), by Dëvarâja Wodeyar, for the service of the Goddess Chàmundëévarï. Another, dated December 30, 1666,\textsuperscript{135} is a stone charter of Dëvarâja, granting an agrahâra (of 92| shares) named Dëvarâjapura—in the Bhërya One Thousand place and its twelve hamlets belonging to Narasimhapura—to learned and deserving Brâhmans of various gôtras and sûtras, on the occasion of Makara-Sankrdnti. The Bhërya copper-plate grant, of the same date,\textsuperscript{198} not only confirms this charter but also records the additional gift by Dëvarâja of a well-built and well-furnished house (in the Maçikarriikà-kshëtra) to each of the 92 donees, on the same occasion. A lithic record, dated in

\textsuperscript{190} E. O., IX Op. 56 : Pîvavatsu, Mâghâ ba. 12, Thursday, Sivarâtri. Sivarâtri, however, actually took place on Mâgha ba. 14, Thursday (February 22, 1666)—see Ind. Rpl., VI. 184. The sithi, mentioned in the record, is apparently a slight scribal error. Cf. Annals, I. 99.


\textsuperscript{184} 1666, V (1) and (9) Hu. 6 : 4. 1666, Parabhava, Ashagha du. 6.

\textsuperscript{193} Ibid., IV (2) Yd. 63 : Parabhava, Pusyâ (du. 14), Sunday.

\textsuperscript{155} Ibid., Yd. 64 : Ibid. For further details about the grant, see under Learning and culture.
April 1667,\(^{127}\) speaks of the grant by Dëvarâja Wodeyar of three additional villages to the Devarâjapura agrahara which he had previously established at Hâluganga-kere belonging to Amritûr. An inscription from the Mackenzie Collection, dated June 22, 1667,\(^{128}\) records a grant by Dëvarâja, of eleven villages in the Paritipâdisthala of Vâmalûr-sîme, for services to God Ranganatha of Seringapatam, on the occasion of his conquest of Tigulâjiya (Tigulanyavannu \ldots muntada râjya-vannu jeyisi jaiyotsavagalalli grâma kshêtragalannu bitta vivara). Another record, a copper-plate charter, dated December 30, 1667,\(^{129}\) registers a gift by Dëvarâja of the village of Muñdûr, in the Sâligrâma-sthala (belonging to Narasimhapura), for an agrahdra (of 21 shares) named Dëvarâjapura. A lithic document, dated May 30, 1668,\(^{130}\) confions the grant by hira of the villages of Hukunda and Dëéipura to the Virakta-mâtha newly built, in the Mallana-mûile to the north of the Kapinî and Kaundiniî ri vers in Nanjangûd. Another, dated July 1, 1668,\(^{131}\) records his gift of the village of Këtahalli, in the Terakanâmbi-sthala, for the free distribution of food in the Lingâyat math in the town of Mysore (Maisûra ura-volagana \ldots Mahattina mathada cmna-ddnada dharmaké).

Another, dated April 1, 1669,\(^{133}\) registers a grant of Dëvarâja, in perpetuity, to a certain Wodeyar (? of Talakâd), in the village of Belakavâdi. A third, dated May 10,

---

\(^{127}\) H. C., III (1) Mâ. 51: t. 1594, Plavanga, Vaidikha. Rice places this record in 1564, relying on the saka date only (1586), which, however, does not tally with Plavanga. Plavanga, Vaidikha actually corresponds to April 1667 and this date is preferred here.

\(^{128}\) I. M. C., No. 18-15-20, p. 43: t. 1589, Plavanga, Aśadha su. 11, Prathamâ-Buddha.

\(^{129}\) E. C., IV (3) Yd. 48: Plavanga, Pushya ha. 10, Monday.

\(^{130}\) Ibid., Gu. 65: t. 1890, Kilaka, (Adhika) Aśadha su. 1, Saturday; vide also Gu. 64 in l.m. 119 sugra.

\(^{131}\) M. A. R., 1881, No. 88, pp. 129-131: Kilaka, Nîra-Aśadhya su. 2. For further reference to this document, see under Domestic life.

1669, refers to the setting up of God Viâvëévara in NSgamangala. À fourth, dated October 19, 1669, speaks of the érection of a temple and a bali-pïtha for God Chandraéëkhara, thè processional image of God éankarëévara of Keregôdu (in'the Channarâyapaṭṭa-sïrue), by Doḍḍaiya, a feudatory of Dëvarâja. Among other records of the year 1669 are two lithic ones (one from the Mahâdëva temple, south of Bestara-pâlayam on the north of the Bhavânî river, and the other from Sengalarâi; Siva-pâlayam, near Satyamangalam, on the way to the same river), registering the gift by Dëvarâja Wodeyar (Udaiyar) of the village of Bestara-pâlayam, surnamed Kumàra-pura (Comârî), to the temple of Kumârasvâmi on the Dhavalagiri hill in the Dûrvâsa-kshêtra at the confluence of the rivers Chintâmani and Bhavânî. A forth, dated February 23, 1670, speaks of Basavaiya as having caused a dîpa-mâlâ pillar to be erected for God Channaràya in the fort of Channarâyapâta. Ànother, belonging to about 1670, records a gift by Dëvarâja of the village of Bindënahalli, for the incense, lights, offerings, décorations and festivals of God Cbandraéèkhara of Channarâyapatâ. A third, dated January 2,1671, registers his gift—on the occasion of Makara-Sankramana—of the village of Jânagere, in the Kottanagere-sthala of the Kunigal hôbli, for the êivarâtri service (Sivarâtri sêvege) and for the offerings to God Agastyëévara at the tri-junction of the Cauvery, Kapilâ and the Sphatika-sarôvara (crystal lake). A fourth, dated January 17, 1671, speaks of his grant of a pièce of land.

128. Ibid, IV (6) Ng. 44: Saumya, Paâtekha ba. 5.
129. Ibid, XII Ty. 72: Saumya, Karîka tu. 5.
131. H. C., V (1) and (2) Ca. 155: Saumya, Phâigumâ tu. 16; d. 1491, in this record, in an error for 1. 1601 (Saumya).
132. Ibid, Cn. 188.
133. Ibid, XII Ng. 1: d. 1582, Saêhârama, Meghâ tu. 2, Monday.
134. Ibid, Ng. 5: Saêhârama, Meghâ ba. 2.
in the Kunigal-sïme to Udeya Nâyaka. À fifth, dated March 20, 1671, refers to his having given away the tank of Virupa-samudra to God Mahadéevara of Molagâla, in the Kânkânhalli (Kânkâranahalli)-sthala, and to its restoration and rebuilding, after a breach, by a private individual. À sixth, dated August 12, 1671, mentions the gift by a private individual of a dipa-màld pillar and a pâtâla-mantapa to the processional image of God Sankarâévara at Keregôdu, under the government of Basavaiya, during Dëvarâja's reign. À seventh, dated in 1671, records the formation of the village of Vinnappalli into an agrahâra of sixty-four shares, and the bestowal of the same on sixty-four Brâhmans, by Dëvarâja Wodeyar. Among the records of 1672, a lithic one, dated August 18, registers his grant of the village of Toravali to God Mahâbalâévara. Two others, dated October 21, relate to his grant of the village of Sasiyâlapura, to provide for the offerings, illuminations and festivals of God Gangâdhâraévara of Malavalli (otherwise named Gangâdharapura) and for the upkeep of the temple of the God. The grant, we learn, was made on a representation by one Gangâdharaiya of the Malavalli-sthala. Another, of the same date, records Devarâja's gift of the village of Râgi-Bommanahalli, for the maintenance of a feeding-house for Brâhmans. A fifth, dated November 7, registers his grant of the village of Marighalli (belonging...
to Ummattûr) to a local god, for the merit of his father (Muppina-Dēvarâja Wodeyar). A sixth, dated November 14, 147 relates to his grant of the village of Kaggundi (otherwise called Dēvarajavpura), for a feeding-house (satrada dharmakke), while a seventh, dated December 19 (Pushya su. 10), 148 records his gift of the village of Madapi, to provide for the daily distribution of food to the Jaina sanyâsîs of the Dana-sâle of Chârukârti-Papditâchârya of Sravana-Belagola. Perhaps the last of the available records of the reign of Dēvarâja Wodeyar is a lithic one, dated January 15, 1673, 149 registering his grant—on the Ratha-saptami day—of the village of Bettahalli (also called Dēvarâjapura), in the Talakâd-sthaja, to provide for the worship and cérémonies of God Mallikârjuna (of the original Sri-Saila) on the left of God Vaidyéévara of Talakâçi (Gajaranya-kshêtra).

À Bhakta-vigraha of Dēvarâja Wodeyar—evidently an authentic likeness of his—is to be seen placed side by side with that of Karïthirava-Narasarâja Wodeyar, in one of the pavilions of the temple of Trinayanéévara at Mysore, with the name Dodda-Dēvarâja Wodeyar latterly inscribed thereon, the prefix Dodda 150 being generally used to distinguish him from his successor, Chikkadévarâja Wodeyar.

Seringapatam, the capital city, continued to be a flourishing centre of social life, with all its attractions, under Dēvarâja. Its importance as the seat of the southern throne (dakšîna-simhâsana) increased with the fall of

147. Ibid, IV (2) Ha. 22: Ibid, Mârgadwâ tu. 6; Thursday.
148. Ibid, V (l) and (3) Cn. 979: t. 1586, Purishâri, Pushya tu. 10. Here, for t. 1586, read t. 1624. The Munigaons. (II, 78-79) speaks of Chikkaâdvarâja, during Dēvarâja’s reign, as having paid a visit to Sravana-Belagola and got the village of Madaneya (Madapi) as a gift to the Dēva-sâle of that place. It was possibly this gift which was, later, recorded on stone in December 1673.
149. Ibid, III (I) TN. 54: t. 1594, Purishâri, Mâgha tu. 7, Wednesday.
150. Fûle Appendix V—(1).
Bhakta-vigrahas of Kanthirava-Narasaraja Wodeyar I and Devaraja Wodeyar in the Trinayanavara Temple, Fort, Mysore.
Penukonda and the Muhammadan occupation of Vellore, the capitals of the rapidly declining Vijayanagar Empire. The systematic adoption of Vijayanagar political ideals and traditions by the ruling House of Mysore also helped in the same direction. This was made possible by the influence exerted by the celebrated Tattacharya family, particularly by Venkata-Varadacharya of Yedur (grandson of Immadi-Tirumala-Tattacharya of Sri-Saila Vamsa and son of Koti-Kanyadanam Lakshmikumara-Tattacharya, already referred to) who, we learn, proceeded to the court of Seringapatam as the preceptor of Deyaraja Wodeyar. Already during the reign, Sri-Vaishnavism had become a living religion in Mysore. Alasingararya, father of Tirumalarya and companion of Doddadeyaraja Wodeyar, continued as the expounder of the Puranas (Pauranika) to Deyaraja Wodeyar after the retirement of Doddadeyaraja to the banks of the Kaundini in or about 1659. The Vasantotsava of God Sri-Ranganatha, the Rama-navami and the Mahanavami (Manomiyukkeva) were, we note, among the popular festivals of the period. The general culture of the times, especially in Seringapatam, is reflected in the references to storeyed

151. E.C., III (1) TN. 28 (1669), 1. 87: agamana Sri-guru-nidhara-vrupakhara-Deyarajasa. Cf. Rice’s rendering of this passage, “who was in his assembly as Brihaspati in the assemblage of the gods” (Ibid, p. 72, translation), which does not seem to be in keeping with the text. Members of the Tattacharya family were very influential at the court of Vijayanagar as royal preceptor (Nurupati-rimhasundaracharya). Koti-Kanyadanam Lakshmikumara-Tattacharya, father of Venkata-Varadacharya, was himself the preceptor of Venkata I (1666-1614) and was reputed to have given away countless virgins in marriage to learned Brahmans, as his title seems evidently to suggest—see Myr. Gaz., II. iii. 222-223. The migration of the family to the court of Seringapatam in the sixties of the seventeenth century seems significant, generally from the point of view of the continuous course of influence of Vijayanagar traditions on Mysore and particularly from the point of view of the growth of Sri-Vaishnavism in the country. Probably the nucleus of the present Parakala-Math at Mysore was laid in the reign of Deyaraja Wodeyar.

152. See C.Vi., VI. 12: Alasingaracharya pura名声 gosodeyol, referring to Deyaraja Wodeyar; see also under Court culture.

153. Ibid, VI, 104-105; VI, 105, 270-274; E.C., III (1) Br. 18 (1664), 1. 55.

154. Ibid., VI, 80-88, 97, 99, 108, 152, 154, 200, 206, 208, 212, 218, 232, 235, etc.
mansions (karumēda) with pavilions (matta-vārana), plastered pavements (kundanada jaguli; chandrōpala pattikā . . . kuttimankana) and apartments (such as Chandra-sale, Bhadra-bhavana, etc.), and in the gay and luxurious life and tastes of fashionable society, as indexed, for instance, by the use of silken clothes and garments and the popularity of music and dancing among the arts. There is evidence of the active pursuit of the ideal of Varnāārama-dharma by the respective sections of the Hindu social order. The social evil, as is seen depicted, shows that it had become deep-rooted in contemporary city life.

The Palace copper-plate granī (1663) testifies to the wealth and grandeur of the court of Dēvarāja Wodeyar. From the Chaupadada-Ptistaka (c. 1670) we glean a picture of him, with his half-tied jaṭā or tress of hair (ara-jate) and the āṇa of musk on his forehead (nosalinolage kaæturi-tilaka), dressed in silken and lace garments (pīt&mbara, dukùla), with wreath of flowers, with ear-rings, finger-rings, medallions and necklaces (set with pearls and precious stones), with the jewelled sword in his hand (ratnamaya-khadga-dharanāgi), and seated on the throne (simhāsandrādhandgi) surrounded by ministers (mantrigalu), functionaries (niyôgigalu), scholars and musicians (éâstra-sangïta-kôvidaru), personal attendants, mahouts and cavaliers (pari-jana . . . gaja-turaga-rēvantara rûvataru). In his court, we note, flourished

155. Pīd, V, 158; VI, 128-129, 156-158, 169, 170, 174, 196, 200, 203, etc.
156. Pīd, V, 170.
157. Pīd, VI, 52, 64-70, 74-81, 141-151, 154-156, 297-299, 269, 274-286, etc. This canto of the poem, though principally devoted to the delineation of the erotic sentiment, indirectly hints at the deeper undercurrents of contemporary life. For further details about the C. Pi., see Ch. XIV.
Aṣṭādhyāyasaṁd-puṇita-tekaṇa-bhoga Durandharāṇ.
159. ll. 1, v, 1-6, etc.; see also C. Pi., V, 8-10. 160. C. Pi., V, 165-169.
poetry, music, dancing, drama and amusements of various descriptions (such as athletic contests, cock-fights, ram-fights, elephant-fights, etc.). Foremost among the court scholars of the time was Venkata-Varadâchârya (of the Tâtâchârya family), the royal preceptor iguru). He was reputed for his proficiency in logic, philosophy and the éâstras (tarka-vëdânta-êâstra-sâmrájya-dhârinë),¹⁶¹ and is referred to¹⁶² as having delivered verses of eulogy on Dëvarâja (râja-prabandhân uvâcha) when the latter granted him the Nûlapûra (or Ikkëri) agrahara. Another scholar at the court was Alasingarârya, to whose attainments we hâve referred in the preceding chapter, He seems to hâve attained considérable popularity as Paurânika to Dëvarâja Wodeyar, who is said¹⁶³ to hâve granted him the villages of Nätanahalli and Biruballi (in the Narasëipura hôbli of the Mandagere-sthalaë) for expounding the Mahâbhârata, particularly the épisode relating to Yudhisîthira's coronation. His son Tirumalârya, the young littérateur, was, it would seem,¹⁶⁴ exercising a profound influence on his co-student and colleague, Chikkadèvarâja, the Crown-prince. Among other luminaries were Lakshmîpati (Lakshmâ-khya budhôtamam), the royal scribe,¹⁶⁵ and Lakhappa-èarman, an astrological scholar (Jyôtirvida)¹⁶⁶

Sacred and secular lore alike claimed the attention, and flourished under the patronage, of Dëvarâja. From the Hâlagere Plates¹⁶¹ (1663) we learn that he got built in the Dëvaràjapura agrahâra, in the Manikarnika-kshëtra,
fifty houses (each 50 feet wide and 100 feet long), with a well and backyard, and settled them with poets, religious teachers, artiste and learned men \((kavi-guru-kalô-dharân'anu-vibudhâmêcha nwêèayâmâsa)\), giving them villages that they might dwell there and carry on their religions exercises. Again, from the Bhërya copper-plate grant\(^{168}\) (1666) we note that he got built ninety-two houses (each 50 feet wide and 100 feet long), also in the Manikarnikâ-kshêtra, and gave them away (each furnished with supplies for a year, together with jewels, clothes and a milch-cow and calf) for the maintenance of Brâhmans of good lineage, learned in Vêdas, Sastras and Philosophy, observers of penance and religious rites, pure, and following the right course of conduct, \((Vêda-âatrårtha-tatv ajnân japa-hôma-parâyanair \ \text{sadâchâra-ratân iuddhân jvalatô brahma-tejasà . . .})\), besides assigning 31 shares exclusively for the recitation of the Vidas \(\text{(tripâda-sammitâ Vêda-vrttiêcha)}\).

Among the authors of the period, Tirumalârya of Kauéika-gôtra, son of AJasingaràrya, composed in Sanskrit the copper-plate inscription, dated July 6, 1663 \(\text{(Sôbha-krit, Ashadha eu. 12, Monday)}\), recording Dêvarâja's grant of Hallikere to Venka^a-Varadâchârya, the royal preceptor.\(^{160}\) This record is as usual written in the kavya style, and is so far the earliest known literary production of Tirumalârya. Chàmaiya wrote the Dëvarâja-Sângatya\(^{170}\) (c. 1670), dealing with the achievements of Dëvarâja. The work, however, as it

\(^{168}\) Ibid., IV (2) Yd. 54, pp. 157-168 (Text).
\(^{169}\) See E.C., III (1) TN. 23, l. 93-94: Kauéika-gôtra . . . AJasingaràrya \(\text{tönâyàb Tirumalâryya vyatânít tămbrâ-Idama ëkàm; also l.n. 112 supra and text thereu. Cf. the Editorial Introduction (pp. 1-2) to the O. Vam., C. Vi., and A. V. C., erroneously assigning this record to 1664.}
\(^{170}\) Ms. No. 19-8-44 (P.; Mad. Or. Lib.), I, 2B: Bhûmipa. Dëvarâjendra-charîkàya Chàmaiya-nâdâ, pêdîbant. See also and compare Kev. Ka. Cha., II. 585-586, fixing the poet in c. 1700, which is not borne out by the internal evidence available.
has corne down, is unfortunately incomplète, coniainfûg as it does only two chapters (sandhis). It is, as its name indicates, a poem written in intelligible Hosagannada sângâtya mètre. The poet, who seems to hâve been a protégé of Dëvarâja, directly refers to his patron as "Dëvarâjêndra of Mysore, of Àtrëya-gôtra," and as distinguished by the titles, Birud-antembara-gança, Dhore* Vira and Karnâtaka-Kuruvara-Chakra. He bègins with invocations to Gôtâla of Padmagiri (Gôtâlaçvâmi Hill), Bânachandra, Paéchima-Ranga and Lakshmîkânta among the Gods, and Vyâsa, Vâlmîki and Jaimini among the poets; gives the usual poetical description of the Karnâtaka country and the city of Mysore; and eulogise Dëvarâja. Another work, also incomplète, written in the Hosagannada chaupadi mètre under Dëvarâja's patronage, has also corne down to us under the title, Chaupadada-Pustaka (c. 1670). Its authorship, however, is unknown, being anonymous. It begins with invocations to Râmachandra, Gañêéa, Gangàdharêévara, Ranganâtha and Narasimha (of Seringapatam), and, besides the eulogy, contains direct références to the achievements, personality, court life, daily routine, etc., of Dëvarâja Wodeyar. Among other writers, Lakshmî- pati, the royal scribe of Dëvarâja, appears also to hâve been a poet. Though no authentic works of his hâve so far corne down to us, we hâve some évidence of his poetical attainments in the verses (in the kanda mètre) at the end of the colophon to the maûuscript copy (1663) of Ranna's Ajitanâtha-Purâna (c. 1000), prepared by him for the use of the Crown-prince, Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar (Chikkëndra-bhûmiêangendu). From the référence to Dëyarâja of Mysore and bis Dalavâi Kumâraiya

in the verses at the beginning of the second chapter of a manuscript of Immadi-Tontadaiya's Vajrabahi-Gharite (c. 1530), it appears probable that a copy of this work also was made towards the close of Devaraja's reign.

The reign of Devaraja Wodeyar saw the beginnings of intercourse of European nations with Mysore. "In the month of June 1671," we note, "Flacour, the French agent, went from [Tellicherry] to settle a trade at Seringapatam, the capital of Mysore. Dellon [the physician who had sailed from France in March 1668], intending to accompany him, went as far as the foot of the mountains, but was deterred there by the excessive violence of the torrents and came back: Flacour persisted, and returned from Seringapatam in November. In January 1672 Dellon sailed from Tellicherry on his return to Surat."

Devaraja Wodeyar had two queens, Muddajamma, daughter of Channarajaiya of Arikkuthara, and Devajamma, daughter of Lingarajaiya of Ammachavadi. Of these, Devajamma is probably identical with "Devamb* and "Devajamma" mentioned in two lithic records dated March 14, 1662. She is, again, referred to in

174. See Kar. Ka. Cha., II. 227, t. n. 1; see also t. n. 227 infra, for a further notice of this Ms.
175. Cf. Ibid.
176. Orme, Historical Fragments, pp. 174-175, Note VII-v.
177. Mys. Dho. Pur., I. 63; see also and compare Annals, L. 95.
178. E.C., III (1) Nj. 56 and 81: t. 1594, Subhakrit, Chatra 5u. 5. These records relate to the construction of a math in Kajale (attached to the Palace), and the grant of the villages of Kuraha[ti and Shambypura as an endowment thereto, by Devamba (Devajamma), with the permission of Devaraja Wodeyar and the consent of (Dajavai) Nanjanthaiya, on the death of her father (?). The expressions, namma arasiyavaru suvarustaragalagi, in Nj. 81, ll. 8-9, are literally rendered by Rice as, "on my king (i.e., husband) going to marga" (Ibid., p. 106, translation). In the absence of specific reference, these expressions may as well imply the death of an elderly member (father of Devamba?) of Devajamma's family taking namma arasiyavaru in a wider sense, in which case we have to assume the identity of Devamba with Devajamma, queen of Devaraja Wodeyar.
an inscription, dated June 22, 1667, recording a cash grant for services (i.e. flower décoration and offerings) to God Banganâtha of Seringapatam. Dëvarâja had no issue by either of his queens. Yet he seems to hâve endeared himself to Chikkadëvarâja (the Crown-prince) and Kanthïravaiya as their uncle, looking upon them as if they were his own sons.

Among other members of the Royal Family, Dođdadëvarâja Wodeyar, elder brother of Dëvarâja Wodeyar—who, as already referred to, had renounced his charge of the city of Mysore in favour of his younger brother by 1659—devoted himself to penance on the banks of the Kaundinî river (near Gundlu-Terakanâmbi), during the latter part of his life covered by the reign of Dëvarâja. The staunch Vaishñava that he was, Dođdadëvarâja was, as he is depicted to us, a saintly personage with a religious and philosophical turn of mind, ever devoutly served by his younger brothers (yad-bhakti-yukta-chittair nityam paricharyatê nijairanujaih; yad-bhakti-bhâva-vivaêair . . . anujaih).


180. See colophon to the Ms. copy (1688) of Ranna’s Ajitānātha-Purāṇa by Rāyāssade Lakshmiṇi, p. 190; Chaupādada-Pustaka, f. 1, v. 1, 3; C. Vi., IV, 176, 178—referring to Dēvarāja as “Chikkaṉaya Raya,” “Chikkaṉaya,” “Kuru-tanda,” respectively. All these terms mean “uncle.”

181. See E. C., Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol., My. 114, l. 30, where the reference to “putrâkṣa” is applicable to the nephews of Dēvarāja in a general sense; also C. Vi., V, 69, 73, where Dēvarāja is made to refer to his nephew, Chikkadēvarāja, as “maga” (son). We have also some records where Kanthïravaiya, the other nephew of Dēvarāja, is generally referred to as “kumâra” (son), vide references cited in f.n. 300-303 infra.

182. Vide section on Vaišnavas and their descend.

183. Vide Appendix V—(2); cf. authorities in f.n. 196 infra.

184. C. Vaiñ., 37-49, 80-160; C. Vi., III, 7-128; E. C., XII Eg. 87 (1669), II. 88-92; IV (2) Ch. 22 (1675), II. 15-17; III (1) Sr. 151 (1678), p. 119 (Text); 114 (1690), II. 28-29, etc. For further reference to the Vaišnavas predilections of Dođdadēvarâja, vide Ch. XIII.
Dévarâja Woñeyar himself is stated to have raled the kingdom of Mysore as a devotee at the feet of his elder brother. Obviously, as the seniormost member of the Royal Family, Doñcjadêvarâja seems to have continued to wield his moral influence over the affaira of the State, during the period of his retirement. Amritâmbâ (Amritamma), daughter of Bâlê Urs of Mûgûr, was his lawful and only queen (dharmapatni; ëkapatnï-vratastham).

185. See Kamand. Sit., I, 65; Déva-janapâlam dhûmagraja-bhaktiyim porase mahiyam; Yâd. Mahât., II, 49; Déva-janapâlam. Doñcjadêva-nayanangriya bhaktiyil âldan. urviyam, etc. Cf. authorities in f.m. 186 infra.

186. Cf. Raj. Kâth., XII, 476-476, where Dévaçandra speaks of Doñcjadêvarâja Woñeyar as not having been allowed by his brother, Dévarâja, to re-enter Seringapatam on his return from a pilgrimage, of his (Doñcjadêvarâja's) subsequent tour in the kingdom, his sojourn in Yeñandâr, the marriage of his son, Chikkaçdevârâja, with the Yeñandâr princess (Dévâjamma), Doñcjadêvarâja's death at Hangalaj and the performance of his obeisances on the banks of the Kauñdîni by Chikkaçdevârâja, etc.; cf. also Wilks in Appendix V-(1), referring to Doñcjadêvarâja and his son, Chikkaçdevârâja, as having being kept as prisoners at Terasanjâmi during Dévarâja's reign. Éâos (I. 365) follows Wilks; S. K. Aiyangar (Ancient India, p. 295) is rather inclined to be critical on the point. There is absolutely no evidence in support of the position of either Dévaçandra or Wilks. A detailed examination of the Raj. Kâth. goes to show that Dévaçandra, who closely follows the C. Vom., only distorts that text in an attempt to trace the connection of Chikkaçdevârâja with his Jain minister, Visâliksha-Padjit. Nor does Wilks seem to have been well-informed by his contemporaries on the point at issue. The truth seems to be that a legend grew up, in later times, about the renunciation of Doñcjadêvarâja and his penance and death on the banks of the Kauñdîni river. Since Chikkaçdevârâja Woñeyar, eldest son of Doñcjadêvarâja, was also, as we shall see, in Hangalaj from 1869 onwards, this would appear to have led to the notion that both father and son were in prison, a notion which perhaps easily crept into later writings like the Kaixoffs, etc., uncritically relied upon by Wilks. We have to totally reject both Dévaçandra and Wilks in the light of the evidence derived from the sources cited in f.n. 180-181, 185 and 186 supra and 191-195 infra.

167. Mys. Dho. Por., I. 67; Yâd. Mahât., II, 45; F. C., IV (2) Ch. 92, II. 21-28; III (1) Sr. 131, pp. 118-119 (Text); also see and compare Ammolu, I. 95; cf. E. C., Ëangalore Dist. Suppl. Vol., Bu. 144 (1880), I. 31, referring to Channasamâmbâ as the mother of Chikkaçdevârâja, which seems evidently a surname of Amritâmbâ. All other sources are agreed that Amritâmbâ was her actual name. See also references cited in f.n. 180 infra. Cf. Raj. Kâth. (XII. 474), where Dévaçandra connects Amritâmbâ with Yeñandâr, for which there is no evidence.
By her he had two sons, Chikkadēvarâja (6. 1645) and Kapṭhiravaiya (Kaṇṭhirava-Arasu, b. 1647), and two daughters, Dēpamma and Guruvâjamma.\textsuperscript{188} Amritâmbâ was, as she is depicted,\textsuperscript{180} an idéal and pious lady, ever devoted to her husband. As already indicated, she got constructed, in 1656, a stone math in the Palace at Hangâla [where Muppina-Dēvarâja Wodeyar (?) had died] and an independent math for Marala-Basavalinga-Dēvaru, granting the village of Horakêri-Bâchahalli as an endowment to the latter.\textsuperscript{190} She also, we learn,\textsuperscript{191} got newly erected a Lingâyat math in the town of Mysore. Evidently she seems to have been a patron of the Vîra-Saivas. She appears to have predeceased Doddadēvarâja Wodeyar,\textsuperscript{192} and her memory is perpetuated by a votive mantapa, to the east of the nāmatîrtha pavilion at Mêlkôtê, with her name inscribed thereon (Amrutammanavarava sêvamantapa).\textsuperscript{193} Doddadēvarâja himself, it would seem, passed away, in his forty-seventh year, not later than November 30, 1669, for we have a lithic record, dated

\textsuperscript{188} Mys. Dho. Pîr., I. 57-58; Appendix V.--(2) and references cited in f.n. 198 supra and 189 infra; also see and compare Annals, I.c.


\textsuperscript{190} M. A. R., 1900, No. 25 (1656), pp. 163-166; see also Ch. IX, f.n. 186 and 168. It was probably this grant which was confirmed and extended by Dēvarâja in 1663—vide f.n. 116 supra and text thereeto.

\textsuperscript{191} Ibid., 1991, No. 38 (1668), pp. 129-131, II, 7-9: Maîstra vîra-volâjagama Mahâtîgge Ammanavaru Amrutammanavararu nâtavardagi kaffista Mahâtînâ-mâfha. Dr. M. H. Krishna renders the expressions, Ammanavaru Amrutammanavaru, literally as Amritamma, “mother” of Dēvarâja Wodeyar (Ibid, pp. 190-131). The word Ammanavaru, however, is only a term of respect by which Amritamma, an elderly lady and sister-in-law of Dēvarâja Wodeyar, is referred to here.

\textsuperscript{192} See M. A. R., I. c., from which it would seem Amritamma had died some time before 1668. The Annals (I. 109, 193) is rather confused and contradictory on the point. In the absence of decisive evidence, we would not, in the light of inscriptions (dated in 1656 and 1668) above referred to, be far wrong in placing her death somewhere between 1665 and 1668.

\textsuperscript{193} E. C., III (1) Sr. 68.
November 19, 1670, registering a grant—on the anniversary day of his death (namma pitru-divasada pmyakâdalldalli)—by his second son, Kanthiravaiya (Kanthirava-Arasn). A mutilated image of God Varadarâja (formerly adorning the Parâvâsadâva temple on the banks of the Kaundini but now to be seen in the Vijaya-Narâyaâcasvâmi temple at Guçîldupet), with the label ēri-DoñdadêvarâjarVarada (lit. giver of boon to Doñdadêvarâja) inscribed thereon, perhaps reminds us of his devotion to that God, especially during the last years of his life. Of his two sons, Chikkadêvarâja, the elder, who had been placed as a junior prince (Kiriyarasu) under Dêvarâja, became the Crown-prince during the latter's reign (Yauvarâjyadol alankarisidam). On February 21, 1662 (Plava, Phâlguna su. 14), Dêvarâja, it is said, got him married to Dëvâjamma (Dëvàmbâ), daughter of Lingaràjaiya of Yejandûr, and Dëvamma, daughter of (Djavài) Kumâraiya of Kaîle. There is evidence of Chikkadêvarâja having stayed with his uncle in Seringapatam till June 1667, for, as we have seen, he made a rare exhibition of his courage and prowess during Dêvaraja's délibérations on the occasion of the siège of Êrôde. It was probably shortly after this event that he was, with his family, sent to Hangala by Dêvarâja for being educated and trained in politics and state-craft under proper arrangements. Kanthiravaiya, the younger son of Doddadêvarâja, appears to have stayed

194. Ibid., IV (1) Hg. 117: s. 1590. Sadharama, Mârgadêva bo. 8. For details, see text of f.n. 200 infra. We have also records in the reign of Chikkadêvarâja Wodeyar, relating to his grants on the anniversary day of the death of his father, Doñdadêvarâja Wodeyar (s.v., Mârgadêva bo. 3)—vide Ch. XIII. Cf. Râj. Kath., in f.n. 136 supra.


196. C.Fam., 190.

197. Annals, I. 96 and 104; cf. Râj. Kath., in f.n. 136 supra. For details about the Kajale Family, see under Rise of the Kajale Family.

198. C.Vâ, V. 60-78; see also text of f.n. 68 supra.

199. Annals, I. 96; cf. authorities in f.n. 136 supra. For further details, vide under Early life of Chikkadêvarâja in Ch. XI.
with his uncle and possibly ruled jointly with him during the latter part of his (Dëvarâja's) reign. An inscription, dated June 22, 1667,\(^{200}\) refers to his grant of the village Horeyâla (Arasinavara-halli), in the Turuvëkere-sthala\(^*\) for services to God Ranganâtha of Seringapatam. A lithic record, dated October 26, 1669,\(^{901}\) records the formation by him of an agrahâra in Tarikallu (and twenty-three adjoining hamlets), named Kànthîrava-samudra, and the grant of the same—divided into 126 shares—to learned and deserving Brâhmans of various gòtraSy sútras and éâkhas, one share being set apart for God Lakshmïkânta-svâmi. Another, dated October 15, 1670,\(^{202}\) refers to his grant of land of 6 varahas (in Âlanahalli?) to Biçârada-Venkataiyya, on account of having sent him to Kâéi. A third, dated November 19, 1670, already mentioned,\(^{203}\) registers his gift of the village of Bilugumba (in Kottâgâla), also named Kànthîrava-pura, to aBrâhman by name Bettpappaiya of Kâtûr (of Gautama-gòtra, Āpastambha-sútra and Yajuééâkhâ), on the anniversary day of the death of his father, Döddadëvarâja Wodeyar. A fourth, dated December 11, 1672,\(^{204}\) records his grant of land, assessed at 10 varahas, to Niranjaiyya, âânabhôg (Sênahôga) of Kittûr, as an umbali-mânya (rent-free) for the Kambara-matha of the Kittûr-sthala. A fifth, a much worn out record, also dated in 1672,\(^{205}\) seems to register his grant of the village of Manchanahalli, in Malavalli hôbli, for the feeding of Brâhmans. Àil these records are usually signed by Dëvarâja Wodeyar, at the end. Evidently the grants seem to have been made by

---

\(^{200}\) I.M.C., No. 18-15-20, p. 45: Plavanga, Āshâdha sv. 11.

\(^{201}\) E.C., IV (2) Hs. 189: s. 1691, Saunyga, Kàrtika sv. 12. The week-day mentioned, Bhûmâyudra, is apparently a misreading, or a scribal error, for Bhûma-mastra (Tuesday).

\(^{202}\) Ibid, Hg. 190: s. 1689, Sàdhârana, Kàrtika sv. 12: s. 1680, in this record, is clearly an error, for Sàdhârana, in the reign of Dëvarâja Wodeyar, corresponds to s. 1692.

\(^{203}\) Ibid, Hg. 119; see also f.n. 194 supra and text thereto.

\(^{204}\) Ibid, Hg. 67: s. 1694, Purâdâhâri, Pushya sv. 2.

\(^{205}\) Ibid, III (1) Ml. 69 (M.A.B., 1930, p. 40, para 96): s. 1694, Purâdâhâri.
Kaçthiravaiya with the consent of his uncle. Maridëvarâja Wodeyar, youngest brother of Doñdadëvarâja Wodeyar and last son of Muppina-Dëvarâja Wodeyar— who had also been placed under the care of Dëvarâja— seems to have stayed in Seringapatam during the reign of Dëvarâja Wodeyar, faithfully serving him. He was familiarly known as "Chikka-Arasinavaru".

A copper-plate inscription (from the Eanganâtha temple, Seringapatam), dated March 12, 1664, registers, under Dëvarâja's signature, a grant by Maridëvarâja, of the village of Allappanahalli, to six families of Srî-Vaishnavas, to provide for daily décoratiön with garlands (tirumâle) from head to foot of God Eanganâtha and the Goddess Rânganâyaki of Seringapatam, and for small garlands to the attendant goddess and the two Nâchyârs (goddesses). The record further registers his grant of a land, assessed at 4 varahas (nâlku-varahada-bhûmi), for God Hanumanta newly set up in the mantapa in the middle of the village. Another inscription, dated June 22, 1667, records a similar pious service of his in the Ranganâtha temple at Seringapatam.

From the domestic, no less from the political, point of view, the reign of Dëvarâja Wodeyar, it is interesting to note, witnessed an important development in the relations of the Mysore Royal House with the Kalale Family.

---

206. See Ibid., Br. 14 (1886), II. 23-30:

Paricharati muddâya bhava-karmânyajam
Sakhalu Marigadêva-kshnapati . . .

Yad. Mâhat., I, 41: Dëvanâyakanali Maridëvendram maha-bhaktiyam tâdediam, etc. See also E.O., Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol., My. 114 (1883), II. 30-31 (Bhrâtr purâänaka sabîl mantri-nukhyâsiha sêstâta), referring, in general, to Dëvarâja as having been served by his brother, sons and ministers. The reference to the brother here is to Maridëvarâja. For further notice of this reference, vide l.n. 181 supra.

207 I.M.O., l.n., vide i.n. 200 supra.

208 E.O., III (1) Br. 13: t. 1885, Sâthakrit, Phâlguna la. 10.

209 I.M.O., vide l.n. 201 supra.
lu view of the influence the latter exercised in later times on the fortunes of the kingdom of Mysore, it seems pertinent here to trace its origin, foundation and rise from small beginnings. The founding of the Kalale Family dates in 1500, according to tradition preserved in the Kalale-Arasugala-Vaméâvali (c. 1830). Two brothers, by name Kânta Woâeyar and Krishçarâja Woâeyar, of Yâdava descent, Bhâradvâja-gôtra and Àévalâyana-sùtra, it is said, proceeded from the région of Dvâraka towards Vijayanagar, intending to carve out a kingdom for themselves. At Vijayanagar they stayed for a while, deliberating with its ruler (Raya). Ultimately, however, Kânta Wodeyar, owing to some differences with the latter, left with his consort and his brother for Kalale in the south, taking with him the shrine of his family god Lakshmikânta. In due course, as unanimously decided by the elders (halabas), Kânta Wodeyar was installed as chief of Kalale by the Pâlegâr of Ummattûr. Kânta Wodeyar I thus became the progenitor of the Kalale Family, and is assigned a period of twenty-two years* rule (1505-1527). Kânta Wodeyar I had a son and four grandsons, one of the latter, Kânta Wodeyar, marrying (Dodda) Dèvîramma, daughter of Hiriya-Bettada-Châmârâja Wodeyar I I I (Vijaya-Chhmarasa Wodeyar) of Mysore (1513-1553). Kânta

210. A paper Me. in the Mys. Or. Lib., No. B. 424. It is otherwise known as Sri-Vinugurâda-Kshatriya-suvare-Vaméâvali. It embodies the traditional history and fortunes of the Kalale Family down to the earlier part of the nineteenth century, and from internal evidence appears to have been compiled about 1880 (see fl. 84). Our account is mainly based on this Ms., supplemented by other sources of information wherever available.

211. K.A.V., fl. 1. The actual expressions used are: diguvâya nimûiyana. Of the founding of the Mysore Royal Family as recorded in the Mys. Nag. For. (Vide Ch. III of this work).

212. Ibid, fl. 1 and 2. The Vijayanagar ruler of the time, according to the Ms., was Krishçâva-Raya (Krishçha Raya). But the actual ruler, in 1500, was Narasa Nâyaka (1497-1508).

213. Ibid, fl. 31; see also Table XIII.

214. Ibid, fl. 2; also Table XIII and Ch. IV.
Wodeyar I appears to have got built a temple to Vishnu (Lakshmikânta-svâmi) in Kalale.\textsuperscript{215} His rule was, however, characterized by considerable domestic embroil between the chief of Ummattûr and the members of the Kalâle House, leading eventually to a wholesale massacre of the latter, with the exception of only one member, Mallarâja Wodeyar, a great grandson of Kânta Wođeyar I, who was rescued and brought up by a faithful adherent of the family. Great confusion prevailed in the land, and the Ummattûr chief placed Kalâle under the nominal sway of one Kântança, a natural son of Kânta Wodeyar.\textsuperscript{216} Meanwhile the Kalâle Family was revived under Mallarâja Wodeyar, whose son, also known as Mallarâja, married (Chikka) Dëvîramma, another daughter of Hiriya-Bêtâda-Châmârajâ Wodeyar III of Mysore.\textsuperscript{217} The family, however, resumed its sway in Kalale only under this Mallarâja's son, Timmarâja Wodeyar I, who is assigned a period of eighteen years' rule (1527-1546).\textsuperscript{218} He is said to have had five sons by three out of his four consorts, the last of the latter, (Chikka) Dëpamma, being a daughter of Bôla-Châmârajâ Wodeyar IV of Mysore (1572-1576).\textsuperscript{219} At his death (in April 1546), Lakshmîkânta Wodeyar, his eldest son by his first consort (Doddâjamma of Hura), was installed by the leaders of the halepaika community. This so much excited the jealousy of Lakshmîkânta Wodeyar's half-brothers (i.e., sons of Timmarâja Wodeyar by his second consort, ChannSjamma of Tagadûr) that they treacherously removed the former to the unbearable agony and bitter curse of his mother who is said to have committed sati with her husband. They sought also the life of Mallarâja (afterwards Karikâla-Mallarâja Wodeyar II)—then a child of five years of age—another half-brother of

\textsuperscript{215} Ibid, f. 5.  
\textsuperscript{216} Ibid, f. 3-7.  
\textsuperscript{217} Ibid, f. 8-9; also Table XIII and Ch. IV.  
\textsuperscript{218} Ibid, f. 9 and 31; also Table XIII and Ch. IV.  
\textsuperscript{219} Ibid, f. 9-10; also Table XIII and Ch. IV.
their (i.e., son of Timmarâja Wođeyar I by his last consort, Dêpamma of Mysore). Luckily, however, a faithful onlooker removed him for safety to Mysore.\textsuperscript{290} The kingdom of Kajale thus fell to the share of the sons of Timmarâja Wođeyar I by his second consort, and, it is said, they kept under custody Dêpamma, mother of Mallarâja.\textsuperscript{221} Of these sons of Timmarâja Wođeyar, Nandinâtha Wodeyar is assigned a rûle of eighteen yearâ (1546-1564).\textsuperscript{222} 'He was followed by Mudda-Mallarâja Wođeyar I (1564-1591), probably a son of his. The latter was in turn succeeded by Kânta Wođeyar II (1591-1605) and Chandraéëkhara Wodeyar of Mullahalli (1605-1615), younger brothers of Nandinâtha Wođeyar.\textsuperscript{223} Meanwhile Mallarâja, who had been brought up at Mysore, was advised by his saviour to proceed against his cousins and take possession of Kajale. Mallarâja approached his maternal uncle, Râja Wođeyar (1578-1617), and sought his assistance. Râja Wođeyar, however, on grounds of policy, directed him to Hîriya-Ramarâja Nâyaka, chief of Yelandûr One Lakh country. Ràmarâja Nâyaka not only promised Mallarâja the assistance he sought but also gave his daughter, Dëvïramma, in marriage to him. During the wedding cérémonies, the pavilion, owing, it is said, to a slight defect in the lagnam already forewarned, caught fire; and Mallarâja himself sustained a severe burn on his foot which swelled and left a scar thereon, whence he became familiarly known as Karikala-Mallarâja (lit. Mallarâja, with the black scar on his foot). Karikâla-Mallarâja, with the assistance in men and money from his father-in-law, succeeded in taking possession of Uppanahalli and Sindhuvalli and eventually Kajale itself. Chandraéëkhara Wodeyar (1605-1615), the last of Earikâla-Mallarâja's halfrbrothers in charge of Kajale,
was obliged to flee for his life to Malabar (Maleyâlam); leaving the other members of his family at Mallahalji where they were kept under a close guard and ultimately died. Unopposed Karikâla-Mallarâja Wođeyar II was installed by the elders on the throne of Kalale. He is assigned a period of twenty-eight years' rule (1615-1644). He was an important member of the Kalale House and, as referred to in an earlier chapter, was the first Daḷavâi of Mysore under the solemn compact entered into between him and Râja Wođeyar in or about 1614. Karikâla-Mallarâja (Karikâla-Mallarâjaiya of other sources) having, however, returned to Kalale and sent in his resignation through his grandson Nandinâthaiya, the compact was not actually in force for some time, possibly because Karikâla-Mallarâja and his immediate successor had had more than they could manage in bringing order out of chaos and in securing their own position in Kalale before they could effectively take part in the politics of the kingdom of Mysore. Karikâla-Mallarâja Wođeyar II was succeeded by his second son, Timmarâja Wođeyar II; and he is assigned

224. *Ibid*, ff. 11-14. 225. *Ibid*, ff. 82; also Table XIII. 226. *Ante*, Ch. V. 227. The K.A.V. is silent as to why Mallarâja Wođeyar utìs Kempê-Arau, eldest son of Karikâla-Mallarâja Wođeyar II (vide ff. 14 and Table XIII) did not succeed the latter to the kingdom of Kalale and how the second son, Timmarâja Wođeyar, became its ruler. It seems, however, possible that the eldest son had been adopted by Lingarâjaiya, son of Tirumalarâja Nâyska and grandson of Hiriya-Ramarâja Nâyska of Hadinâ-Jeyandür. For we have a lithic record, dated July 12, 1647 (Sarwayit, Adhâka ka. 5), specifically referring to Mallarâja as his heir-elect—see E. C., *Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol.*, Yt. 186, II. 10-12: tamma paṭṭada āriyarâda Kaṭlīya-prabhu Mallarâja-Arasina varu. We further learn from this record (l. 12) that Mallarâja had also a daughter by name Mallâjamma. He had five sons (vide K.A.V., ff. 14-15 and Table XIII) who are referred to in a Ms. copy (c. 1670) of Immaţi-Tûpsadaïya's *Tajâbahu-Charitro*, and he is himself found mentioned in it as the right-hand man of Dèvartâja Wođeyar of Mysore in the south (Maiśira-Dève-râjai Naṣeka-thoncasada Kaṭlīya Mallarâja)—see *Kar. ka. Ch sa.*, H. 167, 11. 1; also l. n. 174 supra and text thereon. Evidently Mallarâja Wođeyar utìs Kempê-Arau, as a member of the Kalale family in general and as the ruler of Jeyandür in particular, seems to have occupied an important position during the reign of Dèvartâja
a period of about sixteen years' rule (1644-1660).\textsuperscript{228} Timmarâjâ Wodeyar was in turn followed by his nephew, Kumâra-Mallarâjâ Wodeyar I I I (1660-1679), eldest son of Mallarâjâ Wodeyar \textit{alias} Kempê-Arasu.\textsuperscript{229} The period of rule of Mallarâjâ I I I in Kalale synchronised with that of Dëvarâjâ Wodeyar in Mysore. By now the kingdom of Kalale had been securely established, and the relations between the Kalale and Mysore families were renewed, perhaps under the influence of Mallarâjâ \textit{alias} Kempê-Arasu, father of Mallarâjâ Wodeyar I I I.\textsuperscript{230} Mallarâjâ I I I himself was married to Chikka-Dëpamma, a sister of Dëvarâjâ Wodeyar,\textsuperscript{231} and, as we have seen,\textsuperscript{233} he held the office of Dałavâi also under the latter for a short while (April-July 1660), while Nandinâthaiya (Nanjanâthaiya of other sources) and Kumâraiya, younger brothers of Mallarâjâ I I I, successively held the same office (September 1661-February 1662; April 1662-April 1667; April 1667-1673). The bond of relationship between Kalale and Mysore was further strengthened by the marriage of Dëvamma, a daughter of Kumâraiya, with the Crown-prince, Chikkadëvarâjâ Wodeyar, in February 1662.\textsuperscript{233} Among other members of the Kalale Family, Nanjarâjaiya I (a nephew of Mallarâjâ I I I) seems to have commanded the Mysore army during Dëvarâjâ's southern campaigns (c. 1659-1663),\textsuperscript{234} while his son, Kântaiya, officiated as the Mysore Dałavâi during February-April 1662.\textsuperscript{235} We have thus enough data at

\textbf{Wodeyar. This perhaps accounts, in a great measure, for the renewed friendly relations between Mysore and Kalale and the appointment of Mallarâjâ's sons and other members of the Kalale Family as Dałavâis of Mysore during the reign.}

\textsuperscript{226.} K. A. F., ii. 89; also Table XIII.
\textsuperscript{227.} Ibid.; also Table XIII and f.n. 227 supra.
\textsuperscript{228.} Vide f.n. 227 supra.
\textsuperscript{229.} K.A.F., ii. 15; also Table XIII.
\textsuperscript{230.} Vide section on Dałavâis; also Table XIII.
\textsuperscript{231.} Vide f.n. 197 supra and text thereto.
\textsuperscript{232.} Vide f.n. 60 supra; also Table XIII.
\textsuperscript{233.} Vide f.n. 292 supra; also Table XIII.
\textsuperscript{234.} Vide f.n. 292 supra; also Table XIII.
hand pointing to the rise of the Kalale Family to an
important position in the kingdom of Mysore already by
1673.

On February 11, 1673, Dëvarâja Wodeyar passed away,
in his forty-sixth year, in the Palace at
ChiknàyakanahâJji, while on a tour in
the State. His body, it is said, was quickly conveyed in the course of a single day to
Seringapatam and his crémation, as had been piously desired by him, took place on the banks of the Cauvery,
his queens observing sati.

If Kaçthîrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar I worked for and
evolved the independence of the king-
dom of Mysore in the critical conditions
prevailing in his time while remaining
loyal to the cause of the Vijayanagar Empire, Dëvarâja Wodeyar went a step further by entering into and
claiming the status of the Empire
itself as its political heir, without, how-
ever, completely breaking away from
the original theoretical position of Mysore as a feudatory pf the latter. There is ample evidence, as indicated and
explained above, that this result was, in a large measure,
brought about by a combination of circumstances at once fortuitous and favourable to Mysore from the beginning
of Dëvarâja’s reign. The siège of Seringapatam by
êivappa Nayaka I of Ikkëri, followed by his disastrous
retreat and death (1659-1660); the attitude of préjudice,
if not open hostility, adopted by Emperor Srí-Ranga VI himself towards Mysore after 1660, under the influence of Sivappa Nâyaka's anti-Mysore policy; the série of opérations of Mysore against Ikkëri during 1663-1664; the graduai slaekening of the control of Bijâpur and Gôlkonçja over their Karnâtak possessions; the departure of Srí-Ranga towards the south about April 1663; the simultaneou settlement in Mysore of the celebrated Tâtâchârya family (of Srí-Vaishnava royal preceptors) from the court of Vijayanagar; the victory of Mysore over the southern confederacy at Erôde (headed by Chokkanâtha Nâyaka of Madura) in June 1667; and the rapid dissolution of the Empire itself thereafter—all these contributed not a little to steadily enhance the réputation and prestige of Dëvarâja Wodeyar as a ruler of Mysore. If this général course of affairs is remembered, we would be enabled to follow and estimate Dëvarâja Wodeyar's achievements as a political builder. Though not possessed of conspicuous military talents like his illustrious predecessor, and though he does not appear to have commanded the array in person or taken an active part in any décisive action, there is evidence of his having exhibited rare political insight, diplomatic skill and courage which stood him in good stead, especially when he was on the point of losing in the deep game of political policy, We have référence in the sources to his expert knowledge of politics and diplomacy (niti-éâstra nipunanum; dkhîa râja-dharma nidânam). Indeed it is to these attainments of his that we have to ascribe his success in repulsing Sivappa Nâyaka I from Seringapatam (1659) and his victory against the confederacy at Erôde (1667). Added to these qualities, he was assisted by able Dalavâis like Nanjanâthaiya and Eumâraiya of Kalale, in
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the work of political expansion. And he was, on the whole, able to extend, and maintain the independence and integrity of, the kingdom of Mysore in the west, north and the south, with a tendency to advance further southwards in the direction of Trichinopoly and Madura; and leave a rich legacy to his nephew and successor, Chikkadēvarâja Wođeyar.

As a ruler of Mysore, Dēvarâja Wođeyar was very pious and popular. He was universally adored by his subjects for his numerous acts of benevolence and solicitude towards them. Though a devout and staunch Vaishnava, his toleration towards other faiths and creeds was remarkable. The capital city of Seringapatam under him was a centre of great attraction, and his court was famous for the galaxy of learned scholars and the munificent patronage extended to sacred and secular lore alike. He was, as he is depicted to us,²³⁰ a strong and well-built person of middle âge, possessed of attractive features and a serene countenance expressive of the depth of spiritual merit acquired by him. In domestic life, he was amiable and endearing to all the members of the Royal Family, and he was devoutly served by his queens, younger brother and nephews. His sincere devotion to Doddadēvarâja, his saintly elder brother, was a noteworthy feature of his domestic life. No less significant was the establishment of renewed relations between the Mysore and Kalale families and the rise of the latter to a position of importance in the kingdom of Mysore by 1673, while there were already the beginnings of European intercourse with Mysore during the reign.

An astute political builder and a popular and pious ruler, Dēvarâja Wođeyar occupies an important place in his tory as a "Maker of Mysore." The most enduring
monuments of his rule are the *Thousand Steps* to the Châmucôdî Hill and the huge monolithic *Bull* thereon and the *Dëvâmbudhi* tank (now known as *Doddkakere*) in Mysore. In sum, the period of Dëvaràja Wodeyar's reign justly claims to be regarded as an intermediate stage in the evolution of new ideas, tendencies and factors in the development of the kingdom of Mysore.

On the génération of authors who wrote during the succeeding reign, Dëvaràja Wodeyar has left a lasting impression. Tirumalàrya testifies to the magnificence of Dëvaràja's rule and présents an idéal picture of his personality and character, besides showing an intimate acquaintance with his reign. Among other writers contemporaneous with Tirumalàrya, Chikkupàdhyàya, Timma-Kavi, Mallikàrjuna and Chidânanda speak of the splendour and popularity of Dëvaràja Wodeyar's rule in unequivocal terms; also do later inscriptions (of 1686, 1716, 1722, 1748, 1761, etc.). Under the influence, however, of the compilations of the eighteenth and nineteenth century *Annalists* and other writers, Dëvaràja Wodeyar, as we have shown, has become well known, and been deep-rooted, in popular tradition as Dodkla-Dëvaràja Wodeyar, the prefix "Dodda" being generally, though loosely, used either by way of distinguishing him from his nephew and successor, Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar, or by way of making him identical with Docjdadëvaràja Wodeyar, father of Chikkadëvarâja, or both.

240. *O. Fam.,* i.o., *O. V.* and *VI.*
241. Vide works cited in f.n. 11 and 12 supra.
242. See *B. C., Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol.,* *My. II* 5, *My. 180; III (1) Sr. 1 and 64; TN. 63; *IV (3) Yd. 12 and 19*, etc.
243. Vide *Appendix, V.*
CHAPTER XI.

CHIKKADEVARAJA WODEYÀR, 1673-1704.

Lineal descent—Birth and early life—Accession, etc.—General political situation—Political Development and Consolidation: 

Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar, 1673-1704.
Acquisition of Arkalgud, Aigur, Saklespur and Kodlipet, 1695—Hostilities renewed, c. February 1696—Other events, 1696-1704—Chikkadevaraja's political position, 1698—The period of consolidation: 1698-1704—General political situation in South India—Ohikkadevaraja's embassy to Aurangzib, c 1699—Its return to Seringapatam, 1700—Its implications—Other political activities, c. 1698-1700: Advance on Malabar and Coorg; peace between Ikkeri and Mysore, etc.—Period of peace, 1700-1704: political position of Mysore, 1704.

ON THE death of Dëvarâja Wođeyar without issue, Chikkadëvaràja Wođeyar, his nephew and eldest son of Dođdadëvarâja Wođeyar by Amritâmbâ, became the lawful heir to the throne of Mysore, directly in the Une of Muppina-Dëvarâja Wođeyar. That he was looked upon as the heir-designate from the beginning of Dëvarâja's reign and that his eventual succession as the ruler of Mysore had, perhaps, been the cherished désire of his father (Doddadëvarâja Wođeyar), appear obvious from the works of Tirumalârya, already referred to.\(^1\)

In keeping with this position, Dëvarâja Wođeyar, on the eve of his death, is said to have enjoined on Dalavâi Kumâraiya and other officers to arrange for the installation of Chikkadëvaràja Wođeyar as his successor to the kingdom of Mysore.\(^2\)

Born on September 22,1645,\(^3\) Chikkadëvaràja Wođeyar was, we learn,\(^4\) brought up in Mysore by his father Dođdadëvarâja Wođeyar, till the latter's renunciation and departure for the banks of the Kaundinî (by 1659). Already in this period of his life, Chikkadëvaràja, as has

---

1. Vide Oh. X; also Appendix V—(2).
3. Mys. Dho. Pûr., II. 56: Parthwa, Âsuija su. 12, Monday; see also Annals, 1.104; C. Vam., 166; C, Vi., IV, 61, and Raj. Kath., XII. 478-474 (following the G. Vam.).
been depicted by his, friend and co-student Tirumalarya, displayed traces of a promising career, being educated and trained along sound lines and acquiring proficiency in the principles of drama, rhetoric, poetry and linguistics, in dialectics, Purânas, Dharma-éâstras and politics, in music (including the lute), gymnastics, archery and swordsmanship, and in horse-riding and elephant-riding and various other manly exercises. As indicated in the preceding chapter, Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar, during the reign of his uncle Dëvarâja Wodeyar, stayed in the capital city of Seringapatam as Crown-prince (Yuvarâja) till 1667. In February 1662, he was married to Dëvâjamma, daughter of Lingaràjaiya of Yelandûr, and Dëvamma, daughter of (Dalavâi) Kumârâiya of Kalale. As Crown-prince, he exhibited rare courage and military spirit—during the délibérations at Seringapatam—on the occasion of the siège of Érûde (1667). And he adorned, also, the court of Dëvarâja, taking an active interest in the study and appréciation of various subjects, sacred and secular. From about 1667 onwards, however, Chikkadëvarâja, as a young man of twenty-two, appears to have shown a tendency

5. See O. Vam., 172-184: Naťakalâtankâra kabba palavum déshbâbhugajolam pada-vâya-pramâna . . . vâda chaturya . . . Purâna . . . Dharma-éâstra . . . Râja-niti . . . Sangita-éâstra . . . Vina-rânya . . . garuđi-sadhaka . . . bîkâti modalîga palavum kaidu-gaime-yolam, sa-sudurogalârîdolam palavum kaid-vidyagolam pravîna-nunisidam. See also C. Vi., IV, 98-149. Cf. Raj. Kath., XII, 474-475, where Dëvachandra, who closely follows the O. Vam., makes it appear as if Tirumalarya, Višâlâkha-Pandit and Shajakaharaiya were the colleagues and companions of Chikkadëvarâja in his boyhood. Wilks (I, 108) merely speaks of Chikkadëvarâja’s early youth at Yejandür and of his intimacy with Višâlâkha-Pandit there. There is, however, no evidence in support of the position of either Dëvachandra or Wilks, who seems to follow Dëvachandra here. On the other hand, from contemporary works like the O. Vam. (170-179) and C. Vi. (IV-V), we learn that only Tirumalarya, the eldest son of Alasingarâya, was the colleague and co-student of Chikkadëvarâja from the latter’s boyhood. The connection of Chikkadëvarâja with the Jain Višâlâkha-Pandit and the Vra-Sâlve Shajakaharaiya must have come into being, as we shall see, only during c. 1669-1673, the period of his stay in Hangâja.

6. C. Vi., V, 187-188.
to fall off from his higher leanings, a tendency perhaps indirectly hinted at by Tirumalârya himself. It was, therefore, in the fitness of things that his uncle, according to one authority, resolved to keep him under some restraint at a place remote from Seringapatam. In or about 1668, Dêvarâja accordingly sent him with his family to Hangalâ, a village in the south of Mysore in the present Gândârupet taluk. There arrangements were made for the continuance of his éducation and for affording him training befitting the character and dignity of the future ruler of the kingdom of Mysore. During his stay in Hangala, Chikkadêvarâja Wodeyar, we note, came into contact with Shadaksharaiya (Shadaksharadêva), Vîra-êaiva (Årâdhya) preceptor to the family of Mudda-Bhûpa of Yelandûr, and with Viéâlaksha-Pandit, a learned Jaina Brâhman of Yelandûr, both of whom, together with Tirumalârya, became his friends and colleagues. All these figure prominently in the history of this period. Visâlâksha-Pandit, in particular, is further said to have developed an intimate acquaintance with Chikkadêvarâja and even predicted the latter's ultimate succession to the kingdom of Mysore, forestalling his own élévation as his Prime Minister. Of the détails of that acquaintance very little authentic has come down to us, but it seems not improbable that the foundations of Chikkadêvarâja's greatness as the ruler of Mysore were securely laid in Hangala during c. 1668-1673.

3. Ibid., VI; see also and compare S. K. Aiyangar, Ancient Indiâ, p. 296, f.n. 1.
5. Wilks (i.e.) writes of the continued attachment of Viéâlâksha-Pandit with Chikkadêvarâja at Hangala. But, as noticed in f.n. 5 supra, Chikkadêvarâja could not have come into contact with Viéâlâksha-Pandit and Shadaksharaiya earlier than c. 1668. For further particulars about the colleagues of Chikkadêvarâja, vide section on Council of Ministers in Ch. XII.
6. Raj. Kath., XII. 476; see also and compare Wilks, i.e.
On February 28, 1673, sixteen days after the death of Dëvarâja Wodeyar, Chikkadêvarâja was with due pomp and ceremony installed on the throne of Mysore in Seringapatam, Dalavâi Kumâraiya having, it is said, brought him in state with bis family from Hangala to the capital city. It was thus as a young man, just in his twenty-eighth year, that Chikkadêvarâja Wodeyar began his reign in Seringapatam; and he appears prominently mentioned in the extant records of his, dating in regular succession from 1673 onwards.

The first act of Chikkadêvarâja, on his accession, was the formation of an executive council (rantrâlôchana-sabhe)—a sort of cabinet—consisting of Viéâlâksha-Pandit as Prime Minister and Tirumalaiyangâr (Tirumalârya of literary works), Sha’daksharaiya, Chikkupâdhyâya and Karanika Lingannaiya as Councillors, to assist him in the governance of the kingdom. Dalavâi Kumâraiya of Kalale continued to hold office during the first decade of the reign, wielding considerable influence as Chikkadêvarâja's father-in-law and taking an active part in the politics of the times.

12. Mys. Dho. Pûr., II. 81; also I. 58 and II. 56 (compared): Pahîgâna ha. 8, Friday. Cf. Annales (I. 104), fixing Chikkadêvarâja's accession in Partâhâvi, Pahîgâna ha. 12 (March 6, 1673), and Raj. Kath. (XII. 477), in Partâhâvi, Kârikâ âtv. 5 (October 16, 1672). Wilks (I. 104) places the accession in 1673, and is followed by Rice (I. 966) and S. K. Aiyangar (Ancient India, p. 299). The authority of the earliest Ms. is, as usual, preferred here. Moreover it is in keeping with the inscriptions of Chikkadêvarâja, which begin from 1673—vide under Grants and other records, in Ch. XIII.

13. Annales, I. o. Cf. Wilks, I. 105-106. His story of Viéâlâksha-Pandit bringing about the accession of Chikkadêvarâja by his personal influence, is not founded on fact. Even Dëvatotçandra, the local traditionist, hardly refers to it; he merely speaks of the quiet accession of Chikkadêvarâja after Dëvarâja's death—see Raj. Kath., XII. 477, also XI. 967.

14. Vide in. 3 supra, citing authorities for the exact date of Chikkadêvarâja's birth (September 25, 1653). Cf. Wilks, I. 106. His statement that Chikkadêvarâja "succeeded to the throne at the mature age of forty-five" (Italics ours), is not borne out by evidence.

15. Vide under Grants and other records, in Ch. XIII.

16. Annales, I. 105. For further particulars about the Councillors, see under Council of Ministers in Ch. XII.
The accession of Chikkadēvarâja to the throne marks a turning-point in the history of India, particularly South India. The Empire of Vijayanagar, which had continued to hold its own against adverse forces for well nigh a century after the battle of Baksas-Tagdi (1565), was rapidly losing its hold on the country under the nominal, but attenuated, sway of Srī-Banga VI during the latter part of his life. The Shâhi kingdoms of Bijâpur and Grôlkonda were being drawn into a struggle with Aurangzîb in the Deccan, while the power of Bijâpur in the Karnâṭak-Bâlaghât had been definitely on the wane since the death of Shâhji in 1664. Shâhji had been succeeded in the Karnâṭak possessions of Bijâpur by his son Ėkôji (Venkôji), and the latter was staying in Bangalore, the seat of his father's jahgîr, exercising the powers of a Bijâpur general. The Mahratta power in the Deccan under Sivâji was steadily asserting itself against the Mughals on the one hand and the Shâhi kingdoms on the other. In Ikkêri, in the north-west (of Mysore), Hiriya-Sômasëkhara Nâyaka I having died a victim to court intrigue, had been succeeded by his queen-dowager, Channammâji, in February 1672; and the latter was governing the kingdom with the assistance of Basappa Nâyaka—afterwards Hiriya-Basappa Nâyaka I—adopted, and appointed heir-designate, by her in July 1672. Madura, in the far south, under Chokkanâtha Nâyaka (1659-1682), was on the point of drifting into war with Tanjore on the one side and Mysore on the other. As feudal powers and offshoots of Vijayanagar, both Ikkêri and Madura were practically independent. Indeed, to them Mysore, which had likewise emerged under similar circumstances but was powerful and claimed impérial status as the political heir of Vijayanagar in the Karnâṭak, had become a source of alarm, already towards the close of Dëvarâja's reign. The result was that, when Chikkadēvarâja Wodeyar
ascended the throne of Mysore in February 1673, a conflict between the forces of feudalism and imperialism, as represented by these factors, was almost inevitable, while the maintenance of the status quo of Mysore in the south-east and the north-west seemed to be the supreme need of the hour engaging Chikkadēvarāja's immediate attention.1*

The situation assumed a serious aspect when, about the time of Chikkadēvarāja's accession, Chokkanātha Nāyaka (Chokkalinga) of Madura evinced an attitude of hostility towards Mysore (durhrda-bhāvambettiral).18 On March 5, 1673, i.e., on the fifth day after his installation (patavā-daidaneya-dinadol), Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar proceeded on an expedition towards the east,19 taking in rapid succession the forts of Dhūligōte, Malali, Mutṭānjatti, Paramatti and Salem (Sālya).20 Marching further, Chikkadēvarāja

---


18. See Śrī Mahāt. (of Makkārjana), II. 96. For the chronological position, etc., of this text and of those cited infra, see Ch. XIV. The political data contained in these works (including inscriptions in poetical style) are generally to be understood in their chronological setting with reference to the more specific authority of other sources of information—compared with each other—wherever available.

19. Ibd. The Sachchā. Nir. (I, 61) refers to the beginning of the eastern campaigns of Chikkadēvarāja on the day following his installation (paṭadhiśhika-divasadapart-dhūre prag-prag-dvijyaga); the A. V. C. (III, 56) speaks of the event as taking place immediately after the installation (paṭangogolā); but the Śrī Mahāt., being an earlier work, is more specific.

20. Śrī Mahāt., l.c.; also Kamalā. Nir., I, 81, 99; Kamala. Mahāt., I, 123-126; Hasti. Mahāt., I, 74; Bhag. Gt. Ts., I, 53; Yād. Mahāt., II, ft. 28; Chikkadēvarāja-Vam., p. 27; Sachchā. Nir., I, 51-55; Gt. Gt., p. 55; Gt. Gō., pp. 88, 89. See also E.C., IV (9) Ch. 92 (1775), II. 25-26, and III (1) Sr. 151 (1779), p. 119 (Text), referring to the earlier conquests of Chikkadēvarāja. Paramatti is found mentioned in these records as Parama-tripura, which Rice renders as “the great Tripura” and which S. K. Aiyangar identifies with “Trichinopoly” (see
encountered Chokkanâtha himself at the head of his forces (consisting, we are told, of eight thousand horse, a lakh of foot and a hundred éléphants) commanded by his Dalavâi Venkatakrishtnana Nâyaka and lying in wait at Madhuvana on the borders of the forest région of Sâdamangalam. In the action that took place, Chokkanâtha was repulsed and hotly pursued; his forces severely crushed, and several éléphants, horses and valuables in his camp plundered and captured by the Mysore army. This was followed by Chikkadêvarâja's expédition to êâdamangalam whose chief, Râmachandra Nâyaka, readily submitted to him and was promised protection; the fort of Anantagiri was next taken, and the hostile chiefs of Ariyalûr, Toreyûr and Dhârâpuram, in the Kongu-nâdu, were successively reduced and forced to pay tribute. After having securely established himself in the east—in the places commanding the south—Chikkadêvarâja Wodeyar returned to the capital about the close of 1673. These activities of his are perhaps

Ancient India, p. 299). From the context, however, the reference is obviously to Paramatti, a place in the Salem district. Paramatti (commonly spelt as Parmati) is at present a market-town in the Karûr taluk, 11 miles west of Karûr. Its name has been derived from parana, beat, and atti, Tamil for focas ranamola of Lîn.; Sanskrit scholars, however, say that the name is a shortened form of Paramati-pura, the town of the Supreme God Subrahmanyas, for whom there is a temple in the place. Sâdamangalam (or Chêdamangalam), referred to in the text of f.n. 22 and 24 infra, may be identified with Sendamangalam in the present Karûr taluk, about 25 miles south-west of Karûr.

91. Trî. Tît., f. 17, v. 8: Kudure enchasirâ karâlgalya lakka madadâne mîrurim malûtu mårûnta Madhuryanmanu panja marâdi .

92. Sashôsta. Nir., I, 52 and ff. 191; A.V.C., III, 58, 63 and 79, 88; O. Bi. and O. Go., l.c. The actual expressions used are: Madhuvana-bala-majayan Paramati-pura, Purva-deyuvijaya-yatra-vibrasita Chêdamangalopâna-kântâropagaṭhavyûkh-Wendabhipata-Pâvâya - sendâhipa sangrasinga Venkarakshma-bhavâvarvavara-karanâ . . . See also f.n. 20 supra.


94. Komalâ. Mâhât., I, 122-129; Hasti. Mâhât., I, 76; Yad. Mâhât., II, f. 96-99; Chikkadêvaraja-Vamar., l.c.; Sashôsta. Nir., I, 63; O. Bi. and Go. Go., l.c.; see also E.C., IV (2) Ch. 32 and III (1) Er. 101, l.c.
confirmed by a lithic record from Doḍḍa-Bēḷūr (dated in 1673) referring to Dalavāâ Kumāraiya 25 and are significantly reflected by the new type of coins subsequently issued by Chikkadēvarāja. 26

Meanwhile, the political situation in the north-west of the kingdom of Mysore had taken a serious turn. Acting ostensibly as the restorer for the last time of the fortunes of the house of Srī-Ranga VI of Vijayanagar, but really aiming at the territorial integrity of her possessions on the fringe of Mysore, Ikkēri, under Ghannammâji and Basappa Nāyaka, was on the brink of war with the latter. In this enterprise, she was assisted by the Gōlkonda and Bijāpur forces in the Karnāṭak under Husain Khān and Balbal Khān (Balabalā-Khâna), and by other powerful local chieftains (piridāda manneyar) including those of Bēḷūr and Arkalgūd. 27 The combination was led by Kōdanḍa-Eāma I, a nephew of ēri-Banga VI, according to the Rāmarājīyamu. 28 Among those who took a leading part in the movement were Kesāragōdu (Kāsaragōdu) Timmanḍa Nāyaka, Sabnis (Sabbunīsa) Krishnappaiya, officers of Channamāji—commanding the innumerable forces of Ikkēri (asankhyātamāda sēnāsamūhamam)—and Māṭla Venkaṭapati, a feudatory of Kōdanḍa-Kāma. 29 In 1674 (Ananda samvatsaradol), Dajavāi Kumāraiya was despatched with an army against them. 30 He proceeded

25 I. M. P., II, 1916, Sa. 107. For further particulars about this record, vide under Graṅtas and other records in Ch. XIII.
26 Vide Ch. XII.
28 See S. K. Aiyangar, Sources, pp. 312, 313.
29 Ibid., p. 318; also Rs. N. V., IX, 183, v. 6.
30 Rs. N. V., i.c.; cf. S. K. Aiyangar, in Nāyaka of Māḍura (p. 184, f.n. 60), placing this event subsequent to 1675, and Mys. Guz. (II, iii, 2414), in 1704—which requires revision.
forthwith, winning rapid victories over the local chieftains and the Muhammadan forces, taking Arkalgūḍ. Angaḍī, NuggēhalJi and Sakléépur from Krishçappa Nāyaka of Aigūr, and finally wrestling Bēlūr from Venkaṭādri Nāyaka. At Ḥāssan, however, he was defeated and put to rout with great loss by the combined forces of Ikkēri and Kōdānda-Rāma, the defeat being followed by the resumption by Ikkēri of Vastāre (Vasudhāre) and other places from Mysore. This victory, attributed in the Rāmarājiyamu to Kōdānda-Rāma, was, however, more apparent than real, for, as we shall see, it left Bēlūr, Ḥāssan and Vastāre—formerly belonging to the Empire—virtually a bone of contention between Mysore and Ikkēri during the succeeding years, the impérial claim therefor having quietly receded to the background under the rapidly changing conditions of the period. Arkalgūḍ itself became the southernmost point of attack for Ikkēri, though Mysore had temporarily come into possession of that place, together with Sakléépur, about the close of 1674.

We may now turn to Chikkadēvarāja's relations with Bijāpur. As indicated already, Madura was on the point of drifting into war with Tanjore in 1673. They actually came to conflict between 1673-1674 (after Chokkanātha's repulse from the south-eastern frontiers of Mysore in 1673), and this resulted in the deaths of Vijayarāghava Nāyaka (of Tanjore) and his son, the acquisition of Tanjore by Madura and its rulfe under AJagiri Nāyaka, foster-brother of Chokkanātha Nāyaka, appointed as Viceroy. AJagiri, in due course, began to claim independence as ruler of Tanjore, adopting an attitude of indifférence towards Madura. While he and

31. Vide text quoted in f.n. 27 supra; also E. C., IV (2) Ch. 92, II. 26-28; III (1) Br. 161, p. 119 (Text).
32. Sources, pp. 312, 318; also Ke. N. V., IX. 183, vv. 9-10.
Chokkanâtha were on the point of a rupture, one of the officers of Vijayarâghava Nâyaka at the court of Tanjore planned the restoration of the old dynasty in the person of Changamala Dâs, a boy of the Nâyaka family of Tanjore; and sought the help of Bijâpur. The latter sent Ékôji, with instructions to drive AJagiri out of Tanjore and reinstate the boy on the throne. Ékôji proceeded thither and succeeded in taking possession of Tanjore by siège, forcing the helpless AJagiri to take to flight towards Mysore. He also reinstated Changamala Dâs but, subsequently, after the death of the Adil Shah in 1675, himself usurped all sovereign authority, establishing Mahratta rule in Tanjore and Gingee. From 1675 onwards Ékôji threw off his allegiance to Bijâpur, and Tanjore became his headquarters, though he continued to maintain a foothold on his father’s jahgir of Bangalore in the distant north.33

During the absence of Ékôji from the Karnâṭak in and after 1675, the Bijâpur possessions, in parts of what at present constitutes the Tumkur district, continued to be held by Jahângïr Khân and Husain Khân, generals claiming connection with Rañâdullâ Khân. The menace of Bijâpur and Gōlkoṇḍâ (then in alliance with Ikkëri and other local powers) on Mysore seemed seriously to affect the position of Chikkadëvarâja in the north. About the middle of 1675, he was, therefore, obliged to proceed personally in that direction; and succeeded in wresting from the Muhanimadans Kētasamudra, Kandikere, Handalâkere, Gûlûr, Tumkur, Chiknâyakanahalji, Honnavalji, Sâratavalli and Turuvëkere (Turugere), situated in the Karnâṭak-Bijâpur-

83. Vide, on this section, Nâyaka of Mâdura, pp. 169-168, 279; cf. Annals (R. 100-110), containing a rather confused and gossipy account of the Mahratta conquest of Tanjore, etc.
This was followed by an action against Narasappa Wodeyar (Narasa Nâyaka)—distinguished as Muçtîka (fighter with fist)—chief of the celebrated fort of Jaḍâkana-durga, who opposed him assisted by the Morasas and the Kirâtas. Jaḍâkana-durga itself was bombarded, its name being changed into Chikkadëvarâya-durga. About the close of 1675, Chikkadëvarâja's position in Mysore had become secure. He had succeeded in checking the aggressions of Madura and in ensuring the safety of Mysore against further attacks, and shown a marked tendency to absorb the remaining possessions of Madura in the south; he had also advanced up to Bëlûr in the west (against Ikkëri), despite the reverses at Hassan; and, profiting by the absence of Ëkôji from Bangalore, had extended the sphere of influence of Mysore up to the Karnàṭâk-Bijâpur-Bâlaghât in the north. The suzerainty of Vijayanagar in the Karnâṭaka country had become rather an idea than a reality, after the short-lived success of Kôdanda-Râma I at Hassan (1674), so that Chikkadëvarâja, in November 1675, was actually in a position to claim to rule the kingdom of Mysore from the throne of the Karnâṭa Empire (Karnâṭa-sårâjya-simhâsana-ruddâradhih), as the Châmârâjanagar copper-plate grant of that date testifies. The year 1675 is thus a landmark in the political évolution of the kingdom of Mysore.
By 1676 Êkôji, after his conquest of Tanjore, had proceeded as far as Trichinopoly in the far south, and a war between Chokkanâtha and Êkôji was imminent. The situation was critical for Mysore, exposed as she was to a much-expected attack from Bijâpur (to punish Êkôji for his usurpation) on the one hand and, on the other, to trouble from the Mahrattas under Êkôji, who were establishing themselves on her frontiers. Indeed, the Jesuit letter of 1676 speaks of Mysore—during 1675-1676—as fortifying "the citadels taken from the northern provinces of Madura," of her gathering fresh troops and "making grand préparations for war on the pretext of strengthening herself against the Muhammadans." The letter even anticipâtes in these préparations an eventual attack of Mysore on Madura. In reality, however, the attention of Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar in 1676 was directed towards the consolidation of the southern conquests of his predecessor and the further acquisition of Bijâpur possessions in the north, in which direction he had proceeded already in 1675. In January 1676, Chikkadëvarâja came into possession of Jadakana-durga from Narasappa Wodeyar, after a tough siège which lasted a period of nearly six months; in February, he took Doddadëva-gaganagiri (a peak probably named after Doddadëvarâja Wodeyar, father of Chikkadëvarâja) from Chikkappa-Gauḍa; and in April,
he finally atinexed Honnavalli from Jahângïr Khân. Again, in January 1677, Bommasamudra (in Chikkadêvarâya-durga hóbli) was taken from Husain Khân, while in February, Toda-nâdu (land of the Todavas or Tôdas ?) in the south was acquired from Bhujangaiya, son of the Wodeyar of Ummattûr. Proceeding further, Chikkadêvarâja Wodeyar extended his victorious arms as far as Malabar (Malayâchala, Kêrala). Indeed Dr. Fryer, writing about this time, makes mention of him (Chikkadêvarâja) as "the Raja of Saranpatam" (Seringapatam) enjoying "a vast territory on the back of the Zamerbin" (Zamorin). About the middle of 1677 there was absolute security for Mysore in all the directions excepting possibly the north-east.

For, by now the political equilibrium of the whole of Southern India was disturbed as it were by the sweeping current of Šivâji’s expédition into the Karnâtak. As already indicated, Šivâji had become a force to reckon with in India by 1672, when he began to assert himself as the sworn opponent of Aurangzib in the Deccan. Šivâji's coronation took place at Eaigarh on June 6, 1674 and in the monsoon season of that year he was engagea against Bahadûr Khân, the Mughal gênerai, in the Deccan. Šivâji was extending his warlike activities from Bijâpur and Gôlkonda up to the gâtes of Àgra and Delhi, when the political situation in Tanjore attracted his attention. The government of Tanjore ever since its conquest (1675) by Êkôji, half-brother of Sivâji, had been far from satisfactory. Eaghunâth-Pant, the able confidential
minister of Shâhji—then in charge of Œkôji's héritage in
the Karnâtak—wrote to Sivâji about Œkôji's maladminis-
tration in Tanjore. Œkôji received a letter of admonition
from Sivâji but it was of no avail. Raghunâth-Pant, in
disgust, began to work out plans to secure the kingdom
of Tanjore for Sivâji, and, having entered into an
understanding with some of the Karnâtak chiefs—parti-
cularly the Bijâpur governor of Gingee—left for Satâra,
to interview Sivâji and discuss with him the question of
an expédition to the south. On his way, he concluded
an alliance with the Sultan of Gôlkonda through the good
offices of the latter's Hindu ministers, Akkaña and
Mâdaj^ia. Raghunâth-Pant convinced Sivâji of the
feasibility of his plan. Towards the close of 1676, Sivâji
commenced his march towards the south with an army
consisting, it is said, of 30,000 horse and 40,000 foot.
In February 1677, Sivâji was at Bhâganagar (Hyderabad
in the Deccan) to complète his préparations with the help
of Gôlkonda, to whom he is said to hâve promised one
half of his conquests. Resuming the march, he entered
the Karnâtak in the direction of the Madras plains
capturing Gingee in July. Hère his brother Sântaji,
who was till then with Œkôji, went over to him. After
sending a considérable portion of his army to the siège
of Vellore, Sivâji marched on to Tanjore. In July-
August, an interview took place between him and Œkôji
at Tiruvadi on the Coleroon, which, despite the conflict
among the authorities regarding détails, left the latter
practically master of Tanjore. In August, Sivâji retraced
his steps to Vellore, annexing the territories north of the
Coleroon and subjugating the refractory Pàlegârs. He
confirmed Sântaji in the governorship of Gingee with
a contingent of troops under Raghunâth-Pant and
Haraji, and took the ancestral possessions of Ârni,
Hoskôte, Bangalore, Baljâpur (Dodballâpur) and Sïra in
the eastern, central and northern plateau of Mysore,
Early in November, alarmed by news of Aurangzib's campaign against him, he began his return journey, marching through Sirra to Kopal, then to Gadag, Lakshmeevar and Bankapur, finally arriving at Panhala through Belgaum about April 1678, in time to resume his activities against the Mughal. 45

About the middle of August 1677, Shivaji, on his way from Gingee to his ancestral possessions in the Karnatak, proceeded up to Seringapatam in southern Mysore. 46

A letter, dated August 24, 1677, 47 speaks of Shivaji's design "to take Bridroor [Bednur] and to join Canarato his own conquests." Further, some of Shivaji's parties are said 48 to have "plundered as far as Seringapatam" (in 1677) and Shivaji himself, after his march through Gingee, Tanjore and Valikoidapuram, was believed 49 to have "robbed Seringapatam, and carried away great riches from there." We have also a reference 60 to the Mahrattas under Shivaji having "retired to their own country after having some bloody battles with the Naik of Mysore." The contemporary Kannada works, however, invest this incident with a strong local colour. From them 51 we learn that when Shivaji entered the country of

46. See Sarkar, Shivaji, p. 400, f.n., citing Chitnis, 143. The details, however, are not given.
47. Quoted by Orme in Historical Fragments, Note XLVIII, p. 204: Bombay to Sdrst.
48. Ibid, p. 68.
49. Vide letter cited in f.n. 47 supra.
50. Early Records, p. 73.
51. See A. V. C., I, 80:

Andlanača bhayaadinde manidirpa uppabanda manimat bhuradoḍandu nercodolpi | Sandhihi Shivajiganasindoredu marma-manaavandi-roṣṭugadhi yavanandu kavéndham ||
Sansariyya keloḍodoländiniśu mumbariye banderagi poluvala gondanade Vistkå |
Lagumanaśa vallabojya kondu koloyagidajavinde Chikey- 
Divāmapimādu vagavālguṃ||
the Kannāçhgas his attention towards Seringapatam was directed by the assemblage of local chiefs who had been subdued by Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar; Sivâji, advancing at their head, surprised Chikkadēvarāja (probably in the neighbourhood of Seringapatam) offering a covert fight; Chikkadēvarāja withstood ėivâji and was able to repulse him, causing disorder and loss in his ranks. It would thus appear that Sivâji's progress was definitely arrested in southern Mysore under Chikkadēvarāja Wođeyar. Accordingly, at the end of the skirmish, Sivâji seems to have found it expédient to content himself with securing some booty from Seringapatam and, after taking his ancestral possessions in the eastern, central and northern plateau of Mysore, left Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar undisputed master of the kingdom of Mysore to the south of the Karnāṭak-Bijāpur-Bālaghât.

Sivâji's irruption into Mysore was in the nature of things nothing more than a passing incident in the gênerai course of Mahratta history, but it seems to have been regarded as an event of suprême significance from a local point of view. Indeed Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar is spoken of as having assumed the title Apratima-Vïra (unparalleled hero) after curbing the pride of the famous Sivâji who, it is said, had corne swollen with the pomp

52 Wilks (I. 100) speaks of the Mughal Heutnants, the Shāhi kings of Bijāpur and Golkonda and Sivâji, during the complicated transactions of the succeeding period (1677-1690), as having "found in each other opponents too powerful to admit of their attending in the manner that their importance required, to the gradual and skilful encroachments of Chick Deo Ra." Evidently Chikkadēvarāja was the master of the situation in Southern Karnāṭak in and after 1677; and this, as we shall see, is borne out by our sources also.
of tribute (from the rulers of the countries around Agra, Delhi and Bhaganganagar).\textsuperscript{53} Evidently Chikkadévarâja appears to have held himself out as the opponent of Sivâji in the southern Karnâtak, having asserted his claims to rule from the throne of the Karnâṭaka Empire as early as 1675.\textsuperscript{54} In any case, the event seemed to add considerably to the réputation of Chikkadévarâja Wođeyar as the foremost ruler in the Karnâṭaka country, and the Apratima-Vïra-Charitam of Tirumalârya, we have referred to,\textsuperscript{55} cannot but be regarded as conveying an éloquent indication of this position from the contem- porary standpoint.

\textsuperscript{53} See A. V. C. (of Tirumalârya), III, 28:

\begin{quote}
Mayanà Śambaranà Dakṣāya-sultanà Marichanà ēmbīnam |
Bhāvyāndagare Dhîllī Bhaganganara pratiṅgāloḷ-nāduḷgar |
jayaj-yendīdirīja kappadodram yempērī band-a-Siva-|
jīya sorkam muridikkï-yapratima-virabhikhēyam tājādām ||
\end{quote}

also C. Bi., p. 1, v. 4; Gt. Go., p. 20, v. 39; and E. C., III (1) Sr. 54 (1722), 11, 71-74, quoting from A. V. C. The title Apratima-Vira occurs also in E. C., III (1) Sr. 14 (1686), 1, 86; Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol., My. 115 (c. 1686-1690), II, 499-440; Mbh. Śanti., col., and Sañchō. Nīr., II, 129; and is found repeated in C. Bi., p. 59; Gt. Go., pp. 39 and 70, etc. (See also under Chikkadēvarâja’s titles, in Ch. XVI.) Curiously enough, other contemporary writers like Chikkupâdyâya, Timma-Kavi and Mallikârjuna do not refer to this event in their works, though they wrote in the early part of Chikkadēvarâja’s reign (i.e., c. 1676-1690). Probably they were not so well informed of it as Tirumalârya who, as an intimate friend and councillor of Chikkadēvarâja, seems to have been in a better position to visualise and give éloquent expression to it along with other important events of the reign—when he wrote his Apratima-Vïra-Charitam (c. 1695-1700). Chikkadēvarâja’s own works, the C. Bi. and Gt. Go., cited above, quote from Tirumalârya, the C. Bi. (p. 4), in particular, alluding to the event in prose also thus:

\begin{quote}
Utaraścändaḥāvattare- Charles-rami varaśram vāruvangaḥ lakṣadēśika-yurkālgaḥ beraśu nājādu Dhīlīga-nājananìram kollaṇyāl kallāduṇgalālam jālēgyēdu, Vījāyarudavaram jāyīś, anara nādu-bhuḷgalam koṇḍu, Gōlakondēyāvanam bāṇdēgugunā, avanītā kappananduggone, a vorkinim galkame Kannda-nādam poṇke Śivējāyam ajirvandadulē godīś. \end{quote}

Literary flourishes apart, the passages quoted, besides reflecting Chikkadēvarâja’s contact with Śivējī, point to the profound impression the latter had created on his contemporaries in Mysore by his achievements in Northern India—which endows his irruption into Mysore with a significance all its own.

\textsuperscript{54} Vide f.n. 38 supra and text thereeto.

\textsuperscript{55} Vide f.n. 53 supra.
The retirement of Sivâji from South India was followed by an aggressive campaign, about November 1677, conducted by Êkôji against Sântaji who had fled from his protection and was in charge of the kingdom of Gingee. In the action which is said to have taken place at Valikondapuram, both sides put up a stout opposition and Êkôji was obliged to retreat in great confusion to Tanjore, his plans frustrated. Meanwhile, news of Êkôji's movements having reached êivâji on his way home, he despatched the terms of a treaty—of nineteen clauses—to Êkôji, making provision for the administration of Tanjore on improved Unes. The treaty aimed a blow at the feudal obligations of Shâhji and his heirs to Bijâpur, and it was ratified by Êkôji who reverted to the more humble rôle of ruler of Tanjore- êântaji, having settled everything according to Sivâji's instructions, marched on Vellore which was ultimately captured by Baghunâth-Pant about the middle of August 1678, after an investment of fourteen months. Vellore became a Mahratta possession and was strengthened against an expected attack of Aurangzib. During these activities of the Mahrattas in the south, particularly during Êkôji's war with Sântaji, Chokkanâtha Nâyaka led his army into Tanjore, but, before he could invest the place, Êkôji retreated thither from Gingee. Weak and vacillating, Chokkanâtha, instead of taking prompt action, negotiated with Sântaji, promising him a large sum of money in return for the cession of Tanjore to him. Chokkanâtha* s expectations were foiled by the conclusion of the treaty between Êkôji and Sântaji about the end of 1677. He, therefore, returned in disgrace to Trichinopoly. He was in great straits and, as may be expected, added to the miseries and discontentment of his subjects. All these led to his déposition on the ground of insanity, and the temporary accession of his younger brother Mut tul inga
Nâyaka (the "Mudalagawdry Naique" of the *Fort St. George Records*) to the kingdom of Madura in 1678. The latter's administration hardly improved the prevailing state of affairs, and was followed by the usurpation, for about two years, of Bustam Khân, a Muslim adventurer and influential cavalry officer commanding 2,000 horse. Already by 1678 the Mahrattas had become a force in South India and between 1678-1680 were extending the sphère of their activities from the Karnâtak-Bijâpur-Bâlaghâṭ in the north up to Trichinopoly in the far south, leaving Aurangzîb to carry on his struggle with Sivâji on the one side and Bijâpur and G-ôlkonda on the other, in the Deccan.

To Chikkadëvaràja Woďeyar, Mahratta affairs in Southern India, since Sivâji's departure in November 1677, had become a source of great concern, especially as regards the territorial integrity of the frontiers of Mysore in the south-east and the north and his own advance in those directions. Already there were signs of the beginnings of a contest for the mastery of the south as between Mysore and the Mahrattas, conséquent on the graduai retirement of Bijâpur and Gôlkonda from the political arena of South India, while the shifting policy of Chokkanâtha Nâyaka of Madura was a contributory factor in the situation. In January 1678, Chikkadëvaràja Woďeyar, probably taking advantage of the state of affairs in Madura, proceeded to the east and laid siège to and took possession (from Ghatta-Mudaliâr) of the forts of Andûr and Kuntûr, situated on the frontiers guarding the dominions of Madura. Then he marched on to Ërôde, pursuing...
and capturing its chief Akkā Reddi, but subseqitly pardoning him and accepting his submission. Eeferring, perhaps, to this movement of Chikkadēvarâja, the Jesuit letter of 1678 speaks of him as having entered tjae dominions of the Nâyak of Madura "without striking a blow" and taken "possession of the only two fortresses which Madura had preserved till then in the north." Again, in a letter to Fort St. George Chokkanâtha himself states that "his brother not understanding how to govern the kingdom, did act in such a manner that the Naique of Misure [Mysore] took Madura, etc., places from us and gave Vollam [Vallam] castle to Eccojee [Ékôji]."

After securing his foothold in the south, Chikkadêvarâja turned his attention towards the north, taking the forts of Chikkatotlagere and Koratagere (in February-March 1678) and protecting the chiefs thereof, who submitted to him. This was followed by the siège of Mâgâdi and the settlement of contribution due by its chief Mummadi-Kempe-Gauda. Next Chikkadêvarâja proceeded to the Maddagiri-sïme, then in charge of chieftains by name Timmappa Gauda and Râmappa Gauda. The impregnable and celebrated fort of Maddagiri was bombarded and taken, during May-June 1678. Then followed the siège and capitulation of Kudûr, Virannana-durga, the peak of Maddagiri (Maddagiriya-kumbhi) and Hosûr (in the neighbourhood of Sîra), between June-July.
met with opposition from the Mahratta forces of Êkôji, commanded by his Prime Minister Yaéavanta Eao (Mkôjiya Mahâ-pradhâna-nenisuva Yaéavanta-Râvu); the Mahrattas were, however, put to rout, Yaéavanta Rao himself sustaining the loss of his nose at the hands of the Mysoreans. In August, Channarâya-durga and Manne-kôlâla, and in September-October 1678, the peak of Miðägëéi (Miðagêéi-kumbhi), Bijjavara, Guncjumaledurga and Bhùtipura, were successively besieged and captured. The acquisition of this chain of impregnable hill-forts made the sphere of influence of Mysore practically coterminal with Sivâji's ancestral possession of Sïra in the Karnàṭak-Bijâpur-Bâlaghât.

Evidently, during 1679-1680, Chikkadevarâja Wođeyar was at the height of his power. A copper-plate grant, dated in 1679, while incidentally repeating, and referring to, his conquests from the beginning of his reign up to 1678, speaks of him as wielding the sceptre of an Empire (sâmrâjyam pratipâdayari). Another,  

---


165. Vîda references cited in f.n. 63 supra.

166. Ct. Wilks, I, 106. His view that the conquests of Chikkadevarâja "present little interest or demand no particular explanation," is untenable in the light of the sources utilised here.

167. E. C., III (1) Sr. 131, p. 119 (Text).

the Garani copper-plate grant, dated in 1680, refers, among other things, to Chikkadëvarâja's victory over all his enemies (jita nikhila ripûn), to his prowess on the field (bhûja-vîryânala-mâjirangakë) and the dust caused by the march of his forces (yatsënâdhûli pâli ghanatara patcmailj); it does also écho Chikkadëvarâja's conquests in the north (in the Maddagiri-Bijjavara-sîme) and speaks of him as having been seated on the throne of Mysore in Seringapatam, bearing the burden of impérial sovereignty ( . . . Bangapuryâm . . . Mahïëûra-sinhâsanastha . . . sâmrajya-ëriya-mâvahari). Other sources\(^{69}\) point to his having performed the sixteen great gifts (shôdaia-mahâdânangałam maðî) and to his having been secure in his claim to suzerainty as " Sultan of Hindu kings " (Hindurâya-suratânam or suratrânam) and "Emperor of the south and of the Karnâtaka country " (Dakshinadik-Chakravarti, Karnâ-taka-Ghakravarti, Dakshinadikchakrâvanimandanam), during c. 1676-1680. The impérial idea was a living force in the practical politics of the times and Mysore, under Chikkadëvarâja, was fast completing the procès s of giving adéquate expression to it—a process which, as we hâve seen,\(^{70}\) tended first to manifest itself as far baok as 1663, if not as early as 1642.

On April 5, 1680, Sivâji died and was succeeded by his son Sambhâji (ëambhu, Sâmbâji) to the sovereignty of the Mahratta possessions in the Deccan and the Karnatak, with Haraji, the lieutenant of Sivâji, in charge of Gingee. Sambhâji soon found himself drawn into a struggle with the Sidi of Jinjîra, Aurangzïb and the English factors at Sûrat. Ëkôji continued as ruler of

---


\(^{70}\) Ants., Chs. VII and X.
Tanjore, retaining his hold on the distant jahgïrs of Bangalore, Hoskôte, Sïra and other places in the Kamâtak-Bijâpur-Bâlaghât. Ikkëri, alarmed by the advance of Mysore in the south-east and the north and by the latter's claim to supremacy in the Karnâtak, began her aggressions, taking Kaďûr, Bânâvar, Hässan and Bëlûr, and safeguarding her southern frontiers against further encroachments from Mysore, between 1680-1681 (Raudri-Durmati). Thèse actitities on the part of Ikkëri were facilitated to a considerable extent by the absence from Seringapatam of a major portion of the Mysore army under Dalavâi Kumâuraiya, engagea as the latter was before Trichinopoly in the distant south during the period,

Since 1678 Chokkanâtha Nâyaka of Madura had been smarting under the tyranny of Bustam Khân, the usurper-commander. Muttulinga Nâyaka, brother of Chokkanâtha, having retired to the Tanjore country, Bustam Khân, we learn, made himself so powerful that he began altogether to ignore the ruling family in Madura. Thereupon Chokkanâtha made an attempt to shake off Bustam's yoke. Disappointed in his dealings with Sântaji, he turned for help to the Maravas and Chikkadêvarâja of Mysore. He sent word to Kumâraiya, the Mysore general, about the middle of 1680. This was doubtless a good opportunity for Mysore, having advanced up to Madura already by 1678. The objective of Mysore now became clear. Dalavâi Kumâraiya, marching at the head of a strong

73. Letters to Fort St. George (1682), cited in f.n. 60 supra.
74. Ibid. The letter refers to Kumâraiya as "general named Comariah." Though dated March 8, 1682, it actually reflects the affairs of the period 1680-1682.
army, attacked Trichinopoly. Rustam Khân, says the Jesuit letter, "enticed by the enemy, made an imprudent sally, fell into an ambuscade and lost nearly all cavalry in it." Rustam's inability to conduct the defence of Trichinopoly soon led to a plot among Chokkanâtha's devoted friends, resulting in his (Rustam's) overthrow and massacre with his followers. Dalâvâi Kumâraiya and the Maravas succeeded in quelling Rustam Khân's forces; Chokkanâtha was freed from the latter's tyranny and he was grateful to Mysore for his hard-won freedom. He jubilantly announced his libération to the Governor and Council at Madras, stating (in his letter to Fort St. George dated March 8, 1682) "Wee and the Naique of Misure [Mysore] are now good friends."

Chokkanâtha was, however, it would appear, entirely mistaken in his belief. Dalâvâi Kumâraiya would not so easily let go his hold on him as he seemed to imagine. Indeed, since 1680 Kumâraiya had been steadily pressing his demand for the arrears of contribution due by Madura to Mysore, and, according to a family manuscript, he is stated to have made a vow not to appear before Chikkadèvarâja Wodeyar until he had taken Trichinopoly. About the end of March 1682, Chokkanâtha, having

---

75. See Amala, I. 113. According to this source, the Mysore army under Dalâvâi Kumâraiya and other generals of repute was before Trichinopoly during 1680-1682, for the collection of arrears of contribution from Madura (due since 1667-1668). In the light of the Fort St. George letter above referred to, Chokkanâtha's requisition for help from Mysore in 1680 seemed to offer a tempting chance for the realization of Chikkadèvarâja's ambition. See also Mys. Roy. Oba., 96, referring to the Mysorean expedition to Trichinopoly. For a critical notice of the actual date of the Mysorean siege of Trichinopoly, vide l.n. 92 infra.

76. See in Nagasa of Madura, pp. 288-287: André Freire to Paul Olive, 1682.

77. Ibid.; also pp. 181-182.

78. Vide l.n. 78 supra.

79. Ibid. 80. Vide l.n. 78 supra.

80. Vide in infra.

81. Referred to by Wilks, I. 114-115. But there is no evidence in support of Wilks's dating of Dalâvâi Kumâraiya's siege of Trichinopoly in 1696—vide, on this point, l.n. 92 infra; also Appendix VI—(1).
realised the gravity of the situation, turned for help to
the Mahrattas and found himself surrounded by four
large armies led, respectively, by Dalavâi Kumâraiya, the
Maravas, Haraji (Araéumalai), the gênerai of Sambhâji,
and Ëkôji.⁸²

The southern advance of Mysore as far as Madura and
Trichinopoly during 1678-1680 had
become a source of considérable alarnl
to the Mahrattas, threatening as it did
the safety of their possessions in the Karnâṭak and South
India. Already between 1680-1681, a combination of
the Mahrattas under Haraji, Dâdaji, Jaitaji and other
gênerais had laid siège to the fort of Dharmapuri (in the
east of Mysore) for a period of eight months and, being
repulsed by the Mysoreans, had raised the siège and
been forced to retire southwards, taking their stand in
Samyaminîpaṭṭanam (southern Dharmapuri).⁸³ Early in
1682, Haraji and Ëkôji had greater cause for anxiety,
Kumâraiya having stood before the walls of Trichinopoly
itself. They were, therefore, obligea to proceed thither
on pretence of helping Chokkanâtha, but their real
motive was "to repuise the army of Mysore whose

---

⁸² Nâyaka of Madura, p. 287 (Letter); see also p. 182. Satyanatha Aiyar
places the Mysorean siège of Trichinopoly about 1680 (Ibid., p. 181). In
the light of the Jesuit letter of 1682 (Ibid., pp. 287-288), read with reference
to the Letter to Fort St. George (vide f.n. 60 supra), the siege seems to
have taken place subsequent to March 1682. Although Kumâraiya was
before Trichinopoly in 1680 (vide f.n. 75 supra), the interval of about
two years between 1680-1682 was, as we have seen (vide f.n. 74 supra),
occupied by diplomatic relations between Madura and Mysore. So that
we may approximately place the actual date of the Mysorean siege of
Trichinopoly between c. March-May 1682. Cf. J. Sarkar, referring to the
siège in March 1683 (Aurangzeb, V. 59)—which requires revision. S. K.
Aiyangar, in the Sources (p. 312, f.n.), cites Nelson's Manual of Madura
referring, on the authority of a Mackenzie Ms., to the siege of Trichino-
poly by Dalavâi Kumâraiya of Mysore along with Šivâji and Venkôji,
and to Kumâraiya's defeat and forced retirement to Mysore at the hands
of Šivâji. It is difficult to accept Nelson's authority being apparently a
later and erroneous version. The siege, as we have shown, actually took
place in 1682, i.e., about two years after Šivâji's death (1680).

⁸³ See A. V. C., III, 97 (with gloss) and Sacheṭi. Nîr., I, 58; also see f.n. 94
infra, for details about the Mahratta generals.
proximity they feared, and take possession of all the dominions of Madura." Trichinopoly thus became a bone of contention as between Mysore and the Mahrattas, the Maravas taking part in the struggle only "to get their share of pillage."

Before commencing hostilities, however, Dalavâi Kuinâraiya, "realizing that it was impossible for him to resist such armies with troops so inferior in number," says the Jesuit letter, "offered peace to the Nâyak, promising to preserve his kingdom for him and re-establish the successors of the ancient Nâyaks of Tanjore and Gingi." Whatever might have been the ulterior motive of the Dalavâi in making these proposals, the wisest course for Chokkanâtha "would undoubtedly have been to make a league with the king of Mysore" against the Mahrattas. Instead, he only joined the latter "to fight and destroy the allies whom he had called to his help." Chokkanâtha, however, could neither count on the support of the Mahrattas nor was he capable himself of "a project which required courage and noble détermination." Indeed the situation seemed to demand prompt action on his part but "he was pleased to remain idle spectator of a struggle which must decide as to who among these competitors would be his master and the possessor of his dominions."

Kumâraiya's negotiations with Chokkanâtha having thus proved futile, he made in turn overtures to Haraji, the Mahratta general, offering him 'large sums of money to corrupt his fidelity and pledge him to retire to Gingi.' Obviously he hoped, by these negotiations, to gain time to enable Chikkadëvaràja Woṣeyar in Seringa-

84. Nâyaks of Madura, p. 287 (Letter cited in i.n. 76 supra).
85. Ibid.
86. Ibid.
87. Ibid.
88. Ibid.
89. Ibid.
90. Ibid.
91. Ibid., p. 286.
patam "to send him help which he had applied for/" but his letters "fell into the hands of his rivais, who, sacrificing the interests and glory of the prince and of their country to their personal jealousy, had kept away these despatches to ruin the general."\(^{92}\)

Meanwhile, in or about April 1682,\(^{93}\) a section of the Mahratta cavalry led by Dâdaji, Jaitaji and Nimbâji among others, taking advantage of the absence of the Mysore army from Seringapatam and of the serious predicament of Dalâvâi Kumâraiya at Trichinopoly, moved on from the east and the north of Mysore.\(^{94}\)

Entering the interior of the country (ola-nâdam pokka), they encamped in the neighbourhood of Seringapatam, on the fields of Kottatti and Honnalagere (Kottatti-simântarê, Ponnalagere-prânte), and, by their predatory activities, plunged the countryside in abject terror and confusion, threatening the safety of the capital city itself.\(^{95}\) It was a trying situation. At a moment when Dalâvâi Kumâraiya was himself in absolute need of reinforcements, an express message from Chikkadēvarâja Wođeyar was receiveà at Trichinopoly, directing his officers, as a temporary measure, to dispatch a major

---

\(^{92}\) Vide Appendix VI—(1), for a detailed notice of the evidence in support of this date as against Wilks's date, 1596.

\(^{93}\) See Anmala, I. 113-114; Mys. Raj. Châr., 29; also texts cited in l.n. 95 and 99 infra; cf. Wilks, I. 114. The names of the Mahratta generals are found variously mentioned in these local sources as Dâdaji, Dâdaji, Dâdaji-Kåhâja; Jaitaji, Jaitaji-Kåfaka; Jaitaji-Kåkade, Jaitaji-Ghâit, Jîjî-Ghâit, Jâjâji-Ghâit, Nimbâji-Ghâit, Nimbâji-Ghâit, etc. Wilks (l.c.) mentions only two of these generals as “Jugdeo Ghatkoo” and “Nimbjea Ghatkoo.” We, however, refer to them by their actual names, leaving aside the suffixes, Dâdaji, Jaitaji and Nimbâji were some of Sivâji’s cavalry officers (Sivajî-vâji-simadhipa, simângâh), who had lately succeeded to the leadership of Sambhâji’s army (Sambhâji-mukhya-sträm)—see Mbh. Šânti, col.; Sâcekha. Nir., ii. 121; C. Bi., pp. 4, 68; Gt. Gî., pp. 99, 69.

\(^{94}\) A.V.C., IV, 8 (with gloss); Sâcekha. Nir., I, 58; also Sakala-Vaid. Sam. (c. 1714-1720), p. 8. See also and compare Anmala, I. 114, and Mys. Raj. Châr., l.c. Kottatti and Honnalagere are two extant villages in the Mandya taluk—see List of Villages, 92.
portion of the Mysore army under Doḍḍaiya (nephew of Kumâraiya) and other deputies to the relief of Seringapatam leaving only a handful of troops with Kumâraiya to push through the siège of Trichinopoly. A strong detachment, commanded by Doḍḍaiya, left for Mysore, marching rapidly through the Kâvëripuram passes. Doḍḍaiya, trader spécial instructions from Chikkadëvarâja, proceeded against the Mahrattas, making a surprise night-attack on their camp and stupefying them by means of the illumination of torches carefully fastened to the horns of the oxen of the transport corps (two to three thousand in number) under him. The Mahrattas found themselves placed in an unfavourable situation and could do nothing as the animais were being scattered against them in all the directions by their opponents who were joined by fresh parties from Seringapatam. Unable, further, to cope with the Mysoreans advancing from behind the array of the oxen, they began to take to flight in utter panic. A thick fight followed. The Mahrattas were put to utter rout amidst great loss in their ranks; their camp was plundered of its ail—horses, éléphants, treasures, insignias and other belong-ings; Dâdaji, Jaitaji and Nimbâji were themselves captured and slain on the battle-field, their noses, ears and limbs being cut off; the head of Dâdaji was paraded in the army (mandiyol mereyisi) and those of Jaitaji and Nimbâji were presented as trophies before Chikka-dëvarâja Wodeyar and later displayed on the Mysore Gâte of the fort of Seringapatam."

96. *Annals*, l.c.; cf. *Wilks*, I. 114-115. *Wilks* (I. 115) speaks of Doḍḍaiya as the "son" of Kumâraiya. The *Annals* (l.c.) loosely refers to him as maga, which literally means "son," but Doḍḍaiya was actually a nephew of Dalevì Kumâraiya, i.e., second son of Muppina-Kåntaiya of Kâjale, a cousin brother of Kumâraiya—vide section on Domestic life, in Ch. XVI; also Table XIII.

Almost simultaneously the position of Dalavāi Kumāraiya at Trichinopoly was becoming critical in the extreme. With limited resources at his command and "receiving neither reinforcements nor reply to his letters," he was, we learn, "obliged to seek safety in honourable retreat." Accordingly, says the Jesuit letter, "He ordered the cavalry corps to feign a movement to attract the attention of the enemies, to engage them as long as possible, and then flee with full speed towards Mysore; while he himself would take advantage of this diversion to escape, with his infantry, in an opposite direction and thus save his army. But the Moghuls would not allow themselves to be put on the wrong scent; for a long time past their self-conceit and audacity had been increasing by the inaction of Kumāra Raya [Kumāraiya], which revealed to them his weakness and their strength; they kept close to his army and none of his actions could escape them. Thus, when the cavalry effected its movement, they followed it very calmly without inviting

p. 2, v. 6 and pp. 4, 53; Cī. Go., p. 69, v. 12, pp. 98, 69; Sukala-Vaid. Sam., pp. 2-4; E.C. III (1) Sr. 14 (1686), ll. 65-67, 69-70; Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol., My. 115 c. 1686-1690), ll. 86-88, 90-92; III (1) Sr. 64 (1729), ll. 75-76—referring to and echoing the details of the exploit. Cī. Wilks, I. 117. The actual expressions used in the inscriptions (l.c.) are:

Rāmatmane-yadajaye Khara-Dūshānādyam
Kukshaḥ kulam tadapakṣita Marītu-vaṇṇhman |
Dadaji-Jalājajī-mukham uṇānu Panchavatlāh
Prāptam nihantā sahariś-Chikādēvā-vaṁrīk ṇ |

... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ...

Dadaji-bhūti-Jalājajī ... survange-nasakhiḍi
Śrī-virā Chikādēvārāja-nipatānu yuddhāya badhdhārā ||

In the highly figurative poetical language of these texts, Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar's achievement over the Mahrattas at Kottati and Honnagere is treated on an epic footing, being aptly compared to Rāma's exploits over Khara and Dūshāna at Panchavatī. This is evidently an index of the profound impression the event had left on Chikkadēvarāja's contemporaries.

100. Nāyaka of Madura, p. 985 (Letter); see also pp. 182-183. Cf. authorities cited in f.n. 82 supra.

101. Ibid.
a combat, reserving all their strength to crush the body of the army; besides, this cavalry, demoralized by its sad position, could properly execute only the last part of the orders it had received; it did that wonderfully well, and with all the more facility, that the Moghuls [Mahrattas] did not wish to waste time in pursuit. Then, they fell on the infantry, and the combat was only a horrible butchery; they found rich booty, the result of several years' pillage, and made a large number of prisoners, among whom was Kumāra Baya [Kumaraiya] himself. The defeat and capture of this general, till then invincible, completed the joy and pride of Arasumalai [Haraji]. Taking advantage of his glorious victory, he extended his conquests by driving the Mysoreans from all the provinces and from nearly all the citadels, which they had taken from the Nayak of Madura.''

These reverses were too much for Dalavāi Kumāraiya—then in his old age—to bear. The Jesuit letter is silent as to what happened to him after his capture at the hands of the Mahrattas. The probabilities are that he managed to obtain his release and returned to Seringapatam. For, on May 26, 1682 (Dundubhi, Vaisakha ha, 30), we note, he retired from the office of Dajavāi and was succeeded for a short while (May 27-June 9, 1682) by Devaiya, and later by his nephew Doddaiya (June 10, 1682-June 11, 1690).

ChikkadevarSja's victory over the Mahrattas near Seringapatam, however, appeared to counterbalance Dalavāi Kumāraiya's reverses at Trichinopoly. Indeed, while the latter meant a serious, though temporary, set-

102. Annuls, I. 116; Mys. Dho. Pur., I. 68; flee also under Dalavdis, in Oh. XII. Very little is known of Dajavāi Kumāraiya subsequent to his retirement in May 1682. It appears probable that he died shortly after. For details about the Kalale Family, vide section on Domestic life in Ch. XVI.
back to the progress of Mysore in the south, the former tended to prevent the Mahrattas from having a permanent foothold in and near Mysore, and seemed not only to ensure the eventual sovereignty of the Karnataka country to Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar but also to add to his prestige as the ruler of Mysore.\textsuperscript{103}

No sooner was the Mahratta invasion of Seringapatam overcome than another trouble appeared to engross Chikkadevaraja's attention. The success of Chikkadevaraja in distant Madura (down to 1682) had induced a combination of those opposed to him. Ikkeri and Golkonda joined Sambhaji in contesting his aims and ambitions in the south. Accordingly Chikkadevaraja was, early in June 1682, obliged to proceed in the north-west of Mysore to safeguard the frontiers against Ikkeri, whose activities during 1680-1681 had given him cause for alarm. At Banavar (Banapura) he met with a powerful combination against him, headed by Basappa Nayaka of Ikkeri, the Qutb Shah of Golkonda and Sambhaji,\textsuperscript{104} the last then on his way to the south to join Ekoji and other Mahratta generals.\textsuperscript{105} In the action that followed (at

\textsuperscript{103} See A.V.C., III, 168, 169 (with gloss); also Sakala-Vaid. Sam., p. 4: Karnataka-dhelam Vilayalikshmi-näjaka-pradetha-vanisida, referring to the Karnataka country as the stage left open to the Goddess of Victory in the hands of Chikkadévaraja at the end of the exploit against the Mahrattas; Sangi. Ganga., ll. 9 and 10: Anyachakra Mahidhara-rájyamakhilam Karnatakaiva punah, etc., where Kátipati-Paṇḍita, a mid-eighteenth century commentator, interprets (Dasväi) Doḍḍaiya's victory over the Mahrattas (under Jaitaji and others) as implying the restoration of the sovereignty of Mysore in the Karnataka country.

\textsuperscript{104} A. V. C., III, 21; also R. C., III (1) 8r. 14 (1690), ll. 67-69 and 72-74, echoing the events of 1682. For textual details, vide f.n. 105 infra.

\textsuperscript{105} See Náyak of Madura, p. 259 (Letter), from which it would seem that Sambhaji was in South India by the middle of 1682. See also J. Sarkar, Aurangzeb, IV. 251, referring to Sambhaji's predatory incursions in 1682 after the unfinished siege of Jinhira. Also text in f.n. 106 infra.
Chikkadeva and Wodeyar achieved a distinct victory over his opponents.

Foiled in his attempt against Mysore from the northwest, Sambhaji proceeded towards the east and south, taking possession of all the places conquered by his general, Haraji, who still continued to chase the Mysoreans. He was soon before Trichinopoly itself, attacking Chokkanatha Nayaka in his fortress. About June 16, 1682, Chokkanatha died in a fit of melancholy, "frustrated in all his hopes" of re-establishment by the Mahrattas, "dispossessed of his dominions and all his treasures, abandoned by his troops and deprived of all resources." In July 1682, he was succeeded by his son Muttu-Virappa Nayaka III (1682-1689), then aged fifteen. From about July-August, the general political situation in South India, caused by Sambhaji's movements, was rather unfavourable for Mysore. In the fight for supremacy in the south, the scale had turned in favour of Sambhaji for the time being. The kingdom of Madura had been considerably reduced in extent; Mysore had lost all her fortresses in the east and the south except some, including that of Madura, which she was striving to maintain with the help of the Maravas; Ekoji

106. *A.V.C.,* l.c. : *Idirānta Sambu-Basavara | maḍavāḷīvidanandu Bāṇapura- dajupēndram ; also E. O., III (1) Sr. 14, l.c. : *

107. *Neyals of Madura, l.c. ; also pp. 190-191.*
was continuing his despotic rule in Tanjore; Gingee had come under Sambhalji; Sanibhāji had become an important factor in the south of India, pursuing, as the Jesuit letter puts it, "his conquests against Mysore, not only in the kingdom of Madura, but even in the northern provinces, where he has taken several of its fortresses, all the province of Dharmapuri, and other neighbouring territories"; Golkonda and Ikkeri continued to be his allies, having both "united against (the king of) Mysore (who is) regarded as the common enemy." This shows the success that Mysore had attained thus far in the Madura country (down to 1682). The advance of Sambhalji proved the signal for a combination against Chikkadevaraja. And the fight for supremacy as between Mysore and the Mahrattas was fast becoming a live issue in the politics of Southern India. Chikkadevaraja, on his part, put up a persistent opposition to the pretensions of Sambhalji in the south: perhaps he also found it expedient to keep himself in touch with Aurangzeb, the Mughal Emperor, with a view eventually to frustrate the combination against Mysore. Indeed, Aurangzeb, who was at Aurangabad since March 1682, had, we learn, already been much impressed with the news of the defeat inflicted by Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar on the Mahratta generals near Seringapatam (c. April 1682). Further, the Jesuit letter (of 1682) even speaks of the Mughal (Aurangzeb) as having been on the point

106. Ibid, p. 290 (Letter). The reference here is to the triple alliance of Sambhalji, Basappa Nāyaka of Ikkeri and Qutb Shah against Mysore, which was defeated by Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar early in June 1682.

109. J. Sarker, Aurangzeb, IV, 266.

110. See Sakala-Vaid. Sam., p. 4: Mārañarol praviddharāgīrda Jeji Ghaṭi mūṇḍīda mahaśivarānam kaṁśai . . . Karnaśakadēṣamam Viṣṇu-laktiṃ-maṇḍakā-pradeśa-vaniṇḍa jaya-śastraṃja kīḍāvaṅgaijīka- Pādushaka mūṇḍīda bhūmīva-raḷlaraṃ śhūpūbhāpendu kajyveti kṣarāvattivite, referring to Emperor Aurangzeb and other monarchs as having showered their encomiums on Chikkadevaraja at the news of his exploit over the celebrated Mahratta generals, i.e., Dādaji, Jalsaji, Nimbāji and others. See also Annals, I, 115.
of "sending a formidable army against Sambogi [Sambhaji] at the request of Mysore." 111

The proffered or expected help, however, never came, involved as Aurangzib was in his struggle with Bijapur. 112 Aurangzib thus lost a great opportunity of actively befriending one who had proved so useful an ally in the realization of his own aims and ambitions against the Mahrattas and that without so much as asking for it. A timely pact with Chikkadevaraja would have helped him as much as it would have paved the way for a friendly adjustment between the Imperial Mughal as the ruler of the north and Chikkadevaraja as the ruler of the south. But Aurangzib's character and state-craft were such that high political achievement was as far from him as the sky in the heavens is to the man on mother Earth below. By about the end of 1682 the war between Madura and Mysore had come to an end, but in 1683 Sambhaji's presence in the south contributed to a continuance of disturbed conditions in it. The kingdom of Madura was parcelled out into five portions occupied, respectively, by the Nayak of Madura, the king of Mysore, the Maravas, Sambhaji and Ekoji. 113 And Sambhaji, it would seem, was the foremost to take advantage of this state of affairs to dispute, in particular, the claim of Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar for supremacy in South India. With that end in view he began to wage a systematic war of aggression against Mysore, from the east and the south. About the close of 1683, Chikkadevaraja's political position in these directions was at a low ebb. The Jesuit letter of that year thus sums up the then situation: 114 "The power of the king of Mysore in Madura begins to grow weak, because, violently attacked in his own dominions by the troops of Sambogi,

111. Nayaks of Madura, i.e.
112. Barker, e. e., IV. 300-303
113. See in Nayaks of Madura, p. 291: Jean de Britto to Paul Oliva, 1629; also pp. 193-194
114. Ibid.
he cannot sustain and reinforce the armies he had sent to those countries. The provinces he had conquered there shake off his yoke gradually to claim their independence, or become attached to some one of the princes who have partitioned the shreds of the kingdom, once so flourishing, among themselves." The letter shows that Chikkadevaraja was unable to consolidate his conquests in the south. The position of ascendancy gained in Madura-r-as its protector—against the Mahrattas was in great jeopardy, especially with the advent of Sambhāji. The vassals of Madura, subdued at great cost by Chikkadevaraja, were breaking away from allegiance and the gains made were slipping out of his hands. The position grew worse between 1683-1686. "In the south, the petty rajas, once vassals of Madura/" says a Jesuit letter,\(^{116}\) "continue to shake off the yoke of Mysore, too weak to preserve her conquests; the Thieves (i.e., Kalians) and the Maravas make a war of brigandage against the troops of Ekoji; Sambogi mercilessly conducts war against the king of Mysore, whose dominions he is invading, and is strongly helped by the revolts of the inhabitants against their own sovereign." Chikkadevaraja found that while the subjugated vassals of Madura were breaking away from him, Sambhāji's invasion had caused difficulties for him nearer home. No doubt the Maravas and Kalians kept Ekoji's forces at bay, but they cared more for plunder than for keeping the enemy off their master's territories. According to the Jesuit letter above quoted, it would seem that Chikkadevaraja, "to provide for the expenses of the war,"\(^{116}\) had tried to augment his revenue and adopted steps which brought him into conflict with his subjects "in the eastern provinces of his dominions."\(^{117}\) What followed will be found treated in the sequel,\(^{118}\) and it will suffice here to state that the lack of

\(^{115}\) Ibid, p. 292: Louis de Mello to Noyelle, 1666.

\(^{116}\) Ibid.

\(^{117}\) Ibid.

\(^{118}\) Vide Ch. XV below.
resources in men and money came in the way, for the time being, of the realization of his hopes in the south. He, however, appears to have made a supreme effort to raise the treasure required to replenish his war-chest. The measures he was advised to take were evidently such as not merely to help him to attain the objective he aimed at but also to give occasion to his Minister resorting to means for giving effect to them, which proved both unpopular and impolitic. This apart, soon there was a change in the tide of affairs. About July 1686, the mutual interests of Chikkadēvarāja and Sambhāji seem to have demanded a political adjustment. Hard pressed in their homelands by the Mughal Emperor, the Mahrattas in the south were ready to agree to any terms. Their chronic need was money and a little of that rare, but valuable, commodity was enough to induce Sambhāji to retire. The Mahrattas indeed made a virtue of their necessity. Their withdrawal, though a timely one for Chikkadēvarāja, was forced on them by the pressure of Mughal arms on the Deccan. Since 1684, Aurangzīb had been busy mobilising his resources to crush the Shahi states of Bijapur and Golkonda on the one side and the Mahrattas on the other. On September 12, 1686, he succeeded in reducing Bijapur, and the Mughal arms were preparing to penetrate the country south of the Krishna as far as the Karnntaks-Bijapur-Balaghat.
diminished his authority and prestige in the south and the east of Mysore, but they had hardly affected his claims to supremacy in the Karnataka ever since the defeat he had inflicted on Basappa Nayaka of Ikkeri (June 1682). Indeed, as Orme observes,\textsuperscript{121} he was, in 1684, looked upon as the "most ancient and considerable" of the several ESjas in the country of Mysore. About the close of 1686, Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar had become not only firm in his position as the sovereign of Mysore but also an imperial authority in the south. The Seringapatam Temple copper-plate grant (dated November 19, 1686)\textsuperscript{123} seems to echo this fact when it gives him imperial titles and speaks of him as ruling in peace from the capital city of Seringapatam.

The Mughal, however, soon tried to take the place of the Mahratta in the south. The respite which Mysore enjoyed therefore proved only a short one. In March 1687, a detachment of the Mughal army under Khasim Khan marched by way of Penukonda towards Tumkur.\textsuperscript{133} At this news, Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar proceeded thither. Tumkur was promptly prevented from falling into the hands of the Mughals and, during April-May, Chikkadevaraja succeeded in taking from Ekoji Chiknayakanahalli, Kanikere and Tyamagondu\textsuperscript{124}—places which appear to have been lost to Mysore during the warfare of 1682-1686. These acquisitions doubtless meant the dwindling of Ekoji's power in the Karnataka-Bijapur-Balaghat while they helped to strengthen the position of

\textsuperscript{121} \textit{Historical Fragments}, p. 141.


\textsuperscript{123} See Sarkar, o.c., V. 56, 58, referring to the beginnings of Mughal penetration into the Karnataka in 1667; also \textit{Mys. Dho. Per.}, II. 83-87; cf. Annals, I. 108-107; \textit{Wille}, I. 268.

\textsuperscript{124} \textit{Mys. Dho. Per.}, I.c.; see also and compare Annals and \textit{Wille}, I.c.
Mysore as a serious competitor with the Mughals for the remaining possessions of Bijāpur in that region.

With the increasing influence and power of Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar, Ekōji found it exceedingly difficult, about this time, to maintain his jahgir of Bangalore from distant Tanjore. He accordingly proposed to sell it to Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar for rupees three lakhs. A vakil was sent from the court of Tanjore to Seringapatam to conduct the negotiations. Chikkadēvarāja, having completed the transaction, was about to take possession of Bangalore. Meanwhile, Khāsim Khān, advancing with the Mughal detachment, had occupied the place, finally hoisting the imperial flag over the fort on July 10, 1687. Almost simultaneously the Mahrattas, with a detachment under Haraji (Governor of Gingee), Ke3ava-Triyambak-Pant and Santaji (Generals of Sambhaji), were also on their way thither but, on finding that they had been forestalled by Khāsim Khān, retired without opposition to the Karnāṭak. At this juncture, Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar stood before the walls of Bangalore. A fight took place between the forces of Mysore and the Mughal troops, in which the latter were thoroughly put to rout.

125. Annals, I. 110; see also and compare Rāj. Kath., XII. 482 (referring to the transaction without, however, mentioning the date), and Wilks, I. 108.-110. Also see f.n. 181 infra.

126. Mys. Dho. Pūr., II. 98: Prabha, Nīja-ākhāche tu.11; see also Annals, l.c. Orme (Historical Fragments, pp. 155-156) places the surrender of Bangalore to Khāsim Khān, early in August 1687; Wilks (I. 110), about July 1687; Sarkar (o. c., V. 54-55, f. n.) would fix it on June 10, or July 10, 1687. The authority of the Mys. Dho. Pūr is preferred here as the more specific. Again, in the light of other sources we have here referred to, it is rather hard to accept the meaning of the text of the Persian MS., suggested by Sarkar (Ibid., 55-58, f. n.), viz., that in the surrender of Bangalore “the Mughal General was aided by the chief of Seringapatam, the enemy of Shivaji’s house.”

127. Orme, l. c.; Wilks, l. c.; Sarkar, o. c., V. 55-56 (compared).

128. Annals, I. 110; see also references cited in f. n. 180 infra; cf. Wilks, I. 110-111, referring to Chikkadēvarāja’s final acquisition of Bangalore by purchase from Khāsim Khān, for which there is no evidence—vide also f. n. 181 infra.
and Chikkadevaraja took possession of Bangalore on July 14.\textsuperscript{129} Indeed we have the unanimous testimony of the contemporary texts,\textsuperscript{130} significantly pointing to this repulse of the Mughals by Chikkadevaraja and his wrenching of Bangalore from them. The ultimate delivery of Bangalore to Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar was, however, it would seem,\textsuperscript{131} effected by Khasim Khan under an amicable arrangement, by which, while Chikkadevaraja was for all practical purposes recognised as the legitimate owner of the place, Khasim Khan himself, relieved from the necessity of maintaining a large detachment for its occupation, secured its use as a point of communication for Mughal arms in South India. On the completion of this arrangement, Khasim Khan retired to Srir, where he remained as the Mughal Governor (Faujdar).\textsuperscript{132}

Thus, with the acquisition of Bangalore, the kingdom of

\textsuperscript{129} Mys. Dho. Pur., i.e.; Prabhava, Nija-\text-superscript{-}\text-i\text-superscript{-}dha\text-superscript{-}su, 16; see also \text-superscript{-}\text-superscript{-}\text-superscript{-}\text-superscript{-}\text-superscript{-}Annals, i.e.; cf. Wilks (I. 111), placing the delivery of Bangalore to Chikkadevaraja in July 1637.

\textsuperscript{130} A. V. C., III, 118, 190, 190 and 124 (with gloss); Mogalar ... ... 

\textsuperscript{131. According to Wilka (I. 110), Chikkadevaraja's transactions with Ekoji for the purchase of Bangalore were not complete when the place surrendered to Khasim Khan. Further, he speaks of Khasim Khan as delivering Bangalore to Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar after "accepting the price which the Raja was still willing to pay," and points to an "amicable arrangement" concluded by him (Khasim Khan) with the latter (I. 110-111). There is no evidence in support of Wilks's position, for, as we have seen (vide f.n. 125 supra and text thereto), Ekoji's sale of Bangalore to Chikkadevaraja was an accomplished fact already about the time the place yielded to Khasim Khan. The probabilities are, therefore, more in favour of the view that Khasim Khan, at the end of a fight put up by Chikkadevaraja's troops (vide f.n. 128 and 180 supra and text thereto), found it expedient to deliver Bangalore to its legitimate owner (i.e., Chikkadevaraja) under an amicable arrangement for the greater security of Mughal interests in South India.
Mysore became practically coterminous with the Mughal sphere of influence in the Karnatak-Bijapur-Balaghat.

On September 21, 1687, Aurangzib succeeded in reducing Golkonda. His attention was next directed in an increasing measure towards subjugating the Mahrattas, then predominantly strong in the Karnatak. At the same time the fortunes of Sambhaji in South India were being seriously jeopardised. For Ekoji had lost all interest in the larger questions of Mahratta policy, being engrossed in the immediate preoccupations of the hour in Tanjore. On his death about 1688, he was succeeded by his son Shahji II to the throne of Tanjore. In January 1689, Sambhaji himself was captured by the Mughals, and executed on March 11. In September, Haraji, Sambhaji's lieutenant in the Karnatak, died. In the same year Muttu-Virappa Nayaka III of Madura also died, and was succeeded by Mangammal (1689-1706), the dowager queen of Chokkanatha Nayaka. About the same time the Mughal arms were in process of penetrating into the Karnatak.

All through this period Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar was steadily and systematically recovering his lost ground from the Mahrattas. Already by about 1687-1688, his political position had become strong and secure. Indeed referring to Chikkadevaraja's achievements over his

183 Wilks, I. 110 (f.n. 9), 261; Sarkar, o. c., V. 103, 110.
184 Sarkar, o. c., IV. 356-389, V. 57-62.
184 Sarkar (o. c., V. 68, f.n.) refers to Ekoji's death in January 1686 and the succession in that year of his son Shahji II. But Orma speaks of Ekoji as ruling Tanjore in August 1687 (see Historical Fragments, p. 104), and Wilks and the local sources mention him as having been alive in July 1687 (vide f.n. 126 and 126 supra). Again, an inscription of 1686 (see Nayaka of Madura, p. 661, No. 192) refers to Shahji's conquest of the Pedukota country, possibly during his father's rule. In the absence of decisive evidence, Ekoji's death may be set down to about 1686, subsequent to his sale of Bangalore to Chikkadevaraja (1687).

185 Sarkar, o. c., IV. 401-403.
186 Sarkar, o. c., V. 62.
187 Nayaka of Madura, pp. 294-204.
enemies (including the Śāhi kingdoms of Bijāpur and Gōlikōṇḍa and the Mahrattas) and the fall of Bijāpur and Gōlikōṇḍa, contemporary Kannāḍa works testify to the unassailable prowess of Chikkadevāraja (aḍhēdyavikrama-nenal), perhaps indicating that he was for Aurangzēb yet a power to reckon with in the south. In June 1688, Chikkaiya, agent (Gurikar) of Chikkadevaraja at Sankhagiri, took possession of Āvaniperur, Arasaravani and Hoskote. This was followed by Chikkadevarāja's acquisition of Manugondē-durga, Mannargudi and Vāmalūr in November, and of Dhārmapuri in January 1689. In May, Paramatti was retaken after a bombardment; in July, Gurikār Lingarājaiya, another agent of Chikkadevarāja at Coimbatore, took Kāveripattanam; in September, Kuntūr-durga (Kunnattur) was re-acquired and, finally, in January 1690, Anantagiri under an agreement (kaultt) concluded by Haraji. Among other acquisitions from the Mahrattas during the period were the forts of Kengeri, Bēvuhaḷḷi and Bairanetta. About February 1690, Chikkadevarāja Woḍeyar had not only come into full possession of most of the places lost during Sambhāji's wars (1682-1686) but had also been in a position to reiterate his claim to supremacy as Emperor of the Karnataka country (Kamṭaka-Chakravarti)
In truth he had been securely established in the northern frontiers of Mysore at the end of his protracted struggle with the Mahrattas, as the *Apratima-Vira-Charitam* seems significantly to testify.\(^{143}\)

Meanwhile, Ikkeri, in the north-west of Mysore, had been rising to prominence under Channammāji, under the influence of the general course of Mahratta and Mughal affairs in the Deccan. On the death of Sambhāji in March 1689, Eajāram, his younger brother, succeeded as Eegent during the minority of Sāhu (afterwards feivajī III), the six-year old son of Sambhāji. Eajāram's accession was followed by the fall of Eaiigarh and other forts into the hands of the Mughals under Zulfikar Khān. Eajāram escaped from Panhala to the Karnatak by way of Ikkeri. Channammāji not only afforded him shelter and protection but also, about June 1689, successfully repulsed a Mughal contingent under Jan Nisar Khān (*Jdnsara-Khana*) who, on her refusal to hand over the fugitive, prepared to lay siege to Bednur, her capital. Eajāram, having left Ikkeri under a safe escort, passed through Bangalore and Vellore and ultimately arrived at the fort of Gingee in the Karnatak (November 1689),\(^{144}\) Channammāji's success over the Mughals, however, seemed to add considerably to her reputation and prestige among the feudatories (*manneyarkalol para-khyatiyam padedu*), and, shortly after the event, she left Bednur on a pilgrimage to Subrahmanya.\(^{145}\)

About April 1690 Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar, to justify as it were his title of *Karnāṭaka-Chakravarti*, turned his attention to the recovering of the places lost by

\(^{143}\) *I., 8: Kaḍiḷu Mavrata padeyam | padeyam balporeya-nilipi bopnige-vadeyar* \[I.\]

\(^{144}\) *Sarkar, o. c., V. 22-23, 93; Ka. N. V., IX. 161-163, 166; see also and compare Weihe, I. 118-114.*

\(^{145}\) *Ka. N. V., IX. 166-167, vv. 89-99.*
him (during 1674-1681) in the direction of Ikkeri. Early in April he succeeded in wresting Bagadgi from the Palegar of that place, and this was followed by the acquisition of Haranahalli and Bannavar from Ikkeri in April-May. In June Dalavai Doddayya was succeeded by Timmappaiya of Kola, and the latter resumed the activities against Ikkeri, taking in rapid succession Kadur, Sakrpatna and Vastare between June and August, Chikmagalur and Maharajana-durga in August, and Hassan and Grama in September, the last two places, in particular, being acquired from Krishnappa Nayaka of Aigir.

We may now return to the general course of Mahratta and Mughal affairs. The government of Gingee passed into the hands of Bajaram shortly after his arrival there in November 1689. The Mahrattas began their activities under his officers, Prahlad-Niraji, Moresvar-Pingle and others. In the same year, Aurangzeb, determined to crush the Mahrattas, sent an army under Zulfikar Khan, with instructions to reduce Gingee. On reaching the place in April 1691, Zulfikar Khan found that his resources were too inadequate for the purpose. He, therefore, sought reinforcements from the Mughal and, pending their arrival, marched on towards the Southern Karnatak. He proceeded as far as Trichinopoly and Tanjore, levying contributions from the Zamindars of those tracts. In 1692-1693, he

147. Ibid', Ibid.
148. Annals, I. 116; see also Mys. Dho. Par., I. 69. The AnnaU (I.e.) refers to the successor of Dalavai Doddayya as Timmappaiya of Kollegal, which is apparently a scribal error for Koldla in the light of the earlier Ms., i.e., My8. Dho. Pur. See also under Dalavdis, in Ch. XI I .
150. For the general references on this section, vide Sarkar, o.c, VI 62-127, 130-136; see also and compare Wilks, I. 114,117 (f.n. 1), 229 and 282.
renewed the siege of Qingee, with reinforcements under Asad Khan, Prince Eara Bakhsh and Khasim Khan, but with little success. In 1694, he attempted a diversion of the Mughal arms for reducing Tanjore. Between 1695-1697 there was no peace in the Karnatak, disturbed as it was by the "roving parties of the Moratta and Mogull armies and Pollarighe." In particular, in October and November 1695, the country was raided by the Mahrattas under Santaji-Ghorpade and the Mughal Deccan dotted over with Mahratta chieftains. The progress of Zulfikar Khan at Gingee during the period was definitely arrested. The Mahratta incursions under Santaji added to the Emperor's worries. And he despatched a contingent from his camp at Islampuri, to assist Khasim Khan in intercepting the raiders. Khasim Khan was attacked by the Mahrattas (under Santaji) near Dodderi, a village in the Chitaldrug district, and defeated: to avoid disgrace, however, he took poison and died (December 1695). Santaji became a terror in the Karnatak. In December 1696, Aurangzeb again sent out fresh reinforcements under Bidar Bakht (the "Didar Bux" of the *Fort St. George Records*) to Gingee, ordering Zulfikar Khan "to follow after Santoge in the Mizore [Mysore] countrey." Zulfikar Khan proceeded as far as Penukonda and renewed with vigour the siege of Gingee, while pursuing his activities against Santaji. Luckily, in June 1697, Santaji was slain at the hands of an assassin. At last Zulfikar Khan, with the help of Daud Khan and Dalpat Rao, succeeded in reducing Gingee in January 1698. Rajaram had, however, in the meanwhile, made good his escape to Satara. The reduction of Gingee, till then regarded as the "Troy of the East,"

152. Ibid: Ibid (1696), p. 166; also Letters from Fort St. Oeorge (1698), No. 98, p. 75.
proved a landmark in the history of Mughal advance on South India. But Aurangzib's troubles were not over. Hereafter he began personally to take the lead against the Mahrattas.

In striking contrast with this trend of Mahratta and Mughal affairs, was the policy of Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar during 1691-1694. These years were years of peace and quiet in Mysore. It was in the interests of the kingdom of Mysore that Chikkadēvarāja, during this period, seems to have found it expedient not only to abstain from conquests in the directions where Mughal interests tended to predominate, but also to maintain friendly relations with Khāsīm Khān, the Mughal Governor at Sīra. This was, perhaps, the reason why the Mughal army under Zulfikar Khān hardly came into conflict with Mysore, particularly on its march to Trichinopoly and Tanjore (1691-1694). The Mughal acted as the friend of Mysore, and Mysore seems to have tacitly appreciated the friendly attitude.

At the same time, however, Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar was free to pursue his activities in the direction of Ikkeri—west and north-west of Mysore—outside the Mughal sphere of influence. About the close of 1694, Channammāji, on her return from Subrahmaṇya, appears to have retaliated against Mysore. Among those leading the army of Ikkeri were Daḷavai Channabasava Setṭi, Sabnis Bommarasaiya (Bommaiya) of Koḷīvaḍa, Yāḳūb Khān (Kūpu Khān), Krishnappa Naṭaka of Aigūr and the Bṛḍa chiefs of Chintanakal (Chitaldrug) and other places.

164. *The Ke. N. V.*, as we shall see, is only to be understood to refer to a subsequent victory of Ikkeri over Mysore (c. February 1696). Naturally it maintains a discreet silence over the course of events during c. 1694-1695, evidenced by other sources of information—vide f.n. 155-160 infra.
155 See A. V. C, 11, 21, 111, 80, 140, 146, 169, IV, 5 (with gloss), etc. j also f.n. 166-169 infra.
There were also, we note,\textsuperscript{156} levies of the Mahrattas and Muhammadans in the ranks of Ikkeri. These were evidently irregulars who fought in their own interests and not as units aiding Channammaji from their respective sovereigns. The combined forces marched on towards Mysore and laid siege to Arkalgud which had been taken by Chikkadevaraja in 1674 from its chief Krishnappa Nayaka of Aigur. Meanwhile, the Mysore army under Dalavai Timmappaiya of Kolar proceeded thither. About January 1695, an action took place on the field overlooking the town of Hebbale (Perbdleyura mundana vayalol), in the neighbourhood of Arkalgud.\textsuperscript{157} Both sides, we glean,\textsuperscript{158} began with a regular volley of arrows (\textit{band}), the Mysore elephant Benteraya and the Ikkeri elephant Ramabana taking a leading part in the encounter. Suddenly, however, in the thick of the fight, the troops of Ikkeri began to feign a retreat, only to find themselves overpowered by the Mysoreans. Yet Channabasava Setti and Yakub Khan, seated on an elephant (aneyeri barpinam), turned against their opponents: a bullet-shot from the Mysore side, however, struck Yakub Khan, in consequence of which he fell dead on the field of battle while Channabasava, in panic, alighted the elephant and began to take to flight (\textit{MahiSura-bhataritta gundu taki Kupkhanam bilvina-malki Chennabasavam dummikkalelasi . . , paldyanam}), losing a tooth in the struggle (\textit{pallam muridu}). The flight of Channabasava was followed by general disorder in his ranks. The Ikkeri army was

\textsuperscript{156} Ibid, III, 183.
\textsuperscript{157} Ibid, III, 68. For \textit{Perbdle} read \textit{Perbdle}. \textit{Perbdle}, Haliyaganna\textsuperscript{a} form of Hebbale, is to be identified with Hebbale, an extent area-manga village in the Arkalgud taluk (see List of Villages, 181).
broken (*Kękadiya pade muridu*) and thoroughly put to rout amidst great slaughter and mutilation of noses; *Bämabañq* and other elephants and horses in their camp were captured by the Mysoreans; Bommarasaiya of Ikkëri made good his escape from the field; and Krishñana Nãyaka of Aigūr lay dead on the ground, fighting against odds. It was thus a distinct victory for Mysore. Though it has been represented that the victory was only rendered possible by the discord between Channabasava Setći and Sabnis Bommarasaiya and by the treachery on the part of the latter to bring about the former's destruction by making the Ikkëri army feign retreat under the effect of a trickish palm-leaf letter (*kalldle*), there is no reason to believe that Mysore did not utilize every point of vantage to her own benefit.

The defeat and repulse of the Ikkëri forces was followed by the siege and acquisition of Arkalgūd by Chikkadevaraja between January and February 1695, and of Aigūr, SakleSpur and Kodlipet (from Krishipiappa Nãyaka of Aigūr) between March and April. These acquisitions confirmed Chikkadevaraja in the sovereignty of the western part of Mysore while they effectively checked the pretensions to all authority, in that direction, of Channammājī and Basappa Nãyaka of Ikkëri.

In or about February 1696, however, hostilities between Ikkëri and Mysore seem to have been renewed. Channammājī, we are told, despatched her forces

---

160. *Mys. Dho. Par.*, II, 45-47; *Annals*, I, 109. Cf. Wilks (I, 112, 228) assigning these acquisitions and the peace with Ikkëri to 1694. As we shall see, Ikkëri does not seem to have concluded peace with Mysore till about 1700.
161. *Vide f.n. 159 infra.*
162. *Ks. N. V.*, IX, 167, vv. 31-33. Significantly enough, on the Mysore side there is no reference to this event which seems to have taken place not later than February 1696, since we know that the successor of Dājavāl Timmappaiya in Mysore was appointed in February 1696—*vide f.n. 155 infra* and text there.
In February 1696, Mallarajaiya of Kañale (younger brother of Dalavai Doññaiya) was appointed Dalavai of Mysore in succession to Timmappaiya. He held that office till August 1698 and was followed first by Vlrarajaiya of Nilasoge (August 1698-December 1702); and then by Dasarajaiya of Devaraya-durga (December 1702-1704). During March-April 1697, Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar completed the chain of his conquests in the eastern part of Mysore by the re-acquisition of Salem, Sadamangalam, Paramatti, Namakal and Tammambatti.

By 1698, Chikkadevaraja had succeeded in regaining his position in the eastern and western parts of Mysore and in subduing the local Palégaras, most of whom, it would seem, had by then sought his protection and friendship. Owing to the presence of Mughal arms in the Karnatak during the period (1691-J698), he had wisely refrained from continuing to push up his conquests in the south of Mysore, particularly in the direction of Madura and Trichinopoly, although he never seems to have ceased actively reiterating his claim to sovereignty over it (Tenkana-Rdya). Within the limits of the Karnatak

---

163. Annals, I. 118; Mys. Dce Pdr., I. 69-70; see also under Dalavai in Ch. XII; for details about the Kañale Family, vide section on Domestic Life in Ch. XVI and Table XIII.

164. Mys. Dce. Pdr., II. 48; Annals, I. 109. See also and compare Capt. Read in Bārāmakal Records (1793), I. 129. Wilks’s list (I. 295-298) is conspicuous by the absence of any reference to the re-acquisitions in 1697.

165. See A. V. C., III, 52, 56, 150-152, 154, IV, 20, etc. (with gloss).

166. See Mys. Rāj. Ch., 99. There is no evidence in support of Wilks’s dating of the siege of Trichinopoly by Mysore (under Chikkadēvaraja), and the Mahratt attack on Seringapatam, in 1696 (I. 112-117). These events, as has been shown above, took place in 1699. See also Appendix VI-(1), for a detailed examination of Wilks’s position, etc.
country, however, he had become well established, and he was, we learn, looked upon with awe by the contemporary powers of Tanjore, Madura, Gingee and Sira. He seems to have succeeded also in enforcing his claim to supremacy as the sovereign of the Earnāṭak (Karndtaka-bhumandaldhiaia). Indeed contemporary texts, from about this time, testify to his right to enjoy the undivided sovereignty of the Empire (akhanda-dharam-mandalapati) as an unparalleled monarch. In fine, at a time when Aurangzib in the north was being continually harassed in his struggle with the Mahrattas, Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar, alone among the South Indian powers, was at the zenith of his power in Mysore—apparently a factor of considerable alarm to the Mughal.

At the end of a long period of political struggle and expansion extending over two decades from his accession, Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar had had breathing time to devote his attention in an increasing measure, not only to the consolidation of his power but also to the solution of problems of socio-economic import. The years 1698-1704 accordingly mark an important phase in the reign of Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar.

Almost simultaneously, the death of Channammaji of Ikkēri (July 22, 1697) had removed one great luminary from the political firmament of the Karnāṭak and helped
to add not a little to the reputation of Chikkadevarāja Wodeyar as the sovereign of the Karnataka country. Channammaji had been succeeded by her adopted son Basappa Nāyaka as Hiriya-Basappa Nāyaka I, and he persisted in his hostility towards Mysore. Mangammā continued as the ruler of Madura in the distant south; the Mahratta power in Mysore was no longer active; and Mughal influence continued to prevail from the subdh of Slra. The death of Khāsim Khān, the first Faujdar of Slra, in 1695, seemed seriously to affect the position of Chikkadevarāja Wodeyar in relation to the Mughal Empire, particularly in and after 1698, for, so long as Khāsim Khān was alive, Chikkadevarāja could, under the amicable arrangement above referred to, probably count on his support for a favourable representation of his cause and interests at the court of the Mughal. The only cause for alarm for Chikkadevarāja from 1698 onwards was, therefore, the possibility of an invasion of his dominions by Aurangzīb. Indeed, a letter from Fort St George, dated June 16, 1698, speaks of Aurangzīb ordering "Dulpatrow and Daud Cawn to remove to Bollegol and Adonee and the Nabob to assist Didar bux [Bidar Bakhtl coming against Mysore]." A Mughal invasion of Mysore, following the reduction of Gingee in the Karnataka, appears thus to have been in the air as the crowning achievement of their advance south of the Krishna. Moreover, the recent victories and annexations of Chikkadevarāja Wodeyar, far from quieting down the Palegars, had, it is said, been exciting in them feelings of jealousy and hatred against him. Ostensibly to

172. Ibid., X. 170-177; see also fn. 179 infra and text there to.
173. See also Wilks, I. 111, for a similar reference to this position.
174. Letters from Fort St. George (1698), No. 93, p. 16: Nathaniel Higgson and others to William Hatesil (Governor of Fort St. George). The reference to the Nawāb in the letter is to Zālikar Khān, first Nawāb of the Karnāṭak Pāyaṅhāt, c. 1690-1700—vide Table XVIII, ANGLÆ Annals, I. 140; cf. Wilks, I. 117-118.
safeguard the kingdom against the much-expected Mughal invasion but really to further overawe the turbulent local chieftains and thereby increase his own reputation and status, Chikkadevaraja Woḍeyar, it would seem, found it expedient, in or about 1699, to despatch an embassy to Aurangzib, who was then holding court at Ahmadnagar.

The embassy, we are told, was led by Karanika Linganḍaiya, one of the councillors of Chikkadevaraja, appointed Vakil to represent Mysore at the court of the Mughal. Linganḍaiya presented the Pādshah with rich ḥhillats, and met with a favourable reception at his hands. Aurangzib, in turn, while theoretically seeking to press a claim to suzerainty over Seringapatam, became so thoroughly impressed with the amicable disposition of Chikkadevaraja and the valuable services lately rendered by him in putting down the Mahrattas (under Jaitaji, Nimbajī and others), that he conferred on him the great title "Raja-Jagadev" ("King of the World"), a seal engraved in Persian characters, with the words "Raja-Chikkadevaraj-Muhammad-Shayi," and numerous insignias (such as the red ensign, the Hanuma, Garuda, Makara, Ganda-bherunda, Dharani-Vardha and other emblems of sovereignty), and sent him costly presents with a friendly letter recognizing Chikkadevaraja's right to hold Durbar seated on the "celebrated throne of the Pāndavas." Karanika Linganndeaiya was also duly honoured by the Grand Mughal with suitable gifts.

The embassy returned to Seringapatam in 1700 (Vikrama) and, it is added, was accorded a reception befitting the ḥhillats and insignias from the imperial

Its return to Seringapatam, 1700.

For further notice of Wilks’s position in regard to the details of the embassy, vide f.n. 178 infra.
177. Ibid, I. 145-146.
court, these being taken in solemn procession in the public streets of the capital city.

Although we have so far no independent evidence confirmatory of this account, there seems nothing inherently improbable in it, if we are to judge it with reference to the actual political position of Chikkadevarāja at the time. We ought also to remember that already, as far back as 1682, there were indications of the establishment of friendly relations between Mysore and Aurangzib, as the Jesuit letter of that year would seem to signify. Whatever might have been Aurangzib's attitude towards the embassy, its successful termination, according to the local narrative, had its own obvious implications so far as Mysore under Chikkadevarāja Woḍeyar was concerned. It meant the triumph of Chikkadevarāja's statesmanship, just at a time when a bold stroke of diplomacy was needed to benefit by the existing situation; secondly, it meant no commitment on his side: it neither signified submission nor an offensive and defensive alliance, being more in the nature of a partnership in which each partner was enabled to pursue his own ends without making the other lose the benefits of his own endeavours; thirdly, it served to enhance the power and prestige of Chikkadevaraja from a local point of view, particularly in his dealings with the turbulent local Palegars who saw Chikkadevarāja triumph while the Mahrattas—not so long ago victorious and vigilant everywhere—had to flee the country; fourthly, it seemed to mark the culmination of a long process in the political evolution of Mysore as a power at once independent of and friendly with the Imperial Mughal and secure from any troubles, internal or external; and fifthly and lastly, it tended to confirm, though tacitly, and bring into bold relief, Chikkadeva-rija'B claim to be regarded as Emperor of the Karnāṭaka, a claim which he, as we have seen, consistently and
strenuously enforced and fought for from the early years of his reign.\(^{178}\)

Among other political activities during c. 1698-1700 were the retaking of Arkalgud from Mysore by Ikkeri, and its eventual restoration, with Aigur and Saklespur, to the sons of Krishnappa Nayaka of Aigur; the advance of Mysore arms as far as Coorg and Malabar and their encounter with Garajina-Basavappa-Devaru of Ikkeri; the restitution of Vastare to Ikkeri and the ultimate conclusion of an advantageous peace with Mysore by Hiriya-Basappa Nayaka (of Ikkeri) through Niyogi Saraja-Nagappaiya, by means of a deed of assurance (bhasha-patrike).\(^{179}\)

About the close of 1700, Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar is

---

\(^{178}\) Cf. Wilks, I. 118-119. Referring to the embassy, Wilks speaks of its splendour as having not "made much impression at the imperial court," of its scant reception and of the public assumption by Chikkadevaraja of the high honours said to have been conferred on him by the Mughal, among them *the new dignity alleged to have been conferred by the emperor of being seated on an ivory throne.* Wilks hardly specifies his authority for his statements. Indeed, it is open to question whether he has correctly interpreted the local sources of information (to which he might have had access), especially on points of detail. Whatever might have been Aurangzib's attitude towards the embassy, it is difficult to accept Wilks's position in regard to the "throne," which implies there was no throne at all in Mysore before 1699-1700. That Chikkadevaraja and his predecessors—from the time of Raja Wodeyar's conquest of Seringapatam in 1610—were ruling in Seringapatam seated on the "jewelled throne" (ratna-simhasana), is amply borne out by the epigraphical and literary records we have frequently cited (vide Chs. V, VI, IX and X). The object of Chikkadevaraja's embassy to Aurangzib was not so much to obtain the Mughal's sanction to sit on his throne as to make him get reconciled to the position attained and asserted by Ohikkadevaraja as the Emperor of the South. The authorities available thus lead us to a conclusion which is opposite to the one adumbrated by Wilks. [Wilks's position is adopted by Rice in Mys. Oaz., I. 369, and by S. K. Aiyangar in Ndyaks of Madura, p. 198, f.n. 24. Messrs. M. A. Srinivasahar (in his Note in the C. Vam., pp. 9-10) and B. Puttaiya (in his article, 'A note on the Mysore Throne,' in the Q. J. M. S., VbL XI, pp. 261-266) attempt an examination of Wilks's position regarding the **Mysore Throne."

\(^{179}\) Affinals, I. 111; Mys. Dho. Prir., II. 47 (compared); Ee. N. V. X. 174, w. 7,10.
said to have succeeded in overawing the chiefs of Coorg and Malabar, obtaining rich spoils from their camps (consisting of elephants, horses and valuables) and arranging for the regular payment of annual tributes by them. In keeping with this, the Apratima-Vira-Chwittam, referring to Chikkadevaraja's universal conquests about this time (endesegeldu), testifies to his generals guarding the frontier-forts in the west, east and south, to his victory over the army of the chiefs of the respective coastal regions, and to his exaction of tribute from them; the Chikkadevaraja-Binnapam refers to his (Chikkadevaraja's) signal victory over the chiefs of Coorg, Malabar, Morasa, Tiguļa and Malnad countries, who, it is said, had proceeded against him depending on the Mahratta alliance; the Munivamsabhyudaya speaks of Chikkadevaraja having accepted the submission of Kongu, Coorg and Malabar kingdoms and become distinguished as Sringara-Karnata-Chakri (Emperor adorning the beautiful Karnata country); while another contemporary work, dated in 1703 (Svabhdu), mentions Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar as securely protecting the chiefs of Palghat after crushing the warriors of Calicut. Obviously, during 1698-1700, a combination of local

180. Annals, i.o.
181. I, 9; also 7:

Paṭuvana māḍgana tenkuna
Gaḍi-gōṇgōya kāṭugōnda paṭevakari ya ||
Kāṭeva kafalāṭi-doregalu
Paṭeγam gajḷerpininśe kappam-gombar ||

182. P. 4: Maktama-Maraṭa-rāḷōpanam nambi mumbaridu oḍabala
dojinniṁnun pōvarā Morasa-Tigula-Koḍaga-Maleyaḷa-naḍa mānne-
γaram bānmān-baḍēsi, vētadōḷēnuśeyam gĕldu.

183. II, 85:

Koṅga-Koḍaga-Malaya [lo]di vaiyangala-mangikariē-gaṭūṭirāu
Sṛṅgāra-Kaṅnata-Chakri γemba bēṅgāṃṅa vēvarānte nṛpati ||

184. Chikkadevarāja-Kempadēvamunavammal-Koḍangushinga (a collection of contemporary songs on Chikkadevaraja and his queen Kempadēva-
mm), f. 130:

Paḷaludaṃgala paṭuṇadim kāḍu
Koḍu-kōṭeγa-bhāṭeṇa ṭēḷugāḷu . . .
powers, headed by the chiefs of Morasa, Tigula, Koḍāga (Coorg), Maleyala (Malabar) and Malnad (Ikkeri) territories, seems to have been actively at work, contesting the claims to supremacy of Chikkadevarāja Woḍeyar, backed up by the slender resources of the Mahrattas in the Karnāṭak at the time. The slackening of the Mahratta power in Mysore since 1687, no less their activity against Aurangzīb in their home province (Deccan) since 1698, appears to have eventually enabled Chikkadevarāja to effectively subdue all opposition against his authority. This paved the way in no small measure to the despatch of the embassy to the Grand Mughal and the profound impression it seems to have created on him (c. 1699-1700).

The years 1700-1704 were, on the whole, years of peaceful and settled government in Mysore under Chikkadevarāja Woḍeyar. In 1704, the last year of his reign, the political position of the kingdom of Mysore was as follows: in the north, it had been extended up to Bangalore and parts of Tumkūr districts, coterminous with Slra, the head-quarters of the Mughal Deccan; in the west and the north-west, up to Hassan and Kadur districts, as far as Chikmāgalūr and Sakrēpaṭaṇa, coterminous with the kingdom of Ikkerī; and in the east and the south, up to and inclusive of parts of Salem-Bāṟamahal and Coimbatore districts, with a distinct tendency to advance further in the direction, of Trichinopoly in the far south and Coorg and Malabar in the west and the south-west respectively. A vigorous offshoot, and a living representative, of the ancient but decadent Empire of Vijayanagar, Mysore had become a secure and independent kingdom south of the Krishṇa, attracting the attention of contemporaries, almost at a time when the fortunes of Aurangzīb in the north were at a low ebb. No wonder, with the disappearance of
Bijapur and Golkonda and of the Nayaks of Madura Tanjore and Gingee and the momentary eclipse of the Mahrattas in the south, Chikkadevaraja shone forth ad the "Emperor of the South" as the inscriptions and literary works portray him to us, a status too which Aurangzib was forced formally to recognize as much in his own personal interests as in the political interests of an Empire which was fast slipping away from him.
CHAPTER XII,

CHIKKADEVARAJA WODEYAR, 1673-1704—(contd.)


SIDE by side with the course of political events we have thus far sketched, two distinct landmarks are noticeable in the form of civil government evolved by Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar, the first covering the period of the ministry of Visalaksha-Pandit (1673-1686) and the second that of Tirumalaiyangar (1686-1704). Throughout the period 1673-1704, the influence of Chikkadevaraja's personality made itself felt on every aspect of the administration, to an extent so far unprecedented in the history of the country. Inscriptions
and literary sources invariably point to his rule over Mysore seated on the "jewelled throne of Karnāṭa" in Seringapatam. His was an absolute government conducted as usual along traditional lines, with due regard to the dharma (dharmato dharatalam prasasati; rajadharma tappadante; maha-rajadharmam) and the changing conditions of the time and the happiness and well-being of his subjects. In the actual work of government he was assisted by ministers (sachivar, mantribhih), the Dalavya and officers (such as karanika, karya-karta, etc.). His ministers, according to a contemporary work, were adepts in all matters of policy (sarvatantrajnārddha mantrigalum) and his financiers proficient in mathematics, idstras and agamas (sakala ganita-idstragama kovidarappa karanikarum). There was as yet no clear differentiation of functions, the king being regarded as the fountain-head of all power and authority, civil and military, political and religious.

Chikkadevaraja's early training and education enabled him to discern the importance of a strong executive to manage the affairs of a growing kingdom under the troubled conditions of his time. Accordingly, immediately on his accession, he formed a Council of Ministers (mantralochana-sabhe)—a sort of cabinet—and chose suitable persons to it. These were Visalaksha-Pandit, Tirumalaiyangar, Shadaksharaiya, etc.
Chikkupadhyaya and Karanika Lingannaiya. Visalaksha-
Pa$dit was the Prime Minister leading the cabinet. He
was, we learn, 4 a Jaina Brähman of Ye$landûr, son of
Bommarasa-Pa$dit and Summâmbîka. Early in his life
he had developed precocious habits, and mastered the
Jinastuti, studying the sastras, penetrating into the
fundamentals of all faiths and acquiring an unrivalled
knowledge of the Jaina religion and philosophy. 6 As the
minister-in-chief (mahamatya) of Chikkadevaraja, he
wielded considerable influence at the latter's court and
was reputed as much for his intelligence and efficiency
as for his learning. 6 Tradition says he was a playmate of
Chikkadevaraja Wo$eyar and kept company
with him during his stay at Hangala. Among his
services, during his period of ministership, to the
cause of Jainism in Mysore were 7 the erection of a
chaityalaya to the last Tirthankara in Seringapatam;

4 Bej. Gu. Oha. (c. 1760) of Amanta-Kavi (Ms. No. A. 302—P; Mys. Or. Lib.),
VI, 7:
Ya$adeva Bommarasenu sati Summâmbîka garbhâda$ 
Samminasata Vi$âlâksha-Pa$pîta-namdo yi$mmai-sirvantamogeda||
see also Bâj. Kath., XII. 387, XII. 474.
5 Ibid., 9-9:
Kalitemu Jina-stutiyanu tadalmu$ya(e chalu$da sam$mâgavya$ 
Oidda sakala sastra$va-nor-modalo$ dhêsini vakala mukavanu 
Sâ$ya-Sri-Jinamukanyeyûlendu vo[bo] dividanu lokavanu||
6 Ibid., 10-18:
. . . a purâ (Śrîrangapattana)-pati Chikkadevarajendra . 
avanîe mantri$yedunu lokasantapahara Vi$âlâksha 
. . . slanu $ustâmigraka ñêtâpanipala lalita budha-jana-jala 
. . . mantri-kulâ$gâma ani sam$mîda mukavanu 
jânûni$ jagava sâ$ya sadgyna mahamâni mahamatya nrpelo||
also Bâj. Kath. (XI. 474), where Dêvascandra refers to Vi$âlâksha-
Pa$pîta as an accomplished man of letters (Vi$âlâkshah sâ$hîyabhãràti 
yeniram).
7 Ibid., 19-36:
Śrîrangapuradô$ hu$dya Tirthesu$ge râjâ$ya chaityâgrâhava 
urâ$na mä$fi . . . ||
Tânmarasina vâ$yapadô$li$ Jina$gra$ha-vanmu$katvisi sâ$tyavanu 
sammutanâgî bidî$ $i . . . ||
Dê$yagula-tirthadô$laya-vâ$hâ$ma-mo$dorî yel$ya bhê$ndê$ 
vî$sa$ka rathavanu mä$fi . . . ||
Arhâ$-mâ$la$e ka$pikâ$garûtîrî$da novo pâ$hâ$fi-vargavanu 
doveyinda negötû . . . ||
the conservation of Jaina monuments in the kingdom by making grants of rent-free lands thereto; the effective curbing of all opposition to the religion of Arhat; the endowment of a glittering car (ratha) to God Gomatevari at Sravaij.a-Belagola and the grand performance, with the approval of his master, of the head-anointing cerembyny (Mastaka-pitje) in honour of that shrine, on March 5, 1677. From a lithic record dated in 1685, we further learn that he was familiarly known as "Dodda-Pandita of Yelandur." Tirumalaiyangar (Tirunialarya), councillor next in importance to yidalaksha-Pandit, was a Sri-Vaishnava Brahman of Kausika-gotra and Āpastambha-sutra, the eldest son of Paurāṭika Aśingarārya (Singaraiyangār II or Nṛsimha-suṣūrī) by Singamma. Born in 1645 (Parthiva), about the same time as Chikkadēvarāja, he was, as depicted in his own works, brought up, and was intimately connected, with the latter as his co-student and colleague from his boyhood (odane . . . nade-nudiyam kaltu . . . odanddi . . . odanddi; dharma-sachiva, karma-sachiva, narma-sachiva). He was also a leading scholar at the court of Chikkadēvarāja, enjoying his favour. Although, curiously enough, the extant literary productions of Tirumalaiyangar nowhere

---

8. E. C., III (1) Nj. 41, li. 8-9; see also under Grants and other records, in Ch. XIII.
9. Vide Table in Appendix II—(4).
10. C. Vam., 164-166, 170-172; C. Vi., IV, 19, 87-89, V, 97-103.
11. Vide colophons to ch. in the C. Vi.: Šrī-Chikkadēva-mohārīja kṛpā-paripalita Šrī-Tirumalaiyārya; see also under Literary activity, in Ch. XIV.
directly refer to his actual position as minister under Chikkadevaraja, there is enough data in them pointing to his political, diplomatic and administrative knowledge, while in the Chamardjanagar Plate (1675) he specifically refers to himself as having been "like Brihaspati in the council of Chikkadevaraja." Shađaksharaiya (Shađaksharadeva or Shađakshara-svami) was, we note, a Vira-SAiva (Aradhya) Brahman of Renuka-charya-gśtra and disciple of Chikka-Vlra-Deśika, head of the Vīra-6aiva math at Dhanagūr, Malavalli taluk, where he is said to have been born. Descended from a family well-versed in all branches of Śaiva lore, he was at first preceptor to the family of Mudda-Bhūpa (Muddarāja Urs) of Yelandur (Balendupura) Shadakshari's connection with Chikkadevaraja, however, began, as indicated already, during the latter's stay at Hangala (c. 1668-1673). He was, further, a celebrated poet. Of him it is said that, during the greater part of Chikkadevaraja's reign, he was residing in Yelandur as head of the math built for him by Mudda-Bhūpa, where he ultimately attained deification. At any rate, Shađakshari's service as a councillor of Chikkadevaraja seems to have been generally more of a literary and religious character than political or administrative. Chikkupadhyāya, the next minister of Chikkadevaraja, was another Śrī-Vaishnava
Brahman, of Purukutsa-gotra, Āpastambha-sutra and Yajus-sakha. He belonged, as he tells us, to the Pattur family of learned Vedic scholars and poets, tracing descent from Allālanātha, whose tutelary deity was God Varadarāja of Kanchipuram. The elder of the twin sons of Nachyāramma by Rangāchārya (Ranga-Paṇḍita) of Terakanāmbi (great grandson of Allālanātha), Chikku-pādhyiya was a disciple of Kaṇṭamba Singarāchārya. He had mastered the sacred lore and was, besides, a poet, philosopher and expert mathematician (ganita-sastra-visaradandgi). In his earlier years, he seems to have practised the profession of teaching. Indeed, in keeping with this is the tradition that he was a teacher of Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar himself during the latter's boyhood. His actual name, however, was Lakshmipati or LakshmKā, and he styles himself in some of his writings as Lakshmipati-Chikkupādhyya, the suffix Chikkupādhyya obviously indicating his earlier position.

18. See Śrī. Māhāt. (of Chikkupādhyya), I, 41-42; also references infra.
19. Ibid., 49-50; also Kamala. Māhāt., III, 77; Hasti. Māhāt., I, 104; Vād. Māhāt., I, 18, II, 3, 9; Paṭech. Māhāt., col.; Śr. Sāp., I, 31; Div. St. Cha., I, 92; see also and compare Kar. Ka. Cha., II, 467-468, 490. The genealogy of Chikkupādhyya's family, according to Śrī. Māhāt. (l.c.), was as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Allālanātha} \\
\text{Ārya} \\
\text{Varadarāja} \\
\text{Dēvarāchārya} (\text{Karnāḍa-bhāsa-chaduva}) & \quad \text{Rangārya} \quad \text{w. Nachyāramma} \\
\text{Lakshmipati-Chikkupādhyya} & \quad \text{Dēvarāja.}
\end{align*}
\]

20. Ibid., 51-53; see also under Literary activity, in Ch. XXIV.
21. Ibid., 50: Chikkupādhyyaṁ poreyaḥ buddhiśilatanaśvadu lokaṁ ca jana-

23. See Śrī. Māhāt., I, 50; Kamala. Māhāt., III, 78; Śītha-Dharma, II, 1,

as a junior teacher of Chikkadevaraja, which probably accounts for his subsequent rise to eminence as one of the latter's most trusted and influential councillors. As a minister of Chikkadevaraja, he was reputed for his thorough knowledge of politics and diplomacy, and finance and accounts. Karanika Linganñaiya was a Smärtha Brähman. As the councillor in charge of the public accounts of the country (sime-karanikatana), he appears to have wielded considerable influence over the administration of Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar.

The Council, thus composed, was a powerful advisory body actively assisting Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar in all his administrative measures. Its position and status seem to have been hardly affected by the assassination of Viśalaksha-Pandit in 1686.

During the next period (1686-1704), Tirumalaiyangar, as Prime Minister in succession to Viśalaksha-Pandit, rose high in the favour of Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar.

In 1695, it is said, he obtained Chikkadevaraja's

25. Śrī. Māhāt., I, 51; Venkaṭa. Māhāt., col.; also col. to Śr. Sāp. Hastī. Māhāt., Div. Śr. Cha., Sāṅgātyas and Bhāg. Gt. Ti.; Hastī. Māhāt., I, 103; Yad. Māhāt., I, 18, etc.; cf. Editorial Introduction (l.c.) to Div. Śr. Cha. Among the expressions used in the texts are: Chikkadevarajendrājatā-sakalāntara-matantranaṅga; Chikkadevarajamukhyamātya; Mantri-bhikhamāṇi; Sachiva-nichaya-nilaka; Chikkadeva-mahārājapradaśārāya; Olapu netta; Kṛpālabāha, Kṛṣṇaparijñāti; Chikkadevarāya-gantaranga Chikupādyāya; Paramāṅtaram sat-pradhānām; Chikkadeva-mahārajasamastakāvyā-durandhara- maṇtri-viśāhēya; Pātikāryāka-pradhanottamam, etc.


27. Annals, I, 106.

28. See A. V. C., I, 18:

Tannā simi tanna sēvan |
Tannā geśe tanna bhāgyam Chikkadevē ||
Nḍramānvittam-nendola |
vinniravini Tirumalārya-nunnaśīvelam ||;
also Mitra. Go., I, 18: aiyummalar.

29. See Editorial Introduction (pp. 2-8) to the C. Vam., C. Vī. and A. V. C. Tirumalaiyangar's visit to Madura is echoed in the Śrīśāyāya-dinachārya of the Y. N. Stanāḥ, etc., noticed in Ch. XIV of this work.
permission and proceeded on a pilgrimage to Srirangam and other places. He paid a visit to Madura also, whose ruler Mangamma (1689-1706) made him a grant of villages and lands, desiring him to stay at her court as her minister. Apprised of this, Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar, it is added, sent him a nirupa, directing him to return. Accordingly, in 1698, Tirumalaiyangar came back to Seringapatam and resumed his office of Prime Minister. During 1686-1704 he was on the whole not only at the height of his power as the Prime Minister of Chikkadevaraja, but also attained considerable celebrity as an author and Sri-Vaishnava philosophical teacher, profoundly influencing the religious and philosophical outlook of Chikkadēvaraja Wodeyar. Of the remaining members of council during the period little is known, except the rise to prominence of Karāṇika Linganānaiya after his return from the embassy to the court of Aurangzib (1700).

Among the Dalavais of Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar we have referred to, Kumāraiya of Kalale was his father-in-law. He continued in office during the first nine years of Chikkadevaraja’s reign (1673-1682), retiring voluntarily on the ground of old age in May 1682. He was succeeded temporarily, for a period of fifteen days, by Devaiya (May-June 1682) and later by his nephew Doddaiya (June 1682-June 1690). Doddaiya was followed in succession by Timmappaiya of Kolala.
(June 1690-February 1696), Mallaraiyaiya of Kalale
(February 1696-August 1698), Viraraiyaiya of Nilasoge
(August 1698-December 1702) and Dasaraiyaiya of
Devaraiya-durga (December 1702-1704). The Mysuru-
Ba\jara-Charitre\textsuperscript{u} speaks of Dal Hayes Kuma\raiya and
Doddaiya of Kalale as having been sincere estabfishers of
the Mysore Royal House (Mysuru dhoregalige \ldots vamsoddhdrakardda), a claim perhaps fully justified by
the meritorious services rendered by them in extending
the kingdom of Mysore in all directions, particularly in
withstanding the Mahratta incursions and recovering the
lost ground for Mysore during the earlier part of Chikka-
devaraja's reign (i.e., 1673-1690). Dalavai Timmappaiya
and his successors were also of considerable assistance to
Chikkadevaraja in extending the sphere of influence of
Mysore in the direction of Ikke\ri, Coorg and Malabar and
in crushing all local combinations against his authority
during the latter part of the reign (i.e. 1690-1704).\textsuperscript{m} Some
of the inscriptions of the period\textsuperscript{36} point also to the active
interest the Dalavais evinced in the civil government of
the kingdom.

As the main-stay of day-to-day administration, the
mint and the treasury received due
attention at the hands of Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar. At first these seem to
have been under the management of Chikkup\dhyaya
(as kosadhi\textsuperscript{37}kari) and his colleagues, one of whom was
familiarly known as Bokkasada Narasaiya.\textsuperscript{37} At a
subsequent date, probably after 1686, we note,\textsuperscript{38} Anhaiya,
son of Javana Setti, a Jain, succeeded to the charge of the
mint and connected offices (tenkasdle muntadadhipatya). In
administering the treasures of the State, he discharged

\textsuperscript{34} P. 28. \textsuperscript{36} Ante, Ch. XI.
\textsuperscript{35} See under Grants and other records, in Ch. XIII.
\textsuperscript{36} See Songs on Chikkadevaraja and Kempadevamma (cited in Ch. XI,
\textsuperscript{f.n. 184}, ff. 130.
his duties so assiduously that he rose in the favour and estimation of Chikkadevaraja and eventually got constructed in the latter's name, at great cost and labour, a pond in gravana-Belagola (Sri-Chikkadevendra-mahasvamiyavara kalyani), which is still in existence.\(^{39}\)

The administration of important places in the interior of the country, of newly acquired or conquered tracts and of frontier posts was, as usual, in the hands of not only agents (karya-karta) but also civil and military officials of varying degrees of status (such as Gurikars, Parupatyagdrs, etc.), directly responsible to the central government. Thus, Siddarajaiya of Talakad was an agent of Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar at Kunigal; Kotjiraiya was another at Talakad; and Hampaiya was an officer in charge of the revenue establishment (athavane) at Arkalgud. At Sankhagiri, Tiruchchengodu taluk, Muddaiya represented Nanjanathaiya for Chikkadevaraja; at Taramangalam, Valalur (Omalur) taluk, Kempaiya, son of Chamaiya (Samaiya), was another agent of his; and at Avanas, Mallaiya was his Gurikar (lit. a headman of armed peons). Dasarajaiya, son of Biluguli Kemparajaiya, was in charge of the Nijagaldurga-sime, Nelamangala taluk; [Dalavai] Dasarajaiya-Timmapparajaiya, son of Krishnaiya and grandson of Biluguli Timmarajaiya, was administering the Devarayadurga-sime; and Doddaiya, son of Sangaiya and grandson of Channa-Viraiya, was looking after the Maddagiri-sime. Dasaiya was the agent for affairs (parupatyagara) in charge of Nagamangala, and Devaiya was entrusted with the management of Hangala-sime in Devanagara hobli. Among other officials of Chikkadevaraja, Appuray-Hebbaruva was an agent for the collection of customs dues (sunkada-kartarada); Chamaiya was a supervisor

\(^{39}\) Ibid., 81-87 [According to this poem (Ibid, 88-64), the construction of the pond was actually completed after Ghikkadevaraja's death]; E. 0., II SB. 865; see also and compare Raj. Kath., XI. 390, X I I . 480-481.
of Manegars and Kolukars; Lingaiya was another official in charge of customs, being familiarly known as Sunkada-Linga, while Abhani Venkatcharya of Kausika-gotra and Bhānōji-Paṇḍita were among diplomatic agents (niyōgī) stationed abroad.\(^{40}\)

In the early part of his reign (1673-1686), particularly during 1673-1678 and 1682-1686, Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar, as we have seen,\(^{41}\) found himself engaged in wars with Madura and Ikkeri, Bijapur and Golkonda, the local country powers and the Mahrattas. The administration of the country during these periods of war interspersed by short intervals of peace was, ordinarily, conducted by the Council of Ministers under his general supervision. The years 1679-1681 and 1686 were, however, generally years of peace and security in Mysore. It was during and, at different intervals, after this period that Chikkadevaraja, at the height of his power, appears to have found sufficient time and leisure to personally attend to the solution of problems of administration necessitated by the conditions of the times.\(^{42}\)

Defence was naturally the most important item demanding the serious attention of Chikkadevaraja in the early years of his reign—particularly in and after 1675. Although he was on the whole able to hold his own against the contending factors during 1673-1674, the experience of these years seems to have brought home to him the importance of a larger and well-equipped army as an effective instrument in working out his ambitious scheme of conquests and annexations. Accordingly, having acquainted himself with the state of his finances, he increased the numerical strength of his army by an addition of 12,000 horse and 100,000 foot, with the rest of the equipment that war necessitates.

\(^{40}\) Vide references cited under Grants and other records, in Oh. XIII.

\(^{41}\) Ante, Ch. XI.

\(^{42}\) Cf. Wilis and Devachandra in Ch. XV below.
Thus the fort of Seringapatam was strengthened by the mounting of 44 additional cannons on the bastions and the inner and outer fort-walls.\textsuperscript{43}

About the same time, Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar also struck a new type of gold coins (varaha) known as \textit{Tandava-Krishṇa-Mūrti-Devāraya}.\textsuperscript{*} Though only an administrative event, this was a landmark of considerable significance, particularly from the political and religious points of view. Politically it was, as already indicated, an index of his achievement over Chokkanātha Nayaka of Madura in 1673. Indeed the \textit{Tōndamūr copper-plate grant} (1722)\textsuperscript{45} does seem to echo this position when it speaks of Chikkadēvarāja as having "emulated the sports of Krishṇa in conquering the lord of Madhura" (Madura). And this was, perhaps, the reason why the actual designation of the coin itself associates his name with Krishṇa represented in the dancing posture on its obverse.\textsuperscript{46} From the religious point of view, the striking of this type of coin, as we shall see,\textsuperscript{47} testifies to Sri-Vaishnavism as the personal religion of Chikkadevarāja Woḍeyar.

The next series of administrative measures was, as already indicated, introduced by Chikkadevarāja Woḍeyar during and after 1679-1681. These measures relate, respectively, to the reorganization and administration of local units and the inauguration of fiscal reforms. The total number of administrative units or divisions (\textit{gadi}) up to the time of Chikkadevarāja Woḍeyar was, it

\textsuperscript{*} Annals, I. 111-112; see also Mys. Raj. Ora., 31-32. For details of weapons of warfare, etc., of the period, vide Appendix IX.

\textsuperscript{45} I. M. C., No. 19-15-20, pp. 54-55: \textit{Tandava-Krishṇa-Mūrti-Devāraya}.\textsuperscript{\textit{\textit{kīlah}}}

\textsuperscript{46} E. C., III (3) Sr. 64, II. 61-62: Madhuraśama gudā puravrajangalam seṣadeśiśādāgam khalāra akṣiśāpa Krishṇaṁ iti yeśante vol.

\textsuperscript{47} Vide Appendix VI-(2). Specimens of the coin are still known.

\textsuperscript{47} Vide under Religion, in Ch. XIII.
would seem, 48 72. Presh acquisitions had however, been made by him since 1673. The first important step; therefore, taken by Chikkadevaraja was the amalgamation of all the conquests and annexations of the rulers of Mysore since Raja Wodeyar's time and the splitting up of the same into 84 fresh units (gadi) after granting rent-free lands (umbali) to some Pajegars and settling the contributions (khandane) due by others. Each unit was subdivided into hoblis, the groups of minor villages there-under (ranging from 8 to 16) being absorbed in major ones and the hoblis itself being named after a major village. 49

At the head of the administration of each unit was placed a Subdddr. Under him were posted an assistant (chikka-parupatya-gdra), three scroll-writers (athavanege-prati), six accountants (gumasteyaru) (rayasadavanu). A net-work of postal system was established, a news-carrier (anche-harikara) being stationed over each division. It was his duty to look after the transmission of letters from place to place and to report on matters coming within his direct knowledge. Among the subordinate staff of each unit, whose number varied in proportion to its size and status, were the head-peon (dafeddra), menials (kaluligadavaru), treasury attenders (hastdntri, golla), two watchmen (chavadi-kavalugdraru) and a torch-bearer (divatigeya-jana). Besides, the Ideal militia (kandachara) in each unit was placed on a sound footing, a Thanadar, a Gurikar.

48. The Sri. Māhāt. of Makkārjuna (1878) speaks of Chikkadevaraja as having been served by 72 functionaries or agents in his court (II, 66):

49. Annals, I. 116-117; see also Bārāmāhal Records, I.c.
three Sirastedars, three Gumastas, Hobliddrs, Dafedars, Olekars, the bugler and the drummer (kombinavanu, tamateyavanu) being suitably posted. The number of Olekdrs varied from 100 to 400 according to the size of the unit. Over six Olekdrs was placed a Dafeddr and over 50 Dafeddrs a Hoblidar. Ordinarily it was the duty of the staff of the militia to patrol the unit and safeguard the local treasury (hastantrada kavalu-kattale). In times of war they were required to be ready with arms and ammunition. The militia seems thus to have occupied an important place in the civil and military governance of the country, useful alike in times of war and peace and analogous to what we correspondingly find in the Mughal and Mahratta systems of administration of the period.

A special Subdddr was appointed to be in charge of demesne lands situated in different units. It was his duty to see to the increase of yield from those lands and to supervise the raising of crops therefrom. Under him was posted a civil establishment (consisting of Sirasteddr, accountants and scribes) to maintain regular accounts of receipts in cash and in kind, and a military establishment (i.e., Kandachar, headed by the Killedar, Thanadar and others) to keep watch and ward.

Intelligence, honesty and efficiency were the criteria of all appointments, particular care being taken to see that bribery and corruption were not fostered and that economy prevailed among the officials. The salary of the superior executive staff (like the Subadar, Sirastedar, Killedar and others) was fixed in proportion to the relative  

---

50. Ibid., 117. Cf. Wilks (I. 106), referring to the establishment of the post and the secret service (intelligence department), and commenting on it as the "new and terrible instrument of despotism." There was nothing peculiar in this institution. It was necessitated by the conditions of the times. The contemporary Mughal Empire had an active news service (see J. Berkar, Mughal Administration, pp. 97-101). See also L.N. 61 infra.
responsibilities of the appointments, half the amount being usually paid in cash and the other half in kind. The pay of the Olekârs of the Kandâchâr service was fixed at rates varying from half varaha to one varaha, half the amount being paid in cash and the other half in kind, which was met out of the produce of lands granted to them. To make the Kandâchâr service attractive, all the Olekârs were exempted from forced labour (hittu-bittu) and from payment of dues such as présents, benevolences and house-tax (kânike, kaddâya, maneterige) 51.

Spécial attention was bestowed on the maintenance of law and order in the country. A regular service for conveying criminal intelligence was established. The Olekârs were required to report on the character and conduct of people in several parts of the kingdom and promptly communicate to the central government all occurrences in the interior of the country and on the road-side. In important places and at the head-quarters of the units, a spécial staff, consisting of Kotwâl, âânabhôgs (their number varying from 1 to 3 according to the size of the locality), Pëte-Setti, Yajamân, local accountant (dëéada-éânabhôg), the criers (chalavâdi . . . dandiyavanu), the bugler, the drummer, detectives (kalla-bantaru) and menials (âligadavaru), was entrusted with important duties.

vii. Law and order:
(a) The conveying of criminal intelligence.

(6) The Police System.

61. Ibid., 117-118; also 186-187. Cf. Wilks, I. 216. His reference to the exemption of the soldier from the payment of certain imposts as being intended to “neutralise” their opposition to Chikka Devaraja’s measures, is based on an unfounded assumption. Such an exemption, however, seems to have been justified both on grounds of policy and established custom (see Mys. Gaz., II. iv. 2463). Traces of Mughal and Mahrattie influence are noticeable in the organisation of the gaë (subadâ), the police system and criminal intelligence service, termed “espionage” by the older writers. Compare, for instance, Sarkar, n.e., pp. 80-101, describing the duties of the Subâkdar, Faugdâr, Kotwâl, Thâlîbâdâr and news-reporters including the Karkarâh, and referring to the Subâdâr’s sbândâ (siobândî), troops (retainers), etc. The parallel is interesting.
Thèse officiais had to see that the différent classes and sections of the local populace (such as the Banajigas, Vaiéyas and Pànçhâlas) did not transgress their caste injunctions, to prevent thefts, to see that the merchants carried on their dealings according to prescribed rules and régulations, and to bring the différent classes of offenders to book. Also, during nights they had to conduct a regular patrol of the locality and prevent the commission of crimes. Further, the Kotwâl, Pête-Setti and Yajamân were empowered to inquire into local cases and fine those whose guilt was comparatively light and to report to the king ail serious offences demanding déterrent punishment at his hands.  

In the scheme of fiscal reforms introduced by Chikka-devarâja Wođeyar, the village as the fiscal unit received his foremost attention. In each village, the time-honoured system of rural economy was revived, and placed on a secure foundation, under the désignation of Bârâbalûti, which dénotes the carrying of rural administration by the following twelve élémentts of the village hierarchy: the headman (gauda), accountant (êânabhôg)—number varying from 1 to 3—, Brâhman astrologer (panchângada-brâhmana), blacksmith (kabbinada-kelasadavanu), goldsmith (akkasâlé), potter Kumbâra), washerman (agasa), barber (kelasî), scavengar (tôti), watchman (talavâra), regulator of tank sluices (kere-niruganti) and carpenter (ôjaravanû). The fées (rusum) of these officiais, under the régulations of Chikkadévarâja, varied according to their respective rights, being usually paid in kind (solige-gudde-âya, i.e., a measure of capacity equal to ¼ of a balla or \ a seer), the headman and the accountant, in particular, being entitled to an additional share

52. Ibid, 126-126; see also f.n. 51 supra.
from the crops raised by the villagers (sânaya-rnudre). The headman was further exempted from house-tax (mane-terigē), forced labour (hiṭṭu-bittu) and presents and benevôlences (kânike, kaddâya). Half the pay of the village accountant was to be paid in cash and the other half in kind, he being permitted to receive from the ryots, annually, an additional fee (varying from £, ¼, ½, ¾ to 1 hana per head, according to the status of the ryot) for making entries of land revenue receipts in the village accounts (kadatada kadikeya hana). The carpenter, barber, potter, washerman, scavenger, blacksmith, watchman and others were allowed the right of receiving a bundle of grass (laden with ears of corn) and a measure (kolaga) of grain from individual cultivators. The village officials other than the scavenger and the watchman were permitted to receive from each ryot a fixed quantity of grain as an annual allowance (hadade), calculated on the basis of the numerical strength of the ryot’s family. In addition to all these perquisites, the Brâhman astrologer, accountant, scavenger, watchman and the regulator of tank sluices were granted, for their maintenance, rent-free lands (mânya-bhûmi) varying in revenue value from 1 to 6 varahas according to their respective status. Other officials, like those in charge of government channels (kâluve-manêgâr) and of accounts of crops (hasuge-manêgâr, êânabhôg), were each to receive a bundle of grass (laden with ears of corn) and a measure (kolaga) of grain out of the landlord’s half share of the agricultural produce (vârada ḥuttuyaliyalli)

The revenue System next received a due share of attention at the hands of Chikkadëvâra- râja Wodeyar. Land-tax being the main-stay of finance, elaborate rules

68. Ibid, 119-120. Compare the exaction of perquisites (abwabs) by revenue officials in contemporary Mughal India (Sarkar, o. a, pp. 112-114).
and regulations were drawn up for its organization and administration. As already indicated, a distinction was made between demesne lands and public lands, separate officers being appointed to look after each of them. The principle of State landlordism was the prime feature of the reforming tendencies of the time, and every effort was made to adjust it to the changing conditions of the times and the needs of a growing kingdom. At first, it was laid down that half the share of produce (ardha-vara), such as paddy sugar-cane and other staple crops, from lands irrigated by canals in the Açtagrâm and other divisions, should be credited to government. The subjects, however, represented that this measure would hardly enable them to maintain themselves after meeting the necessary expenses of cultivation (muṭṭuvali). Accordingly, at the harvest, an enquiry was instituted, and it being found that the estimated income from and expenditure on production during the year were nearly balanced, the yield was divided into three portions, one portion being set off against the cost of production incurred by the ryots, another being allowed for their maintenance and the third being ordered to be taken by the government. This procedure, it was ordered, was to be followed only for a year or two, after which the ryots were to make over to the government an equal share of the gross produce (sama-vara). In lands irrigated by tank water, it was ruled that paddy and other crops were to be raised during years of good rains and half the produce credited to, government, while during years of drought the cultivator was to be allowed to raise only dry crops (beddalu pairu) and pay the government the assessment usually levied on dry lands (beddalu kandâya). To facilitate the discharge of water from the canals and embankments' (kâlve, katie) and the cultivation of crops there-unâev, a Manêgâr, a éânabhôg, menials and regulators
of sluices (their number varying from 2 to 4, according to the condition of the canal and the status of the village) were appointed. To supervise the raising of crops from demesne lands, the required officials (hasuge-matnēgār, hasuge-sânabhôg, kâlūligada-jana) were likewise posted. As regards waste and unserviceable lands covered with rank vegetation, revenue concessions were granted with a view to their réclamation. In the case of lands of this class yielding a gross produce of 12 hānas, only one-third was to be received as the government share for a period of five years; in the case of middle class lands yielding 16 hānas, one-fourth was to be collected for a similar period, after which the usual half was to be taken. In places where ryots were few and waste lands innumerable, a partial remission of land revenue (hisse kandāya) was allowed, to enable them to reclaim such lands. The ryots in certain parts of the country having represented their inability to pay the fixed cash assessment (kandāya), it was ruled that in such cases only half the produce actually raised (vāra) was to be taken from them and stored in the principal granary at the capital city, an order to this effect being issued also to the Subâdârs of the units.

The land-tax, under the régulations of Chikkadēvarâja, seems thus to have varied from \( \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2} \) to \( \frac{1}{2} \) of the gross produce, collected in cash as well as in kind. It must be taken to have been a distinct improvement on what obtained in South India under the Chôlas, Vijayanagar sovereigns and rulers of Madura and Tanjore, whose maximum share of land revenue varied in actual practice from \( \frac{1}{2} \) to \( \frac{4}{5} \), or 50 to 80 per cent, of the gross produce, against the \( \frac{1}{6} \) or \( \frac{1}{4} \) permitted by the Hindu law-givers. The settlement effected by Chikkadēvarâja was, again, conspicuous by the absence of farming of revenues and its concomitant evils, oppression and rack-renting, of which we have evidence already in the Vijayanagar period. The heaviness of the land-tax under Chikkadēva,
compared with the lightness of the burden at present (i.e., about 6 per cent, or $\frac{1}{17}$ of the gross produce), was, it has to be conceded, in keeping with the high purchasing power of the pagoda in the seventeenth century. And whatever may be said against payment in kind, it has to be set down that this System has its own advantages during periods of depression accompanied by a severe fall in prices.  

Land tax apart, a System of taxing fruit trees in garden lands was brought into being. Thus, it was laid down, cocoanut trees were to be assessed on the basis of yield of fruits, at rates varying from 15, 18, 25, 28 to 30 varahas per 1,000 trees. In certain parts of the country where garden lands were for long immune from assessment, half the gross produce of both areca and cocoanut trees was fixed as the government share of revenue, while in places where taxation of cocoanut trees was the custom, areca trees also were to be subjected to a levy according to local usage. The tax on tamarind and jack trees in dry lands was likewise based on the yield, and varied from 1 to 2 hanas per tree (maravali kandâya).

As regards garden lands (situated behind tanks in the neighbourhood of canals) leased out for fresh areca and cocoanut plantations, a tax of 3 hanas was at first to be levied on every 100 plantain stumps (bâleya buđa) required for raising the plantations, and, as soon as the areca and cocoanut plants yielded a harvest, the tax on plantain trees was to be remitted, either one half (vâra) of the major produce or an equivalent cash assessment.

54. Vide, on this section, Ibid, 118-119, 122-123. For details about Early South Indian Finance, see article on the subject in the I. A., Vol. XL, pp. 265-289. Of. Wilto, according to whom "the sixth was the lawful share of the orop for which the Raja received his equivalent in raoney" and forced the ryot to agree to "a voluntary increase of the landed assessment," etc., for which there is no evidence—vide Oh, XV of this work, for a detailed critical notice of Wilks's position; also f.n. 69 infra.
Land revenue dues from the administrative units, under the reforms of Chikkadēvārāja Wodeyar, were to be annually collected in full in three instalments and transmitted to the central exchequer at Seringapatam. Besides, the Subādār of each unit was required to execute a bond (muchchalike) to the effect that he would increase the revenue yield from different sources (such as pairu, pachche, etc.). The annual net revenue receipts from the 84 units after deducting the necessary expenses of the civil and military establishments (athavane, kandâchâra) and religious endowments (dēvadâya, brahmadâya), amounted on an average to 7,20,000 varahas (or twenty-one lakhs and sixty-thousand rupees, taking one varaha at Rs, 3). And it was so ordained that every day a minimum of two bags containing 1,000 varahas each was to be received from the local parts and deposited in the treasury at Seringapatam at the time of the king’s observance of the Nâmatīrtham in the Palace. So strict indeed was this ordinance that, it is said, if there was delay on any day in the remittance of the amount to the treasury, the king would devote his time that day to the recitation of the Râmâyana and would not break his fast until he had personally seen the bags and sent them for deposit to the treasury. As for that, no modern Government can or would fail to collect its revenue at the proper time except at the risk of failing in its duty towards itself. The précision

56. Ibid, 1122-128.

66. Ibid., 126; see also and compare Wilks, I., 120-121; S. K. Aiyangar, Ancient India, pp. 802-303. Wilks’s observation (I.o.) that Chikkadēvārāja, “by a course of rigid economy and order, and by a widely extended and well-organized system of securing for himself the great mass of plunder obtained by his conquests, had accumulated a treasure,” etc., hardly takes into account either the actual conditions under which Chikkadēva worked or the historical précédents or the accepted canons of public finance, as explained in the text above.
with which revenue is collected to-day in every civilized country shows that that great duty cannot be abandoned or laid aside, for that would be striking at the very root of its existence. And Chikkadēva's government was not a mère tax-gathering one; it cared for the political* social and spiritual welfare of its people. Further, according to the Hindu science of politics, a well-filled treasury is a necessity to a king and Chikkadēva, considering the times he lived in, would have committed a serious blunder if he had not made adequate arrangements for keeping his finances in order. Even in Europe, the policy of forming public treasures or other reserves, in order to provide for the necessities of the State in times of emergency, is well known. The system of public treasures, indeed, can lay claim to high antiquity. Thus, the Athenians before the Peloponnesian War had accumulated a large sum. The Persian kings likewise had collected the tribute of their provinces in the shape of precious metals, large portions of which Alexander took hold of. The Komans followed the same system of hoarding. In the médiéval period, the practice was continued. It was usual on the death of the king for his successor to gain possession of the treasure. Several

57. According to the Amara-kōsa, Rājyānga consists of the following seven constituents: Swamyamātya vahrtkōsa ragra durgam balānt, king, minister, friend, treasury, kingdom, fortress and army. The Matsya-Purāṇa (I-iv) likewise says:

Swamyamātyača ragramcha durgam kōsa balam srit i
Parasaropādirād the sāyaṅgam rāja mūchyaate

The Mahābhārata adds citizens as forming the eighth constituent. The importance of the kōsa (treasury) is thus stressed by one authority:

Kōsa mahatyār jīvo natu prārah kāthanchāna
Dhruyam hi rājaabhāpaya nasattamati sthitih
Dharmahēko sūkhārthāyā bhūtyānam bharamāyakeh
Ayadarihamecha samrakshyāh kōsah kātawada sada

(Yuktikalpatatu, as quoted under kōsah in Rāja Rādhākānta Dēv’s Subdakalpadrutna). According to this authority, the treasury is, apart from his life, the king’s soul; it is the wealth of the sovereign and shows his condition, apart from his body. This wealth is for enabling him to perform his Dharma and for securing his happiness. It is also intended to support those dependent on him; also to preserve him from dangers; that which has all this stored in itself is kōsa.
instances can be quoted in support of this statement from the histories of England and France. The treasure and the kingdom, in fact, went together, each being looked on as equally a form of property. In England, Henry VIII dissipated the treasure left by his wise father. In France, Henry IV, who was guided by Sully, his celebrated minister, in this matter, was the last sovereign to maintain a treasure, though the practice fell into désuétude by the time of Adam Smith. He notes that it continued to exist in the canton of Bern and in Prussia. Frederick the Great (1740-1786) continued the System in the latter country, and the late German Empire stuck to it tenaciously to the end. "The reasons which induced so many states," as one authority puts it, "to accumulate treasure are to be found in the conditions of society existing at the time." A primitive community has no need of a store of money; provisions and weapons would be more useful in its case. With the introduction of money dealings, the convenience of having a universally desired article on hand would be too plain to be forgotten. "The efficient maintenance of an army in the field depends in a great degree on the supply of what is so often called the 'sinews of war.' Cases are not unknown where expéditions failed altogether from want of this indispensable auxiliary." Where crédit was undeveloped and taxes were occasional and uncertain expédients, a State that had no treasure was in a dangerous situation, unprepared either for attack or defence. The treasure came to be looked upon, as Bastable has justly remarked, as a species of property owned by the sovereign "serving a particular purpose and completing the public economy." The change to the modern économie organization wherein the method of incurring debt (through a well-organized banking system) takes the place of the older System of storing up treasure or other disposable wealth for a time of need, is not yet universal even in Europe. The policy
of building up of reserves for meeting military necessities has been long defended in Germany, while in India the state-treasure policy has not been entirely superseded by a well-organized system of banking, 58

The next item which engaged the attention of Chikka-dëvarâja Wodeyar was the standardisation of weights and measures. The kolaga was the common unit of measure used for determining the quantity of corn. Its measuring capacity, however, varied in different parts of the country, according to local custom. Thus, there were kolagas measuring from 8, 12, 15 to 16 seers each. Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar allowed this usage to be continued all over the country, introducing a change only in respect of the seals to be used by the local officiais for impressing the prevailing units of measure with. The signets (mudreya ungurci) which were in vogue in different localities since the Pâlegâr régime were examined, and, as the estampages thereon were found to vary considerably, a new system was introduced, aiming at uniformity throughout. On the gold signet of each of the 84 administrative units, the name of the unit, together with the figures of the Sun and the Moon on either side and the monogram "De" in the middle—standing for the king's name—was engraved, and the principal local officer of the unit (Subâdâr) ordered to be entrusted with the charge of the seal thus formed. Another type of signet made of silver, with the monogram "De" likewise engraved thereon, was, it was further laid down, to be placed in charge of the subordinate executive staff (namely, Athavane-chikka-pârupatyagâra, Killëdârs, hôbli and village officiais and collectors of taxes such as sunka, pommu, samaydchâra, etc.), for current use by them. Further, the village officiais (like the tôti, talavâr and niruganti) were to be provided with

68. See as to the maintenance of State treasure in Europe generally, Bastable, Public Finance, 586-640.
wooden planks, and the village forum (châvadi) with a staff, impressed as usual with the monogram "De" in the middle and the figures of the Sun and the Moon on either side, for use by them under the direction of their chief (grâmada pârupatyagâra), especially while attaching the properties of delinquents and claiming the government share of produce from lands. Besides, the managers of temples (dëvasthânada pârupatyagâra) in the local parts were to be in charge of the seals thereof, engraved with the names of the respective shrines. Similarly, the general units of weights and measures all over the country, namely, the maund (mana), £ maund (dadeya), maund (panchëru), kolaga (measuring 8 seers), balla (measuring 2 seers), seer, ½ seer, ¼ seer, 1/8 seer and 1/16 seer, were to be suitably impressed with the royal seal, and it was ruled that all commercial transactions were to be conducted only by means of stamped measures. At the same time, the standard weight of 3 Kanthirâyi-hanams being recognised as equivalent to that of 1 duddu, the other corresponding denominations were regulated as under: 1 duddu—1 tola; 24 duddu—1 kachcha seer; 10 seers—1 dadeya (\ maund); 4 dadeya—1 small maund (mana of 40 seer); 44 to 46 seers—1 big maund (mana). Both in the Palace stores and in the market-places, grains, jaggery, areca, turmeric, tamarind, pepper, chillies and miscellaneous spices were to be measured by the big weight (i.e., at 44 to 46 seers per maund) while purchasing them, and by the small weight (i.e., at 40 seers per maund) while distributing them for consumption.

Other important measures Chikkadêvarâja Wodeyar is credited with, generally during c. 1673-1690, were of an économie character, and relate in the main to industries.

6. Industries, trade and commerce.

59. Ibid, 120-122; see also under Orants and other records in Ch. XIII, for the reference to "De" (Chikkadêvarâja's monogram) as found on boundary stones. On p. 121 of the AnnaU, read 8 Kanfolrayi-hanama,
trade. and commerce. Manufacture and sale of iron goods seems to have been a normal feature of governmental activities during the reign. The professional classes, such as dyers (bêmagnagdra), weavers (dêvânga), tailors (chippiga), artisans (êilpi), plasterers (gârekelasadavaru), day-labourers (kâmâti) and basket-makers (wiëdaru), were, under the regulations of Chikkadêvarâja, to be enabled to ply their respective callings in accordance with their time-honoured traditions. In particular on the acquisition of Bangalore by Chikkadêvarâja Wodeyar in July 1687, we learn, not only merchants but also 12,000 families of weavers were securely established there, agreements (kaulu-karâru) were entered into with them and facilities afforded for the passage of bâies of cloth to various parts of the country and, particularly, to Seringapatam. Trade and commerce were, ordinarily, in the hands of Settis of the Vaiéya and Bcmajiga communities. Trade routes were controlled by associations of merchants of various places in different parts of the country (dêëa-dêëada-mahâ-nâda-vartakaru) and transport of articles was being conducted by means of pack-bullocks (gôni-hêru). Articles of commerce were liable to local tolls (sthala-sunka) and import and export duties (olavâru, horavâru) on the basis of loads, the rates varying according to the nature of the commodity. The systematic expansion of the kingdom of Mysore since 1610 appears to have naturally brought in its train problems of its own for solution at the hands of Chikkadêvarâja Wodeyar, particularly in respect of trade and commerce. Spécial attention was paid to the strengthening of the forts and bastions of places acquired from the Pâlegârs, and to the laying out, on an extensive scale, of market-places (pète) in those localities. The merchants having, it is said, represented to Chikkadêvarâja the necessity of bringing together the

different products—grown on a large scale in various parts of the country—to a prominent trade-centre (dodda-pête) for purposes of évaluation (karagapadi), large scales (chintâlu) were fixed up in Bangalore, Gubbi, Turuvêkere and other places, where cotton, areca-núto and other articles of trade were to be brought and weighed and later taken to local markets for sale. A sort of trade-emporium for the distribution of économie products over different areas seems thus to have been brought into being. Besides, arrangements were made not only for the export and import of grains, spices, cloth and other things to and from the market-places (pëi) of the 84 administrative units, but also for the détermination of their value and the levy of tolls (sunka) on different commodities according to the nature of the stock. The customs department (sunkada-chdvadî) was reorganized, salaried servants, namely, a Manéghâr, Sânabhôg (number not exceeding 3) and Kôlukârs, being appointed to look after the same. Similarly officiais were posted in suitable numbers to the charge of toll-gates (ukkada) on the road-side in the interior of the country. Collections from customs dues were to be accumulated in the cash-chests (gôlaka) of the respective administrative units, and merchants in local parts were to be required to set apart a portion of their wares, at rates varying from J to one seer per load (hëru), as contribution (rusum) to local deities and allowances to Bràhmans and others.63

Among measures of a miscellâneous character, recorded to have been introduced by, Chikka-dëvarâja Wodeyar during the period (1673-1686), were64 the arrangements made for the storing and disposai of agricultural produce (from demesné lands and public lands) and other articles of every day utility in the principal granary (dodda-ugrâna)

---

63. Ibid, 126,142. 64. Ibid, 126-128.
and the newly established minor stores (chikka-ugrâṇa) at Seringapatam, and the appointment of stores officials, such as supervisors (gurikârs), writers (kaϊṇikaru), clerks (gumâstas), accountants (éâñabhōgs), measurers (alateyavaru, tûkadavaru), guards (pahareyavaru), etc., their pay being fixed in cash and in kind according to the nature of their respective duties; the extension of the armoury and the magazine (jâna-sâle, alagina-châvadi, maddina-manē) in Seringapatam and the storing therein of fireworks of various descriptions (required for use during the Navarâtri and other festive occasions), together with arrangements for the manufacture on a large scale of weapons of warfare and powder and shot, and for the maintenance of accounts relating to them by a spécial establishment consisting of Gurikârs, éâñabhōgs and others.

Although the administrative measures sketched thus far were on the whole attended with a fair measure of success, it appears not improbable, if we are to view things in the light of the Jesuit letter of 1686 already referred to,65 that the working of the fiscal reforms, in particular, was hampered by the political crisis of 1682-1686, resulting in a friction between the government and the subjects, especially in the eastern parts of the kingdom of Mysore. One account66 has it that despite the facilities afforded, and concessions granted, by Chikkadēvarâja Wodeyar, certain well-to-do and proud ryots organised a stout opposition to the government refusing to pay the revenue dues and openly disobeying the rules and regulations. The agitation, according to this authority, was thus purely fiscal in character. The evidence available, however, seems to indicate that almost simultaneously, during 1682-1686, there was a

66. Ante, Ch. X I, f.n. 115-117; vide also Ch. XV, for détails.
clash of interests, political and économique. In any case, the troubles were successfully overcome. And, towards the close of 1686, the levy of house-tax and other imposts, altogether 19 in number, was systematised. These may be classified under two main heads: (1) Local and (2) Communal. Under local were included such items as *Mane-terige* (house-tax), *Hullu-hana* (tax on straw from fields), *Dévarâya-vattâ* (différence of exchange on ineffective coins—a currency discount), *Ēru-sunka* (plough-bax), *Guluvina-pommu* (tax on plough-share), *Angadi-vasara* (tax on moveable booths in the bazaar streets), *Angadi-pattadi* (tax on workshop attached to a ware-house), *Maggada-kandâya* (loom-tax), *Pâēavâra* (tax on fishery), *Uppina-môle* (tax on local manufacture of sait from saline earth), *Dana-karu-mâriddakke-sunka* (tax on cattle sold), *Kuri-terige* (tax on flocks of sheep), *Gida-kâvalu* (tax on pasburage in forest tracts, resorted bo by the ryots), *Ubbe-kànike* (tax on kettles used by washermen for the boiling and bleaching of cloths) ind *Kaudi-terige* (tax on bullock saddles, *i.e.*, onbullocks forhire). Under communal were *Samayâchâra* (dues on conventional practices or usages observed by the folk), *Kûtâchâra* (dues on corporate rights), *Jâti-mânya* (dues on caste privilèges) and *Maduve-terige* (marriage-tax),

67. See Oh. XV below, for détails.
58. *Annale*, I. 124. Cf. Wilks, according to whom the imposts were levied very early in Chikkadêvarâja's reign and became the *root cause* of the revolt of the Jangamas. Even Dêvachandra, the local traditionist, hardly supports Wilks, for, according to him, the levy of imposts, about the middle of the reign (*i.e*., in 1686), was a *conséquence* of the Jangama agitation—vide Ch. XV, for a detailed critical notice of these authorities, B9, *Ibid*; see also and oompare Wilks’s list (I. 219-219, f.n.) and Rice’s list (I. 592, f.n.). Most of the imposts, referred to, were common in thé Karnâtaka country in ancient times (see Ch. XV) and in contemporary Mughal India (see Sarkar, o. c, pp. 119-128), though forms seem to hâve differed. Chikkadêvarâja's revival of them as effective weapons for keeping at bay the turbulent éléments, appears to hâve been justified from the conditions of the times. Wilks’s statement (I. 217) that Chikka-dêvarâja " had recourse to the law of the *S aster s*, which authorized him, by no verry forced construction, to attaok the husbandman by a variety of vexatious taxes," is neither well-founded nor does it suffi oie ntly take into account the actual conditions under which Chikkadêvarâja ruled—vide Ch. XV, for a detailed oritical notice. 
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Officials were appointed for the administration and collection of these imposts, a Manēgār, a Ėcmābhōg and a Kōlulcār being generally held responsible for each item. Usually all these items of revenue were leased out (guttigege koṭṭu), the annual realisations therefrom being ordered to be added on to the aggregate annual land revenue receipts of the respective villages. These imposts, again, were subject to enhancement according to the condition and status of the individual ryot, and it was ordained that the revenue from this source was to be remitted to the central exchequer at Seringapatam along with the local land revenue collections (sime-kandāya).

With the exception of certain portions of the years 1687-1690, 1695-1697 and 1698-1700, the latter part of the reign of Chikkaḍēvarāja Woḍeyar (i.e., 1686-1704) might generally be described as a period of peace and settled government, accompanied by systematic consolidation of conquered tracts—especially of those recovered from the Mahrattas. The earlier administrative measures, particularly those relating to land revenue, were enforced with rigour and discipline, though with due regard to the general well-being of the people. A good harvest to the ryot was the criterion of happiness and prosperity of the subjects and we have contemporary testimony as to how, in keeping with that criterion, Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar was quite averse to taking from the ryots anything more

70. Ibid.
71. A. V. C., III, 148 (with gloss): Kannada-naḍol bēlanagālenitu perchīān, jām perchīuvar, Chikourced-mahārāyam satyārāṇākumārā, darām mum-mitigeya kandīyamanālūdō perandōdu hasu-utamaṇṇālūdō. See also O. Bi., p. 4 (prose passage, para 2), testifying to peace in the country, happiness and well-being of the subjects, and blessings of Providence in respect of good rains and crops in the State, during the latter part of Chikkaḍēvarāja’s reign (sudēva-pag-adānantadāvarām prajogalā rōjikadhayamuladēyam, divāt-prasādadānaṁ māle-bēlanagālēntadāvarām dagrōjikadhayamuladēyam-mipudāvarām, prajogalēntadāvarām ikadōṭ cogaveldāvar).
ihan the standardised share of land revenue duties. So carefully were the resources of the kingdom managed under the regulations of Chikkadēvāraṇa that, towards the close of his reign, it is said, he was able to leave in his treasury a credit balance of nine crores in the shape of cash and effects, whence he came to be familiarly known as Navakōti-Nārāyana (Lord of nine crores).

The period 1686-1704 was thus marked by the successful working of the earlier administrative measures of Chikkadēvāraṇa Wodeyar. Though there were no additions or alterations as regards these measures during this period, he is credited with having introduced certain developments in the administrative machinery in and after 1700, shortly after the return of his embassy to the court of Aurangzib. These developments, it is added, had their origin in the Mughal System of the time, and relate to the organization of the following eighteen departments (chāvadi):

1. Nirūpada-chāvadi: department dealing with the recording of petitions from the officials to the king and with the disposal of the same in the form of orders (nirūpa) duly authenticated by the latter;
2. Ayakattina-chāvadi: department dealing with accounts—civil and military—of the 84 administrative units (gadigala sīmeya ādāya-vyaṭyada lekka, sainyddā lekka), of the central exchequer (Tōshikhāne lekka) and the king's household (Kartara khāsā ādāya-vyaṭyada lekka);
3. Mysūru-hōbali-vichārada-chāvadi: department dealing with the affairs of administrative units south of the Cauvery;
4. Pattanada-hōbali-vichārada-chāvadi: department dealing with the affairs of administrative units north of the Cauvery;
5. Simeya-kandāchārada-chāvadi:

72. Annals, I.151; of Willes I.120; see also f.n. 56 supra.
73. Ibid, 146.
74. Ibid, 146-150; cf. Capt. Bead in Bardmahal Records (1792), 1.189 para 10; also Wilks, I.119-122, f.n. (including Sir Murray Hammick's list from the India Office, on. p. 122, f.n.), and Bice, I. 590-691.
department dealing with accounts of civil and military establishments in the administrative units and of arms, ammunition and stores required for the equipment of the respective units; (6) Bâgila-kandâchârada-ehâvadi: department dealing with accounts relating to the military and civil officials on the Huzûr establishment and the Pâlegârs; (7) Sunkada-châvadi: customs department for the maintenance of Consolidated accounts of road-tolls on goods, collected all over the country under the régulations of Chikkadêvarâja, and of import and export duties; (8) Pommina-ehâvadi: a spécial department intended exclusively for the collection at one-half the scheduled rates, of duties on commodities purchased or disposed of by certain classes of people such as beneficiaries, Brâhmans and officials; (9) Todâ* yada-châvadi: a similar department intended for the collection of duties at half the scheduled rates [from certain classes of people] in Seringapatam only; (10) PâHanada-hôbali-açtagràmada-châvadi: department having jurisdiction over the eight hôblis newly formed under the GhiJckadêvarâja-sàgara channel; (11) Mysûru-hÔbali-açtagràmada-châvadi: department having jurisdiction over the eight hôblis newly formed under the Dèva-nâlâ (channel)—thèse two departments being required to attend to the repairs of dams and canals under the Cauvery and the Hëmàvatî and to maintain regular accounts of half the government share of produce from lands irrigated thereunder; (12) Bemeya-châvadi: department dealing with the management of Palace cattle, daily collection and disposai of dairy products and the maintenance of accounts relating thereto; (13) Pattanada-châvadi: department entrusted with the upkeep of the Palace, fort, bastions, stores and magazine, and the maintenance of law and order, in the capital city of Seringapatam; (14) Bëhina-châvadi: department of intelligence—dealing with the speedy
transmission by couriers (anche-harikâra) of reports of events from the administrative units to the capital, and with the communication of royal orders (nirûpa) thereon to the local parts; (15) Sawmukhada-châvadi: department dealing with the maintenance of accounts relating to the members of the Royal Family and the subordinate staff on the various establishments of the king's household—a department which was to be administered by Gurikârs Sômârâjaiya and Appâjaiya under the direct supervision of Chikkadêvaràja Wodeyar; (16) Dëva&thâ* nada-châvadi: department pertaining to the management of temples all over the kingdom and to the supervision of their budgets; (17) Kabbinada-châvadi; department dealing with the purchase of raw iron and manufacture and sale of goods therefrom; and (18) Hogesoppina-châvadi: department concerned with the purchase and sale of tobacco in Seringapatam.

Over each department thus organized, a supervisor (gottugâra), three record-keepers (daftaradavaru), accountants (gumâsteyaru), writers (râyasadavaru), a head-peon (dafëdâra), menials (ûligadavaru), attender (golla), watchman (kâvalugâra) and torch-bearer (dïvatigeyavanu), among others, were appointed. Their pay was fixed in proportion to their relative responsibilities, one half being, as usual, ordered to be paid in cash and the other half in kind. These officials, it was further laid down, were to diligently discharge their duties, safeguarding the interests of government and reporting personally to the king every morning particulars of administration relating to their respective departments. Arrangements were also made for the prompt communication to him of important matters (such as daily occurrences, watch and ward, maintenance of discipline, etc.) pertaining to these departments, to enable him to set right any palpable defect or disorder in the working of the System.\(^{75}\)

\(^{76}\) Ibid, 150-151.
The changes described thus far may be taken to reflect the mature political and administrative wisdom of Chikkadēvarâja Wođeyar. In any case they cannot be set down as an attempt at merely imitating the Standards of the Mughal-Mahratta Systems of the time. The idea of eighteen departments (Athârā-çuchêri) may have been borrowed from Mughal administrative practice and procedure but the details of the departments, as worked out by Chikkadēvarâja Wođeyar, were essentially indigenous and adapted to local requirements. They also seem to evidence a strong tendency on his part to improve the old institutions and adjust them to the conditions of his own times along more definite and up-to-date lines. He thus systematised the governmental machinery, centralizing much of the power at headquarters while leaving to local officiais as much authority as they can be expected safely to discharge. It is significant that this administrative achievement of 1700-1704, which followed closely on the political development attained in Chikkadēvarâja's reign, is yet, in its fundamental features, the basis of the government of to-day.
CHAPTER XIII.

CHIKKADEVARAJA WODEYAR, 1673-1704—(contd.)


THE period of Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar's rule (1673-1704) witnessed an important development in the évolution of érī-Vaishñavism, generally as the prevailing creed in the south of India and more particularly as the professed faith of the Mysore Royal Family. Indeed, as we have seen in the earlier chapters, the rapid strides érī-Vaishñavism made in Southern India since the mémorable battle of Baksas-Tagdi (1565) were coeval with its steady progress as the religion of the Ruling House of Mysore and the development of Vaishnava tradition relating to the origin of the dynasty. Further, we have indications that the érī-Vaishnava influence—ever activé in the viceroyalty of
Seringapatam—began to make itself felt on the court life of Mysore, especially on the acquisition of Seringapatam by Bâja Wođeyar in 1610. That influence, however, became more and more pronounced during the subsequent years, consequent on the gradual decline of the Vijayafcagâr Empire and the rise to prominence of Srî-Vaishnava families of repute, accompanied by the migration of some of their members from the court of the Āravîdu Emperors to that of the Wodeyars of Mysore. Mêlkôté and Seringapatam, among others, became the strongholds of rejuvenated ētri-Vaishnavism in Mysore. Singaraiyangâr I was closely connected with the Mysore Eoyal Family as the teacher of Bettada-Chàmarâja Wođeyar (younger brother of Bâja Wođeyar and father of Kanthîrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar); Alasingarârya (Singaraiyangâr I I), grandson of Singaraiyangâr I and father of Tirumalârya (Tirumalaiyangâr), became celebrated as the Paurânika, friend, philosopher, and guide of Doddadêvarâja Wođeyar, father of Chikkadêvarâjâ Wodeyar; and Alasingarârya and his son Tirumalârya were also important ētri-Vaishçava celebrities at the court of Dêvarâja Wođeyar (uncle of Chikkadêvarâjâ). Again, Venkat-a-Varadâchârya of Ettûr, son of Kôtikanyâdânam-Lakshmîkumâra-Tâtâchârya of ētriçaila-vaméa, from the court of yijayanagar, became the preceptor of Dêvarâja Wođeyar himself. So widespread, indeed, was the ēti-Vaishçava influence at the court of Mysore that within half a century from the conquest of Seringapatam, i.e., about the close of the reign of Dêvarâja Wođeyar (1659-1673), it showed a tendency to become the chief religion in the State.

At a very early period in his life—particularly during his term of office as Yuvarâja under personal faith of Chikkadêvarâjâ, 1668—Chikkadêvarâjâ Wodeyar showed a prédilection for Sri-Vaishnavism as his personal
The influence of education and the training he had received at the hands of his teachers; the strong āri-Yaishṇava leanings of his own grandfather (Muppina-Dēvarājâ Wodeyar) and father (Doddadēvarâja Wodeyar), the latter under the teaching and inspiration of Alasingarârya; lastly, the living example of Tirumalârya, companion and colleague of Chikkadēvarâja—these were perhaps factors contributing to that result. The foundations of ēri-Vaishṇavism as the personal creed of Chikkadēva had thus been laid long before his accession to the throne of Mysore in 1673. So that, during the period of his actual rule, he was, as he is depicted to us, an ardent devotee at the feet of deities like Apratima-Rājagôpâla of Haradanahalli (Haradanapuri), Paravâsudēva of Dēvanagara on the banks of the Kauḍḍini, Gôpâla of Kanjagiri (Gôpâlasvâmi hill), Eangēa of Paéchimaranga (Seringapatam) and Nārâyana of Yadugiri (Mêlkôte), among others. Equally devoted was he to ēri-Krishna, as is borne out by the striking by him of gold coins in the latter's name about 1675, as already mentioned. Further, the Châmarâja-nagar Plate (November 1675)* speaks of him as having brought from ēri-Mushna the image of ēvēta-Varâhasvâmi (which had been, it is said, lost during the Yavana invasion) and worshipped it with dévotion in

1. See, for instance, C. Vi., V, 113-152, depicting Chikkadēvarâja's devotion to God Parâvâsudēva, adoption of the Śri-Vaishṇava marks (urdhva-pundra), daily worship of Vishṇu, performance of gifts, acceptance of holy water, etc., during Dēvarâja's reign. Cf. Wilks and other authorities as set out in Ch. XV.
2. See C. Vam., 104-160, 168-184: C. Vi., III and IV; also Ch. X of this work, under Domestic life.
3. See Y. N. Stanaţ, et al., p. 96, vv. 24, p. 100, v. 3; col. to Kâmalâ Mahât., Pâșha Mahât., Yed. Mahât., Śrî Mahât., Śrî Sap., Mbh. Śanti and Śalya Pârva and C. Vi.; also Sacoţa, Nos., I, 63; E.C., III (1) Sr. 14, ll. 74-75, et al. The Kâmalâ Mahât. (III, 30-68) contains also an elaborate account of Chikkadēvarâja's visit to Dēvanagara on the banks of the Kauḍḍini (c. 1677-1678), and of his devotion to God Parâvâsudēva there.
4. E. C., IV (9) Ch. 92, ll. 82-84; see also and compare Anâoia, I. 138.
Seringapatam. Another record mentions him as the èri-Vadshnava-matarpratisthâpaka (establisher of the religion of the èrî-Vaishjhavas). Others likewise point to his adoption of èrî-Vaishnavism as his personal faith. In keeping with this, we have a picture of the daily routine of his religious avocations (nitya -vihita-karmà), which, we are told, used to consist of the following items: rising at dawn; contemplation of Vishnu; ablutions; wearing cérémonial clothes and besmearing the body with sandal paste; observance of the Nâmatirtham, i.e., putting the Ùrdhvapundram and the Tikâ (èrî-Vaishnava marks) on the forehead; performance of the sandhyà and japam (morning rites); worship of Vishnu, reciting His thousand names; acceptance of the holy water and offerings (türtha-prasâdam); offering of oblations (hôma, âjyâ-huti) to fire and bestowal of gifts (of cows, cash,, etc.) on pious and deserving Brâhmans. At the end of this round of religious duties, he would receive the bénédic­tions of Brâhmans and seat himself on the throne (hari* pîtha) and listen to the exposition by learned scholars of topics of religious merit (like the Gïtâ, the Epies, etc.), after which he would attend to the day's business of state. Chikkadêvarâja, we learn, also paid particular attention to the observance of the fast day (Èkâdaéi) and the bestowing of gifts on Brâhmans on the day following, when the breaking of the fast (Dvâdaéi) came

---

6. Ibid., IV (3) Ch. 92 ; III (1) Sr. 161, My. 7, etc.; see also under Grants and other records cited below.
8. Ibid.; cf. Wilks and Dêvachandre as set out in Ch. XV.
off; visited important places of pilgrimage and bathing-ghâts (sapta-kshêtrâçta-tîrthangala darêanam gaidu); was fond of listening to Śrī-Vaishṇava sacred lore; and gave prominence to the Vajra-mahâtī (Vaira-mudil festival and the Gajêndrôtsavam of Śrī-Nârâyana, the famous deity presiding over Mêlkôtê.

The religion of Chikkadëvaràja Wodeyar, thus described, was evolved during the period of his rule (1673-1704), side by side with the systematic, though mutual and complementary, development of Śrī-Vaishnavism in general in Mysore.

Three distinct stages are, accordingly, noticeable in this connection. The first stage (1673-1680), may be conveniently regarded as the stage of initiation and preparation; the second (1680-1696) as the stage of expansion; and the third as the stage of culmination. It would be of interest to trace the course of development during each of these stages.

Despite the indications of a promising future for Śrî-Vaishṇavism in Mysore by about 1673 and the early leanings of Chikkadëvara-râja Wodeyar towards it, there seems little doubt that other religions like Jainism and Vîra-ēaivism were equally active at the court of Mysore during the first part of his reign. The extent of influence of these religions—particularly of Jainism—on Chikkadëvaràja is found much exaggerated in later writings. The truth, however, appears to be, as we shall see, that while Chikkadëva seemed to encourage and even openly tolerate, as became an impartial ruler, other forms of religion that prevailed at his court, Śrî-Vaishṇavism held its own and kept up a steady and vigorous propaganda against its rivals, systematically initiating him into its

---

10 See, for instance, the accounts of Devachandra and Wilks as set out in Ch. XV of this work.
religions and philosophical subtleties and preparing the ground for its further development. Perhaps one strong point in support of this position is the remarkable output of ērī-Vaishṇava literature, produced under the direct patronage of Chikkadēvarâja Wođeyar himself during this period. Another was the influence that was being continually exerted on him and his court by learned Śrī-Vaishṇava leaders like Alâsingarârya and Tirumalârya, and, more markedly, by Chikkupâdhyâyâ. Thus, not only was the religious outlook of Chikkadēvarâja definitely moulded in favour of ērī-Vaishṇavism from 1673 onwards but he had also become a ērī-Vaishṇava both by faith and profession by about 1680.

Alongside of this development, Jaina and Vîra-ēaiva cults also continued to flourish at the court of Chikkadēvarâja Wođeyar during the succeeding period (1680-1696). The tendency for Śrī-Vaishṇavism to overshadow the rival faiths became, however, more pronounced from 1686 onwards, especially after the death of Viéâlâksha-Paṇḍit, the Prime Minister of Chikkadēvarâja, and the accession in his place of Tirumalaiyangâr. Between 1686-1696 ērī-Vaishṇavism occupied a most prominent position at the court of Mysore. Its philosophical doctrines continued to engage the attention of Chikkadēva in an increasing measure; and, already during this period, he appears to have had a ērī-Vaish cant (āchârya) also. So powerful, indeed, was

11. See under Literary activity in Ch. XIV. 12. Ibid.
14. See T. N. Stavafy, etc., pp. 1, 81, 86, 91, 96,100, 112 (first verse in each of the Stavahs and in the commentary on the Y. N. Stavah) and 119, where VSdhûla-Śrînivâsârya, a celebrated ērī-Vaiahūva sholar of the time, is mentioned as the preceptor (Guru, Ouruvarya) of ÂJasingarârya and Tirumalârya, and is further referred to as having taken up his residence in the neighbourhood of Hêmagiri, not far from Mêlkôte. Vadhûla-Orlnivâsârya seems to have been closely connected with the court of Seringapatam also through Tirumalârya. See also Annale, 1.182, referring to a ārī-Vaishoava acharya of Chikkadēvarâja Wođeyar.
the Śrī-Śaṅkara; influence at the court of Mysore that by October 1690 it seems to have become the principal factor underlying Chikkadevarāja Woḍeyar's classification of the Arasu families in the State and his regulations in regard to them. And by 1693 Chikkadevarāja had, indeed, come to be known as an out and out ērī-Śaṅkara, while the heavy proselytizing tendencies of the faith had begun to extend over the court circle and beyond. Thūs, in June 1693, we learn, the purōhīts and scholars of other sects attached to the court of Chikkadevarāja were, agreeably to a représentation of Tirutnalaiyāṅgār, desired to wear the ērī-Śaṅkara marks (ndmam) on their foreheads while attending at the Palace during the king's Nāmatīrtham. Further, the embracing of the Śrī-Śaṅkara faith by adopting its credentials (Pancha-samskāras, namely, Chakrāṅkanam, Urdhvapundra-dhāranam, Dāsanāmam, Mūlamantrōpāsanam and Nārāyaṇa-pujā) and the observance of Vaishnava-dīkshā were laid down as conditions précèdent to any claims to blood-relationship with the Mysore Royal House, in the case of thirteen Arasu families recognised, under the récent classification of Chikkadeva, as of pure blood. Gurikārs Sēmarājaiya and Appājaiya were entrusted with the communication of these injunctions to the families concerned. The latter not only acted accordingly but also, under instructions from the Gurikārs, submitted a solemn pétition to Chikkadevarāja Woḍeyar in March 1694, expressing their deep sense of gratitude to him for having rescued them from the abyss of social dégradation and impurity, and conveying their resolution to adhere to and follow ērī-Śaṅkara both by faith and by profession under the royal decree. In June 1696, however, these families,

15. See under Social life below.
16. Annals, l.o.; see also Dévaohandra in Ch. XV,
17. Ibid.
18. ZWd, 132-184*
having experienced certain difficulties due to their having given up their family deities in favour of ērī-Vaishñava ritualism (*Nārâyana-pujā*), submitted another petition to Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar, praying for permission to worship their respective family deities also while adhering to all other ērī-Vaishñava usages and practices prescribed for them. The permission sought for was granted, Gurikârs Sōmarâjaiya and Appâjaiya being, as usual, desired to communicate the order to the Arasu families.

This relaxation in favour of his relations did not mean any desertion of the chief articles of the Vaishñava faith. There is, indeed, ample evidence for the view that ērī-Vaishñavism reached the culminating point as the religion of Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar in the closing years of his reign, more particularly from 1698 onwards, under the ever active influence and example of Tirumalaiyangâr. So deep-rooted had become the earlier views of Chikkadēvarâja in regard to ērī-Vaishñavism that, during the years 1696-1704, they not only attained a remarkable state of maturity and perfection as articles of his creed but also became expressive to a degree. In fact, as a firm and steadfast devotee of Viṣṇu, he had begun to realize the higher life of the spirit, seeking salvation in accordance with the doctrine of faith in God's grâce (*Nambuge*) and absolute self-surrender (*Prapatti*), and taking a keen interest in popularising his convictions. Of the directness of appeal and the deep moral fervour, earnestness and sincerity of those convictions, his own writings, which can be dated between c. 1700-1704, are a standing testimony. These writings throughout bear the impress

---

90. The *Ohikkadêvardja-Birinapam* and *Gīta-Gōpdlam*. For details about these works, see under *Literary activity* in Ch. XIV below,
of his personality, and they cannot but be regarded as the vivid expression of ērī-Vaishnavism as his personal faith.

Thus, of the Suprême Being and of Salvation, Chikka-devarāja Wodeyar, in the course of thirty humble petitions (Binnapa) addressed to ērī-Nārāyaṇa of Yadugiri (Mēlkōṭe), says:

"Oh, Lord of Yadugiri! Having settled on the famous peak adorning the Karnāṭaka country, Thou hast attained celebrity as the Protector of all people and as the tutelary deity (Kula-dēvate) of the Yadu race. Thou art Para-brahman, the primeval cause of the world; Thou art infinité; Thou art manifest in the Vēdas, Purāṇas and the eighteen Vidyas. The Vēdas proclaim that the entire business of the world is Thine. As the attendants of a king praise him for the attainment of happiness by his subjects and followers, so do the Vēdas praise Thee for the bestowal of eternal happiness on those devotees of Thine following the prescribed course of conduct. The Gītā speaks of this; the Smritis, Itihāsas, Purāṇas and Āgamas describe it. Indeed those who have grasped the fundamentals of philosophy aver without contradiction that Thou art an object of wonder. Thou art an embodiment of the entire world, being "One" in diversity. Even the things perceived during dream turn out to be real if the philosophy of création is rightly understood. In my own case, the sword Nandaka, which I was actually favoured with by Thee in a dream, has stayed perpetually with me and has enabled me, by virtue of Thy glory, to cut down the enemies who surrounded me in all the four directions. A pious king in this world lays down rules and régulations governing the protection and punishment of his subjects. If he acts up to them regardless of any distinction, he will be

21. O, Bi., pp. 1-59. For spécifie references, see infra,
considered as impartial; in scrupulously adhering to them, he will be held as absolute; and in pardoning a delinquent, he will be regarded as kind-hearted. Even so is the case with Thee in awarding Thy rétributions to sentient beings according to their actions (Karma). Thou art the cause of all création, and préserver and destroyer too. Thou art the Suprême Lord of all individual souls, and the essence of our relationship is that of master and servant. As the Suprême Being, Thou art at the head of all création, including animate and inanimate objects, worlds for the experiencing of fruits of past Karma, and océans, heavens and hells of various kinds. Fear of falling into hell vanishes by the mère recitation of Thy name; sinners become purified by contemplating Thee.

"Salvation (Môksha) is an end most cherished by those who are free from mundane cares. AH the other ends are evanescent: salvation alone is eternal and it is to be attained by right action, right knowledge and right faith. Right action purifies the mind and leads to right knowledge and is, besides, part and parcel of right faith. Right knowledge leads to and develops right faith. Right faith centres round the sincere attachment of a devotee to the Lord. A knowledge of the philosophy of the Suprême Being (artha-panchaka-tatvajnâna, sâtvika-sastra) is, however, absolutely necessary for the attainment of salvation. As several routes ultimately lead to the same place, so do the Vidas, the Pâñcharâtra, Yoga, Sànkhya and Pâêupata schools of philosophy, in depicting Thy greatness, aim at one and the same goal. Oh, Lord of Yadugiri! To those who have renounced the world and placed their trust in Thee, Thou art easily accessible. Benunciation of worldly desire, as is taught by the elders, is easiest to achieve and is governed by the conception of relationship between

master and servant. Indeed, if a servant disregarding the king, his master, acquires for his personal use and spends away, according to his own whims, all that is due to the latter from the different parts of the kingdom, such a servant is to be considered as being both avaricious and treacherous. If he, on the other hand, realising his own position, places before his master all the things amassed or acquired in his name and serves him, receiving from him whatever he spares after his use—in the shape of food, raiments, jewels, etc.—such a servant is worthy of being regarded as impartial and sincere. Similarly, if a person, not knowing himself, enjoys worldly pleasures thinking that he is himself absolute, such a person will neither achieve renunciation of desire nor be devoted to Thee. If he, however, realising that he is Thy servant, conscientiously serves Thee by following the prescribed course of conduct (Varnâêrama dharmangal), and experiences the pleasures extended by Thee through the Vidas and àstras, he is to be regarded as really devoted to Thee. Mere action (Karma) is not a sufficient means to attain salvation: it is just like service rendered by a servant to his master, governed by considerations of time, rémunération and the ego; it is also of a two-fold character, good and bad (satkarma, dushkarma), eternal and optional (nityam, kâmyam), and the latter (i.e. dushkarma, kâmya-karma) plunges one in illusion (avidya) and the eternal prison-house of this world (samsâramemba sereyaneyol kedapi), from the fetters of which there is no chance of redemption. Dévotion to Thee, trust in Thee and service and absolute surrender at Thy feet—these alone lead to such redemption.23

"Let Thy grâce, Oh, Lord of Yaduéaila, dawn upon me. I have approached the shadow of Thy feet to rid myself of all my troubles. Make me refreshed by satisfying my cravings. Let Thy accessibility to Thy devotees
manifest itself, and may Thou settle in the abode of my hearer. Favour me with Thy true farm manifested in the Vêdanta, the foremost of all the Vidyaê; relieve my mental torpor and enable me to gain true knowledge and dévotion at Thy feet. Let me be considered a servant of Thine and be made to float on the waves of the ocean of Thy kindness. Let the excellent doctrine of unity in diversity (Viêctâdvaita) be established in my mind. What am I in the ocean of Thy virtues? Let me be tolerated for having attempted to describe Thy glory. Let Thou be pleased with my humble words gathered from my association with elders devoted to Thee. Let me be favoured with eternal happiness and glory. I have placed my absolute trust in Thee. Let the sweet radiance effulging from the corner of Thine eyes be showered on me; let ignorance and passion (rajasamôgunâ) in me vanish and goodness (satva-gîma) be increased. Let me not be forgotten in Thy ever active business of the world. Realising that my being, forra, etc., are entirely under Thy control, I have withdrawn myself from all selfish pursuits. Worldly pleasures are transient. I desire only to serve Thee, which is eternal enjoyment. Let me be confirmed in this. Let my fear of hell be eradicated; let not my sins be made much of; let me be purged of them and protected. Let me be considered a devoted servant of Thine. I surrender myself at Thy feet and seek salvation."

Àgain, holding communion with and realizing the divine attributes of Vishçu, Chikkadëvarâja Woijeyar, int,h,e .Gîta-Gôpâlam, speaks of trust in God's grâce (Nambuge) and self-surrender to Him (Prapatti) as means to the attainment of salvation by the people;
"To the people of this world the hope of salvation lies only in the philosophy underlying the Gîtâ. As a physician administers medicine in the form of milk to the sick person who desires it, so does Chikkadëvarâja expound that philosophy to them.\(^{36}\)

"Oh, Lord Paéchima-Ranga! Tell me whether Thou knoweth not this. It is a source of pteasure for me to know that I am Thy man. I do not recollect anybody else except Thee, nor did I hâve trust in mère action, knowledge, faith and renunciation. In boyhood there is much aberration; in youth much vain pleasure; in old âge there is liability of the body to diseases of various types. The fruits of Karma never cease. Systems of philosophy are many and among them are some disputations. The truth can never be made out by penetratiing into them. Knowledge is never a sufficient means to salvation. By subjecting the body to mortification, by controlling the passions and by rigorous concentration, renunciation can never be achieved. Without giving up the hankering after the material world there can be neither true faith nor salvation.\(^{27}\)

"Oh, Lord Krishṇa! I do not accept anybody except Thee. I know Thy glory. If Thou forsake me I cannot live. I cannot be carried away by mère désir nor descend to the lower plane. I do not transgress the bounds of propriety nor am I particular about other Gods and the results they confer. I cannot swerve from the standard of duty laid down (Mudré), even for once. I do not speak with fools nor mix with tricksters. Neither do I merely hope for without understanding the nature of things, nor tease Thee by entering the wrong path. I do not enter différent routes and wander hère and there, nor engross myself in seûsual pleasures. I do not wish to be born again in this world.\(^{28}\)

\(^{26}\) Gi. GG, pp. 2-8, w. 10-11. \(^{27}\) Ibid., pp. 47-48. \(^{28}\) Ibid, pp. 48-49.
"I am gratified to-day. Giving up all other things, I stand firmly rooted in my position as a servant of Thine. Prostrating at Thy feet, wearing Thy sacred Tiha and Mudras and the clothes, undertaking Thy service, accepting Thy offerings and gifts, looking at Thy divine figure, playing before Thee, mixing with Thy servants, recounting Thy virtues, relying upon Thy infinité love, bênding at the feet of Thy devotees, acting according to Thy gràce and becoming the servant of Thy servants, as I have been, protect me, Oh, Lord! *

"I am always listening to Thy glory and praising Thee. I am settling Thee in my heart, beantifying and devoutly worshipping at Thy beautiful feet. Thou art my Lord; My attachment and love are no burden to Thee. Happy indeed am I, having alighted all my burdens at Thy feet.30

"Oh, people of the world! place your trust in our Lord, Yâdava Náràyana, and be happy. Look back with scorn on your previous conduct; behave well at présent to avoid censure in the future. From hence follow one line of truth and be good. Understand your position well. Oling to an approved course of conduct. Eevile at pride, préjudice and arrogance. Enter von the path agreeable to the good. Shuffle off the hard knot (biru-gaûtu) of Karma and cleanse away the dust of evil from your minds. With a pure heart and mind, follow the right standards and live on well for ever.31

"Tear off and cast away the conceit that we can obtain release by our own conduct. Trust in the higher powers, alight your burden, hâve peace and attain bliss. Trust in the Suprême Being (Parama Purusha). He iremoves ail sins caused by the sensés and purges out ail défile­ment. He exalts you to the plane of your elders and confers prosperity on you. He forgets and forgives the sins of past birth and grants whatever is sought for. He

shines in the heart of hearts, yielding infinité pleasure. He cuts at the root of *Karma* and shuts the mouth of Death. He grants purity of mind and loves and protects one and all. He is the life-spirit of all his devotees."

Of the religion of Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar thus evolved, toleration was, from the beginning, a prominent feature. Although, as indicated, his early éducation and training had been conducted under the essentially Srī-Vaishāvī. influences of the time, it was broad-based enough to enable him to understand and appreciate the points of view of religions other than érī-Vaishāvism. This particular feature of his attainments was, it would seem, fully developed during the period 1668-1673 when he came into contact with Viśāi āksha-Pāṇḍit and Shaḍa-ksharaiya, représentatives, respectively, of the Jaina and Viśa-éaiva religions. They, together with Tirumalārya, not only became his colleagues during his studies but their association with him appears to have given him ample opportunities to discuss with them the fundamentals of their respective faiths. The spirit of enquiry and discussion became so strongly developed in him during the period, that it continued to dominate his character throughout his reign (1673-1704). Ordinarily, during years of peace, religious disputations and discussions formed a regular feature of the activities of Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar's court. Chidānanda, a contemporary Jaina writer, testifies to Chikkadēvarāja's penetrating

94. See *Rej. Kath.*, XII. 474-475, where Dēvachandra, for instance, speaks of Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar as earnestly engaging himself in listening to discussions on Srī-Vaishāvā, Viśa-éiva and Jaina systems of philosophy, conducted, respectively, by Tirumalārya, Shaḍakshari and Viśalāksha-Pāṇḍit, each of them an expert exponent of his faith. There seems little doubt that Chikkadēvarāja, in his religious and philosophical studies, brought to bear a mind well trained in the principles of dialectics, as testified to by Tirumalārya (see text of f.n. 5 in Ch. XI).
95. See under *Social life* below.
96. *Suvimāna*, I, 7; see also Kīmanda. *Nt.* (of Chikkupālīya), I, 69; *Sakala-dharmācharya-yuktam*.
knowledge of the secrets of all forms of faiths (sakalamârgadamarmadolaganaridu), and refers to his constant enquiries into and discussions on Mîmâmsaèiva, Vaishrîava and Jaina Systems of philosophy and religion (parama Mîmâmsa Saiva varavaishnava Jaina samaya charcheyoitada). The composition of his own Council—consisting of Jaina, Vîra-êiva and Brâhmanical éléments—in the early part of his reign points to the breadth of his religious outlook. As already indicated, he encouraged, and even openly professed, the doctrines of sects and creeds other than èri-Vaishnavism. His grants, as we shall relate, were made to all the three sects of Brâhmanical Hinduism—Smârthas, èri-Vaishnavas and Mâdhvás, though the èri-Vaishnavas generally secured a greater share of them than the other two sects. Grants and concessions were likewise made, and extended, to the Jainas and Vîra-êaivas, though their comparative rarity from 1686 onwards has, perhaps, to be explained by the ascendency of Srî-Vaishnavism in court circles during that period. Of Jainism, it is said that it so profoundly impressed Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar in the early years of his reign that he went to the extent of observing the absolute sanctity of all animal life (jîvadayâparanâgi), giving up certain prohibited things and ordering the servants of his own (Palace) household to bring only purified water for his use. Again, Chidânanda, speaking of certain differences caused by his own succession to the Jain pontifical seat (of Chârukîrti-Pai^titaryôgîndra) at sravana-BeJagola, tells us how he was securely established there with the help of Chikkadëvarâja. As regards Saivism, Chikkadëvarâja, in his own work Gîta-Gôvatam, refers to his respect for

86. Ibid., I, 161. 87. vide under grants and other records below. 88. Ibid. 89. See Dêvachandra in ch. XV. 90. Munivam., II, 99-101; see also under literary activity in ch. XIV. 91. P. 51, v. 3 (in the tripadi at the bottom of the page): 

: kîvana pavamagyudu śiva-annikâlouda-pada | 

Kavîdû kallige jîva-kaloyita-pada ||
pnd dévotion to èiva. Another well-known contemporaneous source\textsuperscript{42} speaks of him as having been ever engaged in the worship of the Jangamas, and of his having always busied himself in the discussion of the excellent èivàchâra doctrine. It seems to hâve been the key-note of his policy that all sects and communities in his kingdom were to be protected.\textsuperscript{43} Above all, the note of universalism pervading the Gita-Gòpâlam significantly points to tòleration as an article of his personal faith.

Chikkadëvarâja Woâdeyar is, like his predecessor, reputed for the numerous gifts he made alike to individuals and institutions in and outside the kingdom. In particular, under his active encouragement, learned and deserving Brâhmanical families were, we learn,\textsuperscript{44} constantly settled in Mëlkôte, êrîrangam, Anjanagiri, Kânchî, Vikshavana, ìtâmësvaram, éankbamukha, Darbhaéayamnam, Benares, Dwârâvatipura (Dväraka?), Jagannâtha and Prayâga. One of the earliest of his acts of piety was, it is interesting to note,\textsuperscript{45} the temple he got built in honour of God Paravâsudëva, on the western bank of the Kaundini, near Gundlu-Terakanâmbi (Trikadambanâgari), in the Mâdâla-nâdu, for the attainment of perpetuai bliss by his father Ddoddadëvarâja Woâdeyar: it was provided with a car, pavilion, outer enclosure-wall and tower (vimâna-mantapa prâmëu prâkâravara-gôpuraih). In the temple thus formed, the images of God Paravásudëva and Goddess Kamalavalli and the processional image of the God with the two Goddesses (Nâchyârs)

\textsuperscript{42} Châtû verses on Chikkadëvarâja, cited in the Mys. Gs. (II. iv. 2462) from Châtupâdâyamanînamâr (Ed. by V. Prabhûkara Såstri):

Chakmagaoaçamânu . . . nejâna dhyâna . . . råjâna swâdhâmâgu
Śivâchâra darsanamund sarasu dorugu.

\textsuperscript{43} See, for instance, Muvânam., I, 165:

Sarva varôdrama pâdana pûrvako, urvîya pâḻupandau |
Sarva varoânamo gaṁbhiravâdusthae sarvaro tâhedagirînido |


\textsuperscript{45} Ibbd., II. 190-192.
which were, it is said, brought from ēivasamudram, were set up and an annual provision of 6,000 varahas was made for the services to the God and for the conduct of a Rāmānuja-kūṭa.\textsuperscript{46} Further, a quadrangular agrahāra named Pūrva-ēatakā, otherwise called Dēvanagara, was specially formed to the west of the temple, and trained Brahmānical scholars of the three sects (Srī-Vaishījavas, Mādhvas and Smārthas) were brought in from far and near and settled there with shares (vrittis) bestowed on them, exclusively for carrying on the daily and periodical services in the temple.\textsuperscript{47} A relic of this once flourishing institution is, perhaps, to be seen in a mutilated image of God Paravāsudēva, now in the Vijayanārāyaṇāsvāmi temple at Gundlupet, with an inscription\textsuperscript{48} on its pedestal referring to the God as Apratima-Paravāsudēva (ērī-Vāsudēvarāya suprasanna Srīmadapratima-Paravāsudēvah). Among other acts of piety Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar is credited with are the setting up of a temple in Seringapatam to the processional image of God évēta-Varāhasvāmi from ērī-Mushña, with his name inscribed on the pedestal as Srimadapratima Chikkadēvarāja Wadēru;\textsuperscript{49} the construction of a temple to God Gōpālakrishnasvāmi (Apratima-Kājagopāla) at Haradanahalli and Varadarājasvāmi at Varakōçlu;\textsuperscript{50} the setting up and consécration of God Venkatēśvara in the fort of Bangalore;\textsuperscript{51} the endowment of gold ornaments to the two Nāchyārs in the Nārāyaṇāsvāmi temple at Mēlkôte;\textsuperscript{52} the enlargement

\textsuperscript{46} Annals, I. 137-138.
\textsuperscript{47} E. C., Ibid., II. 122-143; see also and compare Annals, I. 188.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., Gu. 104-105; see also Ch. X, fn. 196.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., My. 89 (M. A. R., 1913, p. 57, para 128; 1918, p. 89, para 130); also Annals, I. 189.
\textsuperscript{50} Annals, I. 140.
\textsuperscript{51} E. C., IX. Br. 118 (1706), II. 7-8: Bengaluru keva valage tamma appāji-yavaru niṭṭanavā ṛaṭīśhe maṇḍirāṭanaḥ Venkaṭēśvara-svāmi, where Kaṭṭhīraḷa II (1704-1714) refers to the consécration of the God during his father's (Chikkadēvarāja's) reign.
\textsuperscript{52} E. C., M. D. Suppl. Vol., Sr. 267 (M. A. R., 1903, p. 28, para 78).
Sri-Venkatéévaravâmi (Venkataramanasvami) Temple, Fort, Bangalore—A side view.
of the bridge, the construction of a vianta\textsuperscript{a} of six ankanams near the Manjikar\textsuperscript{c}k\textsuperscript{a}-ksh\textsuperscript{e}tra, and the endowment of a silver spoon (tirtha-b\textsuperscript{b}era) to the temple of Var\textsuperscript{a}hasv\textsuperscript{a}mi at Seringapatam;\textsuperscript{m} the provision for the upkeep of the e\textsuperscript{a}iva and Vaish\textsuperscript{n}ava temples at different sacred places (like the Ch\textsuperscript{h}ammridi Hills, Nanjang\textsuperscript{d}\textsuperscript{,} M\textsuperscript{\textdegree}lk\textsuperscript{\textdegree}te, Seringapatam, Ye\textsuperscript{\textdegree}atore, E\textsuperscript{\textdegree}aman\textsuperscript{\textdegree}thapur, Kar\textsuperscript{\textdegree}gha\textsuperscript{\textdegree}ta, Benares, B\textsuperscript{\textdegree}m\textsuperscript{\textdegree}\textsuperscript{\textdegree}\textsuperscript{\textdegree}\textsuperscript{\textdegree}varam, K\textsuperscript{\textdegree}n\textsuperscript{\textdegree}ch\textsuperscript{\textdegree}, \textsuperscript{\textdegree}ir\textsuperscript{\textdegree}rangam, Kumbak\textsuperscript{\textdegree}\textsuperscript{\textdegree}n\textsuperscript{\textdegree}m, etc.), and for the livelihood of the needy, the indigent and the detectives; and the grant of special endowments (rakta-kodige) to the families of those who had fallen on the field of battle in the service of the country and the king.\textsuperscript{54}

No less important as an act of gift as of public utility was an irrigation scheme launched out by Chikkadevar\textsuperscript{a} Wodeyar between c. 1700-1701. Damming the Cauvery to the west of Seringapatam, we are told,\textsuperscript{65} he had canals excavated from both sides of the river, the northern canal being led on to a considerable distance by way of the Karigha\textsuperscript{\textdegree}ta hill and named after himself as Chikkadevar\textsuperscript{a}-sagara, and the southern canal, to the south of Seringapatam, being designated as Deva-nal\textsuperscript{a}.

In a Jesuit letter dated in 1701,\textsuperscript{66} we have an interesting contemporary account of the beginnings of this project. During 1700-1701, according to this source,\textsuperscript{57} the river (Cauvery or the Coleroon) continued to be so dry that the inhabitants of Madura and Tanjore dreaded a general famine. "Nevertheless/" continues the letter,\textsuperscript{58} "the rains had fallen in the usual season, and the waters which rush from the mountains would have

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., I. 118; Ibid, l.c.
\textsuperscript{55} See in N\textsuperscript{\textdegree}y\textsuperscript{\textdegree}aka of M\textsuperscript{\textdegree}d\textsuperscript{\textdegree}ura, pp. 515-523; Lockman's Travels—Father Martin to Father De Villette.
\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., p. 321.
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid; see also pp. 211-213.
entered the Goloran [Coleroon] sooner than ordinary, had not the king of Maissoor [Mysore] stopped their course by a prodigious mole he raised and which extended the whole breadth of the canal. His design was to turn off the waters by the bank in order that these flowing into the canals dug by him might refresh his dominions. But while he thus resolved to make his own lands fruitful and thereby increase his revenues, he was going to ruin the two neighbouring kingdoms, those of Madura and Tanjaour [Tanjore]. The waters would not have begun to rise there before the end of July, and the canal would have been dry by the middle of September. The two princes, zealous for the welfare of their respective kingdoms, were exasperated at this attempt; upon which they united against the common enemy in order to oblige him, by force of arms, to destroy a mole which did them such vast prejudice. They were making great preparations for this purpose when the river Goloran [Coleroon] revenged (as was the phrase here) the affront which had been put upon its waters, by captivating them in the manner the prince in question had done. During the time the rains descended but moderately on the mountains, the mole stood and the waters flowed gently into the canals dug for that purpose; but the instant they fell abundantly, the river swelled to such a degree that it broke the mole and dragged it impetuously along. In this manner the prince of Maissoor [Mysore], after putting himself to a great expense, was frustrated, in an instant, of the immense riches which he had hoped to gain." Although the scheme of an embankment on the Cauvery, thus originated by Chikkadēvarāja Wōdeyar in the very beginning of the eighteenth century, proved to be a failure owing to freaks of nature, the document we have quoted from amply testifies to the brilliancy of his constructive effort in a department of public works, which seems to have
profoundly impressed his critical contemporaries, the Jesuit Fathers. The canals, evidently offshoots of the scheme, are, however, extant as the vestiges of Chikka-\-devaraja's rule; but there is hardly any doubt that he was the forerunner of the later developments that Mysore has witnessed in the last half a century and more.\(^5^9\)

Among the extant records of the reign of Chikka-devaraja Wodeyar (most of which—especially the copper-plate grants issued by him—bear his signature in Kannada as Srî-Chikka-devaraja that are impressed with the Boar seal), a lithic one on an anicut at Dodda-Belur, Salem district, dated in 1673,\(^6^0\) refers to its construction by Kumâraïya (Kumâra-Râya), Dalavâi of Chikkadêvarâja. Another, dated April 18, 1673,\(^6^1\) records the erection of a temple to Gauramma at Channarâyapatp by Basavaiya, son of Dôdaiya, a feudatory of Chikkadêva. A copper-plate inscription in the possession of the Lingâyat math at Hullamballi, Malavalli taluk, also dated in the same year,\(^6^2\) registers a grant by Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar, on the holy occasion of a solar eclipse, of 212 varahas, to Budramunidêvârâdhya, lord of the Béva^âradhya math at Hullamballi, situated to the north-west of Mudakatore (Muđudore), to provide for the paraphernalia and expenses of the Svâmi's annual pilgrimage to Srîéailam. The paraphernalia, according to the record, consisted of 5 kambis or bamboo laths for carrying burdens, a musical

\(^{5^9}\) See also Ibiñ, p. 212, f.n. 15, S. K. Aiyangar's Editorial note, for a similar estimate.

\(^{6^0}\) I. M. P., II. 1216, Sa. 107: s. 1595.

\(^{6^1}\) E. C., V (1) and (3) Ch. 156: Pramâdîkha, Vaidakha sa. 11 [12?] Friday.

\(^{6^2}\) M.A.R., 1920, pp. 49-51, para 96: Pramâdikha. "It is stated as a reason for the grant," writes R. Narasimhasaghar, "that the prasada of God Mallikârjuna of Srîaila presented by the Svâmi to the king enabled him to gain undisputed possession of the kingdom." "The grant," he also adds, "comes with the signature of the king, Sri-Krisna." Unfortunately, however, the original of this document has not yet been made available.
band, a Nandi flag, parasols, chowries, a palankeen with bearers and a number of retainers. Among the expenses, it is further interesting to note, was included the annual fee of 18 varahas for a Brâhman who was to perform the Mrityunjaya-japam in the Mallikârjuna temple every morning, naming the nakshatra or asterism tinder which the king was born. A lithic record, dated January 28, 1674, refers to the construction of a large gateway (kallu hebbâgilu) at Kunigal, named the Mysore Gâte (Maisûra bâgalu), by Siddarâjaiya of Talakâd, local agent of Chikkadévarâja. On December 6, 1674 (Le., on the day of the annual ceremony of his father Dođda- dêvarâja Wođeyar), Chikkadévarâja Wođeyar, according to the Dëvanagarga copper-plate grant having formed a second quadrangular agrahâra (of well-furnished houses each fifty feet square) named Dvitiya-éataka, in the country to the west and north of the Kauṇḍinï not far from Dëvanagarga, granted it exclusively to eighty érî-Vaishnava Vëdic Brâhmans of various gòtras, sûtras and éâkhas, with shares (vrittis) in sixteen villages, in the Arikuthàra-stbala in the Hadinâd-sîme to the north of Dëvanagarga, yielding annually 828 nishkas. Again, the Chàmarâjanagar Plate, dated November 25, 1675, records the grant by Chikkadévarâja—also on the anniversary day of Doddadévarâja’s death—for the merit of his father, of two villages named Kabbiligapura (otherwise called Chikkadévarâjapura) and Hullaça (otherwise known as Krishnâpura), in the Terakaçàmbi country, to Krisêça-Yajva of Srîvatsa-gòtra.

63. Z. C., XII Kg. 7: s. 1895, Pramâdîthca, Mâgha âs. 2, Wednesday.
64. Ibíd., Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol., My. 115, li. 151-200 (M.A.R., 1912, pp. 56-57, para 187). Though the grant was made on December 6, 1674 (s. 1896, Ananda, Mârgadiva âs. 2, Sunday), the record itself, for reasons stated in Ch. XIV (see under Literary activity: Bâmîkâram-Tiruma-léya), appears to have been actually composed between 1888-1890. Cf., Annals, I. 186-189.
Àpastambha-sûtra and Yajueââkhâ, son of èrûnivâsârya and grandson of ÔrûnivSsa, as a gift for having performed through him the funeral cérémonies of Doûdadévarâja Woûeyar at Gaya. A lithic record, dated March 24, 1676, relates to Chikkadévarâja's gift of the village of Bommanahalli, in Uduvankanâdu-sthala, to provide for a work of merit, namely, an inn for the distribution of food to Bràhmans in Haradanahalji (nomma dharmavâgi Brûhmarige anna-châtra nađeva mariyâdege dhârâ-dattavâgi). Among other records of 1676 are two lithic ones from the Coimbatore district: One of these refers to the érection of mantapams and the grant of a salagai of paddy land by two private individuals (Rangâ-nâtha Setti and another) to the temple of Subrahmanya at Kumârâpâlayam; another, from the Gôbichettipâlayam taluk, records the building by Chikkadévarâja Wodeyar of a temple for God Kumàrasvâmi on the Dhavalagiri hill in the Dûrvâsa-kshëtra, near the confluence of the rivers Chintâmanî and Bhavânî at Satyamangalam in the Uduvankanâdu. Two duplicates of a êâsana-nirupa, dated May 8, 1677, and addressed to Hampaiya of Arkalgûd Astavane-sthaja, communicate an order of Chikkadévarâja confirming in his office of hereditary êânbhôgi of Arkalgûd one Venkatapati, son of Bhaira-Hebbâruva, who had viodicated his claim against the accusations of his enemy Nanjappa, son of Narasappa, an associate or deputy (hastaka) of Bhaira-Hebbâruva. A lithic record, dated [January 7] 1678, registers the grant by Chikkadévarâja, on the occasion of Makara-Sankrânti, of the village of Mundûr as an agrahâra. Another, from the Tiruchchengôdu taluk, dated Febru-
ary 3, 1678,\textsuperscript{70} refers to the présentation of the images of *Dvârapâlakas* to the temple of Channarâya-Perumâl (Channakééava) at Éâyadurga (éankhagiri, also called Kunnattûr-durga), by Muddaiya, agent of Nanjanâthaiya, an officer of Chikkadëvarâja Woqeyar. A third, dated April 7, 1679,\textsuperscript{71} records the setting up and consécration of the images of Subrahmaçya and the Aravattumûvar (the 63 èaiva saints) in the temple of Kailásanâtha at Târâmangalam (Vâmalûr taluk, Salem district), by Kempaiya, son of èamaiya (Châmaiya), agent of Chikkadëvarâja. Among other records of 1679 (Siddhârthiti), a lithic document\textsuperscript{72} from the Gaurî-êankara temple, Talakâd, refers to the establishment of God Mallëéa—otherwise known as Gaurî-êankara—in Kari-vana (Talakâd), by Koṭṭûraiya, agent of Chikkadëva; a *nirûpa*\textsuperscript{73} speaks of a gift by the latter (tyâge pàlistaru); and a copper-plate charter\textsuperscript{74} describes a grant made by him (Chikkadëvarâja), in the presence of God Venkatëéa of Nilâchala (Karîghatta), of payments to four èrï-Vaïshnava Brâhmans. The *Garant copper-plate charter*, dated January 21, 1680,\textsuperscript{75} records the formation by Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar, on the occasion of *Ardhôdaya*, of an agrahâra named *Chikkadëvarâya-pura* in the village of Garani and the six hamlets attached thereto (in the Bijjavara-sîme), and the grant of the same, divided into 50 shares, in the presence of God Ranganâtha, to Brâhmans of various gòtras, sùtras and

\textsuperscript{70} M.E.R., 1930, p. 51, App. B. No. 512: s. 1800, Pâingalâ, Mâgha ba. 7. The *Reprint* places the record in 1679, taking s. 1800 as an expired year. But *Pâingalâ* actually corresponds to s. 1699. Taking the data of the cyclic year as the more correct data, the record is to be dated February 3, 1679.


\textsuperscript{73} I.M.O., No. 19-1-52, p. 10.

\textsuperscript{74} E.C., III (3) Sr. 151.

\textsuperscript{75} Ibid, Bangalore Dist. Suppl. Vol., Br. 144 (M.A.R., 1816, p. 68, para 180): s. 1801, Siddhârthiti, Pueiya ba. 80. This record is composed by Abhâni-Venkatôbârya of Kuvalka-gòtra (evidently a functionary of Chikkadëvarâja), and engraved by Vitâmbârya, son of Gurumârti (vide ll. 94-95).
éâkhas, 40 of them Srî-Vaishnavas, 5. Mâdhvas and 5 Smârthas. Among other records of the period are inscriptions registering a provision for the daily oblations to God Nârâyaña at Mêlkôте by Dajavâï Kumâraiya, and for the feeding of Brâhmans during the Mahânâvami by Niyôgi Bhànôji-Paṇḍîta, respectively.

A lithic record, dated in November 1681, refers to a grant for God Nannëévara of Hinakal by Appûrâya-Hebbâruva (an agent of Chikkadëvaràja Woðeyar for the collection of customs dues). Another, dated in September 1682, records a gift by Chikkadëvaràja of the village of Mâdâpura in Bidure-sîme to God Ânjanëya. A third, dated January 24, 1685, registers the grant by Chikkadëva of the village of YëchiganahâlJi, in the Mysore hôbli, to "Doñda-Paṇḍîta of Yejavandûr" (Viéâlâksha-Paṇḍîta of Yejandûr). A fourth, dated May 8, 1685, speaks of his having got constructed a "meritorious and large pond" (Èringâra-kolâ) in the fort at Majavalli, for the perpétuai increase of his merit and famé. A fifth, dated August 12, 1685, deals with the grant by him, at the time of Krishna-Jayanti, of certain lands in Mânikâpura (excluding the garden land therein, inherited by Tirumalaiyangâr), for the worship of God Gôpâlasvâmi who, it is said, had appeared to Alasingaraiyangâr (Singaraiyangâr II, father of Tirumalaiyangâr). The Seringapatam Temple copper-plate charter, dated November 19, 1686, records how Doñda-Dêvaiya, a servant of Chikkadëvaràja Woðeyar

77. E.C., III (1) My. 11: Durmati, Kârtika ât?
78. Ibid, XII Ch. 62: s. 1684, Dunda bhâ, Bhâdrapada ba.? The date here is an error for 1604.
79. Ibid, III (1) Nj. 41 : s. 1686, Baktakhô, Pushya ba. 50. Rice places this record in 1684, but the data contained in it actually correspond to January 24, 1686. Cf. Dêvachandra in Ch. XV.
80. Ibid, Mj. 61 : s. 1607, Krâthana, Vaishakh ba. 15.
81. Ibid, My. 7 : s. 1607, Krâthana, Shravana ba. 8.
82. Ibid, Sr. 14 : s. 1609, Akshaya, Mârgâsastra ba. 15.
and son of Cheluvamma, bearer of golden goblet to the wife of king [Chikka] Dëvaràja Wodeyar, set up the image of Sri-Kôdanda-Rama, with Sïta and Lakshmana in attendance, in the middle precincts on the southern side of Seringapatam, and how, with the object of providing for the God's worship and festivals, he presented the village of Avvêrahalli (belonging to Balagula) with the permission of Chikkadëvarâja. A lithic record, dated November 3, 1690, speaks of Chikkadëva as having caused to be made a mantapa-brindâvana at Maddagiri. A nirûpa, dated November 28, 1692, addressed by Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar to Sunkada-Linga, records the remission of tolls and other dues over the property belonging to God Allâlanâtha of Hangaja. Another, of the same date, addressed by Chamaiya (an official of Chikkadëvarâja) to the Manëgârs and Kôlukârs of the Térakaçâmbi-sïme, is to the following effect: "Marriage-tax (maduve-sunka), tax on live cattle (jiva-danada-sunka), tax on workshops (pattadisutnka), etc.—ail these taxes should not be collected from the village of Yaçlavanahalli. On the roadside in the Terakanàmbi-sïme, no obstruction should be caused to the passage of bulls while conveying them after purchase." An inscription from Avanâsi, dated in 1695, records the grant to God Avanàéïévara, by Gurikâr Mallaiya (an agent of Chikkadëva), of the fées of 14 panams (hana) on some bags and 12 on some other bags of goods. Among the records of Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar, assignable to the period c. 1681-1695, an epitaph at Bantënahalli, Bëlûr taluk, registers a gift by him; a
number of boundary atones\textsuperscript{88} from parts of Guççllupet, Çhâmârâjanagar and Nanjangûd taluks are found to contain the officiai monogram introduced by Chikkadêvârâja, namely, \textit{De Maisûru, Maisûru De}; a lithic inscription\textsuperscript{89} on a wall in the verandah of the Vimala-Tîrthankara-Basti at Bellûr speaks of the érection of the Chaityâlaya—on the land granted by [Chikka] Dêvarâja Wodeyar—by Sakkare Setti, son of Dodda-Âdanna Setti and grand son of Hulikal Padmanna Setti, on the ad vice of his Guru Lakshmisêna-Bhattâraka, lord of the thrones of Delhi, Kollâpur, Jina-Kanchi and Penukonâ.

A lithic record\textsuperscript{90} on the east slope of Nijagal-durga, chronicling the items done by Dâsarâjaiya, son of Biluguli Kempa\textsuperscript{*} râjaiya, a servant of Chikkadêvârâja Wodeyar, during a period of twenty years from 1698, speaks of his having begun the construction of the fort of Nijagal-durga (otherwise known as Sûragiri-durga) on December 2, 1698 (é. 1620, Bahudhânya, Mârgaéira \textit{su.} 10) after setting up the image of God Vighnëévara, in front of the principal gâte, in August. A copper-plate charter from Dévarâya-durga, dated April 24,1699,\textsuperscript{91} records the setting up and consécration of Goddess Kalyâçalakshmi in the présence of God Narasimha of Karigiri, and the grant, as an \textit{archaka-svâsti}, to Alama-Sigarâchârya (son of Chikka-Narasaiya and grandson of Narasaiya of \textit{Chikkadêvaraya-durga}, of Kàéyapa-gôtra, Bôdhâyana-sûtra and Yajuâéâkhâ), of lands in Anupina-halli and Chinuvâdanahalli (belonging to Ànebiddajari-sthâja) to provide for the worship and festivals of the

\textsuperscript{88} \textit{E.C.}, IV (2) Gu. 96-102 (M.A.R., 1918, p. 59, para 180). \textsuperscript{89} \textit{Ibid.}, Ng. 43. \textsuperscript{90} \textit{Ibid.}, IX Nt. 66; cf. \textit{M. A. B.}, 1914-1915, p. 69, para 185; also \textit{E. C.}, \\
\textit{Bangalore Dist. Suppl. Vol.}, Nt. 66 revised.

\textsuperscript{91} \textit{Ibid.}, XII Tr. 45: t. 1620 expired, \textit{Prasadhhi, Vaidakkha su. 5, Monday.} Dâsarâjaiya, referred to here, is distinct from the one mentioned in the previous record (vide t. n. 90 supra). He is perhaps identical with Dsa-

râjaiya, Daljavî of Chikkadêvarâja during 1703-1704. The grant appears obviously to have been made by him before he became the Daljavî.
Goddess—by [Dalavâi] Dâsarâjaiya-Timmapparâjaiya, son of Krishnaïya and grandson of Biluguli Timmarâjaiya. Another record, a lithic one, dated October 13, 1699,\(^92\) refers to the formation of the tank of Dëvarâya-samudra by Doddaiya, son of Sangaiya and grandson of Channa-vîraiya, under the orders of Chikkadêvarâja Wođeyar. A nirûpa of Chikkadêvarâja, dated August 8, 1700,\(^98\) addressed to Dâsaiya, Pârupatyagâr of Nâgamangala, is to the following effect: "The Àyakanahalli agrahâra, formed previously, is to be handed over to the charge of the Brâhmans. Manage the affairs smoothly. This nirûpâ is to be got copied in the kadita of the Sânabhôg and left with the donees." Another, dated June 8, 1703,\(^94\) addressed to Jois Ànandâlvâr, refers to Dëvaiya as having been entrusted with the management of affairs (pârupatya) of Hangala-sîme in Dêvanagara hônli, and directs that the treasury seal (hastântara mudre-ungura) pertaining thereto should be handed over to him. A third, of the same date,\(^95\) addressed to the same individual, is to the following effect: "We have ordered the reconstruction on a sound footing and repair of tanks and ponds in Hangaja-sthala, which have breached: let 500 varahas out of the annual revenues from this place be utilized for the purpose, with due regard to increase in the revenue resources of the government. The ryots should be allowed 200 khandugas of corn as half the share of produce (vïdra) and permitted to use 100 oxen and 150 sheep. Besides, they should be granted 250 varahas out of the revenues of Hangala, for the purchase

\(^{92}\) Ibid, Mi, 16 : 1. 1691, Praûthi, Kartaâka su. 2, Friday.
\(^{93}\) I. M. C., No. 19-1-55 (Extract No. 9) : Vikrama, Bhadrapada su. 5.
\(^{94}\) Ibid, No. 19-1-58, p. 29: Svabhôm, Jhâhika su. 6.
\(^{95}\) Ibid, pp. 80-81: Ibid. This record adequately points to Chikkadêvarâja's solace for the welfare of the agricultural population in rural parts. Among the actual expressions used in the document are: Hangajadâ-sálâdali kâstu-kâyirâma koro-kâstijgaiâ saka balandâ kâtinuchâyas kâyajyannâ mâyâsüvâ . . . hirânâdgi pûru-pachâyegallam agu-nâdâ . . . sakalâvâda bâda-prajyajâgallëna kâpadî nâjî , i bombadâu.
Bhakta-vigraha of Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar in the Paravasudeva Temple, Gundlupet.
of sheep; and the administration is to be so conducted that all the poor subjects are duly protected."

No authentic statue of Chikkadēvarâja Wodeyar has, however, so far come to light, although we have, on one of the pillars in the temple of Paravâsudèva, at Gundlupet, a bas-relief figure of his, a Bhakta-vigraha, with his crest sloping on one side (vdraéikhi sahitavâgiruvante).^  

Social ideals had been deeply rooted in the soil for ages. However cataclysmic the effects of certain of the political events of the reign, they appear to have touched but the fringes of social life in the country. The period was in the main, as is depicted for us by contemporary writers,^ characterized by timely rains, good harvests, growth of wealth and increase in the general happiness of the subjects, and immunity from the fear of war (râjika bhayamilladeyum), especially during the latter part of the reign (i.e., 1696-1704). As one responsible for the maintenance of social order, Chikkadēvarâja Wodeyar, we are told,^ strove to preserve and perpetuate the ancient ideal of Varnàèrama-dharma, with a view to promote social harmony on the one side and domestic felicity on the other. Whatever may be said against the caste System as it obtains to-day, there can be no question that in the days we are writing of, it helped to hold the different grades of society together and enabled the king to administer the country with due respect to law and order. The respect for varna and áérama,

---

96. See Annals, I. 188, where the cutting of the bas-relief is attributed to Chikkadêvarâja himself.  
97. See, for instance, Hadi. Dhar., IX, 57-58; C. Bi., p. 4 (prose passage in second para).  

vadadri râjmanarâdža go/阇/=vu/srapamâna: Varnâèramanugyamâma 

nuçyada putiçaram akshëavuduñarningsa, etc.
reflected in the works of the period, means no more than that they bound society together into one whole and held it together for the benefit of its component parts. As indicated above, ērī-Vaishñavism, which was at the height of its power during the period, with its insistence on humility as a virtue and grâce as a prerequisite for salvation, made varnāsramā lose its harsher and cruder features.

Contemporary social life continued to find the most characteristic expression in cities and towns, of which we have authentic descriptions extant. Thus, of Seringapatam, the capital city, we learn: "Surrounded by the Cauvery, its impregnable fort presented a majestic appearance, what with its lofty ramparts, newly constructed rows of spirals, deep moat, wickets, bastions, flag-staffs and banners of various descriptions. Inhabited by the Brāhmans, Kshatriyas, Vaiñyas and éûdras, adorned by glittering temples and richly ornamented mansions (including the Palace) and storeyed buildings set with pinnacles, by the elephant-stables, horse-stables, by the grand Sun and Moon streets and by the market-street (with shops of grocers, jewellers, cloth merchants and métal merchants, among others) and the courtesans' street—it was a delightful city in the plénitude of its glory and prosperity. In keeping with this, a lithic record, dated in 1685, speaks of Seringapatam thus: "With plītm, jack, cocoanut, plantain, lime, orange, fig and other fruit trees, with houses as high as hills, was the city filled; and with cows and Brāhmans, with trees of plenty, with temples, with fine éléphants like Airāvata, with horses neighing like the thunder of clouds, with splendid chariots and foot-soldiers, a beautiful city, having splendid gateways, an ornament to the lady Earth, surrounded by the Cauvery.""

99. See Sri Mahat. (of Mallikārjuna), I I, 46-47,
100. E.C., III (1) Ml. 61. II. 2-10,
Mysore, of which we have a similar account, was likewise a flourishing city, with its fort (conspicuous by lofty spikes, ramparts, tiger-faced gates, wickets, bastions, flag-staffs, cannons, etc.), with a garden (upavana) well laid out with flower and fruit trees, with the principal streets (named after the Sun and the Moon) lined with pinnacled and storeyed mansions (including the Palace in the middle) inhabited by the four-fold classes following their respective vocations, and with the market and the courtesans' streets.

Among the towns, Mělkôte was at the zenith of its glory as the stronghold of Śrī-Vaishnavism in Mysore; Malavatli was a flourishing place, with its fort surrounded by a deep moat; and Dēvanagara, on the banks of the Kaundinī, was a self-sufficient cultural unit. Bangalore, Gubbi and Turuvëkere, among others, were, as indicated in the preceding chapter, important centres of trade and commerce.

From references in contemporary sources, we obtain a fair picture of the state of Hindu society and of general culture during the period, which, in the main, is in accord with the standards laid down in the classical literature of India (e.g., Kautilya's Artha-Śāstra, Laws of Manu, etc.). Thus, in the city of Mysore, the Brāhmans were noted as repositories of Vedic learning and culture; the Kśatriyas were reputed as warriors, as devotees of Vishnu and as persons of taste; the Vaiṣyas were distinguished for their wealth and liberality; and the ēvêdras, ever devoted to the service of the other...
classes, were secure and prosperous in their profession of
agriculture. The capital city of Seringapatam was filled
with priests, poets, wise men and ministers, and the
town of Majavalli with men learned in the Védânta,
érutti, Smjrti and Dharma-éâstras, while at Dëvanagara,
Brahmane of all the three sects, learned in Védas,
Sâstras, the two Systems of Védânta, Drâviďa-Ámnàya and
érauta and Smârtha ritualism, had been settled. Among
the items of costume and ornaments provided for these
scholars were, it is interesting to note, silken garments
for the body (kauïëya), silken head-dress (paññòçñïçam),
ear-rings (ky,ndali) and finger-rings (angulïyaka).
Alasingarjrya (Singaraiyangâr II) and his son Tirumalârya
(Tirumalaiyangâr) were among the typical Srî-Vaishnava
scholars of the period. Olosely connected with the
court of Mysore as Paurârnika to the Royal House from about
the middle of the seventeenth century, Alasingarârya had
by 1678 become familiarly known as ärmlad-Vëdamârga-
pratiçthâpanâchârya, Udbhaya- Védântâchârya, Vaish-
nava-dharma-mûrîti and Paramârtha-vâdî. Indeed
his influence on the court of Mysore seems to have been
not inconsiderable till 1685, in an inscription of which

105. Sîr, Mabât., I, 149-152: Vëdâghâbanâjñâla chaïu-râyan unmuta kâla-
niñyañ parumârđa-dêrgâj . . . dvijç | Dhùra-dhirâhita dhümipäla
śiñîñâja . . . śîtijnâjñâja . . . sañçãrdgrinâ
Achâyuteñata padasântk kajâ-kovadar . . . kâkîryâr | Paurârn
pomarâjgnâla . . . porchîni . . . udârngupadoj pogodîrâ
dañkîjñâjkar ñeñledegurupìjgar . . . dhûnañmatiyam . . . | Narâca
mâhamsadade Bhavâjñâra-rañiñadadhâju . . . bhavâjñâda
pemmesiñci përmeyndipûdãrâ dhânya-râjignâla-nendesuersalâññuñ
chùlîvagam Harigâlarambhavakalâññuñ paradoj-dahu-dhiñmadâ-j
geyam.]
107. Ibid., II. 15-16: Vëdânta-sañkâśa Sûtisparañ, Smûti Dharma Vëdyâñ pûryâ.
Vëdânta-sañkâśa-ábâjan Drâviďanërjñâna paragan . . . drâvita
smârtha vëdâñenadâ.
109. Ibid., II. 190-191.
110. See E.C., IV (3) Kr. 48, II. 12-14; III (1) Sr. 94, II. 12-14; Hâdi. Dhar.,
IX, 61; see also f.n. 128 infra.
111. Ibid., III (1) My. 7, II. 11-12; see also f.n. 81 supra.
year Chikkadēvarâja Woḍeyar refers to him as a principal dependent of his (namma mukhyâsrita). He appears to have died between 1685-1698. His son Tirumalârya (also known as Srïsailârya, the Sanskritised form of Tirumalârya), apart from his activities as minister, poet and scholar of the court of Chikkadēvarâja, profoundly impressed his contemporaries, particularly from 1698 onwards, as a celebrated ērî-Vaishêtava philosophical teacher, respected by Chikkadēva and revered by his disciples, amongst whom was his own younger brother Singarârya (SingaraiyangârII). From the account left by the latter, it would seem that Tirumalârya was a person of fine stature (wearing the Urdhvapunâram, the sacred thread and a garment leading from the navel to the ankle) with a serene countenance, a disciple of Vâdhûla-śrînivâsârya, an ardent devotee of God Nrsimha of Yadugiri (Mëlktote) and an erudite scholar expounding to his band of disciples the right course of conduct and interpreting the abstruse thoughts of great teachers.

As a centre of social activities, Seringapatam, during the period of Chikkadēvarâja's reign, had become the cynosure of contemporary powers. His court appears to have been the very symbol of the culture and tastes of the times. Ordinarily he used to conduct his Durbâr (oddôlaga) in the magnificent court hall of the Palace (âsthâna-mantapa, sabhâ-mantapa, sâtakumbha-stham-bhalaya) known as Saundarya-vilâsa, which was adorned

---

1. The Durbâr Hall.

---

113. Ibid., p. 2; also Y. N. Stavâh, etc., pp. 119-126, vv. 1, 4-8, 91, 44, 54-66, etc.
114. Y. N. Stavâh, etc., pp. 119-126, vv. 1-7, 9-27, 45-55, etc.
by an exquisitely carved, ornamented entrance (avara), pillars (sthambha), architraves (bōdigē), beams (tole), walls (bhittī) and platform (jagati). Dressed in glittering and well-bordered upper garment of white silk (vidyut-prabhāmbara, pattāmbara-dukula, anchina dwwata, dhautāmbara), wearing the richly embroidered coatee (kanchuka) and the crown (sirshadol dharisi Kirītamam; makutavardhana kirita manigana), having the tīkā on his forehead, his person beautified with badges (pendeya), medal lions (padaka), necklaces (koralsara, hurwnanjvya kanthamāle, hāra), finger-rings (anguliyaka), ear-rings (karna-bhūshana, bāvali, chaukuli), bracelets (kankana, kēyūra, kataka), wristlets (kaigala pachcha), sasbes (kati-sūtra) and anklets (nūpura, manijīra, kālpasadana) set with pearls and precious stones of various descriptions, his knot of hair tied up with fragrant flowers (parimaladaralam mudīdu), with ornamented sandals adorning his feet (rannada hāvuge, kanaka pāduke), and with the jewelled dagger (rannada chikkathāri) in his hand, Chikkadēvarāja Woeyar, we learn, would proceed in state to the Durbar Hall. Seated in the golden palankee (kana-kāndholikārūdhanāgi), with the five different kinds of music playing (pancha-mahāvādyangal), and accompanied by emblems like the umbrella, chowries, fans and ensigns (āvrtachchatra chāmara vyajana sīguri patāka samuhanum) and the courtezans (sannutāngiyar, bēlevengal), he would make himself conspicuous by occupying the jewelled throne (ratna-sīmāsana, simha-pītha). The Durbar Hall (sabhā-bhāvana, mantapa) would be adorned

by the following classes of courtiers: thenobility, including relations blood royal (bândhavar, bandhutati) such asbrothers and sons of the king (bhrâtru-sutar) and junior members of Arasu families (kuvarar), well-wishers (hitaram) and distinguished personages (mahônnetarum); tributary chiefs, feudatories and ministers from foreign courts (maniva bhûpâlakar, dharaiyîear, salmantar, digdêêtä mantrîvarar); civil and military officers, such as Ministers and Councillors (sachivar, pradhânar, amâtayar), financiers (karanîkar) and the Commander-in-Chief (danânantha, sênâitì); officials of the general administration (prabhûtavadavar); members of the diplomatic service (niyôgi-varga, sandhi-vigraha-sanchiyabhryajana-varga), including functionaries (niyôgi), news-carriers (harikâra) and interpreters (râyasamam tilupuvar); learned Brâhmans (vipra-prakara, budhâvalî, vibudha-vitâna, vidvajjåla), including scholars in Vëdas, Smritis, êastras, Epies, Purânas and various Àgamas. (êruti-kôvidar, êruti-smrti-abhijnar, vêdarasajnar, êästrajnar, bharatajnar, purânavidar, kathâkuéalar, nàna-agdmajnar); readers (gamakigal, gamakiêrûni), grammarians (vyâkarânajnar), connoisseurs in

3. The Courtiers.

...
poetics (alankåra-rasyaynar), poets (kavinivaha, kaviē-varar, kavirasajanar), experts in literature and various arts and sciences (såhitya-viéaradar, nânå-kalå-pravi-nar, akhila-såstra-kôvidar), and disputants and elocutionists (vådistôma, vågmikar, våkparmatar); the professional class, coraprising priests (purôhitar), astrologers (jôyisar), physicians (vaidyar), scribes (lipijnar), songsters (gâyakar, gâyaka-nikåya), lutists (vainikar), courtezans (ganikeyar, vârânganeyar), dancers (natar, nata-samudâya), wrestlers (mallar), jesters or buffoons (parihdsakar) and panegrists (påthakar, vandi-vrinda, vandi-mågadådhyar); the warriors (yôdhar, bhata-niku-rumba, bhatåli) and skilled éléphant-riders and cavaliers (gajaturugårôhana-praudhar, våhalika-vyûha); and the menials (bhâtya-varga, ûligadavar), including doorkeepers (pratlhâri), mace-bearers (vëtradhâri), chamberlains (kanchuki), and bearers of tassels (kuncha), fans (tåla-vrintakdy bijjanige), bétel, perfume and wreaths of flowers (vïlya-gandha-pushpamâle) aod of the pouch (sanchi), the sword (khadga), the waving goblet (åratiya gindi) and the chowry (châmara). The beauty and grandeur of the scène, as depicted, would evidently be enhanced by the glittering ear-rings (karna-bhûshana), necklaces (håra) and swords (khadga) of the feudatories and supplicant chiefs; by the lustre of the red-coloured silken and lace upper garments (chandragâviya melpodake) and ornaments of gold and pearl (ponna-gejje, fnani-bhûshana, bhûshana-châyeyim), worn by the courtezans; and by the radiance of scimitars (mahåkaMkthêyaka-dyôtiyim) held by the warriors (vïrabhatåli).

Music (sangîïa)—vocal (gåna) and instrumental (vådya)—and dancing (nåtya, abhina-ya) occupied a prominent place in the programme of the Durbår. The vocal

118. Yad. Måhat.t I I, 71, 74; Chikkadèveendra-Vam. pp. 24-25, w. 125,128; Kåmand. Ni., I, 97-98.
musicians (pāduva-gāyakar) are referred to as having been experts in their art (sangīta-kalāvidar, sangīta* sārajnar). We have reference to the symphony of the pancha-mahāvādyya consisting of instruments like the horn, tabor, conch shell, kettle-drum and gong. The lute (viṇā), as an item of instrumental music, seems to have been very popular. The lutists (vainikas) are depicted as having been skilled in the art of keeping time while performing on the instrument (viṇā-vādana tatva-laya-jnāna-kuéalarāda). Dancing was, as usual, the forte of the courtesans (varānganeyar, nartakiyar), and was accompanied by the soft music (nuncharadodane) of the quarter tones (éruti), measure (tāla), tabor (mrdanga) and the guitar (tantri). It was, we further note, also characterized by considerable precision, ingenuity and expressiveness in respect of form, technique, movements of the body, behaviourism, sentiments and unity of effect.

Among other items of the programme were: discourses on sacred lore including the other items. Vēdas (trayī), Purāṇas (purāṇa śanchaya vichāra, kathā praéamse,
kuiala-kathā ēravanaṇa, purāṇadolanā daripudu) and the Vaishnava literature (vaishnava kathā); disputations of scholars in various subjects (bahuiāstra-vāda) including religion and metaphysics (ānvikshaki, vēdānta); expounding of the classical sciences of économies and politics (vārta, dandanīti) and of maxims (yuktigalu); literary entertainments—particularly in poetry (ghana-sāhiti-rasānurakti, sarasa-kavitva, sāhitya-prasanga; kavi-prasanga); the tendering by supplicant chiefs (maniva bhūpālakar) of tributes and présents (kappa-kānike) consisting of necklaces (hāra), golden palankeens (hēmada pallakki), rutting éléphants (mada-mātangāli), silken robes (dukūla), horses (vājī) and swords (khadgāvī); and the recitation of the king's titles and benedictory verses (par&ku, birudāvali) by the panegyrists. The Durbār would corne to a close on the honouring of the Durbāris with bétel, perfume and flowers (vēlyagandha-pushpamāle) and the rewarding of the musicians, courtezans and panegyrists with jewels and cloths (pasadanam kottu, pasāyanamanittu). After this, Chikkadēvarāja Wočieyar would retire to his apartmënt in the Palace.134

Feasts and festivities were a regular feature of social life during the period. Among the former, the Bāmanavami and Krishna-jayanti were very popular;125 among the latter, the birthday of Šrī-Rāmānujahāryar (Emberumāncir Tirunakshatram) at Mēlkôte, in March-April (Chaitra) of every year, occupied a prominent place.126 The Tirunakshatram lasted ten days during the ascendency of the sacred birth-star (Āridrā) of the celebrated

125. Sē. E.C., III (2) Sr. 14 (1826), 11. 92-104; My. 7 (1845), 1. 26; also Annals, I. 151.
126. Tīd., Sr. 14 (1876), 11. 24-26; also Y. N. Shrivā, etc., p. 37, v. 63 (with gloss).
Sri-Ranganathaswami Temple, Seringapatam.
teacher. A lithic record, dated June 20, 1678, relates how AJasingarârya, father of Tirumalârya, gave away in perpetuity the village of BïrttbaiU, in Mandagere-sthaja, to provide for the annual holding of a car festival, distribution of food and other cérémonies at Mëlkôte on the occasion of the célébration of the Tirunakshatram. The Vajra-makuti (Vaira-mudi) and Gajêndra'môksham were other important annual festivals at Mëlkôte. The car festival ( Yinotrôtsava) and the spring festival (Vasantôtsava) of God Ranganâtha in Seringapatam were other important festivals which annually attracted visitors from various countries (palanådugalim). The Mahänânavami festival appears to have continued to dominate the social and public life of the capital city. The prosperity of the Brähmanical settlements (agara, agrahâra), temples (dëgula) and feeding-houses (satra), evidenced in the sources, is, in some measure, an index of the steady progress of cultural and social life all over the country. Old superstitions, however, died hard. An indication of the persistence of belief in ordeals as a means of establishing one's claims in civil disputes is afforded by a record of 1677 referring to Venkaṭapati, son of Bhaira-Hebbâruva, as establishing his claims to the Sànabhôgi of Arkalgûd against his opponent by

127. Ibid., II. 18-90: s. 1900, Kâlayukti, Ashâtha su. 11; see also E.C., IV (2) Kr. 48, and f.n. 169 in Ch. X. According to the record, Birubaili had been formerly assigned by AJasingarârya to the treasury of the Nâra-yanârâmâ temple at Mëlkôte. At the time of the above-mentioned transaction, however, the village of Singanamârâmâbaili, belonging to Kottâgâla, was made over to the temple in lieu of Birubaili. Cf. the Editorial Introduction (p. 1) to the O. Vam., O. VI. and A.V.C.

128. Y. N. Sannâdh, etc., p. 89, v. 30 (with gloss); see also f.n. 9 supra and text thereto.


130. Though we have no account of the Mahänânavami festival during the period, we have a reference to it in a record from the Mackenzie Collection (vide f.n. 76 supra).


132. E.C., V (1) and (3) Ag. 9; see also f.n. 68 supra.
circumambulating the feet of God Arkëévara and plunging his hand into ghee boiled as hot as possible (atikathinatavarâgi kâdu yidda tuppadaïili kaiyannikki . . . ).

Women are found depicted as having been faithful housewives (oluvenðiru). In particular, Dëvâjamma (Dëvâmbâ, Dëvamma) of Yejandûr, the principal queen (paṭṭadarasi, paṭṭadarâni) of Chikkadëvarâja Woðeyar, is spoken of as an idéal lady, an embodiment of all virtues, pure and chaste (sakala-sadguna-sampanne; akalushe). The charming ladies (gâdikâ[r~]iyaru) of the court are referred to as having been highly cultured and accomplished (sarva-sarasavidyâ-siddhâîita-vêdiniyar). Among the maid-servants in the personal service of Chikkadëvarâja Woðeyar, Honnamma, the bearer of his pouch (Chikkadëvarâyana sanchiya Honnamma), had risen high in his favour ( . . . , krpârasadim . . . unnatiyodagûdi . . . êlgevetti), and was noted for her literary and poetical attainments (kâvyâlankâra-nâtakagala pavanige yirava ballavalu . . . sarasa-sâhityada varadëvaté), sringâramma was a young poetess under the fostering care of Chikkadëvarâja (Chikkadëva-bhûpâla santavisida sauna magalu). The code of ethics relating to the duties and responsibilities of women, generally as devoted housewives, continued to be of a very high standard, the preservation and propagation of which, under the essentially srî-Vaishnava atmosphere of the times, found-living expression in Honnamma's Hadibadeya-Dharmam.

133. Hadi. Dhar., I X, 57. 134. Ibid., I, 3,11,16 (pp. 2-4).
135. Ibid., I, 6-7 (pp. 2-3).
136. Ibid., I, 24-25 (p. 4); also colophon to each chapter.
137. Ibid., 1,12, 14 (p. 3).
138. See Ka r. Ka. Oha., I 1. 516-517, quoting from the MB.
139. Vide Ch. X I V below, for détails about the work.
Perhaps a more marked influence of Śrī-Vaishnavism on social life during the period is discernible in the attempt on the part of Chikkadēvarâja Wodeyar to reform and uplift the eûdras by defining and codifying their rites and practices as members of the Hindu social order. This attempt of his finds éloquent expression in the \textit{Sachcùdrâchâra-Nirnaya} (c. 1687-1690) ascribed to him.\textsuperscript{140} In levelling up, as far as possible, the distinctions between castes and according to the eûdras a legitimate place in the social structure, Chikkadēvarâja perhaps sounds the key-note of his success as a benevolent yet strict ruler of the âge.

The work \textit{Sachcùdrâchâra-Nirnaya}, we have referred to, is primarily an exposition of the duties of those who can call themselves \textit{good} eûdras (\textit{Sat eûdras}). The term "good" as applied to a "eûdra" connotes much the same idea as it does when applied to a "Brâhmaṇa," "Kshatriya" or "Vaiéya," that is, one who conforms to the course of conduct prescribed to his \textit{varna}. In that sensé, \textit{sat} would convey the idea of \textit{nirdust}a, \textit{i.e.}, \textit{without blâme}, virtuous, real or respectable. A real eûdra, in this sensé, would be one who has gone through the rites and cérémonies customary to one of his class and keeps up to the duties fixed for him in the social and légal codes applicable to him. According to \textit{Manu}, a good eûdra has service for his duty, service to those above him. His \textit{dharma}, according to the \textit{Garuda-Purâna}, is serving the twice-born (\textit{i.e.}, Brâhmaṇa, Kshatriya and Vaisya). This \textit{Purâna} stresses the \textit{dharma} by saying that as \textit{Yajna} is the duty of the Brâhmaṇa so is service to the twice-born the duty of the eûdra. This \textit{Purâna}, indeed, adds that by service the eûdra attains salvation. The \textit{Varâha-Purâna} says that the eûdra has no \textit{mantra} other than bowing to the Brâhmaṇa, \textit{i.e.}, service to the

\textsuperscript{140}ibid,
classes above him, of which the Brâhmana is mentioned as an example. The Mahâbhârata goes a step further and sets down the religious tie that binds the Brâhmana householder to the âûdra attached to him. According to the epic, a éûdra serving in a Brâhmana household is a member \( (a?iga) \) of that household and as such he is entitled to a pinda (an oblation) in the name of the householder.\(^{141}\) In these and other cases, where the Brâhmana is mentioned, it should be taken as illustrative of the three higher classes and not as exhaustive. If a "good" éûdra is to serve the other castes, the three other castes cannot escape their duties (dharma). Thus the interdependence of the four castes is made manifest. And that is the reason why, quite apart from the different duties attaching to the different castes, ancient authorities stress the duties equally incumbent upon all the four castes. According to the Visnu-Purâna, these are, apart from the procuring of offspring and support of one's family, the practice of kindness to man and beast, patience, humility, purity, truth, gentleness of speech and contentment, with an absence of envy and avarice, grumbling and abuse.\(^{143}\) The Mahâbhârata similarly enumerates the following as the duties common to all the castes: the suppression of wrath, truthfulness of speech, justice, forgiveness, begetting children on one's wedded wives, purity of conduct, avoidance of quarrel and maintenance of dependents.\(^{148}\) Manu also refers to a ten-fold law which every one must obey, in whatever stage of life he may be: "contentment, forgiveness, self-control, abstention from unrighteously appropriating anything, obedience to the rules of purification, coercion of the organs, wisdom (probably of the sacred books), knowledge (of the Supreme soul), truthfulness, and abstention from

---

\(^{141}\) Mbh., Aranya-Parva, Adhyâya 149.
\(^{142}\) Visnu-Purâna, III, 7.
\(^{143}\) Mbh., Śanti-Parva, Sec. 12; also Padma-Purâna; Ganga-Khepa, Adhyâyas XXV-XXVII: Discussion between Nîrada and Māndhita.
anger, form the ten-fold law."  

Epie poets and law-givers both made it plain that the four castes had to observe a common code, besides discharging duties in their respective stages of life (āsramas). This insistence on the observance of a common code made the members of the four castes feel that they were not only one inséparable whole but also bound together for each other's good, and that for attaining the common good, they were all bound by the same ideals of social conduct. The Vishnu-Purāna, indeed, goes to the extent of saying that if a devotee of Vishnu discharges the duties pertaining to his caste and adheres to the code of social conduct common to all, he would be ever immune from Death.

Chikkadēva, it is worthy of note, supports his work from illustrations drawn from the Vishnu-Purāna, the Bhagavad-Gītā and the Manu-Smriti. From the first of these, he quotes a verse which holds up Vishnu as the Lord for adoration to all the Varnâēramas. He then quotes from the Bhagavad-Gītā some notable verses, all of which emphasise the importance of performing one's own duty. Thus, he refers to a verse from the Eighteenth Discourse, which concludes what ēri-Krishna lays down as to the duties of the four castes. Taken together, the verses which precede and follow this particular one stress the point he has in view. The first of these says that "each (man) reacheth perfection by being intent on his own duty (karma). Listen thou how perfection is won by him who is intent on his own duty (karma)."

The next verse—the one quoted by him—says: "He from whom is the émanation of beings, by whom all this is pervaded, by worshipping Him in his own duty (karma), a man winneth perfection/ The next verse drives home the point he

144. Manu, VI, 93 (Bühler's Trans. in S. B. E. Series).
145. The following is the verse:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Varnāērāmanāḥ śarvāṇaḥ purushāṇa parah punān} \\
\text{Vishnu-pradāyate punaḥ maṅgustādṛśhakārāḥ}
\end{align*}
\]

wants: "Better one's own duty (dharma) though destitute of merits than the well-executed duty (dharma) of another. He who doeth* the duty (karma) laid down by his own nature, incurrith not sin." An examination of these and other verses, remarks Chikkadëva, indicates that to those who do their duty in the spirit of the iâstra, the Suprême Lord Nârâyana grants the full fruit thereof. And what may be the fruit thereof? This is furnished to us in the Bhagavad-Gîtâ itself, to which we have necessarily to refer. He who performs the duty (karma) to which he is born, though that be (deemed) tarnished (sadôshamapi), provided his Reason (buddhi) is unattached, his self subdued, his desires annihilated, he attains by renunciation to the suprême perfection of freedom from obligation (karma), And he who attains perfection, obtains the Eternal, the highest state of wisdom. To those of the fourth (or, in fact, any) order, the attainment of the Eternal is not thus barred. Would it make any difference if they did not worship Nârâyana but other deities? Chikkadëva says that that would not matter. He quotes the verse of the Bhagavad-Gîtâ, which reads: "Even the devotees of other Shining Ones, who worship full of faith, they also worship Me, O son of Kunti, though contrary to the ancient rule." Even those who worship other—even inferior—deities, if they do so in the name of the Suprême Lord Nârâyana, they only offer worship to Him; only, Chikkadëva continues, if they do this, they reap the fruit of such worship only through those deities. But, he adds, significantly, that their actions (karmân)
sKouH be done leaving aside-attachaient and the fruit * pertaining to it. ¹⁶³

Brought up in the traditions of Bâmânûja; Chikkadëva insisted on, and even enlarged, the view of the Bhagavad-Gîtâ, that the doing of one's duty led to salvation. A good êûdra, he suggests, niay attain salvation by following out his own âchâra¹⁵* rather than feel discontented over the duty laid on the other three divisions. In a lairger sense, Chikkadëva lays down, as the essential condition of social peace and contentment, implicit obedience to the dharma of his own varna and âêrama, a dictum that is not wanting in votaries even to-day. Such obedience to one's own dharma would be, if we are to follow out Chikkadëva's suggestion, the means of one's own self-expression and salvation in terms of definite duties (karma) according to the definite dharma assigned to each. No wonder, we see him quoting the famous text of the Bhagavad-Gîtâ, which announces the great message to all classes of people, men, womten and sinners even: "They who take refuge with Me, O Pârtha, though of the womb of sin, women, Vaiéyas, even êûdras, they also tread the highest path."¹⁵⁵ The significance of the appeal will be manifest when we remember that ērî-Krishna assures salvation to êûdras as much as to anybody including Brâhmans and devoted royal saints¹⁵⁶ at one end and sinners¹⁶⁷ at the other, provided "they take refuge with Me." As ērî-Krishna declares in the same context: "Even if the most sinful worship Me with undivided heart, he too must be accounted righteous, for he hath rightly res61ved."¹⁵⁸ And, in the next verse, He concludes by

¹⁵³. Ibid, XVIII, 6. This, ērî-Krishna says, "is my certain and best belief." This is one of the more famous texts of the Bhag. Gî.
¹⁵⁴. Traditional or immémorial usage (as the foundation of law); established rule of conduct (as prescribed by immémorial usage). The word aehdra, however, signifies in certain contexts the meaning conveyed by the terms dharma and karma; ¹⁵⁵. Bhag. Gï., IX, 82. ¹⁵⁶. Ibid, IX, 88. ¹⁵⁷. Ibid, IX, 32. ¹⁵⁸. Ibid, IX, 80.
saying: "Speedily he (such a person) becoìneth dutiful and goeth to eternal peace; O Kaúntëya, know thou for certain thåt My devotee perisheth never."\(^{150}\)

What may be the reason, that induced Chikkadëva to write this work (Sachchùdrâchdra-Nirnaya) whose insistence on the Gîtâ idéal of essential dependence on God of all classes of the community for their happiness and salvation, of their niútual dependence on each other for their own and for the common good, and of their ultimate equality before God, is so évident to those reading it? This we can only guess. It is possível he desired to secure social solidarity by this means, in order that political solidarity may not be jeopardised. That he should insist on the upper three divisions discharging their duty towards the fourth and that of the fourth towards the upper three, would indicate that the need for securing social order and consequently of général happiness was, in his view, an important end in itself. Indeed he says, in one place, that the happiness of the three superior classes relates itself to the well being of the fourth. Fearing that the three other classes may discard the happiness of the fourth while the fourth may discard its duty towards the other three classes, and desiring the happiness of the fourth, Chikkadëva says, he wrote this work. To achieve this end, he adds, he brought together, in order to protect the good among the fourth class, their duties as found scattered in the different authorities. This work, accordingly, fixes the duties of the Sachchùdras while it takes the opportunity, at the same time, to favour their interests by securing to them the protection due to them from the three othërs. He would, indeed, suggest, by the phraseology used by him in this connection, that he was spécially favouring them in compiling this particular work in

\(^{169}\) Ibid, IX, 81.
their spécial interests. The main authorities on which Chikkadëva bases bis studies are, as we hâve seen, the Vishṇu-Purâna, Manu and the Bhagavad-Gîtâ. We hâve seen his indebtedness to the last of thèse great works, and the manner in which he brings together the différent déclarations in it in regard to the essential equality of the four divisions of people and their mutual dependence for the gêneral good of the whole community, shows how deeply he had imbibed the fondamental teachings of the Gîtâ. His indebtedness to the Vishṇu-Purâna is equally great. Its open déclaration that to ail varṇas and àéramas Vishṇu is the lord for adoration is his main text. This leads to the next suggestion that one may pray to any deity—inferior or superior—but if he prays in Vishṇu's name, his prayer is heard and he benefits from it. The teaching that the adorer or the devotee of Vishṇu attains salvation finds its counterpart in the Vishṇu-Purâna which proclaims that the messenger of Yama, the God of Death, has no control over those who seek the shelter of Vishṇu. And the devotee of Vishṇu, we are told, is one " who never déviâtes from the duties prescribed to his caste ; who looks with equal indifférence upon friend or enemy ; who takes nothing (that is not his own), nor injures any being." Such "a

160. See Sutrâ. Nûr., II. 12-13:

Ityâdvina mûksharâthibhih assakhas bhagavadanadâhana rûpani samâ vanâchidhâni nitya naimittika rûpani karmâni sakala sangata krito tayagapurovaka manuṣâyâniti nirdhârya

161. This has been declared one of the finest passages in the whole of this Purâna. Considerations of space forbid its reproduction here, but it is well worth reading in the original or in the translation of Wilson.
person of unblemished mind " is to be known " to be a worshipper of Vishçu." And Yama ordains his messenger not to "come into the sight of him in whose heart the imperishable soul resides; for he is defended from my power by the discus of his deity; he is designed for another world (for the heaven of Vishnu)." 162 The main plank in the argument of Chikkadëva that Sachchûdras can attain salvation by the faithful carrying out of their karma is thus a reflection of the teaching of both the Gîtâ and the Vishnu-Purâna. Chikkadëva, however, in thus stressing the duties of Sachchûdras, does not forget to insist on their essential equality with the three other divisions or the mutual interdependence of the four taken as a whole. At the same time, there is no reason to believe that he goes beyond the limits set to them in the ancient teachings (érutis and Smritis) such as Manu and the like. Nor does he, so far as can be seen, transcend the teachings of Bâdarâyana as expounded in the Apaêûdrâdhikaraṇa. 163 Indeed his main theme is that within the limits prescribed by the ancient seers, a Sachchûdra is entitled to protection for the service he renders, and that salvation is possible to him if he devotes himself to his duties and to the adoration of Vishçu. Though Chikkadëva does not show an advance on Manu and the text-writers in the matter of

162. Ibid.

163. The Viyavâ-Pûranâ allows a Śûdra to perform rites in honour of his dead (see Wilson, Viyavâ-Pûranâ, I, 88). As Manu is more rigorous in this respect, it might perhaps be inferred that the Vishnu-Pûranâ marks an advance on the Manu-Smriti in this regard (see Manu, I, 109). As to Bâdarâyana's position, see the Vêddnta-Sûtras—Apaêûdrâdhikaraṇa, I, 3, 33-89 (Bâmânuja); I, 3, 84-88 (éankara and Ananda-tlrtha). But all these ordinances are overshadowed by the déclaration in the Vishnu-Purâna that there are "duties equally incumbent upon all the four castes," a passage which, as shown in the text above, has its counterpart in the Manu-Smriti as well. Both sets of déclarations have to be read together if we are to understand the actual conduct between the four diffe rent divisions of society. This is exactly what Chikkadëva does in his work, in which, he says, he has brought together scattered texts bearing on the well-being of Sachchûdras (vide f.n. 160 supra).
written déclarations, his bringing together of the scattered
texts relating to the duties of Sachchûdras, and no less
the manner in which he has woven the teachings of the
Gîtâ into their texture, shows the humane ruler he was.
He tried to secure social order and political consolidation
by making each unit realize how dépendent it is on the
other for its own good and for the common weal. He
laboured to work out in détail how those belonging to
the fourth order should aim at becoming Sachchûdras
and thus help not only to maintain society together but
also attain to spiritual salvation.

Thus, as an example of the interaction of the ten-
dencies and forces of the times, Chikkadêva's social experi-
ment acquires considérable significance. Indeed, while
there are indications of the widespread application and
adoption of his code, the Śrî-Vaishîjava background
underlying it seems to have formed the suprême factor
governing his législation relating to the Arasu families
also in the State. Some of theëe families, who were directly related to
the Royal House, had shown a tendency
to give up the due performance of rites and cérémonies
originally prescribed for thêta, and had contracted
alliances with families considered as belonging to a lower
status (gauḍapatiṣ sambandha), while others had culti-
vated relations with families of inferior social standing
(baḍajâti sambandha). Eealising the need for preserv-
ing undefiled the social status of these families and their
purity of blood, Chikkadëvarâja Wocleyar, on October 2,
X690 (Pramôdûta, Āēvîja eu. 10), instituted a careful
inquiry into the matter.164 As a resuit of this inquiry,
the doubtful families were differentiated from those who
showed evidence of having maintained the purity of their
blood so far; the former were absorbed in the respective

164. Annals, I. 129. The ordinance which Chikkadéva issued in his connec-
tion, as described above, partakes in part of the character of what may be
called, in modern parlance, a Royal Marriage Act.
lineages with which they had contracted! their relations while the latter were grouped into 31 families (manetana), 13 among them being recognised as of an exceptionally pure stock and the remaining 18 as of a slightly lower status in consequence of certain differences in the usages and practices observed by them. Marital relations as amongst these families, it was further laid down, were to be strictly endogamous in character. An exception, however, was made in the case of the members of 13 families, who were allowed to receive as wives daughters from the 18 families only in respect of second or third connections. To look after the successful working of these arrangements, to supervise the general social relations with the 31 families, and to see that they regularly observed the Vedic rites and practices laid down for them, Somarajaiya of Mugur, father-in-law of Chikkadivaraja, and Appajaiya, the Palace genealogist, were appointed as special Huzur officers (Sarnmukhada Gurikar, Sarnmukhada Karanika), an order to this effect being communicated to the 31 families summoned to the court.

The growth of wealth and luxury in the period was as usual accompanied by the concomitant social evil, by now an established fact in fashionable society. We have as usual accompanied by the concomitant social evil, by now an established fact in fashionable society.
idealized pictures of and scènes from the' courtesans' street (vēyāvāṭa, sūlēgēri)—particularly in the cities of Seringapatam and Mysore—not entirely divorced from actualities, depicting their luxurious life and the ethics of their profession, and suggestively hinting at moderation as an idéal to be achieved. It is a question if the social evil was really as rampant as some of the works of the period would seem to indicate. Evidently members of the female sex had escaped, by about this time, the tyranny to which they had been long subjected from early times. The condition of women had by now been greatly softened by the refinements of social life. Education had made some progress among women. They had even taken to writing moral text-books. Culture had spread and even percolated deeper into the lower strata of society. If the women who had embraced the life of ease and pleasure enjoyed freedom from constraint and had comfort at their command, they certainly reflected a state of society which made such comfort and ease possible of realization by a larger number without the wells of social life being poisoned for them. But neither the growth of compétence nor even of luxury can wholly explain the growth of the social evil to the extent to which it had evidently attained in the time of Chikka-dēva. In the imaginary ramble through a whole night depicted for us in one work of the period, we perceive something more than a mère description of the sights seen by the adventurous couple of night-wanderers in the happy haunts of Seringapatam. We see in it a

169. See, for instance, Yad. Mahat., I I I; Chikkadēv índra-Vam., p. 10, w. 47-61; art. Mahat., I, 140-168, I I, 68-111, etc.
170. See C. Vi. canto V I, where Tirumalaraya shows with powerful insight, in the form of a burlesque, how the rigour of the old sexual laws (laid down by classical writers like Vātsyāyana) was being more honoured in the breach than in the observance thereof in the society of his time. For further références to the gradual growth of the social evil in the 17th century, vide under Social life in Chs. I X - X of this work.
picture, besides, of the rigour of unequal marital unions of the time. Hindu society then sanctioned more easily marriages which were not infrequently incompatible with the true happiness of those brought together in legal wedlock. The independence that women enjoyed under the Hindu Code rendered them free of control. Adultery was not a crime then as now and the damsels consecrated for service in the temples (Dévaradiyâl, Dévodâsi) had fallen low and were able to make a profession of their knowledge of the arts of dancing, singing and even letters. Freedom to secure wealth, legal capacity to own property and transmit it to her own heirs and the human right to be deemed a person and not a thing—as under Boman Law in Europe, until it was superseded by the Code Napoléon in later days—not only enabled every member of the female sex to act as she liked but also to make

171 « The rigour of the marital law may be inferred from the following features characteristic of it: (1) The time of marriage was fixed at the early age of eight years. (2) Marriage was not a contract between the parties but one arranged by the parents whose approbation was, in any case, required. (3) The son was subject to the control of the parents until a legal division was effected between him and his father. (4) Dissolution of marriage was impossible under the law for the upper classes and though divorce was sanctioned by usage in the case of the rest, the example of the upper classes set the standard for all and hence usage was rarely effective in this connection. This inherent dislike to resort to the manly prerogative of divorce was much like the odium which was evinced against its exercise among the Bomans even in just cases. The warmest applause has been lavished on the virtue of individual Bomans who abstained from the use of this tempting privilege for above five hundred years. But the same fact shows, as Gibbon remarks, the unequal terms of a connection in which the slave was unable to relinquish her tyrant, and the tyrant was unable to relinquish her slave. When the Boman matrons became the equal and voluntary companions of their lords, a new legal conception was evolved that marriage was, like other partnerships, a contract and can be dissolved by the abdication of one of the parties to it. We know too how this privilege of divorce has degenerated into mere licence and the most sacred of ties violated in a manner at once unjustifiable and immoral. Happily that stage has not yet been reached in this country and it is to be hoped that it will not be, though society may require an escape from unequal unions in just cases.

172. For, an account of Dévaradiyals and what led to their dégradation, see Myt. Gûs. I 1. ii. 1295-1297.
social life easy for any who could find no felicity in their own domestic circles. If marriage as a solemn sacrament made life difficult in some cases, the existence of a group of women with trained intelligence and a wider outlook rendered escape from the agonies of unequal lives possible. To this loose and voluntary compact, neither religious ceremonies were required nor did legal rights flow from them to either party. The happiness of life which such unions made possible was, however, more apparent than real, for mental adjustments were not always easy and society looked with disfavour on such commingling and it was accounted a misfortune if the existence of such misalliances came to be known in public. The dignity of marriage was refused to them and that was the one effective check that law and society possessed against its more general prevalence to the detriment of society. Changes in the law did not keep pace with the advance of society and centuries of prosperity and corruption did not help to evolve the principle of divorce for the upper classes while the rest suffered from their high example. This arrested development of law resulted in the most tender of human relations being deserted to a transient society of pleasure, which was the more deplorable because everybody knew the evil but none dared propose a remedy for it. The higher ideal prevailed but as an ideal and the generality of the people who stuck to it failed to note the injury they were doing to society at large by their supineness in a matter of primary importance affecting the general welfare of the community.
CHAPTER XIV.

CHIKKADĒVARĀJA WODEYAR, 1673-1704—(conta)


The reign of Chikkadēvaraja Woḍeyar witnessed a literary activity which, perhaps, stands unrivalled in the history of Mysore. Learning and literature flourished under his active encouragement and patronage. Indeed, a mère entrance to the assembly of
scholars in his court, says a contemporary, was enough to remove one's mental apathy and make him really learned and excel in all arts. While adequate attention was paid to the preservation and propagation of sacred lore on the one side, great care was, on the other, bestowed on the fostering of Kannada language and literature. While the Jains and Vīra-ēaivas, under the tolerant policy of Chikkadēvarāja, continued to make their contributions to the latter, literary output was to a considerable extent augmented by the Brāhmans (particularly the ērī-Vaishṇavas) and those working under their influence, including Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar himself. The growth of ērī-Vaishṇivism in the country and its adoption by Chikkadēvarāja as his personal creed were, beyond doubt, the main factors underlying this remarkable achievement. Most of the literary productions of the period are undated, but, broadly speaking, from the internal evidence afforded by the works themselves and from references available from other sources, they are assignable to the intervals of peace and quiet during one or the other of the three principal epochs of the reign, namely, 1673-1680, 1680-1696, 1696-1704. The works are usually found written in Haḷagannada, poetry or prose, though there are indications that Hosagannada was in use side by side, as can be seen from some of the productions, especially in poems of the sāṅgatya metre and in prose renderings among others. Among the subjects dealt with are the Purāṇas, religion and philosophy, politics and maxims, traditional history, poetics and drama. Some of these productions are original writings of exceptional literary merit, while others are intelligible translations from


    Ṛṣabhaḥ jāgīrānām saulantam prasūte
    Sakałā sarasa-vidyā kautalāmi vyanakī |
    Sakaḍāpi Chikkadēvarakshāhāhṛḍāsthana-simā
    Purīgata buḍha-gōṣṭhi-prāṇa-pānti praveśaḥ ||
Sanskrit or Tamil works, containing also original compositions of a varied character. The ērī-Vaish^ava literature of the reign, in particular, is in a great measure créative, expressive and éducative—créative in the sensé that it resorts to newer and popular modes of expression (such, for instance, as the increasing use of sângatya, tripadi, chaupadi, saptapadi, kanda and ragale among the poetical mètres, and the adoption of a dignified yet flowing and homely prose style) without, however, dèviating from clasôical models (as, for instance, the chcmpu), and that it aims at variety in place of uniformity; expressive in the sensé that it fully eitibodies, aiïd reflects, the spirit of the âge; and éducative in the sensé that most of the productions, apart from their value to thé cultured classes, were generally intended for the édification of the masses. The towering personality of Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar appears prominently throughout this literary movement as its guiding spirit, nay, as its very inspirer, if not creator (nûtana sâhitya-brahmangà-nupama Chikkadëva-bhûpatî), as indeed he was looked upon by his own contemporaries.

The leading workers in the field were undoubtedly Chikkupâdhyâya and Tirumalârya (Tirumalaiyangâr), the ērī-Vaishnavà ministers of Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar. To the school of the former belong his protégés, namely, Timma-Kavi, Mallikârjuna and Mallarasa; to that of the latter Singarârya, Chikkadëvarâja, Bâmâyânam-Tirumalârya, Honnamma and èringâramma, ail of whose productions are permeated by the essentially ērī-Vaishrîava spirit of the âge. Though Chikkupâdhyâya and his school appear te clâim by far the greatest share of the literary output during the reign, the influence of the two leaders and

2. Bé ÊH. Mahdt. (of Chikkupâdhyâya), 1,102.
their schools on the development of ērī-Vishnavism in its theoretical and practical aspects was, it is interesting to find, mutual and complementary.

Chikkupādhyāya, whose réal name was Lakshipipatī and whose ancestry and attainments we hâve elsewhere adverted to, was a prominent scholar at the court of Seringapatam during a greater part of ChikkadēvarâjVs reign. He is referred to as one skilled in the art of poetical composition, a neo-Brhaspati in respect of literary accomplishments and an expert in the Kannada language. He was the author of numerous works which hâve come down to us, assignable to the period c. 1673-1691.

Probably the earliest of thèse (c. 1673-1676) are the The Sangatyas, c. 1673-1676. Aksharamālikā-Sāngatya, Paechirna-rangci-Sāngata, Rangadhâma-Stuti* Sāngatya, Éringâra-ÉatakaSāngatya, Rangadhâma-Purusha- Viraha-Sāngatya, Rangadhâma* Niti'-Sataka'Sāngatya and Chitra-éataka'Sàngatya. All thèse are poems composed in the popular sāngatya mètre, —as their names indicate—in honour of God Eanganâtha of Seringapatam, of whom Chikkadēvarâja was an ardent devotee. Indeed they occupy an important place in the devotional literature of ērī-Vaishnavism in Kannada. Perhaps they also seem to indicate an attempt on the part of the poet to commemorate his own élévation from the position of a teacher to that of a roinister, since they invariably voice his intimacy with his patron (Chikkadēvarâja),

3. Vide under Council of Ministers, in Ch. XII.
5. Ms. No. 18-6. II (P. L.; Mad. Or. Lib.), containing the collection; also Ms. No. B. 260 (P.; Mys. Or. Lib.), containing only the Paechirna-Bangadhâma-Sāngatya and Purusha-Viraha-Sāngatya; see also and compare Kor. Ka. Cha., II. 457, 495-496.
6. Vide references cited, and textual expressions quoted, in Ch. XII, f.n. 28.
Next in order are the Kamandaka-Niti and the Saüka-Sapiati (c. 1676-1677). Both these Works are prose renderings, done at the desire of Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar. They begin with invocations to Vishnu, Lakshmi, Râmânuja and the Alvârs. The former work deals, within the compass of 8 chapters (asvāsa), with the ancient science of politics (dandamti) as expounded by Kâmandaki. The introductory chapter contains verses in the vritta mètre and prose passages (vachana) dealing, among others, with the pedigree (vamsāvali) and exploits of Chikkadëvarâja, the latest event referred to being the siège and capitulation of Jadakana-durga (1675-1676). The latter work treats of maxims (yuktigalu) in the form of seventy didactic stories said to have been narrated òages ago by the sage êukâchârya to a king by naine Vahni-ràja. There is, however, no référence to any political event in this work, which would enable us to fix its date. At any rate, since both the Kâmmandaka-Niti and the Gua-Saptati deal with cognate subjects, there is reason to believe that their rendering took place in close succession to one another. Apart from the value of these works as good spécimens of seventeenth century Kannada in Mysore (satkarnâtakâ-rîtiyim; Karndta'Sadbhâsheyol), they embody data which are, as a whole, of considérable importance to us from the points of view of the political history of the earlier years of Chikkadëvarâja's reign, the development of his political and administrative knowledge and the early adoption of êrî-Vaishnavism as

3. Vide Ch. XII, f.n. 95, for details.
his personal religion. So dear indeed is the prose style of these writings that they seem to reveal an attempt at a direct exposition of their subject-matter by Chikkupâdhyâya to Chikkadëvarâja Woâdeyar himself.

On February 18, 1678, Chikkupâdhyâya completed the Divya-Sûri-Charitë. It is a champû work in Hałagannâḍa, in 14 chapters, rendered from the original work in Tamil at the desire of Chikkadëvarâja. It deals with the history of the twelve éri-Vaishnava saints (Âlvârs, Suri). The author styles it an epic (malla-prabandha). The introductory chapter begins as usual with invocations to Bâmânuja, God Banganâtha of Seringapatam and the Àlvârs; and contains a brief account of the pedigree of Chikkadëvarâja Woâdeyar and references to his religious avocations and his court. The succeeding chapters are centred round the subject-matter proper. The diction is sweet and melodious, in keeping with the established principles of the Kannada language (Kannada bhâshâ-kramadi nosedu), the prevailing sentiment being bhakti. It is an important contribution to the traditional history and philosophy of éri-Vaishnavism in Kannada, intended for popular use (rûdhiyâgiralêvâlkendu).

The next série of Chikkupâdhyâya's works belongs to the period c. 1678-1680, and deals mainly with the Purânic accounts of the merits of holy places (Mâhâtmya) of Sri-Vaishnava importance. These accounts are renderings from the originals in Sanskrit, done at the

12. Pub. in the Karnâlaka-Kavya-Kalaniḍå Series, No. 88 (G. T. A. Press, Mysore, 1911)—see XIV, 124: Pîngalâ sivav âsa Phâlûgnâmaḍa mahâpakhaṇḍati; also item No. 74 (P. L. Ms.) of the Cat, Kan. MS. in the Mad. Or. Lib.; see also and compare Kar. Ka. Obs. (II. 426, 479-480) which places the work in, or before 1672 on the ground that a copy of it was made in Virodhitri (1672). Possibly Virodhitri is a scribal error for Virodhâ (1709).
13. XIV, 120.
14. XIV, 119.
instance of Chikkadëvaràja Wòdèyar. Thus, the Kàmalachala-Màhàtmya, in 16 chapters, contains an account of Kanjagiri (or the Gòpâlasvàmi hill) as given in the Bhavishyòttara-Puràna; the Hastigiri-Màhàtmya, in 18 chapters; the Venkatagiri-Màhàtmya and the Srì ranga-Màhàtmya, in 10 chapters each; and the Paschimaranga-Màhàtmya, in 6 chapters—these enshrine, respectively, accounts of Kânchi, Tirupati, ërîranga and Seringapatam, as narrated in the Brahmànda-Puràna; and lastly, the Yàdavagiri-Màhàtmya, in 12 chapters, deals with the account of Mêlkôte (Yadugiri) as related in the Nàradiya-Puràna. These compilations are generally written in a mixture of Halagannada prose and poetry. The methodology adopted in them by Chikkupâdhyâya is of particular interest to us. In the introductory chapter of each Màhàtmya, Bâmânûja, the Àlvârs, the demi-gods of the êrî-Vaishnava hierarchy (like Garuda and Vishvaksèna) and the presiding deity of the place dealt with, are usually invoked. Then follows a geographical description of the Karnâtaka country (bhûbhâga-varnanë) including the city of Mysore. This is succeeded in turn by an account of the pedigree (vamsa-vistàra-vamane) of the Buling Dynasty of Mysore and by a narrative of the exploits of Chikkadëvaràja himself (the hero and the poet's patron), the latest political event referred to being the siège and acquisition of Andûr, Maddagiri and

17. Ms. No. 18-4-18—P. L.; Mad. Or. Lib.; see also and compare Ibid, 467, 488.
18. Ms. No. B. 270—P.; Mys. Or. Lib.; see also and compare Ibid, 467, 486.
19. Ms. No. 18-6-11—P. L.; Mad. Or. Lib.; see also and compare Ibid, 467, 486.
20. Ms. No. 18-21-16—P. L.; Mad. Or. Lib.; see also and compare Ibid, 467, 482.
the adjacent forts (1678).* References to the personality, character and rule of Chikkadēva, his religious avocations and his Durbār and the ancestry and attainments of the poet, among other particulars, not infrequently follow, both by way of completing the descriptive account of the rise and fortunes of the hero (nāyakabhīyudaya-varnāṇē) and by way of indicating that the Māhātmya was a product of Chikkadēvarāja’s court. The succeeding chapters deal with the subject-matter proper of the work. In exceptionally longer works like the Kamalāchala-Māhātmya, the subject-matter commences in the third chapter, the second being devoted to what purports to be an idéal description of the night adventures of the hero (rātri-vihāra-varnāṇe). All these productions are, again, marked by variety in point of style. The Kamalāchala-Māhātmya is a champu work. It is, further, a new form of composition, characterized by grandeur of sentiment, splendour of diction, excellence of meanings, nicety of verbal embellishment and beauty of euphonie junctions and compounds.22 The Hastigiri-Māhātmya, another champu, is also written in the same style of literary expression while adhering to the Kāvya model, the objective aimed at being, of course, popular appréciation.33 The Venkatagiri-Māhātmya is a prose commentary.24 The Srīrang a-Māhātmya is also written

21. Vide Ch. XI, f.n. 57 and 63, for détails. The Kar. Ka. Cha. (II. 468) Peaks of the Hasti. Mahat. and the Kamal. Mahat as having been written in 1679 (Kalayukti) and 1680 (Baudri), respectively, without citing the relevant texts. The manuscripts of these works examined by us seem to contain no référence to these dates. From interne evidence, as set forth above, they hâve to be assigned, along with the other Mahatmyas, to the period c. 1678-1680.

22. III. 78:

23. I, 101, 106, 108: Posatado/mudaginda; surapandha/marmam morovan-
tondi; ekkar prāma/madi tīlādīpante.

in prose, being intended solely for popular enlightenment. The *Paschimaranga-Mâhâtyya* and the *Yâdavagiri-Mâhâtyya* are poems in the sângatya mètre, the latter being written in prose also as *Yadugiri-Mâhâtyya*. The *Mâhâtyyas* of Chikkupâdhyâya, on the whole, constitute a new type of literature in themselves, in that they delineate ēri-Vaishnava tradition against a background of epic poetry, *bhakti* being the prevailing sentiment throughout. They are thus an important addition to the literature on Śrī-Vaishnâvism in Eannaḍa.

To almost the same period (c. 1678-1681) belong the *Bhagavad-Gîtâ-Tîku* and the *Bukmângada-Gharitre*, both written, as usual, at the instance of Chikkadĕvâraja Woḍeyar. The former, a work in 18 chapters, is an intelligible Kannada prose rendering (*tîku*) of the original Sanskrit text. It embodies a clear and popular exposition of the philosophy of the Lord's message to Arjuna. The latter work is a *chanvpu* in 12 chapters, dealing with the story of Bukmângada as narrated in the *Nâradiya-Purâṅa*. It is intended to inculcate the merits of the Ēkâdaśi-Vrata, devoutly observed by Chikkadĕvâraja himself. The
methodology adopted in both these works which are contributions to Śrī-Vaishṇava literature in Kannada, is similar to that followed in the Māhātmyas:

During c. 1680-1691 Chikkupādhyāya appears to have written the Īēsha-Dharmā, the Sātvika-Brahma-Vidyā-Vilāsa and the Vishnu-Purṇa (c. 1691). All these writings begin with invocations to the Śrī-Vaishnava pantheon in the same manner as the earlier ones. The īēsha-Dharma is a prose work (tīku) in 25 chapters, translated from the Āsvamēdhika-Parva of the Hari-Vamēa. Chikkupādhyāya, as he tells us, wrote it at the desire of Chikkadēvarāja for popular enlightenment, following the principles of Kannada composition laid down in the Bhashābhūshanam (12th cent.). The Sātvika-Brahma-Vidyā-Vilāsa is a champū rendered, under the orders of Chikkadēvarāja (âjnaptanāgi), from the original Sanskrit work of that name. It deals, in 9 chapters, with the Śrī-Vaishnava philosophy of Viēistādvaitism which continued to engage the attention of Śrī-Vaishnava scholars. Other works, c. 1680-1691.

33. Ms. No. B. 44—P.; Mys. Or. Lib.; see also and compare Ibid, 467, 480.
34. Pub. in the Karnataka-Kavya-Kalanidhi Série*, Nos. 45, 36 and 30, Mysore, 1914, 1911, and 1910, Parts 1, 4 and 5; also Mss. Nos. A. 99 and 100—P.; Mys. Or. Lib.; see also and compare Ibid, 467. The Mss., referred to, contain no specific reference to Chikkupādhyāya, the author. They appear to have been copied by a scribe who went by the name of Venkatanarasaya, a contemporary of Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar (see ff. 338-339). The colophons in the Mss. differ from those of the published work, which clearly mention Chikkupādhyāya's name; but the subject-matter of the text is similar. The Kar. Ka. Cha. (Le.) refers to the prose version of the Viēhnu-Purṇa and has no particulars aboliit it. It, again, speaks of the work as having been written in 1691 (11. 468) without citing the relevant textual reference. The Mss. and the published work do not refer to the date. However, we are inclined to take 1691 as the probable date of the Vishnu-Purṇa, assigning it to the latest period of Chikkupādhyāya's literary activity (c. 1680-1691).

6. See v. 2 of each ch.: Bēsha-Dharmakke śīkanāsēha janaṁ tiṣṭaṁ teraṁ Chikkupādhyāyaṁ
toṁha Chikkadēvarāram Bhashābhūshanāṁ Kannādaṁ virachārī
dam ||
of Chikkadêvarâja in an increasing measure during the period 1680-1696. The Vishnu-Purâna is a prose treatise in Kannada, translated from the original work in the form of a dialogue between the sages Maitrëya and Paraïtra. It is written in 5 parts (amêa), each containing a varying number of chapters, and the whole dealing mainly with the philosophy of the principal incarnations of Vishnu. Lucid, flowing and thoroughly enjoyable, this work typifies the new model Hosagannada prose style that was evolved in Mysore towards the close of the seventeenth century. The Vishnu-Purâna of Chikkupâdhyâya has come down in 6 parts in the champu form also, the prose version, however, being by far the more popular. Among other contributions of Chikkupâdhyâya to the literature on Sri-Vaishnavism, perhaps assignable to the same period, are the Tiruvâimoli-Tiku, a prose commentary in Kannada on the original Tarn il treatise of the great Nammâlvâr, and the Padma-Purâna-TîJcu, a prose version in Kannada of the original Sanskrit work of that name. He is also credited with having written the Amaruka-èatâka, Vaidyâmrta-Tiku ArthcL-Panchaka and Tatva-Traya.

Timma-Kavi was, as he refers to himself, a Brâhman of Jêmadagni-gôtra, being an ardent devotee of God Vêçiugôpâla. He was probably a disciple of a religious preceptor by name Gôpâla. He occupied an important place.

---

36. See colophon to each part of the published work: Maitrëya-Parâkara-samvadâ rûpasûdâ Sri-Vishnu-Pûrâṇeṣwam prabhântaka.
38. Iibid., 452, 459-460.
42. See Yed. Mahât., I, 26; Chikkadêvendra-Vam., v. 10:
Bhrayamkôrûkhaâlligam numânu Gôpâlanyâpîyâjâham |
Madovarîdahanayûrûyâsirvai-vîdvaññaya-srîdham ||
in the court of Chikkadēvarâja Wođeyar as the protégé of Chikkupâdhyâya, at whose instance he wrote in Kannada the Yādavagiri-Mâhâtmya, the Venkatagiri-Mâhâtmya and the Paschimaranga-Mâhâtmya dealing, respectively, with the merits of the holy places, Mêlkôte, Tirupati and Seringapatam. All these are champu works. They belong to the same category as the Mâhâtmyas of Chikkupâdhyâya (c. 1678-1680) alike in respect of methodology and subject-matter. The latest political event referred to in these productions is the siège and capitulation of Jadakana-durga (1675-1676) and Maddagiri (1678). These works are, again, written in a sweet and flowing diction. Although bhakti is, as usual, the prevailing sentiment, the poet is at his best in his attention to minute details in describing Nature, and in his delineation of the erotic sentiment (êringâra), particularly in the introductory chapters.

Perhaps Timma-Kavi was the earliest contributor to the Mâhâtmyas as a type of literature during Chikkadēvarâja's reign, for, we learn, he completed the Yādavagiri-Mâhâtmya on February 2, 1677. This work is in 16 chapters. The poet gives it the character of an epic treatise (prabandha) composed in the poetic prose style (Kamâtaka vachana rachaneya) An interesting feature of the work is that the subject-matter proper is dealt with from the fifth chapter onwards, the first four being devoted, respectively, to a delineation of the geographical features of the Karnâtaka country (bhûbhâga-varnane),

43. Pacch. Mâhât., l.c.; Chikkupâdhyâya-prâsa-niratam.
45. Ms. No. B. 54—P.; Mys. Or. Lib.; see also and compare Ibid, 492-493, 492-495.
46. Ms. No. B. 97—P.; Mys. Or. Lib.; see also and compare Ibid, 492, 495.
47. Vide Ch. XI, f.n. 56 and 58, for details.
48. See fl 100 of Ms. K. 481: Nâta saumâsa-râtrâda Mâgha sudâha dasami |
49. I, 23; also colophon.
pedigree, rise and fortunes of the hero, Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar (vandor-vistara-varnane; nâyakâbhyudaya-varnane), and his night adventures (râtrivihâra-varnane) and amusements (chatùranga vinôda-yuddha . . . mrgayâ vasanta jalakndâ-varnama), including his visit to the temple of Nârâyana at Mêlkôte (Nârâyana sandarênanâdi). The Venkatagiri-Mâhâtmya, said to have been completed in 1679, is in 10 chapters, written in the narrative style (vastukada mârgadol). The Paêchimaranga-Mâhâtmya, written c. 1679-1680, is in 5 chapters, also composed in the narrative style (vastukarachaneyim) Timma-Kavi was probably the author also of the Chikkadëvëndra-Vaméâvali (c. 1680) a champu work of outstanding literary merit, containing several verses and prose passages—in an modified and highly polished style—from the first two chapters of his Yâdavagiri-Mâhâtmya.

Mallikârjuna, another Bràhman poet of the period, wrote a Kannada version of the Êrî-ranga-Mâhâtmya at the instance of Chikkupâdhyâya (Chikkupâdhyâya-prërita Mallikârjuna pranîta), the work being completed on February 26, 1678. This is also a champu in 12 chapters, and belongs to the same type of literature as the Mâhâtmyas of Chikkupâdhyâya and Timma-Kavi. The subject-matter, however, actually begins in the third chapter, the first two being introduc-
tory chapters which, besides the usual features, contain a descriptive account in an ornate style of both the cities of Mysore and Seringapatam under Ghikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar. Mallikārjunā refers to his work as a pleasing poem (manjula Kavya). He is, perhaps, the most expressive and prolific writer of the school of Chikkupādhyāya. His diction is sweet and majestic. He is, however, at his best in depicting Nature and in delineating the erotic sentiment.

Mallarasā (Mallarasāṅka-Paṇḍita) was another poet of the period. He was a Brāhman of īrīvātsa-gōtra and Kamme-vamēa, son of Tīrūmarasā-mantri by Tippāmbikā, disciple of Sadānanda-guru and résident of Nāravangala.

At the instance of Chikkupādhyāya, he wrote the Daēvatāra-Charitre (c. 1680), another champu, in 11 chapters, dealing with the ten incarnations of Vishṇu. The poet speaks of the work as an epic (mahā-prabandhā).

Tirumalārya (Tirumalaiyangār, the minister), whose ancestry and official position we have elsewhere detailed, occupied the foremost place among the scholars and poets of the court of Seringapatam during the greater part of the reign of Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar. He was celebrated for his wide learning, and was known to have written numerous delightful works in Sanskrit and
Kannada on the ēastras, smṛti and stōtra, narrative and epic poetry, drama and poetics. Indeed, so profoundly did he and his younger brother Singarārya impress their contemporaries that, towards the close of Chikkadēvarāja's reign, as Singarārya himself testifies to, both of them had established themselves as the literary dictators of their day—learned in all the ēastras, skilled in the art of poetical composition and ever engaged in imparting instruction in various branches of the sacred tradition and in the abstruse doctrines of the two Systems of Vēdānta (Udbhaya-Vēdānta). Tirumalārya's works themselves, in particular, we learn, had attained considerable popularity for the melody of his diction and eloquence, and for the grandeur of sentiment delineated by him. They were often quoted too by his own contemporaries.

Perhaps the earliest among the dated writings of Tirumalārya extant are the Tirumalā-kuḍḍu-Narasipur Plates (1663) and the Chāmarājanagar Plates (1675)

64. Ibid., p. 4 (vachana): Pridĕdī ēstra-smṛti-stōtra-granthangalam, ivalladēṇnum Sakkudadalam Kannadadalam bēre vēra kērīginidam sūna palavagaya kavya-nātakalankaram modalada vastuka varṇaka-prabandhangalam gaḍiyīḷaḷa niyaviserpar.

65. Ibid., I, 18 (p. 5):
   "Iṣahirav sararas samāna-charitar śravjan-watyanatar
   Vīvidhābahunaya-tadagranugma-sahāhāyārthangalam bādhīpar
   Svavītāv-kavītā-praṇīga-rabhīr por-sarva-āśvastvanīrīn
   Tīvarindasē jagākhe Banmga-Maṇasimhārīyottamam puviniga!"

66. Ibid., I, 11-12 (p. 4):
   "Prajīnī kūṭākhar Tirumalārya sarvasē śrēchē chittamam
   Tōṇyade Bāngāmabhante vartisingum stuti-mauji-rangadāl;
   Pridĕm prauṣhṭvanamam perkaḷīke kāvīwar kūdpalaḥ-distradōl- менее
   Karami stāhiyadaḥ bāttaripōḍe rasanam Tīrumlāryangge sałgum"

67. See, for instance, Ibid., I, 10 (p. 8), quoting from the C. Vī. (V, 106) and the A. V. C. (III, 46); also works of Chikkadēvarāja and inscriptions composed by Bāṃśayam-Tīrumlārya, noticed below.

68. E.C., III (1) TN. 20; see also Ch. X, i. n. 189.

69. Ibid., IV (2) Ch. 93—see 11. 106-107:
The earliest of the undated works of Tirumalarya are, however, a series of hymns (stavah), also in Sanskrit, composed by him under the Sanskritised form of his name, ērīéailârya or ērīsáila-sûri. The following among these have come down to us: Ėrī-Yadugiri Nârâyanâ-Stavah, and Sîrī-Yadugiri-Nâyaki-Stavalp, in 79 and 24 stanzas respectively, in praise of the principal God and His Consort presiding over Mêlkôte; Sîrī-Lâkshmî-Nriîimha'Stavah in 23 stanzas in honour of God Lâkshmî-Nrsimha of Sêringapatara; Sîrī-Manjula-Kësava-Stavah in 25 stanzas, devoted to God Sàumya-Këéava of Nâgamangala; Sîrī-Apratima-Ràjagopâla-Stavah, in 18 stanzas, in eulogy of God Apratima-Bàjagopâla of Haradanahalli, the patron deity of Chikka-dëvarâja; Sîrī-Paravàsudëva-Stavah, in 70 stanzas, dedicated to God Paravàsudëva of Dëvanagara—on the banks of the Kaundini—of whoma Chikkadëva was an earnest adorer; and ārî-Gîpàla-Stavah, in 32 stanzas.

70. See the end of each Stavah in Y. N. Stavah, etc. : Srisailasûri krtishu.

71. Pp. 1-80 in Y. N. Stavah, etc., edited with Introduction (pp. i-vi) by Mr. Jaggû Venkatâchârya of Mêlkôte—Pub. V. B. Subbaiya & Sons, Bangalore, 1934 (in Telugu characters); see also Ms. No. A. 612—P. : Mys. Or. Lib. Some of the hymns from the Y. N. Stavah (i.e., vv. 3, 6-9, 68), we are told, are recited to this day by devotees of the God at Mêlkôte during the Mantrapushpam and on such occasions as Sankranti, Yugadi, etc (see Editorval Introduction, pp. iii-iv), an indication of the popularity of the Stavah.

72. Pp. 81-86 in Ibid.
73. Pp. 86-90 in Ibid.
74. Pp. 91-95 in Ibid.
75. Pp. 96-99 in Ibid.
76. P. 96. v. 2:

_Bhûna sakhÝdhaftt bhûna Chikkadevarâja-bhûpaâya | Kâhûâyaya Haradanapûrîm Sûtrînâprayatma-Ràjagopâlaâ_ ||

See also under Religion in Ch. XIII.

77. Pp. 100-112 in Ibid.
78. P. 100, v. 8:

_Parânhëma kehotâdhi varuçya bimba Karigiri | Vrîhâtri सûtryanam Yadugiristatí Dëvanagaram | Hrâmabhåjan bhûtya sërabhi Chikka-devëva-nypaâh_ Tëza bhrîdåshthânâya kâlaya mûsahamaraâ_ ||

See also under Religion in Ch. XIII.

79. Pp. 113-118 in Ibid.
devoted to God Gôpâla, the titular deity of Tira-
malârya's family, settled in the abode of his father
Nrsimhôrya or Alasingarârya. All thèse hymns reflect
to a considerable extent the early prédilections of Chikka-
dêvarâja Wodeyar for êrî-Vaishnavism under the influence
and example of his companion and councillor Tiruma-
lârya. Hence they are to be taken as having been written
between c. 1673-1678, a period which synchronises with
the earlier productions of Chikkupâdhâyâya and Timina-
Eavi also. Thèse hymns, again, like the Sângatyas of
Chikkupâdhâyâya, occupy an important place in the
devotional literature available to-day on Srî-Vaishnavism.
Elégant, dignified, and full of religious and moral
fervour, they are an index of Tirumalârya's high attain-
ments, and are good spécimens of his poetical style in
classical Sanskrit.

Next we hâve the Kannada works of Tirumalârya,
also undated. The earliest of thèse is
The Chikkadêva-
raya-Vamsâvali,
c. 1678-1680. a
prose work in Hâlagannaḍa dealing
with the traditional history of the rise and fortunes of
the Mysore Koyal House, down to Chikkadêvarâja
Wođeyar. This work, as it has come down to us, is in-
complète, since it stops abruptly with the invasion of
Seringapatam by êivappa Nâyaka I (in 1659) in the very
first year of the reign of Dêvarâja Wođeyar. It is
conspicuous also by the absence of any référence in the
text to its authorship. That Tirumalârya was the
undoubted author of the Chikkactêvarâya-Vamsâvali and
that it was his first literary production in Kannada are,
however, obvious from the occurrence of passages from

60. P. 113, v. 3, p. 115, v. 14: Vibarali Nrsimhârya ðhâvanî; Srîmum-
Nrsimha-purusârya gṛhyakñetrayât.
61. Pub. with Editorial Introduction (pp. 1-8), in the Kannâṭaka-Kânda-
Mangal-or Series, No. 13, Mysore, 1895; also P. L. Ms. of this work—No.
1081 of the Cal. Kâr. Ms. in the Môd. Or. Lib., and No. 112 (in
Grântha characters) of the Mys. Or. Lib.; also see also and compare Kâr. 
Ks. Ch., II. 481, 484-485.
it in his *Chikkadēvarâja-Vijayam*,\(^{82}\) and from the order of precedence followed by Tirumalârya himself in his *Apratima-Vira-Charitam*\(^{83}\) while alluding to his other works. There are, again, indications in the *Chikkadēvarâya-Vamsâvali* that it was written at a time when Chikkadēvarâja Wodeyar was becoming famous as *Karndtaka-Chakravarti* after curbing the local powers, and when he, at the height of his power, was asserting his claims to the sovereignty over the south as well (*Dakshinadik'Chakravarti*)\(^{84}\) The political achievements of Chikkadēvarâja during the early years of his reign, namely 1673-1678, were so important from the contemporary point of view that, as we have seen, they found adequate expression in the works of Chikkupâdhyâya and other contemporaries of Tirumalârya. Indeed, while these writers attempted in their writings to invest Chikkadēva with all halo of an epic hero by recounting his pedigree and exploits, Tirumalârya seems to have found it convenient to go even a step further and strike an altogether new tone by idealising and exalting his hero (Chikkadēvarâja) to the rank of a divinity—as an incarnation of Vishnu. That, at any rate, is how he has been depicted\(^{85}\) by setting his birth and early life against the background of Vaishnava tradition centring round the early history of the Euling Dynasty of Mysore. The *Chikkadēvarâya-Vamsâvali* appears, accordingly, to have been written not earlier than 1678 and not later than 1680. After invocation to Vishnjîtt, the work begins with an elaborate account of the rule and exploits of Râja Wodeyar (*Râja-Nripa-Charitam*) with spécial référence to his conquest and capture of Seringapatam (1610) from Tirumala, the Viceroy-nephew of Venkata I; and touches incidentally on the Vaishnava tradition relating to the origin and founding of the

\(^{82}\) Compare, for instance, C. *Vu*, I I I, 11, 142-144, with C. *Vam.* 88,160-161.

\(^{83}\) I, p. 6 (prose passage below v. 23).

\(^{84}\) See pp. 168-168; also Ch. XI, f.n. 69.

\(^{85}\) Pp. 146-151,166-169, etc.
Ruling Bouse of Mysore. This is followed by short notices of the reigns of Chāmarâja Wodeyar (Chāmarâja-Charitam), Imma4i-Bȉaja Wodeyar (Immadi-Râjarasa* Gharitam) and Kaçṭhîrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar (Kaṭṭhî-rāvarNarasarâja-Charitam). Then we have a lengthy account of Doḍḍadēvarâja Wodeyar (Doḍḍadēvarâja Gharitam), father of Chikkadēvarâja Wodeyar (and ruler of the city of Mysore under Kapṭhîrava-Narasa), by way of giving prominence to the birth and early éducation and training of Chikkadēvarâja as the heir to the throne of Mysore. At the end of this account is a brief but incomplète référence to the rule of Dēvarâja Wodeyar (younger brother of Doḍḍadēvarâja Wodeyar and uncle of Chikkadēvarâja) in Śeringapatam in succession to Kaçṭhîrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar, with an indication of Chikkadēva's position as Yuvarâja under Dēvarâja.

Though a prose work, the Chikhadēvarâya-Vamsâvali is conceived throughout in the poetic vein. It is a pièce of poetic prose, reading more like epic poetry superbly executed than as a plain prose narrative. Characterized by grandeur of diction, richness of imagery and beauty of the heroic and devotional sentiments delineated, it is a model of polished Ḥaḷagannada prose style in Mysore in the seventeenth century. From the literary point of view, therefore, it is invaluable as a classic. In estimating the Chikkadēvarâya- Vaméâvali from the historical point of view, however, it is to be remembered that Tirumalârya writes not as a strict chronicler but as a poet working on the traditional material available to him at the time. His accounts of historical persons and events, as we have noticed in the earlier chapters, are therefore not unoften marked by poetic license and lack of chronologial séquence, and are occasionally coloured by his personal prédictions as well.86 Due allowance must be made for these limitations in utilising

86. See, for instance, in Appendix II—(2) and V—(2) to this work,
the work for historical purposes. The Chikkadēvarâya* Vamsâvali is the earliest available work so far, enbodying, in particular, a genuine traditional account of the course of affairs relating to the rise and progress of the kingdom of Mysore under Râja Wodeyar (down to 1610) and his immediate successors (down to 1659). Used with caution and discrimination, it is of considerable value as a corrective to all accretions on the subject. From the contemporary standpoint, the Chikkadēvarâya Vamēâvaty iô of unique importance as throwing a flood of light on the development of Òrí-Vaishñnavism in Mysore in the seventeenth century; 87 it indeed has to be regarded primarily as a contribution to the literature on that religion in Kannada, and as an index of Tirumalârya's profound knowledge of its philosophy.

The Chikkadēvarâja-Vijayam, 88 the next literary production of Tirumalârya, is a Haḷarajaja-Vijayant, c. gannada champu in 6 cantos (āsvasa) 1682-1686. dealing with the pedigree of Chikkadēvarâja Wodeyar and his early life as Crown-prince under his uncle Dēvarâja Wodeyar. The poet styles it an epic, clearly mentions his name in the colophon at the end of each canto, and directly tells us that the work was written by him as a protégé of Chikkadôvarâja (àrï-Chikadêva-Mahârâja k r p à-p a r i p al i t a S r i- Tirumaleyârya virachitamappa Chikadēvarâja-Vijaya mahâ-prabandhadol). In the colophon at the end of the sixth canto, he speaks also of the completion of the poem (Chikadēvarâja- Vijayam mahâ-prabandham sampûrtyam), but the canto itself, as it has come down, is incomplete since it stops abruptly towards its close. The Chikkadēvarâja-Vijayam is decidedly earlier than

87. See, for instance, sections on Religion and Social life in Ch. IX, for details.
the Apratima-Vïra-Charitam which not only mentions it next in the order of precedence to the Chikkâdĕvarâya- Vcniávâli but is also found to contain verses from the former. It is, again, later than the Paravásudëva-Stavah and Chikkadĕvarâya-Vamsâvali because it borrows freely from both these works. Also certain portions from the latter work are found versified in the Chikkadĕvarâja-Vijayam. Further, the colophon to each canto of the Chikkadĕvarâja-Vijayam invariably refers to the titles of Chikkadĕvarâja Woḍeyar, some of them being indicative of his achievements over his contemporaries, namely, the Nâyak of Madura, the Muhammadans and the Mahrattas. The latest political event within the direct knowledge of the poet at the time he wrote this work seems, obviously, to be the Mahratta invasion of Seringapatam and its repulse by Chikkadĕvarâja about April 1682. In the light of these data, the composition of the Chikkadĕvarâja, Vijayam has to be fixed subsequently to 1682 but not later than 1686. The first canto in the work begins with the usual invocations to Vishñu, Lakshmi and the Àlvârs among others; and contains the traditional account of the création of the world and of the origin and rise of the Yâdava dynasty up to the advent of the Yadu princes to Mëlkôte and their settlement in Mysore as progenitors

89. Vide t. n. 85 supra.
90. Compare, for instance, A. V. C., i. 26, 29, 32, 34, 36, 39-41, 43, and II, B, 6, III, 17, 18, 26, 43, with C. Vi., V. 79, 101, 105, IV, 118, 96, V, 109, IV, 114, III, 17, IV, 120; and IV, 134, 137, 129, V, 107, IV, 125, V, 60.
91. Compare Paravásudëva-Stavah, vv. 10-12, 14-15, 19, 20, 47, 58, 61-62, 66 with those quoted in the C. Vi., pp. 129-134 (vv. 1-12); see also references in t. n. 85 supra.
92. Compare, for instance, C. Vam., 186-188, with C. Vi., IV, 50-160.
93. Pâñcāya-mandâladhipa-vilango-vilango-koñîhava-Koñîhava (lion to the elephant, the lord of the Pâñcāya country); Bhûrî-turushka-tushka-vara-
94. Decomposition of the Yâdava dynasty up to the advent of the Yadu princes to Mëlãkôte and their settlement in Mysore as progenitors.
of the Mysore Koyal Family. The next three cantoos are closely modelled on the subject-matter of the Chikka-dëvarâya-Vamsâvali. They deal, respectively, with the fortunes of the early rulers of the Wodeyar dynasty of Mysore; from [Hiriya] Bettåda-Châmarâja Wodeyar I I down to Kanthirava-Narasarâja Wodeyar; the idéalisation of Doddadëvarâja Wexjeyar, father of Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar (and ruler of the city of Mysore under Kanthirava-Narasa); and the birth, early life, éducation and tfaining of Chikkadëvarâja, the herô of the work, conceived of and depicted as an incarnation of Vishnu (Yadugiri-Nârâyana). The fifth canto mainly centres round the political events of the reign of Dëvarâja Wodeyar (younger brother of Doddadëvarâja Wodeyar and successor of Kanthirava-Narasarâja Wodeyar), and deals with the daily routine, etc., of his nephew Chikkadëvarâja as Crown-prince (Yuvarâja) under him. The last canço delineates a picture of the night adventures of the hero (i.e., Chikkadëva).

As a poetical work written on the classical model (champu), the Chikkadëvarâja-Vijayam is of considérable literary rnerit. It is a grand poem clothed in the most élégant language. Indeed, as Singarârya testifies, it is characterizëd by beauty of diction, straightforwardness and propriety of meanings and sweetness of sentiments and éloquence. The terseness of Tirumalârya's poetical style, however, is occasionally counter-balanced by the variety of mètres (like the tripadi and the sangatya) to which hefreely resorts. He is undoubtedly at his best in his delineation of the erotic sentiment and exhibits a thorough acquaintance with the text of Vâtsyâyana (Kâma-éâstra ; Kâma-tantradavaisika-prakarana),

---

96. See Miéra, Gô., I, p. 4, referring to an appreciation of the C. Pi. while quoting from it (p. 8, v. 13): 'Adhumâgulî mulpunâdûtâ sabudângala swayyam saralumum, karunovan purâna pavanaigeyum saravamunmeyin kemiodeya shneyanty tumidam listiâgalgo karegumî Tirumalârya shyderoya sarasatiya mulpunâda ukhiya boundaryam.'
particularly in the last canto. That is an épisode in itself, a sort of burlesque as it were, set against an idéal background of contemporary society, with a note of realism pervading throughout. The Chikkadēvarāja-Vijayam, as indicated above, treats of the traditional history of the rise of the kingdom of Mysore under Râja Woḍeyar (down to 1610) and his immediate successors (down to 1659), on the same footing and under the same background as the Chikkadēvarāya-Vamsâvali. At the same time, used with caution, it certainly is of greater importance than the latter as perhaps the only available contemporary source of information for the political history of the reign of Dēvarâja Woḍeyar (1659-1673), particularly on the relations of Mysore with Ikkēri (1659-1664) and the siège of ĖrÔdê (1667). No less significant is the work as a contribution to the literature on Srî-Vaishṇavism in Kannâḍa and as affording valuable évidence of the adoption of that faith by Chikkadēvarâja Woḍeyar.

Perhaps the latest work of Tirumalârya extant is the Apratima-Vira-Charitam, a treatise in 4 parts (prakaraṇa) on poetics (alâṅkâra-grantha), written at the instance of Chikkadēvarâja Woḍeyar. It is so styled because it treats of the exploits of Chikkadēva in so far as these serve to illustrate the aphorisms (sûtra) of the science of poetics, Apratima-Vira being only a title of Chikkadēvarâja which he is said to have acquired after curbing the pride of Ėivâji (1677). From internai

96. Vide Ch. XIII, for a detailed notice of the socio-religious data.
98. Vide Ch. XI, l.e. 58, for details.
évidence, the *Apratima-Vira-Gharitani* was, it would seem, a product of the latter part of Chikkadêvarâja's reign. It appears to have been written just at a time when Chikkadêvarâja was securely established on the throne of Seringapatam and when he was enjoying the sovereignty of the Karnâṭaka country after subjugating the contemporary powers in all the directions. Further, the latest political event of Chikkadêva's reign within the living memory of Tirumalârya at the time of his writing this work was, we note, the war with Ikkêri and the final acquisition of Arkalgûd from its chief Krishnappa Nâyaka (1694-1695). Chronologically, therefore, the *Apratima-Vïra-Charitam* has to be assigned to the period c. 1695-1700. The work begins with the usual invocation to Vishnu and with a brief référence to the pedigree and rule of Chikkadêvarâja personified as a divinity. The subject-matter proper is dealt with thus: On each item of the science of poetics, the relevant original *sûtra* in Sanskrit (from standard works of the classical school, like the *Kâvya-Prakâêa* of Mammaṭa, *Pratâpa-Rudrïya* of Vidyânâtha and *Kâvyâlankâra-Sûtra* of Vâmana) is first stated. This is followed by its gloss (*vritti*) in Kannada, together with

101. Compare the Editorial Introduction (p. v) to the A. V. C, which refers to the possibility of its having been written at a time when Tirumalârya was only a court poet (i.e., before 1686), on the following grounds: firstly, that the exploits or achievements of Chikkadêvarâja, echoed in the illustrative examples of the A. V. O., took place when Chikkadêva was Yuvaraja or Crown-prince (under his uncle Dêvarâja, 1659-1673); secondly, if it be assumed that Tirumalârya wrote the work during his period of office as Chikkadêvarâja's Prime Minister (i.e., 1686-1704), it would be open to question whether he could have found time and leisure for literary pursuits amidôt his onerous duties. This position is thoroughly untenable. For it does not consider in détail nor evaluate the internai évidence of the work bearing on the events of Chikkadêva's reign (1678-1704), but confines its attention only to certain verses in the text, borrowed from the C. V., referring to the early life and career of Chikkadêvarâja (i.e., during 1669-1673). Again, it was certainly not quite impossible for a person of Tirumalârya's capaoity and attainments to attempt literary production during c. 1695-1704, which was the period of consolidation and peaceful government in the long reign of Chikkadêvarâja Wodeyar.
an illustrative example in the form of a verse or verses. Soifte of these verses are found freely borrowed from the earlier work of Tirumalârya, namely, the Chikka-dévàrâja- Vijayam, while most of the illustrative examples are explained in intelligible prose also. The first part deals with the types of poetical composition and their general characteristics (kabbada lakkana); the second treats of style, diction, sentiment and verbal figures (rîti, sayye, pâka, vritti, sabdalankara)) the third deals with one hundred types of figures of speech bearing on meanings of rhetorical expressions (arthalankara) ; and the last with figures relating to sentiment (rasâlankara), and proof or testimony (pramndlankara) as expounded by the neo-scholiasts (posa-bijjevalar pêlvudam).

Apart from the value of the Apratima-Vïra-Charitam as a text-book of poetics in Kannada, the incidental references in the illustrative portion of it throw useful light on the relations of Chikkadêvarâja Woḍeyar with his contemporaries, namely, the Nâyak of Madura, the Mahrattas, the Muhammadans and the local powers including Ikkëri. Indeed, on this topic, Tirumalârya writes from direct knowledge, giving prominence to the delineation of the heroic sentiment. Looked at from this point of view, the Apratima-Vïra-Charitam constitutes an important contemporary source of information for the political history of Chikkadêvarâja's reign, while it also bears evidence of the culmination of Srî-Vaishnâvism as his personal religion during the latter part of his reign.

Tirumalârya is also credited with having written the Paschimarangaraja-Stavah and the Other works. Ėkddaëï-Nîrnaya in Sanskrit, and the Chikkadêvaraja-Satakam and the Kîrtanegalu in Kannada. Thèse hâve not corne down

102. Vide Ch. XI, for détails.
103. See Editorial Introduction to the C. Vam. (p. 3), C. Vi- (p. 8) and A. V. C. (p. iv); also Kar, Ka, Cha., I I. 461,
to us so far. The Chikkadevarāja-éatakam is, however, found mentioned by Tirumalārya himself in the Apratima-Vira-Charitam as a poetical work next in the order of precedence to the Chikkadēvarāya-Vamēâvali.

Singarārya (Singaraiyangār II), second son of Alasingarāya and younger brother of Tirumalārya, was, as already indicated, another prominent scholar at the court of Chikkadēvarāja Wođeyar. He was, we note, well known for his accomplishments in various subjects which he had mastered by the favour of Tirumalārya. Evidently he was a disciple of Tirumalārya, and had attained celebrity as an authority on matters literary.

Among his works in Sanskrit are a Gloss (vyākhyāna) on the Yadugiri-Nārāyaṇa-Stavah of Tirumalārya, and a poetical pièce named Srīsailārya-Dinacharyā (daily routine of Srīsailārya). Both these works are conspicuous by the absence of the name of the author. But internai évidence goes to establish that Singarārya wrote them as a disciple of Tirumalārya. In particular, the commentator refers in the Gloss to Nrsimhārya as his father, the latter being identical with the father of Singarārya and Tirumalārya, namely, Alasingarāya. The first stanza at the commencement of the Gloss occurs in the beginning of the Srīsailārya-Dinacharyā also. Further, there is a close similarity in respect of style of both these works as also an intimate acquaintance on the part of the author with the personality, character and works of

---

104. I, p. 5 (prose passage below v. 23).
105. Mitra, G., I, 3 (p. 2); see also Table in Appendix II—(4).
106. Ibid., p. 3 (prose passage below v. 6): Tirumalārya ya kṛṣṇyācārya-
galavatāda patavam bijjagatim norevanishc gudū.
108. See pp. 1-30 in the V. N. Stavah, etc., noticed in f.n. 71 supra.
109. See pp. 119-128 in Ibid.
111. See pp. 1, 110.
Tirumalârya, whom he regards as his preceptor (guru). The Gloss appears to have been written about 1678-1680 since the Stavahs of Tirumalârya are themselves assignable to the period 1673-1678, and since the latest event referred to in the Gloss, namely, the célébration of car festival, etc., at Mêlkôte on the occasion of the birthday of Srî-Râmânuja in the month of Ghaitra, is corroborated by a lithic record dated in 1678. The ériéalârya-Dinacharyây on the other hand, is to be dated in or about 1700, since the latest event echoed therein, is the visit of Tirumalârya (Srîsailârya) to Madura and his political advice to the Pândyan prince there (c. 1698).

Both the Gloss and the Srîsailârya-Dinacharyâ are indices of Singarârya's attainments in classical Sanskrit. The Gloss contains a word-for-word explanation of each stanza of the Yadugiri-Nârâyana-Stavah. Clear and authoritative, it évidences in a remarkable measure his thorough acquaintance with Sanskrit grammar, lexicon and poetics. The Srîsailârya-Dinacharyâ is composed in an élégant and dignified style and is full of religious and moral fervour of the poet as an earnest disciple of ériéalârya.

Only one Kannaḍa work of Singarârya is extant, namely, the Mitravinda-Govindam, a play (rûpaka) in 4 acts. It is perhaps the only available contribution to dramatic literature in Halagannada (Kârnâtakam nâtaham), being an adaptation of the Ratnâvali, the well-known Sanskrit work of Srî-Harsha. Singarârya

112. See pp. 119-128, vv. 1, 4-6, 22, 44, 54-56, etc.; see also and compare the Editorial Introduction (pp. ii-iii) to the Y. N. Stavah, etc., assigning the authorship of the Gloss to Singarârya on grounds similar to the above.
113. Vâde f.n. 110 supra.
114. H.C. III (1) Sr. 84; see also Ch. XIII, l.n. 126.
115. See Y. N. Stavah, etc., p. 126, v. 41: Srîsailâ-nirvâtha Pândya-nîpâya.
clearly refers to himself as the author of the play. The *Mitravindâ-Gôvindam* is later than the *Chikkadëvara-Vijayam* (c. 1682-1686) of Tîrumâlâyâ, the *Dëvanagara Copper-plate grant* (c. 1686-1690) coiposed by Râmâyânam-Tîrumâlâyâ and the *Sachchûdrâ-châra-Nimaya* (c. 1687-1690) of Chikkadëvarâja, for it quotes passages from these sources. It is, again, almost contemporaneous with the *Apratima-Vîra-Gharitam* (c. 1695-1700) because it refers to Tirumâlâyâ as having completed ail his works, including the treatise on alankâra (i.e., *Apratima-Vîra-Charitam*), at the time Singarârya wrote this dramatic piece; and points also to the last phase in the life of Tirumâlâyâ when he had attained prominence as a Sri-Vaishnava philosophical teacher. The *Mitravindâ-Gôvindam* has therefore to be fixed in the period c. 1700-1704, when Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar was ruling the kingdom of Mysore in peace and quiet, at the end of a long series of conquests by which he had Consolidated his position as a ruler. The work begins with the usual invocation to Vishnu (Govinda). The plot of the play is similar to that of the *Ratnâvali*, its prototype. It differs, however, from the latter in so far as the dramatist invents his own names for the characters, Vâsudëva (or Krishna) being made the hero, with Bukmini as his senior queen and Mitrvindâ (the counterpart of Ratnâvali) as the heroine (afterwards junior queen of Vâsudëva). Again, considérable space is devoted in the work to the delineation of the comic sentiment, the play being intended to

117. I, 3-5 (p. 9.): *Singarâraya-nusîrdam; Singarâraya-rovîndam... nâtaka.*


119. P. 4 (vachana); see also f.n. 64 supra.

be enacted under the Very eye of Chikkadēvarāja on the occasion of Vasantōtsava\textsuperscript{121} of God Ranganātha of Sēringapatam, evidently a very popular festival of the time. The Mitravindā-Gōvindam is written in an eminently enjoyable style and, as Singarārya himself tells us,\textsuperscript{122} is characterized by a wealth of pleasing mētres, directness of meaning, sweetness and beauty of diction, a happy association of words, figures and sentiments, and harmony of sounds. Altogether a unique contribution to the Kannada literature of the times, testifying to the activities and tastes of the court of Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar during the last years of his reign.

Singarārya refers\textsuperscript{123} in the Mitravindā-Gōvindam to two more works of his, namely, Rāghava-bhyudaya and Gīta-Rangēsvara. These, however, have not so far come to light.

A series of works either ascribed to or written by Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar himself, are extant. The earliest of these is the Bhārata-Vachana,\textsuperscript{124} a Kannada prose version of the Mahābhārata in Chikkadēvarāja's name (Chikkadēva-Mahārāja-pranītamappa tīku; Chikkadēvarāya virachitamappa Kamāta-bhāshā rachita . . . tippāṇadō), dealing with the Sānti-Parva, salya-Parva, Gadā-Parva, Sauptika-Parva, Aishika-Parva, Strī-Parva, Mausala-Parva,
Makâprasthâṇq-Parva and Svargârôhana-Parva. All these episodes from the great epic seem to have been compiled between 1682-1686, since the latest political event directly reflected in them (especially in the colophons to the Sânti-Parva) is Chikkadēvarâja’s repulse of the Mahratta invasion of Seringapatâ under Dâdaji and Jaitaji (c. April 1682), and since they point to Chikkadēva as having been at the height of his power at the end of his campaigns against his feudatories (Karnâṭa dharâmandalanum; samasta sâmanta-nrpa sarvasva sanhrâmana). They begin with invocations to Gaṇêśa, èārada, Vâsudēva, Krishṇa and Vēda-Vâyâsa. Some of the colophons to the chapters refer also to ChikkadēvarâjVs dévotion to Yadugiri-Nârâyana and Mukunda. The Bhârata-Vâchana is written in homely Hosagannada prose style, and is another index of èrī-Vaishcavism as ChikkadēvarâjVs personal religion during the interraeditate stage (1680-1696). To the same period belongs the Kannâda prose version of the second section of the Bhâgavata (also in Chikkadēvarâja’s name) entitled Chikkadēvarâja-Sûkti-Vilâsa.125 The colophon to the work refers to Chikkadēvarâja as enjoying the sovereignty of the Empire (c. 1686) (sâmrajyaéchikkadêvarâja-, nrpatêh).

The next work of importance in Chikkadēvarâja’s name is the Sachchûdrâchâra-Nirnayay c., Nîrnay, a126 (èrī-Chikkadēva-mahâ-râjêna pranijêshu; èrī-Chikkadēva-mahârâja krtishu Sachchûdrâchâra-Nîrnayê), a treatise (mahâ-prabandha) in 14 chapters (adhikâra) defining and codifying the rites and practices for a good Śûdra. The introductory chapter (upôdghâtadhikâra) begins with the usual invocation to Vishjju and deals with the pedigree and exploits of Chikkadēvarâja Wodeyar. At the end of

125. Ms. No. 16—P.L. Mys. Or., Lib.; see also and compare Kar. Ka. Cha; Le.
The last chapter is a long prose colophon recounting a series of titles of Chikkadēvarâja, which reflect his achievements and the outstanding political events of his reign. The latest of these events incidentally referred to in both these chapters are Chikkadēvarâja's repulse of the Mahârânta invasion of Seringapatam (1682) and his acquisition of Bangalore from Ėkôji (1687). The poetical passages and the prose colophon included, respectively, in these parts of the work are evidently taken from the compositions of Râmâyariam-Tirumalârya. Such borrowing, as is usual with Royal authors, does not, however, mean here anything more than that the king refrains, out of modesty, from speaking in praise of his own ancestry or exploits. Again, the Sachchûdrâchâra-Nirnayais slightly later than the Seringapatam Temple copper-plate charter (1686) and almost contemporaneous with the Dêvanagara copper-plate grant (c. 1686-1690), since the introductory chapter contains verses which are found in both these documents. It appears further to have preceded Chikkadēvarâja's legislation relating to the Arasu families in October 1690. We would not, therefore, be far wrong in assigning the work to about 1687-1690. The Sachchûdrâchâm-Nirnaya is a compilation in a mixture of prose (vachana) and poetry in Sanskrit, the subject-matter being taken from the 12th chapter of the Siva-Mâhâtrtvya of the Sûta-Samhitâ in the Skânda-Purana. It is supported also by illustrative références from the Vishnu-Purana, the Bhâgavata and the Manu-Smriti. The work was, we learn, written with a view to bring about a much-needed social reform, namely, the uplift of the êûdras and the préservation intact of the idéal of Varnâérama-dharma applicable to them as members of the fourth order of Hindu society. The subject-matter.

proper begins with invocation to Šrīśaila-Guru. The chapters forming the work are devoted to the consideration of matters relating to a good ōûdra's privilèges and duties. Among the topics dealt with are: définition of the nature of the Šūdra caste (ōûdra-jāti svarūpa); rights and limitations of a Šūdra in respect of āâstraic and Vēdic studies (Sāstra āvasyatva, vidyāsthānēshuchādhikārānadhikriye); principal duties and practices observable by him (mukhya-dharma); détermination of his privilèges in regard to imprégnation and other cérémonies (nishēkādishu); the dīkṣā, etc., according to the Pāñcharātra (Pāñcharātrōkta dīkṣādi); divine knoweldge (brahmajnānādhisthikāra); daily prayers (sandhya ā karma); pollution (āêaucha) and funeral rites (karma-prayōga). 128

Ascribed to Chikkadēvarāja Woûeyar are a number of songs in Kannada, composed in the saptapadi and tripadi mètres. Thèse hâve corne down to us under the appellation of Çhikkadēvarāya-Saptapadi129 and Tripadigala-Tâtparya130 the latter being also known as Sringāra-Sangīta-Prabandha. The latest political events echoed in these works are Chikkadēvarāja's législation relating to Arasu families (1690) and the acquisition by him of Šākrepāṭṇa and Chickmagalūr (1690).131 Thèse songs are accordingly to be assigned to the period c. 1690-1695. They not only eulogise Chikkadēvarāja's exploits but also serve to illustrate his dévotion to Vishṇu. Further, they seem to reveal, and bring us into intimate touch with, the personality of Chikkadēvarāja Woûeyar.

128. See ff. 10-13 (Introd. Ch.) referring to the scope of the work, etc. For a detailed exposition of the aims and objects of the Sachchā. Nir., see under Social life—Social législation, in Ch. XI11.
130. Ms.No. 18-6-6—P. L.; Mad. Or. Lib.
181. Vide Ch. XI, f.n. 149, for détails.
Of, perhaps, greater interest and significance, however, are two Kannada productions entitled Chikkadēvarāja-Binnapam and Gïta-Gôpalam. Both these works are later than the Chikkadēvarāja-Vijayam (c. 1682-1686), the Apratima-Vïra-Charitam (c. 1695-1700) and the Sachchûdrâchâra-Nîrnaya (c. 1687-1690), since they freely borrow verses from the first two sources and the long prose colophon in Sanskrit from the last-mentioned one. Both begin with invocation to Vishnu (as Yadugiri-Nârâyana), and both are assignable to the period c. 1700-1704, which corresponds to the latest phase of Sri-Vaishnavism as the personal religion of Chikkadēvarâja Wodeyar. The Binnapam, however, is the earlier of the two and appears to have been written in or after 1700 when Chikkadēvarâja was, according to the work itself, ruling Mysore in peace having subjugated his enemies (including the Kodagu and Maleyâla chiefs) in all the eight directions (endeseya pagegaladangidudarim). The Gïta-Gôpalam is slightly later than the Binnapam, since it contains poetical pièces and prose passages from the latter, though in a condensed form.

The colophon at the end of each of these works provides additional information about the timing and origin of these works. The Chikkadēvarāja-Binnapam and Gïta-Gôpalam, c. 1700-1704.
refers to it as a prabandha and to the author as Chikkadēvarâja Wodeyar (Srî-Chikadēva-mahârâja virachitamappa divya prabandhangalol). At the same time these productions evidence, as usual, a free borrowing from, and are indicative of an acquaintance with, the earlier writings of contemporaries, particularly those of his minister Tirumalârya. Nevertheless there are sufficient grounds on which we can assign their authorship to Chikkadēvarâja Wodeyar himself. Firstly, the subject matter of the texts is wholly permeated by the prédictions, expériences and views of Chikkadēvarâja. Indeed his persônality appears prominently throughout, arid the reader is made to feel that he is being directly addressed by, and brought into intimate contact with, him. Secondly, the methodology of these works differs from that of the well-known contributions of Tirumalârya and his, colleagues, in so far as the author here clearly states and develops his thesis with an individuality and zest ail-his own. Thirdly, in marked contrast with the works of Tirumalârya and other scholars, the prose and poetical style of these writings is perfervid, yet homely, eminently popular and quite intelligible. Fourthly and lastly, although there is no independent evidence that Chikkadēvarâja Wodeyar was an author himself, there is enough data at hand to hold that he was a person of many-sided tastes and accomplishments and that the possibility of his having tried his hand at literary ventures, particularly during the peaceful years of the latter part of his reign, is not altogether ruled out.  

137 187. For détails about the tastes and accomplishments of Chikkadēvarâja Wodeyar, vide Ch. X V I below. Cf. Kar. Kd. Cha. (II. 466, 460) which, while ascribing both these works to Chikkadēvarâja, refers to the possibility of Tirumalârya having written the Gi. Gô, and passed it off in Chikkadēva's name, on the ground that verses from Tirûmalârya's works (like the C, Vi. and A.V.C.) occur largely in it. This position is untenable since it eschews considérations of personal élément, style, methodology, etc., above referred to, borrowals apart.
The Chikkadêvarâja-Binnapam, as noticed in the preceding chapter, deals with the essence of the Śrī-Vaishnava philosophy of Visistâdvaitism, in the form of thirty humble prose pétitions (Binnapa) addressed by Chikkadêvarâja Wodeyar to God Nârâyana of Mêlkôte, the tutelary deity of the Yadn race (tan tanna kula-dëvatey appa Yâdavagiri-Nârâyananañadidâvaregalge biamapam geyva nevadol). The work commences with eulogistic passages in poetry and prose referring to or echoing Chikkadêvarâja's exploits and achievements. Then the Royal author sets out his objective, namely, popularisation of the fundamentals of all philosophical knowledge among his subjects in readable Kannada, in accordance with the well-known message of the Lord in the Bhagavad-Gītā, to enable them all to attain salvation. The first ten pétitions deal with the nature and attributes of the Suprême Being as creator, préserver and destroyer (trividha-kârananum). The next eight pétitions are centred round the romance of création (srsti-krama), with spécial référence to the universe, the éléments, heaven and hell; and the last twelve expound the nature of salvation (môksha) and the means of attaining it. The work reads throughout as a model pièce of flowing Halagannada prose, each Binnapa beginning with a stanza in the Jcanda mètre by way of introduction. The Gita-Gôpâlam is a poetical work in two parts, modelled on the Gita-Gôvinda of Jayadêva. It is devoted to an exposition of salvation for the masses in accordance with the teaching of the Bhagavad-Gītā, as is pointed out by Chikkadêvarâja Wodeyar himself. Each part contains a série of songs in seven sections (saptapadî). Each section of the first part contains seven groups of songs,
ail in the tripadi mètre; each section of the second part also embodies the same number of groups of songs which are, however, in the panchapadi, tripadi and ēkapadi mètres, their number varying. The songs, on the whole, seem to be modeled and improved upon those of the earlier works ascribed to Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar, namely, the Chikkadēvarāya-Saptapadi and Tripadigala-T.ātparya. They are occasionally interspersed by prose passages (vachana) briefly explaining the point at issue in each section. Both the parts are intimately connected with the explanation of the doctrine of trust in God's Grāce.¹⁴¹ The first part (pūrva-bhāga), in particular, depicts the boyhood and sports of Lord Srī-Krishna by way of giving prominence to Chikkadēvarāja's holding communion with and realizing the divine attributes of the Suprême Being;¹⁴² the second (uttara-bhāga) treats also of the doctrine of absolute surrender to Vishnu as the means of attaining salvation.¹⁴³ Delivered in a colloquial diction, the songs in the Gīta-Gōpālam have a fascination of their own; they are soul-stirring and universal in their appeal and unfailing in the human interest attaching to them.

The Chikkadēvarāja-Binnapam and the Gīta-Gōpālam thus occupy an important place in the ērī-Vaishṇava literature of the period as living expressions of that faith in its popular aspect.¹⁴⁴ Chikkadēvarāja's religion as propounded in the Binnapam, in particular, is not merely the irreligional acceptance of a remote deity but a passionate insistence on the love and mercy of God. This prose-poem of his is not to be deemed a petty study

---

¹⁴¹ P. 5: Eruḍum dhagudolo!... nambugeyemba taṇḍupayamam nīrūpāvar.
¹⁴² Ibid.
¹⁴³ P. 41: Mokṣhamam adhipudarke upayamāda prapattī-vraṇāpanam nīrūpāvar.
¹⁴⁴ For summaries of relevant extracts from these works, vide under Religion in Ch. XIII.
or a simple exposition of mere theological opinion; it is the portrait of as variously gifted and fascinating a man as ever lived. Various gifted, we say advisedly, because the legend of his having been a religious persecutor has well nigh buried the lyric poet, the great soldier, the thinking philosopher, the subtle politician, the brilliant diplomat and the humane ruler. This work enables us to see the whole man as he was. His portrait of himself, as sketched here, may cause controversy; but he has helped to kill the traditional portrait perpetuated through the centuries. His Appeal—such a self-revealing, humble name—is one of great charm and humanity and is, even in the religious literature of India, of quite unusual design. There is not another work which gives, in such brief compass, so attractive a presentation of the true inwardness of the Vaishnavite doctrine of Grâce. It is one of the most successful attempts ever made to link up mystical Vaishîjavite theology with the great doctrine of Prapatti. Only a devout, passionate and earnest Vaishnava, imbued with the truest spirit of the doctrine of Grâce, could have written it. And when that is acknowledged, we acknowledge the fine spiritual atmosphere in which he lived, moved and had his being.

Another Śrī-Vaishnava scholar at the court of Chikka-
dēvarâja Woḍeyar was Râmâyarîam-
Tirumalârya (or Tirumalâchârya) of Kaundînîya-gôtra. He was by profession, we note, a reader of the Râmâyana and the Mahâ-
bhârata, skilled in composing poems in Kannada, Telugu

---

145. See E.C., III (1) Sr. 64 (1720), II. 727-728, 730-731, and Sr. 100 (1724), II. 91, 198-200:

Rāmāyanam-Tirumalâryam Kaundînîya Vaishnava kavīm ||
Śrī Rāmāyana-Bhārata-parayana-vihīna-vrīthiṇa-hṛtiṇa |
Kavīs Tirumalapachārya . . . ||
Korekândârâ-samâkhya-kavîś-rudhâravakâdhu yath hukulâ ||
Tennâdat Rāmāyana-Tirumalapachārya-vâripa . . . ||
and Sanskrit languages, and proficient in music. With the assent of Chikkadëvarâja, he composed the Dëvanagara copper-plate grant in Sanskrit and Kannada. The subject-matter of this grant, as referred to in the preceding chapter, relates to the year 1674, but the grant itself appears to have been actually composed at a considerably later date, since there are clear references in it to the events of 1682 and since it records also an additional share (vrittî) granted subsequent to 1674. The earliest record echoing the events of 1682 is the Seringapatam Temple copper-plate charter dated in 1686; the next one is the long introductory chapter in the Sachchûdrâchâra-Nirnaya (c. 1687-1690), narrating the pedigree and exploits of Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar. The Dëvanagara Plate seems obviously to be subsequent to the former and almost contemporaneous with the latter, since it contains verses found in either of these latter sources. Hence it must be taken to have been composed between c. 1686-1690.

On the ground of similarity of style and language, the Seringapatam Temple copper-plate charter and the introductory chapter to the Sachchûdrâchâra-Nirnaya (setting out the pedigree, etc., of Chikkadëvarâja, together with the long prose colophon at the end of the treatise), referred

---


147. Ibid., II, 98-106; see also Ch. XI, f.n. 98 and 108, for details.

148. Ibid., I, 160-176.

149. Vide references cited in f.n. 127 supra.

---
to above, haverto Jbe asaigned, to Râmâyaṇam-Tirumalârya, although his name is not specifically mentioned in both of these works. These documents are jirawn up in the approved kâvyâ style in Sanskrit. Indeed so melodious are the poetisai passages of Râmâyaṇani-Tîtn- malârya that Singarârya quotes from them in the Mitravindâ-Gûvindam.²⁵⁰

Among the poëtesses of Chikkadêvarâja's court working directly under the Sri-Vaishnava influence, were Honnamma and Srigâramma. Honnamma wrote the Hadibadeya-Dharmam a Kannada poetical work in 9 chapters (sandhi) dealing with the duties of a faithful housewife. The poetess was, as noted in the preceding chapter, the bearer of Chikkadêvarâja's pouch (sanchi). She appears to have belonged to the fourth order of the Hindu society,²⁵² and was attached to the household of Chikkadêvarâja Wocienyar since her teens (pâdadûligadolu baleda bâlaki).²⁵³ She was, as she refers to herself,²⁵⁴ an ordinary unlettered lady who wrote under the influence and favour of her religious preceptor Alasingarârya. Indeed Alasingarârya, we are told,²⁵⁵ had once brought

---

²⁵⁰ I, 9 (p. 8); see also i.n. 118 supra. For details about the 18th century compositions of Râmâyaṇam-Tirumalârya, vide Ch. XVIII in Vol. II of this work.
²⁵² See I, 20-84, also 8-10, where she speaks of herself as a humble, yet highly favoured, chambermaid serving under Chikkadêvarâja.
²⁵³ I, 94.
²⁵⁴ I, 22, 28, IX, 63, 66-68: Oleviṣṭânu ma vâdadârîve; palavattugâpiṇde pana demonstrâdu pînavâgâpiṇde balavastibhugonendrinavâjâla; Alasingarâryamukhânu kpa vaidhavako; nagaûa maineyindâgi mahâtery pêlideny; A upadâvatvâvâraya tanaça vâdhadâlo pêlideny.
²⁵⁵ I, 12-18 (pp. 1-4), 20-83; see also under Position of women in Ch. XIII. Compare the account of the poetess and her work in the Editorial Introduction (pp. 1-5) to it and in the Kar. Ka. Oha. (II, 506), which refers to the possibility of Honnamma (the poetess) having been a native of
her literary and poetrical talents to the notice of Chikkadēvarâja, who desired his principal consort, Dëvamma of Yeândûr, to hace a poem composed by her (Honnâmma). And Honnâmma, thus encouraged, wrote the work. The Hadibadeya-Dharmam is an undated poem. Internal evidence, however, goes to show that it was written at a time when Chikkadēvarâja Wodeyar was at the height of his power after his series of conquests in all the eight directions (astadigvijaya lakshmiyaru) during the early part of his reign, and when Alâsingarârya, father of Tirumalârya, had risen to eminence in the social life of the period as a leading Śrī-Vaishnava philosophical scholar. In particular, the titles (namely, srîmad-Vëdamarga-Pratisthâpanâchâryâ, Ubhaya-Vëdântâchâryâ) by which Alâsingarârya is addressed in the Hadibadeya-Dharmam are found repeated Verbatim in two litbic records of 1678 referring to him. The Hadibadeya-Dharmam was thus a product of the period c. 1678-1680. The introductory chapter (piṭhikâ sandhi) indicates the scope and subject-matter of the poem. It begins with invocations to Gûd Paechimarangadhâma and Goddess Kanganâyaki of Seringapatam as well as God Nârâyaṇa of Yadugiri (Melkôte). Then follows a reference to the ancestry of Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar and a brief notice of his rule.
and court and the circumstances under which the work came to be written; The poem, in the words of the poetess, is an embodiment of the essence of the philosophy of virtuous womanhood, an elixir of life, the quintessence of sublime truth and the secret of dharma being intended for study and practical observance by all good housewives.

The theme of the poem is adapted, and aptly illustrated by references, from the Râmâyana, Mahâbhârata (including the Bhagavad-Gîtâ), Bhâgavata, Vishnu-Vûrûna, and the canonical texts of Manu and other law-givers, with which the poetess shows her acquaintance.

The next eight chapters are centred round the subject-matter of the work proper. Each of these chapters begins with invocations to Vishnu and Lakshmi in their various manifestations. The second and third chapters deal, respectively, with the devotion of a good housewife to her husband and the nature of her services to him. The fourth chapter treats of her behaviourism towards her parents-in-law and other inembers in the family, and of faithful service to her husband. The fifth deals with the treatment to be accorded to her by her parents, brothers and sisters, parents-in-law and other relations; and touches on the responsibilities of parents in bringing up their daughters and bestowing them in marriage on right types of husbands. Chapter six is an exposition of the ethics of honourable wedlock, with reference to the happy companionship and co-operation of the married couple through life. Chapter seven depicts the state of renunciation and passionate longings of a virtuous lady separated from her husband during his long absence from his place. The next chapter deals with the daily

159. I, 33, 49, IX, 54: Sati dharma . . . idu pâtīrâtya-dharma-tâpâda


routine of a devoted wife in her household. The last chapter is an earnest plea for single-minded devotion to and worship of Vishnu on the part of faithful housewives, at the end of their meritorious careers, as means of attaining salvation in accordance with the doctrines of Sri-Vaishnavism. The poem concludes with an expression of the indebtedness of the poetess to her preceptor Alasingarârya and an eulogy of Çhikkadêvarâja Wodeyar's rule in Mysore.

The Hadibadeya-Dharmam is in the main written in the sângatya mètre. The close of each chapter, however, is indicated by a verse in the kanda mètre (sanchiya Honnamma nusirda kabbadolu . . . sandhi). The work is a typical piece of Halagannada poetry, its diction being grammatically pure, homely, easy-flowing, free from ornamentation and intelligible to a degree. Throughout, the poem is expressive of the humility, earnestness and sincerity of convictions of an unsophisticated mind yearning for the maintenance unimpaired of the ancient ideals of Hindu womanhood, and for the preservation and promotion of domestic peace and felicity. Although, perhaps, Honnamma may be said to depict an idealistic picture of things, she maintains an intimate connection with the realities of contemporary life, in so far as she wrote under the Sri-Vaishnava influence of the times. Indeed she does appear prominently as a moralist working against a religious and philosophical background, and her poem is but an index of the popularity of Sri-Vaishnavism in the court of Mysore about 1680. As an exceedingly interesting though a plain lettered ode, as an everlasting code of social ethics relating to the duties

162. See IX, 1-6, 19-12, 45-48, referring to the merits, etc., of jñâna, vaisnâya, kari-bhakti, ânya-karma, nitya-naimitha-karma, vâhasya-traya, pancha-samskrta and arthapancha-svâtra as means of salvation (nukita).

163. See I, 38: Elikarunarivancavatvavatugulinde sottawone, where Honnamma herself refers to the simplicity of her style.
and responsibilities of women as good housewives,¹⁶⁴ the Hadibadeya-Dharmam occupies a unique place in the Kannada literature of Chikkadévarâja's reign.

Sringâramma wrote the Padmini-Kalyâna¹⁶⁵ (c. 1685).

She belonged to a Srî-Vaishnava Brâhmanical family, being a daughter of Chintâmani-Dêéikëndra and disciple of ērînivâsa-Dêéika.¹⁶⁶ She was, as already referred to,¹⁶⁷ a young poetess favoured by Chikkadévarâja Wođeyar. The Padmini-Kalyâna is a Kannada poem, also in the sângatya mètre, describing the inarriage between God ērînivâsa of Tirupati and Padmini.¹⁶⁸

By far the most important contributor to Vîra-éaiva literature during the reign of Chikkadévarâja Wođeyar was Shadaksharadéva (Shađaksharaiya), particulars of whose ancestry, etc., we have elsewhere noticed.¹⁶⁹ Shadaksharadéva, we learn,¹⁷⁰ had attained celebrity, and been honoured by the cultured classes, as an expert in the art of composing poems in the Sanskrit and Kannada languages. His "Vmtings generally belong to the période. 1655-1700, although, curiously enough, there is nowhere any référence therein, to his actual position as one of the councellors of Chikkadévarâja's cabinet. Among the extant works, in Halagannada, of Shadakshari are the

¹⁶⁴. IX. 54: Dharmada namah muryadante kriyagâ niṁmi niśeśaṁi.
¹⁶⁶. Ibid.
¹⁶⁷. Ante, Ch. XIII—see under Position of women; also Kar. Ka. Cha., I.c.
¹⁶⁹. Vide under Council of Ministers, in Ch. XII.
¹⁷⁰. See colophon to Shađaksharadéva's works (i.e., Bhaktadâkhyâ-Ratnâcâl, Bâjâṭkârâ-Vîlês, Vrâbhândra-Vîjaya, and Sabaravânârâ-Vîlês): Sanskrta Kândâka dhâshamaya sarasa-prabhanda-nirmâna-chaturi-dharîna; sarasamednamândâbhâyakavita-vîdâra; udhâyakavita-vichâra. See also Râj. Kath., XII. 474, where Devachandra speaks of Shađakshari as having been a distinguished poet of his age (Shađaksharâya kudâkkhara-nîśadhi).
Rājasēkharar Vilāsa,¹⁷¹ Vrshabhēndra- Vijaya,¹⁷² and Ēabaraēankara Vilāsa¹⁷³ all written in the chāmpu style. The earliest of these is the Rājaēēkhara-Vilāsa, a pràbandha completed on January 30, 1655¹⁷⁴. It deals, in 14 chapters, with the story of how prince Rājaēēkhara, son of Satyēndra Chōla, received capital punishment at the hands of his father for having caused the death of a child during his récréations in the streets of his capital city, and how he ultimately obtained salvation at the hands of īva. It is based on the original Tamil work of Tirugnāna-Sambandar (Pillai-Nāinār), first written in the form of an epic poem in Kannada by Gubbi-Mallānārya (c. 1513) in his Bhâvachintāratna.¹⁷⁵ A manuscript copy of the Rājaēēkhara-Vilāsa appears to have been actually completed on July 9, 1673 (Pramâdîcha?, Srâvana eu. 6).¹⁷⁶ It was probably this copy which is said to have been presented by Shadaksharadēva at the court of Chikkadēvarāja. The Vrshabhēndra-Vijaya, also called Basavarāja-Vijaya, was brought to completion on January 28, 1677.¹⁷⁸ It is a mahā-purāṇa in 42 chapters, dealing with the life of Basava, founder of Vīra-Śaivism. From a manuscript of this work it would seem that a copy of it was made by one Ganjām Yatirājīya by December 23, 1700.¹⁷⁹ The Ēabarasankara-

---

¹⁷² Ms. No. K. 406—P.L.; Mys. Or. Lib.; see also and compare Ibid., 442, 446-447.
¹⁷³ Ms. Nos. 67 and 387—P.L.; Mys. Or. Lib.; see also and compare Ibid., 443, 446-449.
¹⁷⁴ XIV, 164: Jayābhada Māga tuddha . . . trīṣīṣgyali . . . i kṛti parījanomāhya.
¹⁷⁶ Ms. No. K. 67 (referred to in t.n. 171 supra), ff. 113, v. 185.
¹⁷⁷ See Rāj. Katha. (XI. 489, XI. 593), where Dēvachandrā speaks of Shadakshari as having been well acquainted with Lālāvati and other narrative poems (vasthā kārya), and refers to his (Shadakshari’s) presentation of a copy of the Rājaēēkhara-Vilāsa to Chikkadēvarāja and to his being honoured with grants of māths, rent-free lands, etc., on the latter’s appreciation of it.
¹⁷⁸ f. 169, v. 91: Nājaba Māga māsāda nīpa-paṇḍha pāchanci.
¹⁷⁹ Ms. No. K. 406 (referred to in t.n. 171 supra), ff. 154 (ending).
Vilasa\textsuperscript{180} (c. 1690-1700) is also à prabandha in 5 chapters, dealing with the well-known sportive fight of éiva (in the guise of a huntsman) with Arjuna. Shadaksharadéva is further credited\textsuperscript{181} with having written in Sanskrit the Kavikarna-Rasâyana, Bhaktâdhikya-Rdtñâvali and Sivâdhikya-Ratnâvali. Only the first two of these works (c. 1680-1690) have, however, come down to us,\textsuperscript{188} and they are contributions to the devotional literature on Vîra-êaivism. The Bhaktâdhikya-Ratnâvali, in particular, has also a gloss (tippanî) entitled Bhaktânanda-Dâyini, written by one Guru-Siddha-Yàti.\textsuperscript{183}

Shadakshari usually begins his works after invoking êiva and the deities of the Saiva panthéon (i.e., Ganëéa, Shanmukha, Nandi, etc.), and after referring to his preceptor (Chikkavîra-Dêéika) and the early Vîra-êaiva poets (i.e., Basava, Channabasava, Prabhudéva, Mallana, Harîévara, Bâghavânka, Sômanâtha, Nijagurîa-êivayôgi and others). He invariably speaks of the excellence of his writings as stressing new modes of literary expression (navîna . . . ukti; nava-kâvya; nûtana; posa rlti . . ; navinamâlankrti)\textsuperscript{184} His diction is majestic, flowing and melodious, though his descriptions are in an ornate style. Altogether Shadaksharadéva's contributions are an index of the potency of Vîra-êaiva tradition in Mysore during the latter part of the seventeenth century.

\textsuperscript{180} From the order of precedence mentioned in a P. L. Ms. (No. 67, ff. 29-30) of the Sabaradankara-Vîlsa, it would appear that the latter work was written subsequently to the Rajaíkhara-Vîlsa, Vyshakândra-Vîjaya and Kavikarna-Rasâyana. Hence we are inclined to place it within the latest chronological limits, i.e., c. 1690-1700. See also and compare Kar. Ka. Cha., II. 468.

\textsuperscript{181} See Preface to Bhaktâdhikya-Balnâvâji.

\textsuperscript{182} Ms. No. A. 61—P.; Mys. Or. Lib., and B. 990 (Pub.) in the Mys. Or. Lib. In view of what has been stated in f.n. 180 supra, we have to assign these works to c. 1690-1890.

\textsuperscript{183} See p. 88 (colophon) of B. 990 cited above.

\textsuperscript{184} Vide Ms. cited in f.n. 131-133 supra; see also Kar. Ka. Cha. (II. 444-448, 449), quoting texts from the originals.
Among the Jaina authors of the period, Chidânanda and Chikkawa-Pandita claim our attention. Chidânanda was, we note, a poet, on whom the pontifical office at the Juin math of Ėravâna-Belagola had been bestowed by his predecessor Chârukîrti-Pandita-Yôgîndra who had left the place to Sôniavârpet owing to certain serious local differences. At the time of Chidânanda's succession to the pontificate after the death of Chârukîrti, the same state of affairs, we are told, continued at Ėravaca-Belagola, in conséquence of which he had to go about on a tour through various parts of the country (nânâ nàdugalolu saricharisi). Ultimately, however, he was established in the pontificate with the assurance of safety (abhaya) promised by Chikkadēvarâja Wodeyar.

As a mark of gratitude to Chikkadēvarâja, it would appear, Chidânanda wrote the Munivamêdbhyudaya, c. 1700. The poem, as it has come down, is in 5 chapters (sandhi) and is incomplete. The first chapter begins with invocation to Jina (Vîtarâga) and contains verses of eulogy directly addressed to Chikkadêvarâja Wodeyar and pointing to the excellence of his government tested with reference to the principles of the ancient science of politics, namely, the three-fold éléments of power (utsa ha-prabhu-mantra-ialctî) and the seven-fold éléments of sovereignty (saptânga, Le., svâmi-mantri-mitra-kôêa-dëêa-durga-balalakshanam). In the second

chapter, the poet sketches the pedigree of Chikkadéva by way of tracing the existence of friendly relations between the Mysore Royal House and the pontificate of Chàrukïrti, especially since the tinie of Châinarâja Wodeyar V (1617-1637). The subject-matter of the work commences from the third chapter.

The Munivamsâbhyyudaya has to be placed towards the close of the reign of Chikkadëvarâja Wođeyar, since it presents a picture of him as a king ruling Mysore in peace after overawing the chiefs of Kongu, Kođagu and Maleyàla countries (c. 1700), and since it is conspicuous by the absence of any référence to Viéâlâksha-Pàndïta (1673-1686). It is written in the colloquial sàngatya metre, and is invaluable as affording us some insight into the character of Chikkadëvarâja as ruler of Mysore with toleration as an article of his political faith.

Chikkaṇṇa-Pàrîdïta was a Jaina Brâhman of Kâéyapa-gôtàra, son of a scholar by name Dođçârya. He compiled the Vaidya-Nîghantu-Sàra, a work on Pharmacology in Sanskrit. It was, as he tells us, prepared in 1703 (i. 1625) at the désire of physicians and experts (in various êâstras) of the court of Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar. The work begins with invocations to the five great Jaina preceptors (panchaguru), to Jina and Sarasvatûand to the earlier Jaina poets like Samantabhadra, Pûjyapâda, Âditya and Simhasêna. It is in 14 chapters and deals with the préparation of drugs from ingrédients of various classes (varga), such as grains, roots, plants, herbs, flowers, fruits, sandal, sugar-cane and metals. The treatise was, as the compiler says, intended for practical application, to ensure the happiness of ail living beings.

188. Fide Ch. XI, t.n. 188, for details.
Aînongjhe miscellaneous works assignable to the reign of Chikkadëvarâja Wocveyar, the Sarajâ-Hanumëndra-Yaso-Vilâsa (c. 1700) is a Kannâda champu in 5 cantos, dealing with the history of Sarajâ-Hanumappa Nâyaka, son of Sîtârâma, chief of Târikere-Santebennûr and a contemporary of Chikkadëvarâja. The author of the work is Krishna-Sarma, a Brâhman of Bhâradvâja-gôtra and Yajussâkha, grandson of Appâji and son of Patte-Timmârya by Tirumalâmbâ. Skilled in poetical composition, he was, as he tells us, a devotee at the feet of Goddess Mînakshi of Madura, and was the head of the guard establishment at the Palace of the king of Mysore, i.e., Chikkadëvarâja Woeyar (Mahisûra-râu'gëha-dvârâr dhyaresha). The Chikkadëvarâja-Dharañûramanâbhyu* dayah (c. 1700), an anonymous epicpoem (mahâ-kâvya) in 5 cantos in Sanskrit, deals with the rise and fortunes of the Mysore Royal House upto Chikkadëvarâja Woeyar. Lastly, the Chikkadëva-Kempadëvammanavara-mélâna-â'dugalu is a collection of Kannada songs in the sângatya mètre, in honour of Chikkadëvarâja and his principal consort Dëvamma, composed in or about 1703 (Svabhânu). The compiler does not mention his name but he seems to have been the son of one Narasaiya, a treasury official under Chikkadëvarâja (Bokkasada-Narasa-vibhu-putranâgi)* Another Kannâla work, of unique popularity, though not written under the direct patronage of Chikkadëva, is the Jaimini-Bhârata (c. 1700)—dealing with the Âśvamëdhika-Parva of the Mahâ-bhârata in 34 cantos (sandhi) in the vârdhika-shatpadi mètre—by Lakshmîéa of Dëvapura or Dëvanûr (in the présent Kadûr district), son of Annamânka of

136. Ms. Nos. 21 (P.L., in Grantha characters) and B. 12. (P.) in the Mahârajâ's Sanskrit College Library, Mysore.
Bhâradvâja-gôtra and a devotee of the local deity Lakshmîramaça (Dêvapura-nilaya Lakshmîramaña), whom he invokes. 195

Hère we take leave of the authors of the period of Chikkadëvarâja'a reign and their contribu­tions. The period was one of considérable activity. Despite the political troubles and the wars which resulted from them, the peace and order Chikkadêva evolved throughout his kingdom helped towards a Vaishnavite Revival, which may be said to have reached its culminating point in his reign. He was, perhaps, the first leader of the Vaishnavite Re­naissance, which had its remote origin in the reigns of the Vijayanagar Emperors of the third and fourth dynasties. This Renaissance gave to the masses and the intellectuals alike a philosophy of life, a philosophy that linked life to spirituality as its sure sheet-anchor. The poetry of the period does not prétend to be a substitute for religion; this view is plainly discarded. Vaishnavite philosophy made poetry the handmaid of religion. But religion does not overshadow the living faith of man in his higher destiny, though it furnishes the poet his subject-matter. It is hère that we see the highest blessing that Vaishnavism bestowed in its new setting. This, however, does not mean that all poetry became devotional; it is not so, as

195. Considérable contre ver sy h as, of la te, oentred round the nativity, date, etc., of Lakshmlâa, the author of this classic (Pub.). "Dêvapura," "Surapura" or "Gîrvânâpura," occurring in the text, has been identified by some with Surapura in the présent Hyderabad State, while the work itself is attempted to be placed in the 15th century. The trend of all the available evidence, however, is in favour of the identity of the place with Dêvanûr in the présent Kadûr district and of the poet being a àrl-Vaishuava Brâhman. Both on the ground of style and from références to Lakshmlâa in Kannada Works of the 18th century (see Kar. Ko. Cha. I I I . 16, 67), the poem must be held to have been composed about, or slightly subséquent to, 1700 when the harassing wars between Mysore and Ikkëri had corne to a close and Dêvanûr, situated on the bordera of both the kingdoms, had begun to enjoy the blessings of peace. As to its popularity, it ought to suffice if it is said that there is hardly a Kannada knowing man who lias not read it or heard it read (see Mys. Gas ll. iv. 2456),
we have seen above. The Vaishnavism of this period helped to bring back poetry and even what went by the name of philosophy to a sense of stability, of realism, of belief in a fixed order of things which makes life worth living and work worth undertaking. That is what animates and informs poetry of this period. With the Renaissance, the old order of scepticism, of unbelief, of idealism that is not rooted in the earth, is dissipated and we get in its place a poetry that expresses the absence of unbelief and implants a sense of deep spirituality, a spirituality that knows no bounds, which treats all alike, which sweeps in all humanity under its wings, and which has behind it a philosophy which avowedly takes the whole of experience into consideration and thus opens a vista for the man of action as much for the man of inaction in the true spirit of the Bhagavad-Gîtā.¹⁹⁶

¹⁹⁶. See Bhag. Gi., VI, 3, which may be thus rendered: "For a Sage who is seeking Yoga, action is called the means; for the same Sage when he is enthroned in Yoga, inaction is the means,"
CHAPTER XV.

CHIKKADÉVARÂJA WODEYAR, 1673-1704—(contd.)


We have reached a stage in the narration of the story of Chikkadêvaraja's reign, where we may conveniently pause a little to consider an episode in it, to which brief reference has been made in an earlier chapter.¹ This episode relates to the mode in which he is said to have raised money for carrying on his warfare. There are three definite reasons why we should consider this episode at some length. First, because it looms large in his life-history; secondly, it furnishes the key to his financial and administrative measures and the political motives underlying them; and thirdly and finally, it is necessary to evaluate the actual truth underlying it, as much in the interests of historical research as of the practical value attaching to it in the career of a great ruler.

¹, Ante Ch. XI: see text of i.n, 116-118.
hère what they sent home as the information gathered by them. Writing of what occurred between 1684-1686, they stated:

"Attacked in the heart of his kingdom by the armies of Sambogi [Sàmbhâji], the king of Mysore, to provide for the expenses of the war, resorted, in the eastern provinces of his dominions, to exactions and cruelties so revolting that his subjects rose in a body against him and all his ministers. Stimulated by the losses which weakened him on all sides, driven by the impulse of the présent sufferings without any thought of what was to happen, destitute, moreover, of sentiments of patriotism and national grandeur, like ail enslaved people, they chose as their générais two Brâhmans, chiefs of the sects of Vishnu and Siva, and formed two large armies. The one composed of seventy thousand men marched straight against the fortress of Mysore and besieged the king who shut himself up there; the second composed of thirty thousand men burst on the province of Satyamangalam and the adjoining countries. After discharging their first fury on the officers of the king and many magistrates, the two générais took advantage of the occasion to vent their hatred against our néophytes and destroy Christianity." "The king of Mysore," it is further stated, "incensed at their (his subjects') insolence, sent an army against them to carry fire and sword everywhere, and toss the rebels on the point of the sword, without distinction of âge or sex. Thèse cruel orders were executed. The pagodas of Vishnu and éiva were destroyed, and their large revenues confiscated to the royal treasury. Thosé idolators whè escaped the carnage fled to thé mountains and forests, where they led a misèrable life."

2. See in Noyats of Madura, p. 292: Louis de Melio to Noyelle, 1686.
Though the above letters of the Jesuit Fathers seem partly to exaggerate and partly to mis-state what had actually occurred in Chikkadēvarājā's own kingdom, there is need to hark back a little and examine the conditions that prevailed in it during the period the war for supremacy was going on in the distant south (1680-1686). Chikkadēva's war, ostensibly in favour of the Nāyak of Madura, was really, as we have seen, for the assertion of his own right of overlordship over the entire south as the most powerful surviving Viceroy of the old Karnātaka province of the Vijayanagar Empire. Since the death of Śivāji there was evidently a stronger sentiment in his favour in the south, while his own martial prowess helped to substantiate, even better, his claim to the title. The wars waged by Chikkadēva should have entailed great expenditure, and the expenditure had to be met. The flow of men and money into Madura could not evidently be kept up in an uninterrupted fashion, especially as he had to provide for the defence of his home-lands attacked by Sambhâji. One result of this was that the dependents of the Madura Nāyak, who had joined him or acknowledged his overlordship, either began to desert him or went over to others who claimed to occupy the broken-up kingdom of Madura. In these circumstances, Chikkadēva appears to have made a supreme effort to find fresh resources for carrying the war to a successful issue. The exact measures he took and the actual persons whom he selected for giving effect to those measures are lost to us, perhaps, for ever, for, beyond the Jesuit letters above quoted from, we have only the accounts of Wilks, the historian, and of Dēvachandra, the Jain attthor, both of whom wrote from the traditionary tales current in their own period (19th century). Thus we have three versions to compare and contrast in this connection—the Jesuit

4, Ants, Ch, XI; aee under Myaorw and the South, 1680-1696.
version, the story as narrated by Wilks and the tradition as developed by Devachandra. It will be seen from the sequel that while the version of the Jesuit Fathers is not possible of belief because of its palpable improbabilities and the patently confused character of the news which it embodies, the stories given currency by Wilks and Devachandra are to a large extent echoes of excesses committed neither by Chikkadeva nor by his agents but ascribed to them by tradition which fastens itself to "some prominent person whose memory is fading; who has been dead, that is to say, for about a hundred years or less, if the real facts have never been widely known." But, before we pursue further this aspect of the matter, we may examine here the three versions we have referred to above.

First, as to the version of the Jesuit Fathers so graphically set out in their letters.

Examination of same. There is, it must be stated at once, no evidence so far on the Mysore side, confirmatory of what we find in them. No doubt the statements made are of a contemporary character, but news travelled slowly in those days and much of it was gossip or truth, largely, if not wholly, diluted by hearsay. Such "testimony," even though contemporary, has to be received with great caution, especially when there is no independent evidence of any reliable kind to corroborate at least its principal points. The following statements are specifically made in regard to Chikkadeva: (1) to meet the cost of the war, he resorted, in the eastern provinces of his dominions, to exactions and cruelties so revolting that his subjects rose in a body against him and all his ministers; (2) taking advantage of his difficulties, his subjects chose two Brahmins as their generals, one the head of the Vaishnavites and the other the head of the Saivites; (3) each of these

5. Vide Appendix VI—(4)
gênerais, collecting a large army, discharged their fury first on the officers of the king and many of his magistrates and then attacked the Christian néophytes with a view to destroy their religion; (4) the king, in his anger, sent an army against his subjects, which carried fire and sword everywhere and tossed the rebels on the point of the sword, without distinction of âge or sex; and (5) he also destroyed the temples dedicated to Vishṇu and Siva and confiscated their treasures to the royal treasury. The first of these statements is evidently an écho of the administrative and fiscal reforms undertaken by Chikkadëvarâja. The further statement that these were restricted to the "eastern provinces" is not correct, as we know his financial zeal and reforms, such as they were, extended to his whole kingdom. It is possible that they gave rise to some misunderstanding but the suggestion that they were intended specially as a lever to raise the cost of the war or were pressed through in an oppressive manner seems far from the truth. Much less can the suggestion that his measures led him into "exactions and cruelties so revolting" as to make his subjects rise in a body against him and all his ministers carry conviction. What makes it more incredible are the statements that his subjects chose two "Brâhmans" as their "gênerais," one of the "Vaishnava" and the other of the "Saiva" persuasion, that each of these collected an immense army and that they jointly discharged their fury first on the officers of the king, then on his magistrates and then on the Christian néophytes With a view to destroy the Christian religion! The story of the sélection of the two "Brâhman gênerais" and their insurrection apart—wholly uncorroborated by any other evidence as it is—the concluding suggestion that they took hold of the occasion "to vent their hatred against the Christian néophytes and destroy Christianity," shows both the bias of the writer of the letter and the
petty character of some of the rioting that should have occurred in some restricted area. There is no independent evidence to believe that there was a widespread rebellion of the kind, alluded to, during Chikkadevaraja's reign; nor is there any evidence that Christianity had by then so far advanced in this region as to invite such wholesale destruction at the hands of rebels whose grievances, if any, were primarily against the king and his ministers rather than against the poor Christian neophytes who were probably confined to the poorest classes at the time and who could not have occupied a territory so large as to include the whole of the "eastern provinces." There is manifestly not only some exaggeration here but also some religious bias against the king, in whose dominions such destruction of Christianity came to be canvassed. What follows is even more impossible of belief. It is said that the popular insurrection raised the ire of the king, that he sent an army against his subjects "to carry fire and sword everywhere and toss the rebels on the point of the sword, without distinction of age or sex," and that "these cruel orders were executed." The cruel punishment referred to here is the one of impaling people on the point of the sword (Kazhuvikkettaradu), which, tradition says, a Pandyyan king of Madura resorted to in that town in the case of the Jains after his own reconversion from Jainism to the Saivite faith.

6. The Franciscans found their way to Mysore from Goa about 1687. When the Jesuits arrived in the 16th century, they found Catholics in the Mysore territory, and a flourishing congregation at Seringapatam. Father Cinnami made Seringapatam the head-quarters of the Jesuit Kanarese Mission (Mys. Gat. New edition, I. 842). The eastern dominions of Ghikkadèva extended to the Satyamangalam area, where the Portuguese Jesuits had founded the Kanarese Mission and had a centre of their own. Though there was a flourishing congregation in Satyamangalam, the rural parts had presumably not yet been invaded.

7. Vide Appendix VI—(6).
wide in Southern India. Evidently those responsible for transmitting the news of distant happenings to the Jesuit Fathers transferred the story of the supposed royal iniquities of a past period to Chikkadēvarâja, and the Jesuit Fathers—themselves probably familiar with the story in the Madura country—passed it on in their letters to their superiors at home. There is here a complete transference of old memories of alleged cruelties practised by a certain king to another king of a later date, which is just what sometimes happens when news—especially political news—is transmitted by word of mouth through long distances and through widely differing individuals. What makes the whole story even more difficult of credence is the further statement that the king destroyed all the temples of Vishṇu and āiva and confiscated all their revenues to the royal treasury. All that we know of Chikkadēva independently makes us pause and reflect whether, even if he were the cruel king he is described to be in these letters, he would have ever perpetrated such sacrilegious acts as these, however much he might have been offended at his subjects.

That those who conveyed news of the happenings in the eastern dominions of Chikkadēva to the Jesuit Fathers in the Madura kingdom believed in the truth of those happenings or that the Fathers themselves believed in them cannot be held to be a proof of their having actually occurred. But the fact that such news was conveyed

8. Often our eyes see things which are not actually in existence and our ears hear things which have no physical basis. This self-deception—or rather the capacity for self-deception—is well illustrated by a story told of Mr. George Bernard Shaw, commonly known as G. B. S. "Those letters G. B. S. recall to my mind," writes Mr. J. S. Collis, the well-known publicist, "a certain incident which has always seemed to me perfect as an illustration of the popular view of Shaw as well as a perfect symbol of the ways of eye-witnesses all the world over. The following conversation took place in Dublin city whose inhabitants have never cared much about Shaw." "I was talking," Mr. Collis continues, "with a friend about Bernard Shaw. My companion inveighed against the man's colossal
may be taken to be a pointer. We need not try to make history out of such news—news which probably was itself secondhand or hearsay—but we would be right in

conceit. 'I saw him at a hôtel the other day,' he said. 'His car was outside on the drive and, believe it or not, just above the index number he had actually put a plate on which were inscribed in large letters—'G. B. S.'! 'My friend,' adds Mr. Collis, 'had seen 'G. B. the letters that cars from Great Britain carry abroad. But he had expected to see, he had wished to see, *G. B. S.' And so—like a true eyes witness—he saw it.'

In this connection, Samuel Johnson's observation is worth noting: "He who has not made the experiment, or who is not accustomed to require rigorous accuracy from himself, will scarcely believe how much a few hours take from certainty of knowledge and distinctness of imagery... To this dilatory notation must be imputed the false relations of travellers, where there is no imaginable motive to deceive. They trusted to memory what cannot be trusted safely but to the eye, and told by guess what a few hours before they had known with certainty."—Johnson's Works, IX. 144, quoted by G. B. Hill in Boswell's Life of Johnson (Clarendon Press, Oxford), I I . 217, f.n. 4. Johnson advised Boswell to keep a journal of his life and in doing so, said: "The great thing to be recorded (said he) is the state of your own mind; and you should write down everything that you remember, for you cannot judge at first what is good or bad; and write immediately while the impression is fresh, for it will not be the same a week afterwards."—Ibid, I I . 217. In a letter to Dr. Burney, Johnson wrote: "Of the caution necessary in adjusting narratives, there is no end. Some tell what they do not know, that they may not seem ignorant, and others from mere indifference to truth. All truth is not, indeed, of equal importance, but if little violations are allowed, every violation will in time be thought little; and a writer should keep himself vigilant on his guard against the first temptations to negligence or supineness."—Ibid, IV. 361. Johnson insisted on a "superiority of understanding" on the part of a narrator of a story. Apropos of this, Boswell sets down the following conversation: "He told me that he had been in the company of a gentleman (Bruce, the Abyssinian traveller) whose extraordinary travels had been much the subject of conversation. But I found that he had not listened to him with that full confidence, without which there is little satisfaction in the society of travellers. I was curious to hear what opinion so able a judge as Johnson had formed of his abilities, and I asked if he was not a man of sensé. Johnson. 'Why, Sir, he is not a distinct relater; and I should say, he is neither abundant nor deficient in sensé. I did not perceive any superiority of understanding.' Boswell. 'But will you not allow him a nobleness of résolution, in penetrating into distant régions?' Johnson. 'That, Sir, is not to the present purpose. We are talking of his sensé. A fighting cock has a nobleness of resolution.'"—Ibid, I I . 333-334.

The Jesuit fathers saw in the news conveyed to them what they had heard about Kazhuvikkēttaradu and believed that Chikkadēvarâja had practised it in his own kingdom!! Troublesome problems arise only from an inadequately description of events that occur in the world by means of a faulty language.
assuming that beneath even such news, wrongly conveyed or wrongly understood, there lurks something worthy of careful investigation. Indeed the laborious task of consulting all possible evidence and weighing conflicting accounts is necessary, if we are not to be misled into wrong conclusions. The Jesuit Fathers passed on what they heard or imagined they had heard as they understood it. They were not writing the story of their own times with sober judgments formed on a review of all the known facts. They seldom had the means to test their sources when dealing with what they heard and recorded in their letters. Contradictions are often set down without the writer noticing them: like the narratives of medieval writers in Europe, their letters cannot be relied upon unless we can verify them by collateral evidence. They never pretended to be historians of the scientific type and it would be wholly wrong to expect them, in the circumstances they were placed, to have been scientific in their method; and possibly they would have been so, if they had had our expectations for comparison. Their writings cannot be treated as history in the truest sense. What is even more, remarkable is that their narrative fails wherever we could test it from facts independently known. Furthermore, even "traditions" current in the very country where these "cruel" deeds are said to have been perpetrated do not countenance the carrying out of such barbarous acts as we find given currency in the letters of the Jesuit Fathers. These "traditions" are referred to by Wilks and by Devachandra. A narration of them will show how widely different they are from the versions sent home by the Jesuit Fathers.

Of these two, Wilks is the earlier, writing as he did about 1810. Though he does not specifically state his sources of information, he frankly admits that What
he gives is the "traditionary account" which, he says, "has been traced through several channels to sources of the most respectable information." Writing more than a hundred years after the events, he had, in the absence of authentic information, necessarily to depend on "tradition" which had its own modes of transmuting facts. Certain similarities between his own version and that of Dēvachandra suggest a common source to both. It is possible that Wilks based his account on the oral information available both to himself and to Dēvachandra at the time, they being contemporaries. Lt. Col. Mackenzie, who carried out his Survey of Mysōre in 1804, was a friend of Wilks and possibly knew Dēvachandra. Dēvachandra himself, a Jain Brāhman of Kanakagiri (Maleyùr), actually completed his work Rājāvali-Kathā in 1838. In this work, he treats of the kings of the Karnāṭaka country (including those of Mysore) from the earliest times down to the nineteenth century. He writes, however, not as a critical historian but as a gatherer and chronicler of current tradition. Added to it, he was a full-blooded Jain and wrote with all the fervour of a good partisan who believed in the greatness of his own religion. Wilks's story is found detailed in different parts of his work. It is brought together here and presented in one conspectus, so that a complete idea may be formed of the "tradition" as Wilks received it.

"One of the earliest measures of this Raja's reign," writes Wilks of Chikkadeva, "had been to compel the dépendant Wadeyars and Poligars, who, like his own ancestors, had commenced the career of ambition by affecting in their respective districts to be addressed by the title of Raja, publicly to renounce that assumption of independence, to disclaim the local prérogatives of punishment."

Wilks, I. 219.
and confiscation without previous authority from the **Raja**, and to revert to their original character of obedient officers of the government. This object was aided by first inviting, and then compelling them to fix their residence at Seringapatam; by assigning to them offices of honour about the Baja's person, and gradually converting them from rebellious chieftains to obsequious courtiers. The insurgents in the districts were left, in consequence, destitute of the direction of their accustomed leaders, and the Jungum priests, deprived of their local importance, and much of their pecuniary receipts, by the removal of these mock courts from the provinces, were foremost in expressing their detestation of this new and unheard-of measure of finance, and in exhorting their disciples to resistance. Everywhere the inverted plough, suspended from the tree at the gate of the village, whose shade forms the coffee-house or the exchange of its inhabitants, announced a state of insurrection. Having determined not to till the land, the husbandmen deserted their villages, and assembled in some places like fugitives seeking a distant settlement; in others, as rebels breathing revenge. Chick Deo-Raj, however, was too prompt in his measures to admit of any very formidable combination. Before proceeding to measures of open violence, he adopted a plan of perfidy and horror, yielding in infamy to nothing which we find recorded in the annals of the most sanguinary people. An invitation was sent to all the priests of the Jungum to meet the Raja at the great temple of Nunjendgode, about fourteen miles south of Mysoor, ostensibly to converse with him on the subject of the refractory conduct of their followers. Treachery was apprehended, and the number which assembled was estimated at about four hundred only. A large pit had been previously prepared in a walled inclosure, connected by a series of squares composed of tent walls, with the canopy of audience, at which they
were successively received one at a time, and after making their obeisance were desired to retire to a place, where, according to custom, they expected to find refreshments prepared at the expence of the Raja. Expert executioners were in waiting in the square, and every individual in succession was so skilfully beheaded, and tumbled into the pit, as to give no alarm to those who followed, and the business of the public audience went on without interruption or suspicion. Circular orders had been sent for the destruction, on the same day, of all the Jungum muts (places of résidence and worship) in his dominions; and the number reported to have been in consequence destroyed was upwards of seven hundred.

The disappearance of the four hundred Jungum priests was the only intimation of their fate received by their mournful disciples; but the traditionary account which I have above delivered has been traced through several channels to sources of the most respectable information, and I profess my entire belief in the reality of the fact. This notable achievement was followed by the opérations of the troops, which had also been previously combined. Wherever a mob had assembled, a detachment of troops, chiefly cavalry, was collected in the neighbourhood, and prepared to act on one and the same day. The orders were distinct and simple; to charge without parley into the midst of the mob; to cut down in the first sélection every man wearing an orange-coloured robe (the peculiar garb of the Jungum priests); and not to cease until the crowds had everywhere dispersed. It may be concluded that the effects of this system of terror left no material difficulties to the final establishment of the new System of revenue; and there is a tradition which I have not been able to authenticate, that the Raja exacted from every village a written renunciation, ostensibly voluntary, of private property in the land, and an acknowledgment that it was the right of the state,
If such documents ever existed, they were probably destroyed in 1786."

"The sixth was," says Wilks in another part of his work,\textsuperscript{10} "the lawful share of the crop for which the Raja received his équivalent in money; and, from previous reasoning and subsequent fact, we have every cause to believe that he was unwilling to risk the odium of increasing this proportion in a direct manner. He therefore had recourse to the law of the Sasters, which authorized him, by no very forced construction, to attack the husbandman by a variety of vexatious taxes, which should compel him to seek relief by desiring to compound for their abolition by a voluntary increase of the landed assessment: and this is the arrangement which generally ensued; although, from the great discontent excited by the taxes, the compromise was generally made on the condition of excepting some one or more of the most offensive, and proportionally increasing those which remained; but the Raja, with that profound knowledge of human nature which distinguished all his measures, exempted from these new imposts all the lands which were allotted to the provincial soldiery in lieu of pay, according to the ordinary practice of the smaller Hindoo states, and thus neutralised, in some degree, the opposition to the measure, and ensured the means of eventual compulsion. Those who may be desirous of comparing the ingenuity of an eastern and a western financier, may examine the subjoined détail of these taxes. The whole System is stated to have been at once unfolded, with intimation that it would be gradually introduced according to circumstances; but the commotions which it produced by leading to measures of extrême severity, precipitated its total and abrupt introduction."

"The religious principles of the Raja/ remarks Wilks in a différent part of his work,\textsuperscript{11} " seem to have been

\textsuperscript{10. Ibid, 217-319.} \textsuperscript{11. Ibid 214.}
sufficiently flexible to adapt themselves without difficulty to the circumstances of the times. There is little doubt that he was educated in the principles of the Jungum; but he openly conformed to the ceremonial of the Vishnoo, which was the ruling religion. His early and long intimacy with Visha Lacsha, the Jain Pundit, whom on his élévation he had appointed his first minister, created a general belief that he was secretly converted to that persuasion, and an expectation that he would openly profess it; and this circumstance was supposed chiefly to have influenced the Jungum to assassinate that minister. When Tremalayangar, a Vishnavite, became afterwards the confidential minister, the Kaja evinced as strong an attachment to that persuasion: but political considerations alone would have rendered him the decided enemy of the religion in which he was supposed to have been educated. The hostility and hatred of the Raja was farther increased by the opposition which the Jungum incited against his financial measures.

"The first fourteen years of this reign," Wilks writes elsewhere in his work, were occupied in these financial measures, interior reforms, and minor conquests; but these reforms had rendered so unpopular the administration of the Jain Pundit, to whom they were chiefly attributed, that a plan was secretly concerted for his assassination. Chick Deo Eaj had, without doubt, in the early part of his life, been educated in the doctrines of the Jungum, which was the religion of his ancestors: he had hitherto, since his accession to the throne, shewn no very marked attachment to any form of worship, but was supposed, from particular habits which he had adopted, and from the great influence of the Jain Pundit, to have conceived the intention of reviving the doctrines of that ancient sect. The Pundit was attacked and mortally wounded, while returning at night, in the usual

manner, from court to his own dwelling (1686); and, in addition to religious motives, the Jungum had a deep account of revenge to retaliate, for the murder of their priests, the suspicion of this assassination fell chiefly upon that people, and tended to confirm the alienation of the Raja's mind from the doctrines of their sect. He was much affected at the intelligence of this event, and immediately proceeded to the house of the minister to console him in his last moments, and to receive his advice regarding the choice of a successor. The advice was entirely unprejudiced, and he recommended, as the most able and honourable man of the court, a person of adverse religion, namely, Tremalayangar, a bramin of the sect of Vishnou. To him the Raja gave his whole confidence; and, in conformity to his advice, soon afterwards made an open profession of the doctrines of that prevailing religion. In other respects, the new administration was conducted on the same principles as the preceding, and with an equal degree of prudence and vigour."

Such, in the words of Wilks, is his version of the "tradition" as he received it, a "tradition" he believed in. We may now turn to Dêvachandra who wrote some twenty-eight years later than Wilks, though probably, as remarked above, he was one of those who, as an active gatherer and chronicler of tradition current during his period, was possibly also one of its oral disseminators, and as such one of those on whom Wilks himself was

13. Wilks (I. 107) places Viṣālakṣaṇa-Paṇḍit's death roughly in 1686, i.e., in the fourteenth year of Chikkadēvarāja's reign. Dēvachandra, however, does not specify the exact date of death, though from the extracts from his work, noticed in the sequel, we have to fix the event in 1686, allowing an interval of about two years for the course of affairs leading to it from the first outbreak of the Jungama agitation (October 1684). The latest available reference to Viṣālakṣaṇa is in a lithic record dated January 24, 1685 (see E. C., III (1) N j. 41, cited also in Ch. XIII, f. n. 79). In the light of this document and the Jesuit letter of 1686 (cited in f. n. 3 supra), the death of Viṣālakṣaṇa-Paṇḍit must be held to have occurred not earlier than July 1685. Compare the Editorial Introduction (p. 9) to the C. Vam., C. Vi. and A. V. C. referring to the Paṇḍit's demise in 1684, for which there is no evidence.
probably dépendent to some extent. However this may be, Chikkadēvaràja was, according to Dèvachandra,\textsuperscript{14} governing the kingdom he had inherited, since February 1673 (\textit{i.e.}, from about three months after his accession), with the counsel (\textit{mantralochaneyim}) of his minister Viéâlâksha-Paṇḍit. Chikkadēva's first administrative measure, aiming at the public weal, was the introduction of a land survey and settlement. A fixed assessment (\textit{siddàya}) of six \textit{hanas} per 100 measures (\textit{kamba}) was introduced on lands of the first class, four on those of the middle class and two on inferior ones, exemptions being granted in respect of benevolences and compulsory dues therefrom (\textit{kāṅike}, \textit{kaddāya}). While he was thus ruling his subjects and attending to his conquests, the Jangamas, being the proud possessors of many \textit{maths}, houses and rent-free lands all over the country, had become exceedingly powerful, and, fortified in the belief that the title \textit{Wodeyar} was applicable to them alone and none else, began to consider themselves as virtual rulers of the kingdom. In October 1684 (\textit{Baktàkshi, Āévïja}), they, having come together, assembled a huge crowd of people, numbering nearly a lakh, on an extensive field near Tàyūr. Fencing the area with a thorny hedge and pitching up their camp within it, they appointed three from among themselves as their principal leaders, designating them as king, minister and commander-in-chief respectively. They then expelled the king's officials—who were enriching themselves in local parts—asserting their own claims to rule. The Jangama annoyance soon became unbearable. They stopped payment of revenue dues and organized armed opposition to established authority in the local parts. To Chikka-\linebreak[4]dēvaràja Wodeyar, their réduction by ordinary means seemed well nigh impossible. At length, however,

\textsuperscript{14} Raj. \textit{Kath.} XI. 477, 482-485, 487-488, also XI. 387, 389, 391-392, 394-395,
Viśālāksha Pāṇḍit's counsel prevailed. In accordance with it, Paridullā Khān (Faridullā Khān), an officer commanding 200 horse, was entrusted with the task of quelling the rébellion. He proceeded against the rebels, with his men fully equipped, and soon secured entrance to the camp of the leaders, feigning submission to them ostensibly as an adventurer in search of pasture (charāyi) below the Passes. The leaders were occupying their seats on an elevated ground. Believing in Paridullā Khān's words, they dictated their ultimatum (namely, the extinction of all legitimate rule and the establishment of their own sovereignty within three days) and tried to win him over to their own side. This led to an altercation, in the course of which Paridullā Khān pushed his opponents aside and instantly knocked them down with the aid of his arrows. Thereupon, a hue and cry followed in the camp; and the assembled crowds began to disperse in abject terror. On receipt of this news, the king (Chikkadēvarāja) ordered the démolition of the maths and houses of the Jangamas in the rural parts, and the confiscation of their rent-free lands. The Jangamas began to evade the issue by concealing themselves. A regular search for them was instituted by the king's officers. Gurikār Nanje-Gaūda of Kamaravalli offered his services in the work of tracing out the rebels. He went about the country with his followers and succeeded in capturing a thousand Jangamas, most of whom were found plying the agricultural profession in disguise. These were brought in before the king who, in great wrath, had them all put to death (arasant kōpisi yallaram pariharisidanu). Further, on all those subjects who had made common cause with the disloyal Jangamas, he levied an enhanced révenue assessment. Thus, for every varaha of the original assessment, they were now required to pay an additional tax of 5 hāna-ัดda under ferar-items, namely, benevolences (bêdîgé), currency
discount (nânya-votta), fee for grazing rights (hullu-samîf) and for observance of local usage or custom (vyavaharaṇe-bâgê). Side by side, eighteen departments (châvaḍî) for the administration of sunka, pommu and other items of taxes levied were established, and officials posted to supervise the revenue collections. All this added to the distress of the subjects. Meantime, the remaining Vîra-êaivas became thoroughly irritated with Viéâlàksha-Paṇḍit. "This Jain alone," they deliberated, "is the main cause for the slaughter of the Jangamas, our preceptors, and for the uprooting of all our dwellings, maths and rent-free estates. Therefore he should be done away with." Accordingly they prevailed upon an individual by name Nâgaṇṇa, who had practised at arms. Nâgaṇṇa made friends with the followers of the Paṇḍit. One day, as the Paṇḍit was proceeding to the Palace seated in a palanquin (sibigeyanêri), the hireling flung himself at him and pierced him through leaving him unconscious, in which state he was conveyed home. At this intelligence, king Chikkadëva proceeded in person to see the Paṇḍit: he felt immensely grieved that all his power was lost. The Paṇḍit, in his last moments, recommended Tirumalârya (Tirumalaiyangâr) as his successor in office, and passed away. In commemoration of the minister's services, the king issued a lithic grant, bestowing on Bommarasa, son of the Paṇḍit, the village of Yëchiganahalli as a rakta-kodige. From hence, Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar began to rule the kingdom with the ad vice of Tirumalârya. On one occasion, Chikkadëvarâja, having entrusted the general management of affairs to an influential person by name Dodda-Dëvaiya in Seringapatam (sarvâdhikâradolirisi), proceeded on an expedition in the north. At this opportune moment, the Vîra-êaivas, having assembled, apprised Dodd-Dëvaiya thus: "Formerly, Viéâlàksha-Paṇḍit, as the foremost man in power, brought about the
destruction of our maths and houses. Now is your chance. Being a Vīra-ēaiva, you have to do away with all the Jain temples in the kingdom." Accordingly, in September 1698 (11620, Bahudhānya, Bhādrapada), Dodḍa-Dēvaiya, with the help of 10,000 labourers, demolished about 1,700 bastis situated in the neighbourhood of Mysore. Hearing this, the king ordered the stoppage of further molestation. Dodḍa-Dēvaiya died in prison sometime later.

In the early part of his reign, we are further told by Dēvachandra, king Chikkadēva, having inquired about the fundamentals of all religions, became convinced that Jainism was the most sublime of all and the Jaina mode of living (Jaināchāra) the purest. Accordingly, he enjoined on the inmates of his household to bring in water only after filtering it clean of all insects. Further, he would not accept certain things known to be obnoxious (kelavu dōsha-vastugalāṃ kollāde). Being kindly disposed towards living creatures (jivadaya-paranāgi), he laid down that in lieu of the countless animals like sheep, etc., that were being slaughtered by vile persons to propitiate or appease the deities, only coconuts should be used. Following the advice of Viēālāksha-Paṇḍit, he also directed the construction of a Chaityālaya to Vardhamâna-Tīrthankara, near the Purâna-Basti in Seringapatam, setting up therein the images of the 24 Jinas; and further got sanctioned the performance of the Mastakābkishēka in Sravana-Belagola twice or thrice. In the latter part of Chikkadēva's reign, however, Tirumalārya, continues Dēvachandra, brought home to the king's mind the greatness of the Śrī-Vaishnava faith, and secured concessions and benefactions, grants of titles and insignias of office to individual adhērents of that religion, making it not only pure and sacred but also great in the popular eye.

Many were converted into Vîra-Vaishnavas in this manner. The scholar Chikkanna-Pandita (Chikkaiya-Pandita), Bommarasa-Pandita and Dèvarasa, who were all Jaina Brâhmans, accepted, with a view to ingratiating themselves into the king's favour, the ėrī-Vaîshpava mudrâ and put on the tîkâ, the Śrî-Vaishnava mark; and thus became avowed enemies of the Jaina faith. In short, Tirumalârya glorified ėrī-Vaishnavism and carried on a vigorous propaganda of proselytism, putting the tîkâ on several people, impressing the mudrâ on them and making the individual Dâsas strong in their professions of Śrî-Vaishnnavism.

Both Wilks and Dèvachandra, in the above extracts, speak of the administration of Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar as having been attended with some trouble during the early part of his reign. Each, however, has his own version regarding its origin, development and suppression. According to Wilks, the trouble originated from the discontent brought about by the curbing of the independence of the Wodeyars (including Jangama priests) and Pâlegârs, and by the levy of "a variety of vexatious taxes" on the husbandman, in addition to the lawful share (\(\frac{1}{6}\)) of the government dues, by Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar; under the working policy of his minister Viéâlâkshâ-Paçdit, it assumed the shape of open résistance to authority, though the promptness of the king prevented a formidable combination on the part of the insurgents; it was suppressed by the treacherous massacre of 400 Jangamas, leaders of the revolt, at the temple of Nanjangûd, followed by the démolition of more than 700 mathı̄s of the Jangamas, the dispersion of the mob by the military and the forced renunciation of private property; and finally it ended in the revengeful and retaliatory murder of Viéâlâkshâ-Paçdit by the Vîra-éaivas (1686). According to Dèvachandra, on the other
Hand, the government of Chikkadêvarâja Woðeyar, during the early years of his reign, was beneficent; trouble arose however, about the middle of Chikkadêvarâja's reign, when the Jangamas having become exceedingly powerful, began to assert themselves and incited the people to revolt; it assumed the shape of an organized rebellion against established authority, the insurgents stopping payment of revenue dues and expelling the unpopular officiais; it was suppressed by the slaughter of the ringleaders, followed by the dispersion of the mob by the military, the destruction of maths and houses and the confiscation of the rent-free estates of the Jangamas, the search for the fugitive Jangamas, the massacre of a thousand of them under the orders of the king and the levy of an enhanced assessment on the disaffected subjects; it ended in the retaliatory murder of Viéâlâksha-Pâñdit by the Vïra-êaivas (1686), and later by the démolition of the Jain bastis by them (in 1698). The religion of Chikkadêvarâja Woðeyar was, according to Wilks, flexible. In the early part of his reign, he was a Vïra-êaiva ("Jungum") though openly conforming to the cult of Vishnu, while the Vïra-êaivas, from his intimacy with Viéâlâksha-Pâñdit, believed and suspected him to have been secretly converted to Jainism, expecting him to publicly adopt the latter faith, a circumstance which, it is suggested, influenced them (Vïra-êaivas) to murder the Pandit. Consequently, in the latter part of his reign, Chikka-dêvarâja was definitely alienated from the doctrines of Vïra-êaivism and openly professed [Sri] Vaishnavism under the advice and influence of Tirumalaiyangâr.

17. The destruction of Jangama maths in the first instance and then of Jain bastis by way of reprisal appears to be an invention strangely reminiscent of happenings of an earlier period. In the Basava Purâna (1389) of Bhima-Kavi, we are told that in the reign of Bijjâja (1154-1167), Jain temples were destroyed by the Jangamas headed by Bhânta-Râmâyâ. The story of the destruction of Jangama maths and houses during Chikkadêva's reign seems a sort of counterblast to this ancient exhibition of wrath on the part of Jangamas against the Jains.
According to Dëvachandra, on the contrary, Chikkadëvara­
râja Woďeyar was, in the early years of his reign, a
confirmed Jaina, adhering to the tenets of that faith and
encouraging the Jains under the advice of Viéâlâksha-
Parijdit. Even in the latter part of his reign, Dëvachandra
would make it appear, Chikkadëvarâja
continued his prédilections for Jainism despite the
proselytizing tendencies of ērî-Vaishñavism at his court
under the influence of Tirumalârya (Tirumalaiyangâr),
the new minister.

Wilks's account starts with his assumption that
from the beginning Chikkadëvarâja's
administration was based on the idea
of all régal power being concentrated
in himself, which led, in his opinion, ultimately to a
public revolt. His view-point of the fiscal measures and
policy of Chikkadëvarâja Woďeyar is wholly opposed to
the administrative traditions current in the country and
does not take adéquate notice of the actual conditions
under which Chikkadëvarâja worked. He believes in, and
exaggerates, the story of the massacre of the Jangamas,
while his conception of the évolution of Chikkadëvarâja's
personal religion is governed more by political and
economie considérations than by the probabilities of
historical fact. Dëvachandra being himself a Jaina, his
account is throughout characterized by bias in favour
of Jainism as the religion of Chikkadëvarâja Woďeyar.
His picture of the sudden rise and revolt of the Jangamas
under idéal conditions is rather inconsistent. His
attribution of the massacre of the Jangamas directly to
Chikkadëvarâja Woďeyar is, again, a sheer exaggeration,
if not a travesty of facts: it is both improbable and
impossible and it contradicts his own statement that
Chikkadëvarâja, as a staunch follower of Jainism, was
kind to all living créatures. Further, his chronology is,
as usual, vague and unreliable. He allows an interval of

Their basio assump-
tions and limita-
tions.
twelve years to lapse between the murder of Viéâlâksha- 
Pandit (1686) and the démolition of the Jain bastis by 
the Vîra-éaivas (1698), which is incredible. Both these 
writers, as we shall further see below, differ also between 
theirselves on certain points of détail connected with 
the Jangama agitation. These limitations apart, an exami-
nation of the accounts of Wilks and Dëvachandra in the 
light of other sources would go to show that there was 
some public disturbans in Mysore during 1684-1686, i.e., 
about the middle of Chikkadëvarâja's reign: it appears 
to have been due not so much to religious persécution or 
political aggrandizement on the part of Chikkadëva as to 
fear engendered in the rural classes as to the effect of the 
fiscal measures introduced by him, which was fanned 
into flame by those who would be most affected by them, 
especially at just the time when Chikkaçlëvarâja was 
straining every nerve to maintain his foothold in the 
Madura country as against the Mahrattas. The disturb-
anse that followed was quelled with a strong hand; the 
ringleaders were put to death; respect for order and 
authority was enforced without fear or favour by Viéâ-
lâksha-Paṇḍît, the Prime Minister of Chikkadëvarâja 
Wodeyar, which eventually brought about his own down-
fall; and a System of checks and counter-checks intro-
duced, by which the possibility of further disturbances 
was minimised. Neither the allégation that Chikkadëva-
râja attacked the husbandman with "a variety of vexatious 
taxes" nor the story relating to his alleged participation 
in the sanguinary massacre of the Jangamas has so far 
been substantiated. There is not even a whisper of the 

18. Vide Chs. XI and X I I of this work, for références to the issue in its oon-
temporary bearings. 
19. Among modem writers, Bice accepts Wilks's account (see Mya. Gaz. 
Old edition, I. 366-367); S. K. Aiyangar (Ancient India, pp. 300-301) 
interpreta the fiscal position as a "revision of taxes which cost the life of 
the Jain Pundit, the responsible author of the révision," and speaks of 
"a wholesale massacre of the fanatical Jangam priests" after the 
murder of the Paṇâit, for which there is equally no evidence. The
latter incident, nor even a passing référence to it, in earlier Jaina works like the *Belgolada-Gommatëévara-Charitre* (c. 1780) and the *Munivaméàbhyudaya* (c. 1700), while the taxes levied by Chikkadêvarâja Wodeyar were no inventions of his but, in substance, a revival of the old ones to suit the changing conditions of the times.\(^{20}\) Again, the trend of available évidence goes to show that Chikkadêvărâja Wodeyar was, from the beginning of his reign, if not from the early years of his life, a devout Śrî-Vaishnava by faith and by profession, tolérant towards ail sects and creeds, a just administrator aiming always at the happiness of his subjects, and an intensely humane personality.\(^{21}\) The accounts of Wilks and Dêvachandra being later writings, based on "tradition/" coloured by political bias and religious préjudice, cannot prove acceptable in the absence of independent corroborative évidence. They are accordingly to be used with caution as authorities for this part of the history of Chikkadêvărâja’s reign.

Nor are the différences between the accounts of Wilks and Dêvachandra on the one side and the Jesuit Fathers on the other less negligible. The Jesuit account represents the "exactions" as it stigmatizes the fiscal measures of Chikkadêva as the resuit of his military policy, and suggests that the people rose against him because of his "exactions" and the "cruelties" practised. Whether the "cruelties" were the resuit of

\(^{20}\) Vide *Ch. XII*, for détails about the taxes levied by Chikkadêvarâja. For particulars about taxation in ancient Karnâ^ak, see *E. O.*, I I I (1) TN. 27 (1290), 11.45-60, Ml. 95(1506), 11.21-25, IV (2) Gu. 67 (1505), 11,16-20, etc. (Texts in the originals).

\(^{21}\) Vide *Ohs. XII*, XIII and XVI, for détails.
the reaction caused by the "exactions" is not clear, though they were presumably so. One of the Jesuit letters, at the same time, suggests that the people should have responded to the call of the king; it indeed charges them with a lack "of the sentiments of patriotism and national grandeur" and almost goes to show that their revolt was not justified from that point of view. It even seems to reiterate that they should have seconded the efforts of the king in his conquest for supremacy over the South. What follows in regard to the choosing of Brāhman gênerais—one of the Vaishnava and another of the éaiva faith—and the manner in which their large armies vent their fury on the officers of the king and his représentatives and the poor Christian néophytes in the Satyamangalam area is not reflected in the accounts of either Wilks or Dêvachandra. What makes this more than incredible is that the king was a staunch Vaishnava with undoubted good-will towards the éaivas and Jangamas, as we know from other sources. Nor is the other statement that the king himself was besieged in his own fortress at Mysore confirmed by either of these authorities. As a matter of fact, between 1684-1686, the king, as we have seen, was actually residing in Seringapatam. It will also be observed that "Brāhman" gênerais are made to take the leading part in the Jesuit account, while in the accounts of Wilks and Dêvachandra it is the Jangamas that figure prominently. Bemem-bering the mutual animosities existing between the Jangamas and Jains, there is ground at least for the belief that the later version is an attempt on the part of Dêvachandra and his sect at making the Jangamas get the worst of it. Wilks's narration reflects evidently a version entirely différent from that of the Jesuit Fathers, whose account unfortunately appears to have been based on wrong information or information which had been

22. See Ch. XIII, for détails. 23. Ante, Chs. XI-XIV.
badly mutilated in transmission to them from Mysore to Madiira, from which latter place they wrote. The suggestion of the particular kind of cruelty practised on Chikkadëva's subjects shows, if anything further at all were needed, how exaggerated should have been the news that reached them. There is not even a whisper of this horrible cruelty in either Wilks or Dëvachandra, though, as a good Jain and an ardent chronicler of wrongs done to Jains, Dëvachandra would have been the first to mention it, if it had been adopted against any set of them, and more so against the Jangama leaders or those whom the latter (Jangama leaders) misled into rébellion, Nor, again, is there any the smallest suggestion in either Wilks or Dëvachandra that the king indulged in the cruel order for the démolition of the " págöças of Vîshñu and ëiva " or in the further statement that they " were destroyed " and " their large revenues were confiscated to the royal treasury. " Nor, finally, is there anything in the accounts of Wilks and Dëvachandra that there was such a général massacre of the " subjects " of the king—as is mentioned in the Jesuit letters—as would necessitate their " escaping their carnage " and fleeing to " the mountains and forests " there to live " a misérable life. " Wilks makés the whole thing an insurrection of the peasantry who hated the new financial measures of the king and who, having lost their national leaders, the Pâlegârs, they having been compelled to live at the capital by the king, had fallen an easy prey to the Jangama priests who had, at the same time, lost their pecuniary receipts owing to the absence of the Pâlegârs. There is not a word of ail this in the Jesuit letters. Nor is there anything in them to suggest that the king was aiming at obtaining from his subjects a voluntary renunciation of their " private property in land " and an acknowledgment that " it was the right of the State. " Dëvachandra also makes the Jangamas the fomenters of the insurrection in the
raralarjeais and hé and Wilks agréée when they stâte that trôops were etaployed to put the insurrection down. The story of the employment of Faridullâ Khân for the purpose, mentioned by Dëvachandra, though omitted by Wilks, is probably true; it is one of the few points on which Wilks agréees with him when he says that troops of cavalry were employed to disperse assemblages of mobs and eut down without parley: "every man wearing an orange-coloured robe (the peculiar garb of the Jungum priests)." Dëvachandra, on the other hand, makes the Jangamas the worst offenders—not merely leaders of the peasantry in the insurrection, but the very authors of the revolt. According to him, the annoyance caused by them soon became unbearable. Even the king's officiais were not safe at their hands. He represents the king as ordering the démolition of their maths and houses, the confiscation of their rent-free lands and, finally, the for-feiture of their very lives! The story is thus found full-fledged in Dëvachandra. Absolutely absent in the Jesuit letters, we find it as small as a man's hand in Wilks, but in Dëvachandra, the persécution of the Jangamas takes its final shape in a manner which shows how Jaina tradition worked up the whole story in such a form as would fully bear out its traditional hatred towards its hated oppfessor, the Jangama priest. Nothing more seems necessary to show that the entire account of the Jangamas leading the revolt or of their being put to death in thousands—and that at the instance of Chikkadëvaràja himself, whatever his financial needs or political ambitions—is a product of the fertile imagination of Dëvachandra without the least basis for it. It is unnecessary to deny for Jdiis purpose that the Jangamas suffered like the rest of the peasantry; it may also be conceded that they were in sympathy with those who suffered with them as the result of the financial measures—if thèse did so suffer in fact; and it may also be granted that the king took
certain measures to carry through his fiscal schemes. It is possible too that certain of the Jangamas suffered heavily in the conflict that followed. But to say that the king ordered a general hunting down of the disguised and craven Jangamas, as Dévachandra puts it, or ordered their massacre at Nanjangûd, at the hands of expert executioners, as detailed by Wilks, is to ask posterity to believe in a story which does not figure even in a cryptic form in the contemporary account of the Jesuit Fathers; nor in the accounts of earlier Jain writers; nor in any of the many inscriptions of the period; nor even in the other writers of the time, who, belonging to other religious persuasions, might be expected to have made a point of it in their favour. It is a story too which is incredible from the point of view of what is known of Chikka-dêvarâja Wodeyar from other sources, easily verifiable and absolutely untainted by sectarian animosities and religious or political prejudices of any kind. Finally it has to be remarked that the "tradition" which came to be thus worked up within about a hundred years after the death of Chikkadêvarâja bears on its very face the impress of successive additions until it reaches its finally evolved form in Dévachandra. What in the Jesuit letters appears as a measure of finance for meeting the exigencies of war becomes a purely fiscal measure in Wilks, while in Dévachandra there is no mention either of a financial or a fiscal measure as the cause of the insurrection. What again appears in the Jesuit letters as a general revolt of the people of the "eastern provinces" comes out as an insurrection of the peasantry led by the Jangamas in Wilks, and solely by the Jangamas themselves in Dévachandra; and finally the objects of destruction, according to the Jesuit Fathers, are the Vaishnava and ēaiva temples, while in Wilkg they are 400 Jangama priests, and more than 7,000 Jangama matht, and in Dévachandra they are 1,000 Jângama
priests and all their houses and maths all over the rural parts. It is also worthy of note that while Wilks makes the fiscal measures the root cause of the insurrection, in Dévachandra the enhancement of the assessment comes off as an after-effect, as the conséquence, of the Jangama agitation, by way of punishing the agitationists for their disloyalty. It is thus clear that the "tradition" on which Wilks worked up his account of Chikkadēva'â fiscal measures and the results that followed their introduction is one that has undergone much development during the course of a century and more that had elapsed since the events connected with them actually took place. "Tradition" has a tendency to grow, to transmute facts, and even to displace events by hundreds of years. If the treatment said to have been meted out to the Jains by an ancient Pândyan king can be transplanted in the 17th century to Chikkadēvarâja, why should not "tradition," a hundred years later, get itself busy especially in the hands of a writer of the poetical, not to say sectarian, type of Dévachandra, and look like an actual *"fact" of history in the setting in which it is made to appear by him? The truth is that traditional narrative—of which epic poetry is the highest form—deals with ritual drama, and not with historical fact. The real facts of a career, like all historical facts, have been, and could only be, ascertained, as has been authoritatively declared, from contemporary written records, interpreting the word "written" here in the larger sense as inrûding inscriptions, etc.24

If the view of Wilks were held to be true, then the history of Chikkadēvarâja's reign would be nothing more than a chapter of crimes and misadventures. But that would be plainly distorting the whole of his life-story.

---

24. See Appendix VI—(4), on "What is Tradition?" for a just appreciation of the historicity of tradition.
and what he did for his country and what he attempted to do in the direction of a settled and orderly form of government for Southern India as a whole. Nobody has yet accepted the remark of Horace Walpole that the history of the Yorkists and Lancastrians, and many others besides, is like reading the history of "highway robbers." The saner opinion has been that even amid the bloodied records of a king's life—to-day we may even justifiably say, a nation's life—we find jewels of culture, ornaments of wit and treasures of useful invention. It is these that redeem our faith in man and it is these again that restore our hope in his future. We have to remember, thus much at least if we are to read history aright or to purpose. In the case of Chikkadevarâja, there is reason to believe that neither his policy nor his actions ever reached that extreme point which landed him in or necessitated the perpetration of dark deeds even for the purpose of gaining selfish ends. Granting for the sake of argument that the version of Wilks is true and that it is founded in truthful tradition, the utmost that would have to be said would be that he was served by a minister who possibly exceeded his instructions or went beyond the limits of what might be called ministerial responsibility. We know that Chikkadeva came to the throne quite peaceably. He was king of the whole country and all its people. Amongst his own people, he knew neither friend nor foe, for he came from Hangalâ to succeed to the throne and had held aloof from every one connected with his predecessor. To bring peace and order into the land, to gain for it the supremacy that belonged to it as the rightful successor to Vijayanagar claims in the South, and to rule the country justly and well, were his objects. These would have been difficult of achievement even to a wise and experienced ruler during the period his life was cast in; and to Chikkadéva, who was only twenty-eight years old when he ascended
the throne, they should have been well nigh impossible; but he seems to have known by instinct how to govern and make laws, how to choose his ministers wisely, and how to get the best out of them. With these good qualities he had the pertinacity to keep steadfastly to what he distinctly aimed at; this was to strengthen and bind together the country he ruled over and the additions he was constantly endeavouring to make to it, so that his kingship might extend over the whole of the south of India. To this end, he made himself the centre of all power. He mapped out his plans; he chose the men to carry them out; he remembered everything, he thought of everything, and he cared for everything. When busy with his wars in the distant south or the equally distant north-west, he found time to think of reform in the administrative and social structure, not excluding even his Palace household. Nothing, indeed, seemed to escape his eye or his hand and that is possibly the main reason why his reign seems so full of action. Nor did he forget his Maker or his responsibility to Him. He was deeply religious, though religion with him did not mean mere bigotry or superstition.

Everything that is known of Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar from the reliable sources pertaining to his period shows him to have been a popular king and a king too who was interested in his work. He might not have succeeded in all that he strove for or attempted. It is given to no human being to achieve everything he aims at. Thaë Chikkadëvarâja failed in some of his objectives only shows that he was but a human being. Perfection cannot be, and is not, claimed for him. A man below or above humanity is rightly termed a monstrosity and Chikka-dëva was neither. He loved his people, his country and mankind. In his work—of administration and reform—he was helped by his minister Viéâlåksha-Pandît, evidently a man of ready wit, who had been his colleague-at-studies
and whom, when he became king, he had made his Minister-in-chief. Evidently Chikkadēvara had grown to like him and begun to trust him as only an intimate friend would. Between the two—aided by the rest of the cabinet—they seem to have managed the business of the country. The nearest parallel we can think of in English History to the relationship that existed between them is that of Henry II and Thomas Becket. If Becket met his fate at the hands of assassins, so did Viâlâksha. Henry's outburst in the one case led to the murder of Becket in the cathedral; but in the case of Viéâlâksha, it was the munster's own unpopularity that led to his death in the streets of Seringapatam. If Henry's remorse was genuine, Chikkadēva's sorrow was sincere, for he knew the extent of the loss he had sustained. All that we know of Chikkadēva makes us doubt whether the causes that led to Viéâlâksha's death can be set down to his master. We now know that the reforms—fiscal and administrative—were themselves not of a kind to raise the ire of the people against the king. If that be so, then the manner of giving effect to them—purely an executive act—must have been such as to render the minister not only unpopular but also hated. There must have been something in the modus operandi of the minister, that rendered the scheme itself unwelcome, if not odious, in the popular eye. This should have helped to transfer the responsibility for pushing them through from the minister, whose duty it was to give effect to it, to the king who was, perhaps, neither aware of the exact methods employed nor of the extent to which punitive steps had descended for giving effect to them. The minister was by religion a Jain and that was enough to suspect his bona fides. When the measure affected the local peasantry who were more or less in the hands of priests, whose relationship with the Jains as a class was something other than cordial, all the
conditions necessary for an insurrection were evidently present. What followed may be inferred from the letters of the Jesuit Fathers, though there is reason to believe that there was evident exaggeration in the manner in which the récalcitrants were dealt with. It may be conceded that the minister crushed the insurrection with measures which were harsh even for his times and the harshness, as a matter of course, came to be attached to his sovereign as the probable person who should have sanctioned it. The sequel shows that this should have been so. The minister died and the whole incident closed. The king chose as his minister the person recommended by Viéâlâksha, but then too there was no evidence of popular discontent. The king had nothing to fear from his people, and there was no danger of a rising against him. The people were true to him and to his new minister, though the latter was a person of the choice of the hated Viéâlâksha himself. The people indeed—at least the chief malcontents—had no common cause against him, and they were silenced by the turn that events had taken. Viââlâksha's choice of his successor was excellent and the king's approval of it proved evidently magical in its effects. It might be that the king, immediately order was restored, beat down one by one the remaining leaders of the agitation and thus put down quietly what would, in less capable hands, have given occasion for further trouble. Though Chikkadëva, moderate in his use of victory, spared the masses who had been misled, he did not evidently let go his grip over the leaders whom he so weakened that they could do nothing against him. After this insurrection, the Pâjegârs and religious leaders lost still more of their power, and the king's ascendancy over the whole kingdom became nearly absolute. But the memory of the insurrection and the hatred conceived by the populace against the minister, whom the country
held responsible for the whole trouble—the manner of his death is witness to this—long survived the event, and in due course tradition built round it a tale that has puzzled as much historians of the period as the veracious seeker after the truth, wherever it might be.
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Life in the Royal household at Seringapatam during the reign of Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar was ordinarily one of peace and felicity. We have reference\(^1\) to Chikkadevaraja attended by his queens and served by chambermaids holding in their hands the pouch, spittoon, staff, tassels, goblet and fans) and accomplished ladies of the court, proficient in dancing, music (vocal and instrumental) and poetry among the arts. Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar is further credited\(^2\) with having improved the management of the Palace household by instituting twenty-two departments and organising their administration. Devâjamma, daughter of Lingarâjaiya of Yelandûr, was his principal queen. (pattada-râni, pattada-râni)

---

1. See Hadi. Dhav., I, 3-9 (pp. 2-8); also Songs on Chikkadevaraja and Kempâdevamma, II. 180, v. 2; Chikkadevarâna-Vam., p. 80, and Yad. Mahât., II. 92 (prose passage), etc.
2. Annâla, I. 138. The departments, referred to, related among others to treasures (kukkan), robes (jasañj), swords (kotë), king's apartments (samvukha), beddings (hêsige), interior chambers (ala-kâpû), name-stocks, establishment of servants of the Mysuru-hobî and Pattâdana-hobî, stables (dâya) of horses, elephants, camels and cattle, presents and benevolences (kâsiha), jewels (odâna), body-guards (mâigdâna), cavaliers (râmûsûna), urgent calls (avasarura hobî), attendants, etc.
pattadarasî). She is identical with "Kempadëvamma," "Dëvàmbâ," "Dëvamâmbâ" and "Dëvamma" of Yełandûr, prominently mentioned in literary and other sources. She was an idéal lady, pious and ever devoted to her husband. Among other queens of Chikkadëvarâja were Dëvamma (daughter of Dalavâi Kumâraiya of Kâlale), Kempamma (daughter of Sömârâjaiya of Mügûr), Chikka-Muddamma (daughter of Châmârâjaiya or Châmâiyaiya of Yełandûr), Dodda-Dëpamma (another daughter of Dalavâi Kumâraiya), Dodda-Muddamma (daughter of Dëvaiya-Arasu of Kalale), Kempânajamma and Gauramma (daughters of Virarâjaiya of Hullahalli),

3. Annals, I, 104; J.M.C., No. 19-15-20, p. 65; B. C., Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol., Sr. 905 (referring to Dëvajamma of Yełandûr); see also Hadâ. Dhâr., cited in f.n. 4 infra. Dëvajamma (Dëvamûmbâ) is referred to in the Dëvanagara Plate (c. 1660-1690) as the daughter of Lakshma-Varma of Bâlându-nagara or Yełandûr (see E. C., Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol., My. 115, l. 101-102). Perhaps Lakshma-Varma, mentioned here, was the surname of Lûggârajaiya of Yełandûr.


5. Hadâ. Dhâr., l.c.; see also Ch. XIII, f.n. 134

6. See E. C., Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol., My. 115, l. 95-96, 98, where Râmnâyam-Tiramalârya refers to her thus:

Saitahu mâyâsau saitahu châeaya
Sri-Dëvamûmbâ mahishi rpaeyâ
Pattavaiyam ganâm prasangâ
Sri-Dëvamûmbâ prathamâbhâdiyâ

See also E. C., III (1) Sr. 64 (1792), l. 98-99, repeating the above.

7. Annals, I, 104-105; Mys. Dho. Pûr., I, 63-64 (compared). According to the Annals (l.c.), the first two queens of Chikkadëvarâja (i.e., Dëvajamma of Yełandûr and Dëvamma of Kâlale) were married to him in February 1663, and the next eight (aṣṭa-mahishiyārâ) in June 1679. All his queens, it is interesting to note, came from Arun families which were either in friendly alliance with or closely related to the Royal Family. The Hadâ. Dhâr. (I, 4, p. 2) also refers to the eight queens (aṣṭa-guṇeyâroバリュ, vanâyârâ). Further, we learn (Annals, l.c.), these eight queens were married to Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar with the Arka rite (arka vírâcagunaraddi vírâcaguna mājikôdâ aṣṭa-mahishiyârâ). Arka is the Sun-plant Calotropis gigantea, a small tree with medicinal sap and rind, the larger leaves of which are used for sacrificial ceremonies. Arka signifies also the membrum virile. Marriage with the Arka plant is enjoined to be performed before a man marries a third wife, who thus becomes his fourth, vide Appendix XVI—(3), for a detailed notice of Arka and the ritualism of the Arka marriage.
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Deviramma (daughter of Basavarajaiya of HullahaLi) and Kûntamma (daughter of Krishçiaiya of Kottågâla); Devajamma of Yelandûr, the principal queen, was, it would seem, the most favourite consort of Chikkadêvârâja. Her memory is perpetuated by a votive mantapa (of nine ankanams), to the north-east of the principal pond (Jcalyânî) at Mëlkôte, with her name inscribed thereon (arasi ammanavaru Yalavandûra Devâjammanavara sëve* mantapa). Of the junior queens of Chikkadêvârâja, Gauramma appears mentioned in a lithic inscription dated November 3, 1690, recording her gift of the Gôpåla-sarasu pond for the Goddess (Ammã) of Talaku, south of the town of Maddagiri. By his senior queen Devâjararna, Chikkadêvârâja Wodeyar had a son (ê. 1672) by name Kanthïrava (afterwards Kanthïrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar II). He is also said to have had a daughter by name Devâjamma (6. 1680) by Dôdda-Muddamma of Kalale, one of his junior queens. Among other members of the Royal Family, Kanthïravaiya (Kanthïrava-Arasu), younger brother of Chikkadêvârâja Wodeyar, appear to have stayed in Seringapatam holding a subordinate position during the reign. A lithic record, dated June 17, 1676, registers the consécration by him of the image of Pattåbhïrâma in Sômanàthapur and his grant of the village of Uklagere for its maintenance.

8. E. C., Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol., Sr. 806 (M. A. R., 1908, p. 25, para 76); I. M. C., No. 18-15-20, p. 65; see also Annals, I. 141.
9. Ibiç, XII Mi. 15: 6. 1618, Pramûdâla, Kârâka su. 12; see also Ch. XIII, f.n. 83.
10. Annals, I. 106, 185 (compared); Mys. Dho. Psv., I. 58, II. 58 (compared); also E. C., Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol., N. 290 (1716), v. 19:

Tasmâcheîr v Chikkadêva-vyapamakutamanâgåv Dvamambodaråbhau | Vishnurâmína jàtâh . . . Kañthïravândraâh ! |; and III (1) Sr. 84 (1722), H. 133-104.
11. Annals, I. 106.
12. See Annals (I. 187), according to which Chikkadêvârâja is said to have specially got constructed a miniature palace (Chikkâramâne) in Seringapatam for the residence of Kañthïrava-Arasu with his family.
From the domestic, no less from the political point of view, it is of interest to note that the Kalale Family came into greater prominence and into increasing contact with the Mysore Royal House during this period. Mallarâja III, eldest son of Mallarâja Wodeyar alias Kempê-Arasu and grandson of Karikâla-Mallarâja I, continued to be the chief of Kalâle till December 1679 when, having no issue, he was succeeded by Dôdda-Mallarâjaiya or Mallarâja IV (1679-1719), a nephew of his and eldest son of Dalavâi Kumâraiya of Kalâle. Kumâraiya himself having been foremost in the service of the kingdom of Mysore since 1667, appears to have brought about this arrangement, under which, while he aimed at securing direct succession in his own line to the sovereignty of Kalâle, he also sought to cement the bond of relationship between the Mysore and Kalâle families and paved the way for opportunities to promising members of the Kalâle House to serve as Dalavâis of Mysore. Indeed, as we have seen, Kumâraiya was himself the father-in-law of Ohikkadëvarâja Wodeyar, having given two of his daughters (Dëvamma and Dodda-Dëpamma) in marriage to him. His brother Dëvaiya-Arasu likewise married his daughter (Dodda-Muddamma) to Ohikkadëvarâja. Further, on the retirement of Kumâraiya in May 1682, he was succeeded in the office of Dalavâi of Mysore by Doddaiya, a nephew of his and second son of Mûppina-Kântaiya of Kalâle. Doddaiya held the office with conspicuous ability, during 1682-1690. Again, Mallarâjaiya, younger brother of Doçlçlaiya and last son of Mûppina-Kântaiya, was the Dalavâi of Mysore between 1696-1698. The foundations of greatness of the House of Kalâle in the history of

14 K. A. V., II, 16, 33; see also Table XIII.
15 Supra; see also under Dalavâis in Ch. XII, for details about the periods of office of Dalavâis from the Kalâle Family.
16 K. A. V., II, 18; also Table XIII.
17 Ibid.
Mysore had been laid, and developed, already during 1660-1704.

The progress of Kalale was coeval with the advance of Mysore into a first-rate political power in the south of India. Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar had been reaching his sixtieth year and was, from all the available evidence, in the full possession of his faculties to the end of his reign, directing the affairs of his kingdom with vigour and determination. The religious vein in him, though strong and pulsating with life, did not prove an obstacle to his work as a warrior and statesman. He was rather unfortunate in one respect and that was the physical weakness of his only son Kaśithirava who, as we shall notice in the sequel, was both deaf and dumb. What makes him great in the eyes of posterity is the singular equanimity with which he evidently bore this infirmity in his son and successor. The existence of steadfast and loyal ministers like Tirumalaiyangār and others of his cabinet must have proved a consolation to him in his thoughts on what might happen to his son and to the throne when it fell vacant. His ripe spiritual wisdom, his developed sense of dependence on God's grace and his undaunted courage should have contributed fortitude enough to sustain him in the firm belief that his kingdom would be safe in the keeping of God. When the hand of Death was on him on November 16, 1704, in the sixtieth year of his age and the thirty-second year of his reign, he should have passed away, if not with contentment, at least in the hope that the kingdom he had built up with such assiduity, zeal and military valour would, despite the frailty attaching to his son,

Death of Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar, November 16, 1704.

18. Mys. Dho. Pur., II. 31: Tāraka, Kārtika sa. 80. There was a solar eclipse on this date (see Ind. Eph., VI. 211). See also Mys. Raj. Chā., 82; Raj. Kath., XII. 408, and Amnkh, I. 164. All the authorities cited, it is interesting to note, are unanimously agreed as to the date of death of Chikkadēvarāja.
continue unimpaired for generations to come. His queens, however, are stated to have not observed sati.¹⁹

Under the influence of his early éducation and training,²⁰ the personality, accomplishments and character of Chikkadēvarājā Wodēyar attained, as his reigns progressed, a harmonious development and a remarkable state of maturity, which profoundly impressed his contemporaries. Possessed of exceptional personal strength, courage and prowess,²¹ he was, as he appears to us from contemporary sources, a handsome personage (Chenniga Chikadēvarāyā),²² with features characteristic of a great man destined to rule as a sovereign²³—features suggestive of budding manhood, charming round face, large lotus-like eyes, well-proportioned nose, soft arms, round chest, well-built thighs, tender feet, white complexioned body, pleasing countenance and excellent voice.²⁴

In civil society, his personal beauty was a source of attraction to those around him,²⁰ while on the field of

---

19. Amala, I, 165. This departure from the established usage perhaps points to the humanitarian influence of Śrī-Vaišnavism during the period of Chikkadēvarājā’s reign.

20. Vide section on Early life of Chikkadēvarājā in Ch. XI, for details.


22. Hadi. Dhar., see kanda verse at the end of each chapter.

23. C. Vam., 168: Mahāpurusaka lakahana; anga-prayānga chakravarti lakshana.

24. Venkaṭa. Mahāt., I, 64; Śrī. Mahāt. (of Mallikārjuna), II, 82-83; Chikkadevarādā Vam., p. 29 (prose passage); Yad. Mahāt. (of Timma-Kavi), II, 82 (prose passage); C. Vam., 166; C. Vī., IV, 69-72; Manivum, I, 9. Among the expressions found used in the texts are: Bāgipoppuva jāvumā; kondēvarum pōla muddu moga; ananamindu vendu; bagasegagal; nayanam lanceupala; nīlu naa bāgīda muga; nāti ti; orde baṭṭumāda; tola bīloya kambu; molnatu; padamam jānīse padamamendu; acheha bāgogoda mayyri; prasama vadamāvindu; śrivāṇi.

battle he was a terror to his enemies. 26 Master of the science of arms and the different arts of warfare and of horsemanship and elephant-riding, 27 he would personally lead his mighty army (horse and foot) on the field, fight against heavy odds like a daring hero (kaḍugali), deftly (kara-chamattritiyim) cut off his adversaries (i.e., hostile powers) at the point of his famous sword Nandaka and make himself conspicuous by displaying his shining standard, the Garuda-dhvaja, as an emblem of victory (jayaēri vilasita natana). 28 The accomplished person that he was, 20 Chikkadēvarāja Wodēyar was celebrated as a distinguished scholar of his age. 30 He had a subtle


27. C. Bī., pp. 58-59; Gī. Gō., pp. 68-69, 69-70; Mōh. Śānti, st. 8 (col.); Sacehō. Nīr., fl. 120-121 (prose passage): Astraṇidā Ḍharpavāmanum; akaraṅaṅa kalādahrīṭaṃ rājanāmanum; gajāṅaṅaṅa kalādahrīṭaṃ jayantaṃ, māgāvanāmanam, etc.


29. Paśch. Māhas, I, 45; C. Vī., V, 105; Mitra. Gō., p. 3 (prose passage); Mūricam, I, 154: Sārakaṃ; supraṣṭiḥ; alampaṅgra; kalaṅiḍhiḥ.

30. Paśch. Māhas, I, 48-44; C. Vī., V, 105; Śriṅgāra-Bātaṇa-Sangāya, fl. 183; Mitra. Gō., I, 7; Mūricam, I, 107; Songs on Chikkadēvarāja and Kompāṭvamma, 1, 180: Chaḍuraṇa; nippaṇaṇa, kāḍatuṇaṇa kāleṣṭa; uruṅkaṅha kūndi; māhāvaṇiḍhaṃ; vidyaprasāṇa. See also Rāj. Kāth., XII, 37, where Dvēchandra speaks of Chikkadēvarāja as having been the foremost among the learned celebrities of his age (Chikkaṇḍēvērāmaṅaṃ būḍha-dhikamanti-yeṣvādam).
mind capable of grasping the learned arts, and quick in comprehending the sentiments of others (chāru-rāsajnam). He was a brilliant conversationalist (vākkōvidam) and took a keen interest in debates and discussions among scholars in his court (sāstrigala váda). To talk with him once was, in the opinion of a contemporary poet, to wish for more talks with him, and to him who had not conversed with him even once, the desire was to find an opportunity to do so. "If the nectar is only known by the name," this poet asks, "is it possible not to yearn for a drop of it? When you have had a taste of it, is it possible not to hunger for it the more?"

An expert in all arts and sciences, Chikkadevarāja had dived deep into their secrets (sarva suhalegalplagutta tilīdu). In particular, as we learn from another contemporary, he would personally test the weapons, diamonds, horses and elephants required for his use (āyudha ratna vaji gajamam tānē parikshikkumām). Well-trained in the study and appreciation of music and literature (samantu kuéalam sangīta-sāhityadol), he was an ardent lover of them and had a thorough knowledge of their fundamentals. He was himself an expert among the lutists (vainikarol praviṇa nereyam), having

---

33. Ibid., II, 1; Ruk. Oche., I, 97.
34. See Chātupadgamanjari, vv. 46-64 (Ed. by V. Prabhākara Śāstri), quoted in the Mys. Gaz., II, iv, 2461.
35. Kamalā. Maha., I, 110; Śrī. Maha., II, 31; C. Vi., V, 106; Chikkadevana-Vam., l.c.; Yad. Maha., II, 54; Mbh. Śanti, l.c.; C. Bi. and Gr. Gō, l.c.; A. V. C., I, 19; Mitra. Gō., I, 7: Sākala kāla nīlayam; praviṇa; dharamam; virātha kāla praviṇam; kālā hōvidam; āstrāravahābhāvam; akheśa āstrāngala, etc.
37. See Bīgarāyas in Mitra. Gō., l.c.
38. Ibid.; see also C. Bi. and Gr., Gō., l.c.
been taught to play scientifically on the instrument (lute), to the extent of endowing it with life and enrapturing his audience. Référence has been made in an earlier chapter to Chikkdëvarâja Woḍeyar as the guiding spirit, nay as the creator, of the literary movement of his reign and to the works ascribed to or written by him. Undoubtedly, in the literary and cultural spheres, he dominated the most notable circles of his time. Himself a connoisseur of literary merit, he had a high standard of appreciation, and appears to have initiated a policy, in pursuance of which literary works were to be produced along up-to-date lines, yet without breaking away from the earlier traditions. Thus, we learn, he used to keep himself engaged in the enjoyment of writings characterized by symmetry in respect of form, sentiments delineated, diction, style, descriptive powers and figures of speech used (like similes, illustrations, etc). Further, it seems to have been his desire that authors attempting literary productions in Kannâḍa prose and poetry should aim at popular understanding and appreciation (ellar prämade tilidâlipante ; aiësha janam tiliva terade; ellararivinim) while paying due regard to beauty of form, sentiments, verbal embellishments, modernity in the médium of expression, use of kanda and other
varieties of mètres and melody of diction.\textsuperscript{45} The extent to which these standards were realised is, perhaps, borne out by the literary achievement of the reign described in the chapter relating to it. Of, perhaps, greater importance to us is the keen interest he evinced in the history and culture of his country, for he was known to have "directed an extensive collection to be made of historical materials, including all inscriptions then extant within his dominions, which were already reported to be voluminous."\textsuperscript{46} In this hereminds us of Rāja-Kāja, the great Chōja ruler. Magnificent, prosperous and happy, of sweet and good words and pleasing manners, calm and gentle, prudent, stainless, adhering to the established course of conduct, kind-hearted and generous,\textsuperscript{47} Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar was, as he is depicted to us by his contemporaries, an intensely human character. With a thorough control over his passions and with a

\textsuperscript{45} See Hasti. Mahāt., I, 101, 105-109; Kamala. Mahāt., III, 73-75, 76-79; Śu. Sap., I, 19; Bhag. Gt. Tāta, I, 57; Sīsha-Dhāma, v. 3 (col.); Śrī. Mahāt., col., etc.: Esakam bețtu . . . rasa hāvatā nām pritī rati sadartha; posutādātunāśi; padabandham posutādā hanta tatiyim nāmavṛtta sandhādām; kēla jana brindakāllam tṛayavā sampāda muñmutīrve. For details about these productions, vide Ch. XIV of this work.

\textsuperscript{46} See Wilks's Preface to his Mysor., I, pp. xxxii-xxxiii, where he obviously records a genuine tradition fresh in the memories of his contemporaries in Mysore.

\textsuperscript{47} Sat. Dr. Vis., I, 46-47; Pusck. Mahāt., I, 49-44; Kamala. Mahāt., I, 110; C. Vi., V, 106; Chikkavindra-Vam., pp. 92, 99 (prose passage); Yad. Mahāt., II, 69, also f. 88 (prose passage); Venkata. Mahāt., I, 54; Yad. Mahāt. (of Chikkamādhyāya), I, 18; Munivam., I, 9, 148, 168; see also E. C., III (1) Sr. 14 (1606), l. 45: Vai bhava doṣa kalpa sata, atyanta tapayādūmar, abhyudayamam paśčedopaṇu, bhāvatka m; vinayākta, madhuramaya bhūṣkaram, oṣṭānta-gyānakam, jana-manda-karman, ussauidoṣa Bānam; antam, nagadīram, gāmbhiryāva, vidvākalī, uchītajnom; abalaka, vināla-manaṁ; nīnagaram, dhāraṇī-nilgha, sadayām, daya-sapā exploits; udaraḥ, chāgī. Cf. Nāyaka of Madura (p. 294) which refers to Chikkadēvarāja as "the niggardly king of Mysore," on the authority of Taylor (Or. Hist. Mem., II, 924-936), by way of bringing out the greatness of Mangammāi, of Madura (1694-1706) contrasted with the former (i.e., Chikkadēvarāja), her contemporary. There is absolutely no evidence in support of this characterization. Taylor's authority is itself a later tale on the hostile Madura side. It is not entitled to credence in the face of the strong testimony of incidental references from local sources cited in this chapter.
mastery of the sciences of politics and diplomacy, he had a deep insight into the character of his councillors while remaining an enigma to them (sakala sâmâjikarolava tilidu nijaprakrtiyanavarge Kanisada). His government was that of a true Kshatriya, deeply rooted in the ancient idéal of dharma (râjadharmam), which had as its objectives punishment of the wicked and protection of the good (dîîçta-nigraha èîçta-paripâlemam) and promotion of happiness of all his subjects in général and of Gods, Brâhmans and the dumb création typified by the cow in particular. Gifts to Brâhmans (implying the leisured class), révérence and liberality towards poets and the learned, relief to the needy, dependents and the deserving, mercy and assurance of safety to supplicants, affection for his followers, kindly attention towards his subjects, gracefulness towards the fair sex, above all dévotion to Vishnu—thèse were the cardinal features of Chikkadêva's character as the ruler of a growinj kingdom.
Contemporary testimony as to his greatness.

Literary flourishes apart, contemporary testimony to the greatness of Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar is very weighty indeed. Mallikârjuna, in his ānṛṛanga-Māhp-
tmya (1678), observes: "There are no sovereigns who do not perform obesiance to Chikkadēva, no chiefs who do not do homage to him, no warriors who do not regard him as a hero, no enemies who do not seek his protection, no Brâhmans not gratified by his gifts, no tract not impressed with the emblem of his sovereignty, and no vénérable persons not duly honoured by him." Tirumalārya, in his Apratima-Vīra-Gharitam (c. 1695-1700), speaks of him thus: "In this world there are none greater than Chikkadēva; if there be, they must only be in ancient writings. None are equal to him; if there are, they are only his reflection. Opponents he has none; if there are any, they are only for amusement in sports; nowhere else are they to be seen."

Among the insignias and titles of Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar were: Dh a r a n i-V a r a h a (boar), Gaṇḍa-bhērunda (double-headed eagle), Birudambar-agaṇḍa (champion over those who say they have such and such titles), Malepa-nripa-madamardana (curber of the pride of refractory chiefs), Advaita-parākrama (of peerless
An estimate of Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar:
As a political builder.
1682-1686 and the advance of Mughal arma into the south of India in the succeeding years, i.e., 1689-1696. All these adverse circumstances, however, resulted in limiting his jurisdiction only up to the forts on the eastern frontier of Mysore, overlooking the south. In the other directions, he achieved a great deal of success. While systematically extending the kingdom of Mysore in the western and central Karnátak at the expense of local chiefs (like those of Ikkêri and Maddagiri) and foreign powers (like Bijâpur and Gôlkonda and the Mahrattas) during 1673-1687, he withstood and repulsed the Mahratta attacks on Mysore in 1677 and 1682, quickly recovered from the crisis of 1682-1686, and maintained unimpaired his diplomatic relations with the Mughal Empire (1687-1700). The net result of his policy was that during the last years of his reign (1698-1704), when Aurangzîb was engagea in his ever-déeeopen struggle with the Mahrattas in the Deccan, Chikkadêvaràja Wodeyar had not only ensured the integrity and independence of the kingdom of Mysore as a bulwark against the Mughal Empire in the North but had also been sufficiently well-established in his claim to the sovereignty of the South and the Karnâtaka country, and was in fact at the zénith of his power, an achievement creditable in no small measure to his un-tiring personal exertions and the activities of his Dajavàis.

To the student of history the reflection occurs that it was a public calamity that the ill-starred conditions of his time did not favour Chikkadëva with complète success in his southern campaign. With it the chance of the restoration of an orderly government throughout Southern India was lost for another century until the Pax Britannica made it possible. The results of the unfortu-nate check that Chikkadêvaràja received in that direction and in his attempt at the assertion of supremacy over

As a politician.
thé territory which for ages Vijayanagar had held together and ruled over, made themselves increasingly felt with the lapse of years. What Chikkadēva's success might have meant it is needless to contemplate now; it were really profitless to consider a " what might have been." But it is patent enough to a chronicler of the times that his ill-success signified the loss of a strong central government that Chikkadēva alone—of all the men of the time in the South—could have bestowed on the country as a whole. Neither the Mahratta king nor the Mughal Emperor could have done this. The Mahratta king was carrying on a warfare in the South not so much for founding a central government, with a view to extending the benefits of an orderly administration, as for getting footholds in it which might help in the future for collecting the chauth and the sardēsmukhi from its chiefs and princelings. The imperialism of Sivāji, Aurangzīb and their successors differed widely from that of Chikkadēva's idéal of an Empire. If what Chikkadēva attempted for his kingdom is any guide to what he might have aimed at for the larger territory he tried to conquer, there is hardly any doubt, it would have denoted a System of governance under which the blessings of peace and order were to prevail over the whole of the South for some décades at least. Aurangzīb's fight over the Southern Muhammadans consumed all his talents and treasury, and the extension of his rule over the South, even if it had materialized, would not have brought for the people the reign of a sovereign who intended peace and contentment for the conquered tracts. In any case, it would not have spelt a System of administration which would have recalled to the Hindūs of the South a continuation of the orderly Vijayanagar rule to which they had grown accustomed for well nigh four centuries. The passing away of Chikkadēva

66. ON the relative claims of Mysore, the Mahrattas and the Mughals to Empire in the South, vide Appendix V*-*-7.
(in 1704) thus meant to the South something more than the loss of a Shivaji or an Aurangzib. So long as Chikkadева lived there was the chance of a restoration of order in the South, a restoration which the interests of the country and its people needed from the days of Venkaṭa I (1586-1614), the Vijayanagar Emperor, and a restoration, too, which would have been in keeping with its own past traditions and culture. Whatever the Mughal or the Mahratta may have been for their homelands, they were essentially different to the kingdoms of the South which had had a civilization and a settled government of their own. His death, as we shall see, meant the loss for all time of such a chance, with the result that the way was open for the pretensions of the Mahrattas and the Mughals (including the Nawabs of Arcot and the Nizâm) in later days, to levy contributions from the feudatories of the old derelict Empire, or to lay waste the country which taxed not only their resources but also strained those of the common people so much that the very presence of the armies of these demanders proved a signal for a general exodus of the inhabitants of towns and villages. The threat of an invasion thus proved worse than a war actually carried out, a state of affairs which added to the misery of the people who neither had peace nor security for another century.

Chikkadева was a born ruler of men. He was essentially a man of action. He was undoubtedly one of the greatest of his race. He aimed high but did not go beyond the possible. His government was a centralized despotism of the benevolent type, usually conducted along traditional lines. His administrative measures and Works of public utility reveal a personality far in advance of his South Indian contemporaries, a personality with an ardent desire for reform of old institutions to suit the changing conditions of the times, and with a genius for initiation
and exécution of new ideas and schemes. His fiscal régulations were as strict as they were just, for they aimed at the standardization of revenue dues and provision of facilities to the ryots on the one hand and, on the other, at reducing to the minimum, chances of disaffection on their part. He linked the civil, criminal and revenue sides of the administration in such a way that control and governance during difficult times was rendered easy and possible. In the matter of foreign relations, he, much like Sivâji, refused to seek the aid of outsiders, though he maintained diplomatic relations with the Mughal. A devout êrî-Vaishñava by faith and profession, he evinced a keen interest in the philosophy of that religion while tolerating other sects and creeds. Numerous were his gifts and acts of piety. Cities, towns, and Brâhmanical settlements in local parts, which were as ever before the vanguards of spiritual and temporal culture, were in a flourishing condition under him. As head of the social order, Chikkadëvaràja Woḍeyar, in keeping with the ancient idéal of Varṇâ-srama-dharma, strove hard to maintain social well-being in the country. His court was noted for its dazzling splendour and magnificence, being thoroughly expressive of the tastes and culture of the times to which he belonged. Himself an accomplished person and an engaging personality, he gave an impetus to the development of Kannâda literature as the means of popular éducation, ushering in a new erâ in the literary history of Mysote. His encouragement to and patronage of scholars and poets was proverbial. Regular and systematic in his habits and pursuits as he was, his domestic life was marked by peace and happiness.

With Chikkadëvaràja, religion was the rock-bed of social well-being. Religion divorced from society was as nothing to him. Here we see religious duty identified with
social duty. Sin is an offence against the latter and not the former. Redemption, it would seem to follow from this standpoint, is tantamount to libération from association with unhelpful society, a society that discards human sympathy and human good-will towards its own kind. Conduct is greater than mère profession of belief. Religion is, in this sensé, the fountain-head of morality and that is morality which has its suprême sanction from religion. We can now appreciate why Chikkadêva stresses duty in one's own sphère in the true spirit of the Bhagavad-Gîtā. He incubâtes the view that if human solidarity is to be achieved peacefully, it is necessary for each in his own place to do his duty selflessly and thus help towards harmonious action. That is a doctrine that has its value as much in the national as in the international sphère even to-day. It would seem that in the religious and social domain, as in the political and administrative, Chikkadêva realized the limits of human action. If it is the first duty of a reformer to prevent any future reformation, Chikkadêva splendidly succeeded in his attempt. To those who think that they can by a stroke of the pen remould society or remake religion, hère is something to unlearn, if not to learn.

Monarchs hâve seldom condescended to become the preceptors of their subjects. If some praise is due to Aéôka for the care with which he propagated the Law of Piety and to Justinian for reducing a laborious system of law into a short and elementary treatise understood by the youth as much of Eome as of Constantinople and Berytus, then some crédit is also due to Chikkadêva for the diligence with which he attempted to teach those committed to his charge the solidarity of humanity. To him ail human beings—the four orders of the Hindu social life—were oné, each being indissolubly bound up with otheirs and ail being one single whole for the common good. His conception of human equality.
conception of equality transcended law. It was some-thing more than equality in the eye of the law. It was equality in the eye of God, for all who worship Him or in His name are, according to him, equal before Him and attain to everlasting life. That is a conception of equality which is not only great but also one which stands unique in history.

As a "Maker of Mysore." A worthy contemporary of Sivâji and Aurangzib, a consummate warrior, a strenuous political builder, a shrewd administrator, a humble seeker after truth and an intensely human personage of many-sided tastes and attainments, Chikkadêvarâja Woðeyar must be reckoned, from the materials now available to us, a typical character of Southern India during the latter part of the seventeenth century. He is undoubtedly entitled to rank high as a "Maker of Mysore." He is, perhaps, best remembered by the most enduring monuments of his rule, the Chikkadêvarâja-sâgara-nâlâ and the Déva-nâlâ (Chikkadêvarâja-nâlâ), canals in the present district of Mysore. His reign thus fully exemplifies the truth of the well-known saying, "Peace hath her victories, no less renown'd than war."

The influence of Chikkadêvarâja Woðeyar on the génération of writers immediately after his death was profound. He figures prominently in the literature of the eighteenth century.56 In particular, one literary work, belonging to the reign of Kaçthïrava-Narasarâja Woðeyar II (1704-1714), significantly echoes the memory of his greatness as a warrior-king of Mysore.57 Another work,
belonging to the reign of Krishnarâja Wodeyar I (1714-1732), vividly points to the glory of his reign.\(^{58}\)

Chikkadëvarâja stands out in history by reason of his exceptional personal quality, which makes him more noteworthy than his contemporaries. Among the rulers of the new states that had grown up out of the wreckage of the old Vijayanagar Empire, he was easily first. His greatest claim on posterity is that he laid the foundations of a government which stood for peace and order. He may be said to have realized that order was as important for cultural progress as peace itself. During the thirty-two years of his reign, the country, despite the wars he fought, enjoyed the blessings of a settled government. The literary activity of the period is the best evidence of this great blessing. After the fall of the resuscitated Vijayanagar Empire at Penukonda, an interval of nearly a hundred and fifty years from the death of Venkata I (1614), the last great ruler of that illustrious line, till the mémorable reign of Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar of Mysore (1672-1704), is faintly marked by the obscure names and imperfect annals of a series of kings—beginning with Śrī-Ranga III (1614) and ending with Brī-Ranga VII (1759)—who successively occupied the Impérial throne of Vijayanagar. During the same period, Mysore, as we have shown,\(^{59}\) rose from the position of a mère viceroyalty to the proud status of a sovereign seat, which, under the capable rule of a discerning king, Chikkadëva, was fast taking the place of the old Impérial House (of Vijayanagar) itself, a king who might have deserved a statue among the best and bravest of the successors of ancient Hakka and Bukka. Chikkadëva's kingdom suffered a temporary eclipse because, as

\(^{58}\) Sakala-Vaid. Sam., pp. 2-4 (Introd. Oh.).

\(^{59}\) Vide Chs. V, VI, VIII, X and XI of this work, for the political évolution of Mysore during 1610-1704.
we shall notice, weaker sovereigns began to appear in the
line of succession, who were neither fired by the same zeal
nor possessed of the same capacity to manage men and
things. The ideals and objectives aimed at by him—the
idéal and objective primarily of a united South against
the aggressive Mughal who tried to break through the
frontier states and destroy what was left of the ancient
Hindu land—were lost sight of by those who immediately
came after him. Servants tended to become masters and
loyalty to get displaced by rank treachery. The usurpation
of Haidar was only ended by the dévotion of trusted leaders
who again and again asserted the principle of right over
might and held aloft the high principles of service,
dévotion and loyalty, and amidst all kinds of difficultés
owned no other duty to the Sovereign House of Mysore
but that of duty dûne for the sake of duty.
(1) ON THE DÉRIVATION OF "WODEYAR."

_Wodeyar_: Kan. plural and honorific form of _Qdeya_, lit. lord, master; spelt variously as _Qdeyar_, _Wodeyar_, _Wadêyar_ and _Wadêyaraiya_, in inscriptions and literary works of the Vijayanagar and Mysore periods. In Tamil, the word occurs as _Uḍlaiyar_, as in Chôla inscriptions among others. Between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries, Vîra-êaïvism was the prédominant creed in the Southern Karnâtak. This is evidenced by the fact that the word _Wodeyar_ not infrequently appears in the literature of the period in a modified form as _Vadër_ or _Wadër_, a term of respect by which Jangama priests were, and are even now, addressed.

(2) ON THE DÉRIVATION OF "MYSORE."

_Mysore_: Derived from _Mahisha_ (or _Maisa_ + ûru, lit. buffalo town. Popular mythology associâtes the place with the destruction of Mahishâsura, the buffalo-headed monster, by the consort of Siva, worshipped by the Mysore Royal House as their tutelary Goddess, i.e., êrï-Châmuriôéëévāri of the Châmuriôé Hills, Mysore. There has been considerable discussion among scholars, for some time now (see App. J in _Mys. Gaz._, I I . iv. 3118-3120, for a summary), on the dérivation of the word Mysore, which they generally take to connote a tract or territory variously identified as _Mahisha-mâñôdala, Erumai-nâdu, Mahisha-râshtra, Maisa-nâdu, Mahi-shmati_, etc., referred to in inscriptions and literature. The Sangam poets (6th cent. A.D.) in particular, as is well known, refer in their works to _Erumai-yûran_, a name which has been taken tomean "he of Mahishapura
or Mysore" (see Kar. Ka. Cha. I I I , Introdn., pp. xxi, xxv), and latterly attempted to be identified as a chief of Yemmiganûr (see Mys. Gaz., 3120). Although the last word has not yet been said on the subject, enough data is at hand to hold that a portion of the present State of Mysore, including the place called Mysore, was either coterminous with, or formed part of, the extensive tract known as Mahisha-manḍalcû or Maisa-nâdu (Mahisha-nâdn) in ancient times (vide Ch. I I I of this work, for documentary details). Equally significant is it to note the survival of the name of the place in its earlier forms as Mayisûr and Mahisûr in the inscriptions down to the sixteenth century A.D., and its gradual transformation to Màisûru (Mysore) in the seventeenth. The word in its Sanskritised form Mahi-shâpura appears side by side with the earlier forms in the epigraphical and literary records of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. By way of literary flourish, it is spelt also as Mahîéûra-pura (lit. hero town) by later writers.

(3) HUDÈVU.

This word is defined thus: "A circular bastion-like structure of stones, etc., at some distance from a village, in which peasants endeavoured to secure themselves in the time of a sudden attack from marauders" (Kittel, A Kannada-English Dictionary, p. 1673). At the time of which we are writing (i.e., 14th-15th cent.), hûdêvu could not mean anything more than a sort of fort irregularly laid out.

(4) PURAGËRI.

Kelying obviously on the Mys. Nag. Pur., Wilks (I. 41-42) refers to Puragëri as "Pooragurry" (?Puragadi) and interprets it as an old name for Mysore. He also states (Le.) that Mysore ("Mysoor" from "Maheshoor—Mahesh-Asoor") was a new name assigned to "Pooragurry" in 1524 after the construction of the fort. It
bas, however, been pointed out (vide Ch. III) that Mysore was known as Mayisûr as far back as the twelfth century. Hence Puragâri, in the period referred to, would only mean an outskirt or suburb of Mysore, which was considerably improved by Hiriya-Bêṭṭada-Châmarâja Woḍeyar I I I (1513-1553) by the érection of a fort, and raised to the status of a town (Mahisîru-nagara), in 1524. See also and compare the Muddarâja Urs Ms.* cited in the Annals (II. 87-88). The référence to can­ nons said to hâve been placed on the bastions of the Mysore fort (Annals, I I , 89-92) is, however, applicable to a later date, since this is not mentioned in the original of the Mys. Nag. Pur., examined by us.

(5) THE TEMPLE OF KODI-BHAIRAVA IN MYSORE.

This is the place where Yadurâya and Krishna are said to hâve halted after their visit to the Châmûndî Hills according to the tradition narrated in the Annals (vide Ch. I I I, for détails). It is situated behind the Triçëévara temple, and south of the Sômëśvara temple, Mysore Fort; and is dedicated to Bhairava, known as Kôdi-Bhairava (lit. Bhairava at the outlet of the tank).
"The image of Bhairava, about 3 feet high," states the M. A. R. (1922, p. 2, para 8) noticing this monument, "has for its attributes a trident, a drum, a skull and a sword. It is flanked on the right by a female chauri-bfcarer and on the left by a female figure, apparently Bhadrakâli, with a bill-hook in the uplifted right hand."

(6) THIRTY-THBEE VILLAGES.

The names of twenty-nine out of thirty-three villages, referred to, are traceable in the Mys. Dho. Vam. (ff. 6-7). Thèse are: Mahiëûra (Mysore), Eeranagere (Vîranagere), Maluhaïli, Beechanahalli, Yenñe Mâragondanahalli, Buva-[*Eamma] nahalli, Kenabâyanahalli [*Kyâtabôyana-hajli], Sâtagahalli, Dëvarasanâyakana-pura, Målâgâla,
Darihalli, Mankahalli [? Mandakahalli], Madagarahalli, Marasehajli, Hechige, Kembal, Marahalli, Tâlûr, Dura-chiianahalli [? Dura], Mâvinahalli, Hemmanahalli, Anga4ihalli, Mádihalli, Këtanahalli, Kenchalagûd, Nagarahañli, Yaďahalli, Malalagâla, Yaďahallipura. Most of these villages are extant, their forais being slightly changed; and are situated in the Mysore and Nanjangûd taluks (see List of Villages, 82, 110, etc.). Places over which branches of the Mysore Royal Family held direct away towards the close of the sixteenth century, are indicated in italics.
APPENDIX II.

(1) SIÈGE OF MĀSURU, AND NOT MYSORE, IN 1593.

According to Ferishta, "In 1593, Munjum Khan, the Bijapur général, besieged Mysore belonging to Venkatadri Nayak, accompanied by Arsappa Nayak and Ganga Nayak; and the place was reduced in three months and 20 fine éléphants taken. Munjum Khan was proceeding rapidly in his conquests, when the rébellion of the king's brother in Belgaum occasioned his recall and left the affairs of Malabar once more in an unsettled state" (Briggs, III. 176). The siège of Mysore, referred to in this passage, is incorrect. Mysore, in 1593, was yet a small town under Râja Wođeyar, who was gradually becoming prominent by his aggressive policy against the local chieftains in the Seringapatam Viceroyalty. The fort of Mysore was then being strengthened by him. Moreover, Râja Wođeyar was, about this time, a feudatory of the Seringapatam Viceroy Tirumala II (1585-1610). That Munjum Khân, the Bijâpur général, should come all the way to besiege the town of Mysore without taking Seringapatam and other places, seems inconceivable. A close reading of Ferishta, however, would go to show that what he meant was a place near Ikkēri under Venkaṭâdri Nâyaka. Again, since we are told that Munjum Khân was obligea to go back immediately to Bijâpur to attend to the Pâdshah's affairs, and since Malabar (probably Malnâçl or part of the country bordering on it is implied hère) is mentioned as the scène of his opérations, it seems obvious that the Khân's activities were confined to the outlying part of the Karnâtaka country, where the place referred to was situated. Indeed he could not hâve retraced his steps immediately, had he really been as far south aè Mysore itself. The
pénétration of the Bijâpur Muhammadans into the South (i.e., Seringapataru and Mysore) did not begin until 1638-1639 (vide Ch. VIII of this work, for détails). The occurrence of the word Mysore in the passage from Ferishta, has therefore to be otherwise explained.

In the Keâladi-Nripa-Vijayant (V. 73), we have the following:—

Venkatâppa Nâyakam Râmarâyar pâlbenqe umbaligendu munnitta Mâsûra-sîmeym âttikolalaidida Manjuâ Khândanam murida.

From this passage we learn, Mâsûru-sîme, granted as a rent-free estate (umbali) by Bânia-Bâya (of Vijayanagar) for the supply of milk and butter, belonged to Venkaṭappa Nâyaka I of Ikkêri (1582-1629). Its occupation was attempted by Manjula Khân (a Kannâda colloquial for Munjum Khân), who was repulsed by the latter. Venkaṭappa Nâyaka, referred to here, is to be identified with the Venkaṭâdri "Nâyaka of Ferishta. He was also known as Hiriya-Venkaṭappa Nâyaka according to the Ke. N. F. In his inscriptions he is mentioned as Venkaṭâdri [see B.C., V I I (1) Tl. 38, 56 and 58]. Venkaṭâdri cannot therefore be identified with Venkaṭâpati-Bâya (of Vijayanagar) as has been done by Sewell (see A Forgotten Empire, pp. 218-219), nor can the place referred to be Mysore, as both he (Le.) and the Kev. H. Heras (Ârâvûdu Dynasty, I. 418) take it to be. Mâsûru-sîme, mentioned above, occurs in inscriptions also [see E.C., V I I a) and V I I I (2) Si. 1, Nr. 33 and Sk. 324]. Mâsûr is an extant village in Sàgar taluk (see List of Villages, 147). In the light of these references it would be obvious that what Ferishta meant was Mâsûru, near Ikkêri in Sàgar taluk, Shimoga district. Possibly Mysore was a corruption of Mâsûru since Ferishta wrote in the seventeenth century. There is thus enough evidence to hold that Mâsûru was the place actually besieged by Munjum Khân in 1593, and not Mysore [based mainly

(2) POETICAL WORKS ON THE SIEGE OF KESARE (1596).

The K.N.V., C.Vam. and C.Vi. being essentially poetical works, there is a tendency in them to make earlier events as having taken place at a later period and *vice versa*. In other words, tested with reference to the authority of inscriptions and chronicles, these works are conspicuous by the absence of chronological sequence of events described in them. Thus, in the K.N.V. of Gōvinda-Vaidya, the siege of Kesare is made to appear as having taken place towards the close of Tirumala's rule in Seringapatam (III, 94-96). Secondly, the curbing by Rāja Wodeyar of the power of the chiefs of Bēlūr and Narasimhapura (Hole-Narasipur), a later event, is mentioned as though it preceded the siege of Kesare (III, 50-51). Thirdly, Tirumala's retreat from Seringapatam, also a later event, is spoken of as if it followed immediately after the siege of Kesare (III, 95). Similarly, in the earlier part of the C.Vam. (2), Tirumalârya makes it appear as if the siege of Kesare took place immediately after Rāja Wodeyar resolved to expel Tirumala from the Viceroyalty of Seringapatam, consequent on the latter's treacherous retreat during Venkaṭa I's action against Vīrappa Nāyaka of Madura. In fact, however, Tirumala's expulsion happened fourteen years after the siege of Kesare itself. Tirumalârya himself, in the other work of his, namely, the C.Vi., makes it obvious that Tirumala's expulsion was resolved upon by Rāja Wodeyar, after the siege of Kesare (II, 52-55). A detailed study of the C.Vam. itself, in the light of other sources, brings this out prominently. Again, in the C.Vam, (8-10) as in the C.Vi. (II, 29), among other
events, the curbing by Bâja Wođeyar of the chiefs of Kannambâqî, Talakâq, Bannûr, Arakere, etc., clearly a later achievement, is made to appear as having preceded the siège of Kesare; and some of these chiefs are even made to bring about the action against Bâja Wođeyar by insinuating Tirumala. Evidently Râja Wođeyar's conquest of Seringapatam (1610) and the events immediately preceding and succeeding it, have been uppermost in the minds of the poets (i.e. Gôvinda-Vaidya and Tirumalârya). Hence the juxtaposition noticeable in these works. Allowing a fair margin for the poetical conception of events and the literary flourishes, these texts are drawn upon for an almost contemporary picture of the course of transactions connected with the siège of Kesare. Both in regard to this topic and the other political events of Râja Wođeyar's reign, these poetical works are to be understood in their chronological setting with référence to the more spécifie authority of the chronicles compared with one another. Compare Âravîdu Dynasty (I. 342-343, 419, etc.), where the Rev. Father Heras criticises the story of Tirumala's retreat from Madura and the subséquent détails recorded in the C.Vam. as "untrustworthy" and "a concoction of the poet for justifying Râja Wođeyar's capture of Seringapatam," etc.—a position not warranted by a detailed study of the texts.

The composition of Tirumala's army during the siège of Kesare, according to the K.N.V. (III, 23-44), was as follows: Râmarâjêndra of Hadinâqû was with 10,000 foot, 1,000 horse and 50 éléphants; the lord of Rudragapa (chief of Piriyâpatna) with 20,000 foot and 50 éléphants; Nanjarâja of Talakâq with 16,000 foot, 1,000 horse and 30 éléphants; Timma Nâyaka of Kereyûr with 8,000 foot, 500 horse and 20 éléphants; Bairêndra, son of Sala Nâyaka, with 10,000 foot, 500 horse and 20 éléphants. There were also levies (numbers not specified in the text) from the chief s of Narasimhapura (Hole-Narasipur) and
Bëlùr, from "Dâsa Nâyaka of Nuggehallî, from the chiefs of Kenge (Kengêndra), Kôlâla, Ballâpur ànd Bangalore, and from Timmapparâja, Pradhâni Appi-Seṭṭî, Immaḍî-Jakka, Pummâni-Pâmi Nayaka and Guṇḍî Nâyaka—altogether a force consisting of a lakh of foot, seven to eight thousand horse and two hundred rutting éléphants (III, 35). Among the leading éléphants which graced the army on the occasion* were: Birudina-Kaçdeya, Raya Gajânkusa, Ganganagôlu, Mïsara-Gaçda, Bôyâla-Pôtârâja, Madana-Gôpâla, Narasimha, Tirumala-Râya, Tiru-Venkaṭanâtha, Morasara-ganḍa and Kastûri-Ranga. According to the C.Vam. (14), there were in all, on the occasion, one lakh of foot, twelve thousand horse and one hundred éléphants. There were levies from Ballâpur, Kôlâla, Punganûr, Mâgadi, Bangalore and other parts of Morasa-nâdu, consisting altogether of 20,000 foot, 2,000 horse and 20 éléphants; forces of the chiefs of Talakâd, Yejavandûr (Yelandûr), Ammachavâdi, Terakaṇâmbi, Kôte (Heggaḍdévankôte), etc., places in the interior of the province (ola-nâdu), comprising 2,500 foot, 500 horse and 25 éléphants; from Malnàd (including Bëlûr, Kejadi, etc.), consisting of 20,000 foot, 2,000 horse and 20 éléphants; from Chintanakal, Chiknâyakanahalli, Bânâvar, Basavâpaṭça, Sïra and other parts of the Bëḍa dominions, making up 2,500 foot, 500 horse and 5 éléphants; also from Raṇa-Jagadêva-Bàya, Timma Nâyaka of Kereyûr and others, consisting in all of 24,000 foot, 4,000 horse and 15 éléphants, while the main army of Tirumala (mûla-baladol) was composed of 30,000 foot, 3,000 horse and 30 éléphants. Compare Ancient India (p. 283), where S. K. Aiyangar doubts the probability of the actual présence of these numbers (of the 0.Vam.) on the field. The numbers, however, in the light of both the texts, appear to hâve actually taken part in the action, scattered and encamped in the neighbourhood of Seringapatam, Mysore and Nanjangûd
though the works are not much in favour of the efficiency of this miscellaneous rabble.

(3) SOMB VERSIONS OP EÀJA WODEYAR'S ACQUISITION OP SERINGAPATÀM (1610).

The prevailing version is that Tirumalarâjaiya, the Vijayanagar Viceroy at Seringapatàm, having been afflicted with a fatal cancer (*bennu-phaṇi*), sent for Râja Woḍeyar of Mysore and desired him to hold the charge of Seringapatàm on his behalf, saying that he (Tirumala) would go to Talakàḍ, Tirumakûḍlu and other sacred places for being cured, and that if he happened to breathe his last, Râja Woḍeyar was to hand over charge of the city to the chief of Ummattûr. Tirumala then went over to Talakàḍ where he died shortly after, and Râja Woḍeyar entered into the government of Seringapatàm on February 8, 1610 (see *Mys. Dho. Vam.* ff. 2; *Mys. Nag. Puṛ.*, pp. 28-29; *Beṭṭadakôte-Kaif.*, p. 86, etc.). The *Annah* (I. 23-24, 29-30, 45) also gives a similar account, with slight variations. ērï-Ranga-Râya (? Tirumala), afflicted with a fatal cancer, deliberated with his councillors thus: "Râja Woḍeyar, our friend, who is the most powerful ruler, has stood us in good stead on some occasions. Born in the Yadu race, he is the proper person to occupy the throne and rule the country. Since he has defeated some Pâlegârs and extended his territories, he will naturally take Seringapatàm also, if some one else is appointée!." Accordingly, Srî-Ranga-Râya sent for Râja Woḍeyar, narrated to him the story of the acquisition of Seringapatàm and the throne by his ancestors, bestowed upon him both the throne and the kingdom, and, accompanied by his two wives (Alamëlamma and Rangamma), proceeded to Mâlangi, near Talakàḍ, where he died some time later.

Thèse versions, it will be seen, refer to the acquisition of Seringapatàm by Râja Woḍeyar as an act of "conditional
transfer" and "gift" or "bequest" respectively, conséquent on a "fatal cancer" Tirumala was said to be suffering from. They, however, seem to indicate a later attempt to justify Râja Wođeyar's acquisition from the point of view of Tirumala. For there is nothing in the earlier sources to show that Tirumala was suffering from any bodily ailment at the time of Râja Wođeyar's occupation of Seringapatam, and that he made any arrangement with Râja Wodeyar for the administration of the Viceroyalty. Indeed epigraphical evidence points to Tirumala having been alive as late as 1626, sixteen years after he left Seringapatam [see E. G. I I I (1) Nj. 181; also Mys. Gaz., I I . iii. 2203-2208]. The story of the "fatal cancer" is, perhaps, applicable to ërî-Ranga II of Vijayanagar (1574-1586), who, as we shall see below, appears to have spent his last years in Seringapatam, and not to Tirumala.

Wilks (I. 49-52), while referring to and rejecting this "tale of singular bequest of confidence and friendship" as contrary to all probability, writes: "The acquisition of Seringapatam, in 1610, . . . is related in différent manuscripts, with a diversity of statement, which seems only to prove a mysterious intricacy of intrigue beyond the reach of contemporaries to unravel. . . . Forty-six years had now elapsed since the subversion of the empire from which the Viceroy had derived his original powers. This sinking and fugitive state, foiled in the attempt to re-establish its government at Penconda, had now renewed its feeble efforts at Chundergherry. The Viceroy himself was worn down with âge and disease: his Government, long destitute of energy, had fallen into the last stage of disorganization, faction, and imbecility: it is not improbable that, foreseeing its impending destruction, he concluded the best compromise in his power with his destined conqueror; and the manuscript of Nuggux: Pootia even détails the names of the persons,
probably of his own court, who had combined (as it is stated, with the permission of Venkatapattee Eayeel, who then reigned at Chundergherry) to compel him to retire. All that can be determined with certainty is, the quiet retirement of Tremul Baj to Talcaud, where he soon afterwards died; and the peaceable occupation by Baj Wodeyar of the fort of Seringapatam."

In examining Wilks's position, we have to note, there is no evidence to show that Tirumala "was worn down with age and disease." On the contrary, enough data is at hand to hold that he was about forty-five years when he retired from his charge of the Viceroyalty (see Mys. Gaz., 2208; also C. Vam., 28, according to which Tirumala was just approaching his old age in 1610). Nor is there any ground to believe that he concluded "the best compromise in his power" with Baja Wodeyar. Indeed we have seen how Tirumala, by provoking Baja Wodeyar, brought about his own downfall in 1610 (vide Ch. V), As for the statement that Tirumala "quietly retired to Talcaud," Wilks relies here mainly on the Mys. Dho. Pur. which he refers to as the manuscript of Nagara Putiaiya. An examination of this manuscript in the light of other sources would go to show that the "quiet retirement" was resolved upon by Tirumala only on the Raya-nirupa of Venkata I, his uncle. It was merely an aspect of the situation and Wilks is just nearer the point so far. The K. N. V. and the C. Vam. (utilised in Ibid), however, to a considerable extent enable us to clear the "mysterious intricacy of intrigue beyond the reach of contemporaries to unravel," referred to by Wilks.

Dewachandra, in his Raja Kath. (XII. 455-464), gives an account of Raja Wodeyar's conquest of Seringapatam from Tirumala, drawing freely upon the C. Vam. But he is hardly reliable when he loosely writes thus (X. 285-295, 313-318, 371, XII. 449-450, 464-465, etc.): "Raja
Wođeyar I, a posthumous son of Dëvarâja of Mysore, was established in the kingdom of Mysore by his Jain adhérents. With their help he ruled the country and received from èrî-Ranga-Râya of Vijayanagar the charge of the Seringapatam province in 1585-1586, when the latter was suffering from a fatal cancer. Èrî-Ranga went over to Talakâd where he died, his wives committing sati. Thereupon Râja Wođeyar I began to rule from Seringapatam. He died after some time. Then Ramarâjaiya and his son Tirumala, from Vijayanagar, occupied Seringapatam. From hence the descendants of Râja Wođeyar had to rule only in Mysore. In 1609-1610, Râja Wođeyar II, one of these, conquered Seringapatam from Tirumala and continued to govern from there." The only élément of probability in this version seems to be the death of Èrî-Ranga II (1574-1586) by cancer in or about 1586. There is little truth in the story of reconquest to regain a lost possession, built up by Dëvachandra.

(4) ON THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE Karna- Vrittânta-Kathe.

Noticing this work in the Karnâtaka-Kâvya-Kalânidhi Séries (Mysore, 1917), the Editor, Mr. M. A. Ramanuja Aiyangar, attributes its authorship to one Pradhâni Tirumalârya who is said to have flourished in the reign of Râja Wođeyar of Mysore, and states: (i) that this Tirumalârya, a descendant in the line of Èrî-Vaishnava preceptors of the Vijayanagar rulers, formerly resided in Mêlkôtê early in the seventeenth century; (ii) that he came into intimate touch with Râja Wođeyar of Mysore, who was often visiting Mêlkôtê; (iii) that he was instrumental in moving Venkatapat-Râya (Venkata I) of Vijayanagar to confer upon Râja Wođeyar of Mysore the sîme of Seringapatam as a present or gift; (iv) that thereupon Râja Wođeyar went to Mêlkôtê and bestowed upon the relatives and disciples of this Tirumalârya three
agrahādras with 128 vṛttis (yielding 1,024 varahas) in Muttigere, Hādanūr and other villages; (v) that after this grant Rāja Wodeyar requested Tirumalārya to stay with him in Seringapatam as his preceptor; (vi) that Tirumalārya at first refused the offer but afterwards, being much prevailed upon by Rāja Wodeyar, was taken by him to the capital city (Seringapatam) and appointed his Pradhāni; (vi) that Tirumalārya was a great friend of the Royal House in Seringapatam, and died somewhere in the middle of the reign of Karīṭṭhrava-Narasarāja Woḍeyar I (1638-1659); (viii) that Tirumalaiyangār (Tirumalārya), the Prime Minister of Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar, was the great grandson of this Tirumalārya (i.e. son of his grand-daughter); (ix) that the two brothers Tirumala Rao and Nārāyaṇa Rao of the times of Haidar and Tipū (1761-1799) were the descendants of Appājappa, son of Pradhāni Tirumalārya (the author of the Karna-Vṛttānta-Kathe); and (x) that these two brothers belonged to the family of this Tirumalārya according to the genealogy secured by Lt.-Col. Wilks also (see Editorial Introduction to the Karna-Vṛttānta-Kathe, pp. i-iv).

Thus, the Editor of the Karna-Vṛttānta-Kathe distinguishes three persons by name Tirumalārya, the first one being, according to him, a Pradhāni of Rāja Wodeyar; the second a minister of Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar; and the third the agent-in-chief of Mahārāṇī ērī-Lakshmmawiyavaro of Mysore. And he assigns the authorship of this work to the first of these. He states that the text could not have been written by Tirumalaiyangār, the Prime Minister of Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar, because (i) he was not known as Pradhāni Tirumalaiyangār; (ii) it is nowhere mentioned in his works that he was conducting the office of Pradhāni; (iii) there are many differences in style as between this work and the works of Tirumalaiyangār (as, for instance, the Chikkadēvarāya-
Vaméâvali, Chikkadévarâja-Vijayam, etc.) ; (iv) Tirumalaiyangâr invariably refers to Chikkadévarâja in his writings, but such a référence is conspicuous by its absence here; and (v) the style of this work is based on ancient models and it is possible that the Vaishñava background for the text, in the introductory chapter, later served as a guide to Trumalaiyangâr while writing his own works. Further, he adds, Tirumala Eao of the eighteenth century could not have been the author of the *Karna-Vrittânta-Kathe* as he spent a greater part of his lifetime in political and diplomatic activities (*Ibid*, pp. i-ii).

An examination of the views of the Editor of the *Karna-Vrittânta-Kathe* shows that they are not based on any authentic sources of information, which, again, are neither quoted nor referred to in his Introduction. The only inscription cited [namely, *E.G. I I I (1) Sr. 157*] does not prove that Râja Wodeyar made the grant of *vrittis* to the disciples and relatives of (Pradhâni) Tirumalârya, nor does it even mention the latter's name and désignation. This document is only a grant to ērî-Vaishrîava Brâhmans in général by Râja Wodeyar for the merit of his parents. There is no clue in the *Karna-Vrittânta-Kathe* itself in support of the position that Tirumalârya was a Pradhâni of Râja Wodeyar. Even Wilks, who is referred to, does not support the Editor's view that Pradhâns Tirumala Bao and Nârâyana Rao were descendants of (Pradhâni) Tirumalârya. Wilks, in fact, holds that between Tirumala Rao and Nârâyana Rao themselves there was considérable disagreement as to their descent. Further, the genealogy furnished to him by the brother of "Tremal row" is said to have shown that Tirumalaiyangâr, the Prime Minister of Chikkadévaraja, was the "alleged ancestor" of the former (Tirumala Rao) (*Mysoor,II.* 239, f.n.). There is also this additional
point to remémber that if it were true that Tirumalaiyangâr (Tirumalârya)—friend and co-student of Chikkadêvarâja—and his family were directly descended in the grand-daughter's Une from the alleged (Pradhân) Tirumalârya—as is held by the Editor—he (Tirumalaiyangâr) would not hâve missed mentioning, if not actually enlarging on, that point in his works.

All that the available évidence seems to point to is that there was regular succession in a line of Srî-Vaishnava teachers in Mysore, exercising their influence on the Mysore Royal Family probably from the time of Râja Wodeyar. The genealogy of this line of teachers according to the testimony of inscriptions and literary works is as follows :

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{Tirumalai Ananta Ājvār} \\
& \quad \text{(of Kauḍika-gūṭha, Āpastambha-sūtra} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \text{and Yajñāśākhā)} \\
& \quad \quad \text{(c. 1600).} \\
& \text{Singaraïyangâr I} \\
& \quad \text{(Singaraîrya I) of Seringapatam} \\
& \quad \quad \text{(c. 1540-1630).} \\
& \text{Singaraïyangâr II} \\
& \quad \text{(Singaraîrya II)} \\
& \quad \quad \text{(c. 1610-1690)} \\
& \quad \quad \text{m. Singamma.} \\
& \text{Singaraïyangâr III} \\
& \quad \text{(Singaraîrya III)} \\
& \quad \quad \text{(c. 1650-1710).} \\
\end{align*}
\]

[Based on JS.C, I I I (1) Sr. 13 (1664), II 19-21; and 94 (1678), 11. 10-14 ; T.N. 23 (1663), 11. 92-93 ; IV (2) Ch. 92 (1675), II 106-107 ; and Kr. 45 (1678), IL 10-14 ; also 0. Vam., 163; Mitra. Go., I, 3; and Commentary]
on the F. Y.V. Stavah, etc., p. 1, v. 1; p. 119, v. 1. Singaraiyangâr I, in Sr. 13 (1. 20), is referred to as "Chennapyâji Singaraiyangâr." If "Chennapyâji" is taken to be a scribal error for "Châmappâji," then this name would be in keeping with his position as the preceptor of Beṭṭada-Châmarâja Wodeyar according to the Sriranga-Mâhâtmya, referred to in the text of Ch. V.
APPENDIX III.

ON THE EARLY DALAVAIS OF MYSORE.

Wilks appears to have had some misconception regarding the early Dalavâis of Mysore. Indeed, while indicating that he had no access to the "genuine history of the Dulwoys," during the period of Châmarâja's rule (1617-1637), he points out that in the manuscripts of the family history of the Dalavâis available to him there is no référence to "Veecrama Raj" (Dalavâi Vikrama-Râya), his name itself having been "obliterated from their annals" (I. 56-57). If Wilks be understood to refer hère to the manuscripts of the Dalavâi family of Kalale, he does seem to be under an impression that from the beginning the Kalale Family regularly furnished Dalavâis to the rulers of Mysore. We hâve, however, seen how, towards the close of Râja Wodeyar's reign, there was an agreement between Kalale and Mysore regarding the furnishing of Dalavâis by the former to the latter (Ante, Ch. V), but there is so far no évidence that it was observed by the Kalale Family till rather late in the seventeenth century. We hâve also seen how Karikâla-Mallarâjaiya, the first Dalavâi designate of the Kalale House, resigned his office, and how Râja Wodeyar, in the last year of his reign, had to make his own choice in the person of Bettada-Arasu (Ibid). Bettada-Arasu continued in office under Châmarâja Wodeyar and he was followed by three others, namely, Bannûr Lingawa, Basavalingaçna and Vîkrama-Râya, all locally chosen (vide text of Ch. V I, for détails as to their periods of office). Bettada-Arasu and Vikrama-Bâya were connected with the Mysore Royal Family, being natural sons (gândharva-putra) of Bettada-Châmarâja Wodeyar, younger brother of

1. Sons by marri âge by the Gandhaurva as distinguished from the Brahma form of marriage.
Râja Wodeyar, while Bannûr Lingapria and Basavalingança were private persons belonging to the Vîra-Saiva community (see *Annals*, I. 63). There seems accordingly no reason why these early Dalavâis should figure in the annals of the Kalâle Family as Wilks appears inclined to think. The *Mys. Dho. Pur.* itself, relied upon by Wilks but not perhaps thoroughly examined by him in the original, refers to all the four Dalavâis of Châmarâja Wodêyar in regular succession (I. 66). Stray inscriptions also, as we have shown (*vide* Ch. VI, f.n. 6 and 42), refer to two of these. We have thus enough data bearing on the "genuine history" of the early Dalavâis of Mysore. Another misconception Wilks appears to have been labouring under was that in the period of Châmarâja's rule the office of General and Minister was held by one and the same person, namely, Vikraina-Râya (I. 56). But, we know, these two were distinct offices held by separate individuais (*vide* text of Ch. VI: see under *Ministers, Dalavâis, etc.*). A third misconception of Wilks is in regard to the rôle of Dalavâi Vikrama-Bâya as the supposed minister of Châmarâja Wodêyar. He writes (I. 57): "The preceding Raja [Châmarâja Wodêyar] had succeeded to the government at the early âge of fifteen. We may conjecture from subséquent events that his minister had found him of an easy temper; and in the mode so familiar to Indian courts of modem and ancient date, had, by inciting and corrupting his natural propensities, plunged him into habits of low and licentious indolence; and thus kept him through life in a state of perpétuai tutelage." There seems absolutely no foundation for this conjecture. Wilks speaks as thôugh Vikrama-Bâya was the only Dalavâi and minister of Châmarâja Wodêyar throughout the latter's reign, and makes his statements more in the light of later happenings than the realities of the case. We hâve, however, seen that Vikrama-Râva was the fourth
and last Daḷavâi of Châmarâja Woḍeyar, succeeding to the office in 1630. It thus becomes hard to accept the state of affairs conjectured by Wilks, which is quite opposed to the spirit of the materials now available to us (*vide text of Ch. VI*).
APPENDIX IV.

(1) MUPPINA-DÊVARÂJA WODEYAR AND HIS SONS.

The Mys. Dho. Pur. (I. 53-54) refers to the Muppina-Dêvarâja Wodeyar of the "Armais (I. 16, 95) as Muduka-Dêvarâja Wodeyar, "Muppina" and "Muduka" (lit. old) being synonymous with each other. According to the former manuscript (I. 53-54, II. 55, compared), Muppina-Dêvarâja had two wives, Hiriyamma (Dëvâjamma) and Kiriyamma (Kempamma). By the first, he had a son by name Yeleyùr Dêparâja Wodeyar, who saved Râja Wodeyar's life from the hands of the assassin Singappa Wodeyar in 1607 (vide Ch. V), but of whom, however, little is known during the subsequent period. By his second wife, Muppina-Dêvarâja Wodeyar had four sons, Doddadëvarâja Wodeyar (b. Durmati, Phâlguna ba. 3, Monday: February 18, 1622), Kempadëvarâja Woçleyar (b. Prabhava, Jyëstha ba. 5, Friday: May 25,1627), Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar and Maridëvaràja Wodeyar, the last-mentioned being further referred to as the youngest of the four (yivarellarigû kiriyavaru) (see also Table IV). All these four sons of Muppina-Dêvarâja are found referred to in the earlier and contemporary sources (vide Tables II-III; also Ch. X), but the only difference lies in the order of precedence followed, Kempadëvarâja Wodeyar and Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar being mentioned in the manuscript as the second and third sons respectively of Muppina-Dêvarâja Wodeyar, whereas in the former sources Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar is invariably spoken of as the second, and Kempadëvarâja Wodeyar as the third son of his. We make use of the genealogical data of the Mys. Dho. Par., subject to correction in the light of earlier documents, the order of precedence followed therein being preferred.
The following is a summary of the traditionary account of the usurpation and fall of Dalavâi Vikrama-Râya, as narrated in the Mys. Dho. Pur. (I. 45-51, II. 55 compared): On October 11, 1638 (Bahudhânya, Àsviâja eu. 14), three days after the death of Immadi-Râja Wodeyar, Kanthîrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar proceeded from Naḷḷûr to Mysore, with a view to being installed; and took up his résidence at the local gymnasium (garadi-mane). On the 19th (Àsviâja ba. 7), however, Dalavâi Vikrama-Râya left Seringapatam on a tour in the State, leaving ten servants in the personal service of Kanthîrava. He returned to the capital about a month later, i.e., on November 17 (Kârtîka ba. 7). To Kanthîrava this was a trying situation, since Vikrama-Râya was caring for his own ends. Two of Kaçthîrava's faithful attendants, namely, Sunnada-Râma and Mahanta, pointed out to him that Vikrama-Râya had killed by poison the preceding ruler Immadi Râja Wodeyar, and that, intent on securing power for himself, he was bestowing offices on his own men. They sought also Kanthîrava's permission to put an end to the usurper. Meanwhile, in Seringapatam, Bangapataiya, an adhèrent of Vikrama-Râya, having caught scent of these délibérations, advised him, on his return from the tour, to proceed to Mysore some time later. Vikrama-Râya, feigning, for all outward purposes, to be loyal, went thither forthwith and showed himself up to Kaçthîrava. After an interview he retired to his résidence. About two hours later, on the night of the same day, Vikrama-Râya went to the backyard of his résidence attended by a torch-bearer, to answer the calls of nature. It was a dark night. As previously arrangea, the two attendants of Kanthîrava (namely, Sunnada-Rama and Mahanta)
descended the parapet wall of the backyard and fell upon the torch-bearer putting out the light. Sunnada-Râma, the first attendant, then stood in front of Vikrama-Râya. "Who is it?" asked he. "Sunnada-Râma," was the reply. "Ah! I am undone by this wretch." So saying, Vikrama-Râya flung a goblet at him. Evading the blow, Suçnada-Râma engaged Vikrama-Râyâ in a hand-to-hand fight, in the course of which the former went down and was being almost overpowered by the latter. At this juncture, Sunçada-Râma whispered to the Mahant (the other attendant): "Are you ready?" "Are you up or down?" asked the Mahant. "Down," was the reply. At this, the Mahant thrust himself at Vikrama-Ràya and made short work of him. On November 22 (Kârtika ba. 12, Thursday), Kanthirava-Narasarâja Wodeyar succeeded to the throne of Mysore and he proceeded to Seringapatam on December 8 following (Mârgaéira eu. 12, Monday. The week-day was, however, actually Saturday).

Curiously enough, the manuscript is silent as to what happened during the period of fifteen days intervening between the alleged assassination of Vikrama-Ràya and Kanthirava's first visit to Seringapatam after his installation. There is an air of suspicion and loose sequence of events in that part of the narrative relating to the assassination of Vikrama-Eâya and subsequent details. Compare Wilks (I. 58-59) who closely follows the account as detailed in the manuscript, and S. K. Aiyangar (Ancient India, p. 290) who adopts Wilks in the main.

(3) OK THE Muhammad-Nâmâh AS AN AUTHORITY ON THE SIÈGE OF SEEINGAPATAM (1639).

According to the Muhammad-Nâmâh' (pp. 170-171), a contemporary official history in Persian by Zahur bin

1. Quoted by J. Sarkar in his article, A Page from Early Mysore History, in the M. B., November 1929, pp. 601-502. See also his article, Shahji Bhomle in Mysore, in Ibid, July 1929, p. 9, briefly touching on the subject.
Zahuri, the siège of Seringapatam (Srirangapatan) took place in 1639: "Randaula Khan (who had lately been given the title of Kustam-i-Zaman) left Shahji Bhonsle in charge of the recently conquered fort of Bangalore and marched from that place in order to punish the Rajah of Srirangapatan, who was inordinately proud (or refractory) . . . When he arrived near the fort of Srirangapatan, his troops began to fight and encircled the fort. After fighting and exertion on both sides had been protracted for nearly a month, the Eajah sent his envoy to Rustam Khan, saying * Please leave the fort of Srirangapatan to me, as you have done to other (Rajahs) cherished on the silt of the August State [Bijapuri Government], and lay before the throne the five lakhs of hun in cash and presents of various kinds which I am offering.' Rustam-i-Zaman, at this submission of the Rajah, reassured him with promises of Adil Shah's favour, and seeing that the rainy season was near, he left Qazi Sa'id there with Kenge Nayak to take delivery of the indemnity agreed upon and himself returned to Court . . . The Qazi, on getting the money promised by the Rajah of Srirangapatan, started for the Adilshahi capital. Kenge Nayak rebelled."

The référence in this version to the "Rajah of Srirangapatan" is to Kanṭhīrava-Narasarāja Woḍeyar I of Mysore. The account on the Mysore side, as we have seen (vide Ch. VIII), is marked by definite chronological data and by fuller local détails relating to the siège of Seringapatam and is corroborated by more than one particular source of information. The Muhammad-Nāmāḥ, on the other hand, though it has the merit of being contemporary, is relatively vague in regard to chronology, cause of action, and détails of the campaign.²

². See also S. K. Aiyangar's criticism of the Persian sources on the Bijāpur invasion of Mysore, in his article, The Bise of the Maratha Power in the South, in the J. I. H. Vol. IX, p. 204.
Its version seems to be based on reports compiled at a place remote from the scene of action and is, further, not corroborated by independent evidence so far. If we are to take literally the "submission of the Bajah," referred to, it is very much to be doubted whether Kanthirava, after the crushing defeat he seems to have inflicted on Ranaullah Khan, would have ever countenanced the idea of sending an envoy to the latter and offer him cash and presents in token of his submission. The contradiction is thus obvious. The submission may not have been an actual fact, although from an examination of all the available materials it seems probable that Ranaullah Khan ultimately raised the siege of Seringapatam and retired to Bijapur after the conclusion of a truce with Kanthirava, and after having effected a mutually valuable settlement for the future safety of the Bijapur possessions in Mysore. Such a settlement seems to have been readily acquiesced in by Kanthirava in view of the prospective benefits assured to him under the truce (see Ibid, for details).

(4) KANTHIRAVA'S GOINAGE.

Of the coins of Kanthirava-Narasaraja Wodeyar I we have lately an account by Dr. M. H. Krishna in the M. A. R. (1929, pp. 31-32). The available type of Kanthiraya-hanam issued by Kanthirava is familiarly known as Agala-Kanthiraya-hana (Agala, lit. broad) as distinguished from the well-known Gidda-Kanthiraya-hcma (Gidda, lit. small) issued by Dewan Purnaiya in the nineteenth century. It is a gold coin and one variety of the type is of 2'5"(?) size with a weight of 5.2 grains, having on the obverse "the figure of four-armed Narasimha seated to the front holding conch and discus" and on the reverse "a three-line Nâgari legend, with inter-linear double rules, probably standing for

1. Sri
2. Kamthi

8. rava (PL. IX. 29)."

Another variety of the Agala-Kanṭhīrāyi type has also been traced with a similar obverse but on the reverse are to be seen some dots which Dr. Krishna interprets as "three-line legend uncertain, with similar raies (PL. IX. 30)." These dots may, perhaps, be taken to represent the constellation under which Kanṭhīrava was born or the coin issued at first (vide article on Two Centuries of Wodeyar Bule in Mysore, in the Q. J. M. S., Vol. XXIII, p. 464, f.n. 112). The former position, in particular, appears to find some support from the specific mention of Svāti as the birth-star of Kanṭhīrava, in a lithic inscription of his referring to the striking of coins by him [see E. C, V (1) and (2) Ag. 64 (1647); also Ch. VIII, f.n. 5].

Dr. Krishna describes next what he calls "an interesting half-varaha" from the Bangalore Muséum Collection, said to have also been issued by Kanṭhīrava. It is a gold coin 4" in size with a weight of 26 grains, having on the obverse the usual "four-armed Narasimha holding conch and discus, seated to front on dais with Lakshmi on his left lap" and on the reverse "the three-line Nāgari legend

1. Śrī Kam (thi)
2. (ra) va Nara,
3. (sa) rāja (PL. IX. 27-28),"

a type which, as he observes, "closely follows the Vijayanagar model in respect of its weight, in the presence of a god on the obverse and in the use of Nāgari for the three-line legend on the reverse." There seems no doubt about the issue of varahas by Kanṭhīrava, since their use in Mysore is evidenced by inscriptions and other sources also (17th-18th cent.).

As regards the copper coins, Dr. Krishna writes: "No distinctive copper coins of Narasarāja are known. But
among the copper coins of the chequered reverse type described under the provincial coins of Vijayanagar is a variety with a lion facing and seated on its haunches, which may as well have been issued by Kaṇṭhīrava-Narasarâja." That Kaṇṭhīrava issued also the éléphant type of copper coins (Âne-Kasu) appears warranted by the circumstance that he was victorious over the chiefs of Koḍagu, Kongu and other places, and acquired rich spoils in the form of éléphants, which were stabled in the capital city of Seringapatam (see Ch. IX). Possibly the éléphant type was issued by him in commémoration of the victory. The obverse of this type contains the figure of an éléphant while the reverse is chequered (vide also article in the Q. J. M. S., above cited, pp. 464-465, f.n. 114).
APPENDIX V.

(1) ON THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE SUCCESSOR OF KANTHĪRAVA-NARASARĀJA WODEYAB I IN LATER WRITINGS AND MODERN WORKS.

There has been much confusion and loose thought in later writings—especially the secondary works—regarding the identification of Dēvarāja Woḍeyar, the actual successor of Kaṇṭhīrava-Narasarāja Woḍeyar I. He is generally referred to in these sources as Doḍḍa-Dēvarāja Wodeyar, either by way of distinguishing hira from his successor Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar or by way of making him identical with Doḍḍadēvarāja Wodeyar, father of Chikkadēvarāja, or both. The earliest authority evidencing this method of identification is the Mys. Dho. Pur. (c. 1710-1714), according to which Kempadēvarāja Woḍeyar, younger brother of Doḍḍadēvarāja Woḍeyar, actually succeeded Kaṇṭhīrava I in August 1659 under the name Dēvarāja Woḍeyaraiya (Dēvarāja Wodeyar), and later came to be known as Doḍḍa-Dēvarāja Woḍeyaraiya (Doḍḍa-Dēvarāja Woḍeyar), especially in and after the reign of his nephew Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar (II. 23, 25, 30, etc). The Mys. Nag. Pur. (c. 1734-1740), however, speaks of the successor of Kaṇṭhīrava only under his original name Dēvarāja Woḍeyaraiya (Dēvarāja Wodeyar) (p. 29). The Mys. Rāj. Gha. (c. 1800) mentions him as Doḍḍa-Dēvarāja Woḍeyar (p. 25). The K. A. V. (c. 1830) refers to him as "Doḍḍa-Dēvarāja

1. Doḍḍa-Dēvarāja stands for the prefix by which the name of Dēvaraja Woḍeyar (Kempadēvarāja Woḍeyar), third son of Muppina-Dēvarāja and successor of Kaṇṭhīrava I, is generally found mentioned in later writings. Doḍḍadēvarāja was the actual name of his elder brother, i.e. the eldest son of Muppina-Dēvarāja and father of Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar (1678-1704) vide Ohs. VIII-X; Appendix IV—(1), V—(2); and Tables II-IV]. This distinction in spelling is sought to be maintained in this work, from the point of view of clarity,
Wođeyaraiyanavaru of Mysûru-nagara " (ff. 15). Dëvachandra, in the Râj. Kath. (1838), speaks of the succession of Dëvarâya (younger brother of Doď^adëvarâja) after the death of Kanthîrava, and states that he became subsequently known as Doďda-Dëvarâya (Doďda-Dëva-râyanenisida Dëvarâyam) (XII. 475-476). A later copy of a paper sanad in the possession of the Lingâyat Guru of the math at Hangaja (M. A. R., 1930, No. 24, pp. 161-163), originally dated in 1663, refers to " Doďha-Dëvarâja Wođeraiyanavaru " (Doďda-Dëvarâja Wođeyar), the latter being identical with Dëvarâja Wađeyaraiya (Dëvarâja Wođeyar), referred to in a still earlier copy (c. 1800) of the same from the Mackenzie Collection (Ms. No. 19-1-52, p. 13). Among other compilations, the Bettadakôte-Kaifiyat and the Mysûru Dhoregala-Vamèa-Pârampare» Kaifiyat (c. 1800-1804) assume the successor of Kanthîrava to be Dodda-Dëvarâja, father and brother respectively of Chikkadëvarâja according to them (p. 86 ; ff. 12). The Annals (first compiled, 1864-1865) refers to the adoption by Kanthîrava of Dëvarâja Wodeyar, third son of Muppina-Dëvarâja, as heir to succeed him, but subsequently assumes him to be identical with Dodda-dëvarâja Wodeyar, father of Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar (1.93,95-103).

Relying mainly on the Mys. Dho. Pur., Wilks, among modern writers, refers to " Kemp Devaia " (Kempađevaiya) as the successor of Kanthîrava, and identifies him as " Dud Deo Raj " (Dođçia-Dëvarâja) (I. 68, and f.n.). He further tells us that " Dud Deo Raj " was selected as the fourth or last son of Muppina-Dëvarâja (" Muppin Deo Raj ") " to the exclusion of the three elder brothers, and their mâle issue," that " Dud Devaia " (Doddadëvaiya or DodĎadëvarâja), the eldest son of Muppina-Dëvarâja, " was an old man," that his (DoĎadđedevaiya's) son Chikkadëvarâja was of the "same âge" as his younger brother (" Dud Deo Raj "), i.e, thirty-two,
and that "Chick Deo Raj with his father were kept as prisoners at Turkanamby" (Terakaṇāmbi) during the reign of Doḍḍa-Dēvarāja (I. l.c.; also 105). These statements are neither borne out by the original manuscript itself, examined by us, nor corroborated by authentic sources so far [see Appendix V—(2), and compare authorities in Ch. X, f.n. 186], Eice generally follows Wilks's position (Mys. Gaz., I. 365; Mysore and Coorg, p. 128), though in the Introduction to E. G., III (1) he merely indicates the identity of Doḍḍa-Dēvarāja with Dēvarāja, third son of Muppina-Dēvarāja (see f.n. 2 to the Table on p. 33), and in E. C, IV (2) he mentions him as "(Doḍḍa) Dēva-Rāja" (see Introduction, p. 31).

S. K. Aiyangar, in the light of the Annals, works of Tirumalārya and certain inscriptions of Chikkadēvarāja's reign, attempts to identify Kempadēvaiya, third son of Muppina-Dēvarāja, as the ruler in succession to Kanṭhīrava, and maintains that he "became Dod Dēva Rāja Woṭeyar of Mysore" [Ancient India, pp. 295-296, 313; see also Appendix V—(2), f.n. 1 below, for a critical notice of S. K. Aiyangar's interprétation of Tirumalārya's works in regard to the succession question]. R. Sewell, in assigning a number of inscriptions from the E. C and other collections to DoḍḍUjadēvarāja Woṭeyar of Mysore, maintains that Doḍḍadēvarāja, and not his brother Kempadēvaiya, succeeded after Kanṭhīrava's death in 1659 (see H. I. S. I., pp. 282-285); but his position is hardly borne out by the internai évidence of the documents themselves, referred to by him. In the Mys. Gaz., New édition (II. iv. 2441), Wilks's position is generally adhered to. An article entitled Dēvarāja Wodeyar of Mysore (by N. Subba Eao, in* the H. Y. J. M. Ü. Vol. III, No. 1, Reprint) attempts an examination of the succession question in support of the position that Dēvarāja Woṭeyar alias Kempadēvaraja Wodeyar, third son of Muppina-Dēvarāja Wodeyar, was the actual ruler of
Mysore in succession to Karïthïrava, between 1659-1673. It has now become possible to reconstruct the entire position relating to the identity, relationship, details of the reign, etc., of this Dëvarâja Wodeyar, with référence to the évidence of contemporary sources of information, making use of the later writings (especially the *Mys. Dho. Puṟa, Annals, etc.*) subject to comparison, correction and corroboration wherever necessary (*vide* text of Ch. X).

(2) **ON THE POSITION OF TIRUMALÂRYA REGARDING THE SUCCESSOR OF KANTHÎRAVA-NARASARÂJA WODEYAR I.**

After dealing with the reign of Kanthîrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar, Tirumalârya, in his works (*G. Vam.* and *G. Vi.*), writes of Doddadëvaràja Wodeyar (eldest son of Muppina-Dëvarâja Wodeyar), making it appear as though he ruled in succession to Kanthîrava. He starts with a picture of Doddadëvaràja Wodeyar ruling for some time in the city of Mysore, of his paying a visit to Mëlkôte, then reaching Seringapatam in the course of his return journey (*payanagatiyol Srîrangapattanamam sârdu*) and subsequently (i.e., just before and after the birth of his son Chikkadêvarâja) ruling from there seated on the jewelled throne (*Doddadëva mahârdyam Érï-râjadhâniyöl ratna-simhâsanârûdhanâgi sâmâryamȳm geyyuttire*). He next speaks of Doddadëvaràja as having made up his mind, in accordance with the family précédent as he is made to say, to proceed on a pilgrimage and perform penance (*tirthâyâtrâdi tapassâmrâjyama-nanubhavipem*), after relieving himself of his burden by arranging for the succession in chief (*piriyarasutana*) of Dëvarâja Wodeyar (Kempa-dëvaiya), the second younger brother of his (the first one Chikkadëvaiyarasa or Chikkadêvarâja having pre-deceased Doddadëva), and making his own eldest son Chikkadêvarâja a junior prince under Dëvarâja
He further speaks of how Doddadēvarāja Wodeyar, having installed and suitably advised Kempadēvaiya, and having placed his own sons (Chikkadēvarāja and Kanthīravaiya) and his last brother (Mariyadēvaiya or Maridēvarāja) under his (Kempadēvaiya's) care and protection, proceeded to the banks of the Kauridinī in the south, and how he eventually passed away there after performing penance for a long time (palavum kālam tapam geydu) (G. Vam., 37-48, 89-160, 160-185, 185-188; C., III, III, also IV, 170-180).

In examining the above position of Tirumalārya, it is to be remembered that he wrote as a poet after the death of Doddadēvarāja and during the reign of the latter's son Chikkadēvarāja (1673-1704), with whom he was intimately connected as his co-student and companion. Tirumalārya's primary object, as is obvious from the texts, was to glorify the birth, and anticipate the eventual succession, of his hero Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar and, incidentally, to hallow and exalt Chikkadēva's father (Doddadēva) as an ideal ruler. There is thus full scope in this portion of his works for the free play of imagination on his part. Chronologically, therefore, it is inconceivable how Doddadēvarāja Wodeyar could have been ruling independently from Seringapatam, seated on the jewelled throne, before and after the birth of Chikkadēvarāja as is depicted, for we learn from the texts themselves that the latter was born in 1645 (Pârthiva) (Ibidy 166; Ibid, IV, 51), and it is well known that the actual ruler of Mysore in Seringapatam between 1638-1659 was Kanthīrava-Narasarāja Wodeyar I. Doddadēvarāja was, accordingly, a contemporary of Kanthīrava-Karasa, and could not have been more than a prominent member of the Mysore Royal Family holding charge of the city of Mysore and for some time residing in Seringapatam, and possibly ruling jointly with
Kànthîrava from about 1644 onwards. It would then follow that it was his charge of the city of Mysore, and not Seringapatam, which he had renounced by 1659 in favour of his second brother Kempadēvaiya after arranging for the care and protection of his last surviving brother Maridēvarâja and his own two minor sons Chikkadēvarâja and Kanthïravaiya. Indeed it would appear from the texts (C. Vam., 187-188, 190; C. Vi. IV, 170, V, 3) that there was a hiatus of time between this act of Doḍḍadēvarâja and the actual succession of Dēvarâja to the throne of Seringapatam after the death of Kapthïrava (in July 1659). Doḍḍadēvarâja was born on February 18, 1622 [see Appendix IV — (1)]. His renunciation at a comparatively early âge of 37 or so was, perhaps, due as much to domestic affliction caused by the prématuré death of his first younger brother (Chikkadēvaiya or Chikkadēvarâja) as to family précè­dent. Unless therefore Tirumalârya is understood and appraised on this footing, it would be uncritical to accept him literally as a poet.¹ For further détails about Doddadēvarâja, see under Domestic life in Chs. IX-X.

1. Cf. Ancient India (p. 295), where S. K. Aiyatogar, accepting literally Tirumalârya, writes: "Tirumala Aiyangar himself makes Dœj Dëva Bâja succeed nominally only, while Kempa-Dëviah, his third brother, was carryingon the administration in fact. The truth appears to be that Kempa-Dëviah, the third son, was the successor ruling for a short time in the name of his eldest brother who must hâve been old and then in his own name, on condition that the said broth er should succeed him/" This interprétation, however, is neither in keeping with the internai évidence of the texts nor due it take suîciently into account Tirumalârya's position as a poet. Of. also the Note in the O, Vam. (p. 5), where Mr. M. A. Srinivasachar asserts that Doddadēvarâja, eider son of [Muppina] Dëvarâja, succeeded Kanthîrava I.
APPENDIX VI.

(1) ON THE DATE OF THE MAHRATTA INVASION OF SERINGAPATAM.

Wilks (I. 114-116, f. n.) speaks of the Mahratta invasion of Seringapatam during the reign of Chikkadēvarâja Woḍeyar as having taken place in 1696, on the following grounds. Firstly, the memoirs of the Dalavâis which have few dates, place the invasion next in the order of events to the occupation of Bangalore (1687); secondly, Pûrçaiya's compilation, formed on a discussion of authorities, mentions it after the western conquests from Bednûr (1690-1695); thirdly, the manuscripts are agreed that the Mysore army was at the time before Trichinopoly; and lastly, according to a letter from Fort St. George, Madras, dated January 19, 1697, the Mahrattas were in the Mysore country in 1696 and Nawâb Zûlfikar Khân (the Mughal gênerai) had gone thither—whether to join or fight them—and left a very small part of his army in those parts.

As against this position of Wilks, the trend of évidence now available—noticed in détail in Ch. XI and f. n. thereto—is as follows; The earliest record extant, referring to and echoing the Mahratta invasion of Seringapatam (under Dâdaji, Jaitaji and Nimbâji) and its repuise by Chikkadēvarâja Woḍeyar, is the Seringapatam Temple Copper-plate grant, dated November 19, 1686. The chronicles are agreed that Kumâraiya was the Dalavâi of Mysore only up to May 26, 1682, when he was succeeded by his nephew Doddaiya (1682-1690). From the Jesuit letter (1682) and the letter to Fort St. George (1682), it would be obvious that Dajavâi Kumâraiya was with the Mysore army before Trichinopoly in 1682 when he was being harassed by the Mahrattas there. In keeping with this position, it was in 1682 that
a major portion of the Mysore army was, according to one source (see Ch. XI), diverted from the siège of Trichinopoly and marched on under Doḍḍaiya to fight the Mahrattas near Seringapatara. Again, Yīrarāja of Kajale, in his Sakala-Vaidya-Samhitā-Sārārnava (c. 1714-1720) and Āndhra-Vachana-Bhāratamu—Sabhā-Parvamu (1731), alludes to the exploits of his father Dalavāi Doḍḍaiya against the Mahrattas under Dādaji, Jaitaji, Nimbāji and others during the reign of Chikka-dēvarāja Wodeyar. The Mahratta gēnerals, referred to in these and other sources, were contemporaries and belonged to the army of ëivâji and Sambhâji; and they carried on their warlike activities in Southern India and Mysore during c. 1680-1682, i.e., shortly after the death of Sivâji.

In the light of all these data, the manuscripts mentioned by Wilks—later compilations as they are—do not seem to have been quite correct in placing the Mahratta invasion of Seringapatam and Dalavāi Kumâraiya's siège of Trichinopoly in the latter part of Chikkadēvarāja's reign. As regards the Fort St. George letter dated 1697, cited by Wilks, it is to be understood to refer only to the Mahratta disturbances in Southern India and parts of the Mysore country, under Sāntaji, Dhanaji and other leaders, during Aurangzīb's prolongea siège of Gingee (1691-1698) [see J. Sarkar, Aurangzib, V. 122-130]. It has absolutely no bearing on the Mahratta invasion of Mysore under earlier gēnerals like Dādaji, Jaitaji and Nimbāji. Accordingly, the Mahratta invasion of Seringapatam could not have taken place later than April 1682, the last year of Kumâraiya's period of office as Dalavāi of Mysore. Wilks's date 1696 is too late a date for the event and cannot be accepted.1

1. Wilks's date is followed in the Mus. Gaz. (Old édition), 1.868, (New édition) IV. ii. 2447; and in Nayaks of Madura, p. 207. The last-mentioned work (I.o.) even speaks of the successful repuise of the Mysore army by Mangammal (the dowager-queen of Chokkanfitha Nāyaka of Madura), for which there is no evidence. The Editorial Introdution (p. vi) to the Sakala-Vaid. Sam. assigns the event to 1691, which, however, is not borne out by the materials on record.
(2) CHIKKADEVARAJA'S COINAGE.

In the M. A. B. (1929, pp. 32-33), Dr. M. H. Krishna attributes two types of coins to Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar, which he describes as follows:—

"No coins are known which can be definitely attributed to the successors of Narasarāja until we come to the reign of Chikkadēvarāja. Elliot long ago published a coin, regarding the authorship of which he was doubtful.

*Type:* Krishna.

*Gold:* Size 4", weight 52.7 grains.

*Obverse:* Under ornamental arch baby Krishṇa dancing, wearing girdle of jingles and holding a lump of butter in his right hand, while the left is outstretched. Near his feet is a curved line with a three-prolonged head which is either the petals of a lotus or the hoods of a cobra. In the latter case, the image would be that of Kālinga-mardana and in the former, of Navanītā-nṛttakrishṇa.

*Reverse:* Three-line Nāgari legend with single intervening raies:

1. *Sri Chi*
2. *Ka de va.*
3. *rāja*  

[PL. IX. 31.]

A half-varaha weighing 25.7 grains has been published by Elliot (No. 107) and another exists in the Bangalore Muséum Collection. It is exactly similar to the above varaha, but the legend appears to be slightly différent (PL. IX. 32).

Chikkadēvarāja altered the old Mysore type both on the obverse and on the reverse but he kept up the old weight standard.

*The Kannada Numéral type.*—Large numbers of coins are found near Mysore having a chequered pattern on the reverse with meaningless symbols in the inter-spaces and bearing on the obverse a bordering circle of dots in
the centre of which is a Kannada numeral. These numbers range generally from one to thirty-one and there can be little doubt that they belong to some Mysore king. As all the varieties are of nearly the same weight and size, it is clear that the numbers do not indicate their value. The only possible explanation would perhaps be that the numbers stand for the regnal years of issue. Who then was the Mysore king who reigned for 31 years? It has been suggested that the coins could be attributed to Dodda Krishnaraja who reigned between 1713 and 1731. But it may be noted here that the Mysore king who reigned for 31 years and died in the 32nd year was Chikkadèvarâja who reigned from 1672 to 1704. It may also be noted that it was in the reign of Chikkadêvarâja that Mughal influence was very strong at Mysore leading to a political alliance between Chikkadèvarâja and Aurangzib and the introduction into Mysore of the Mughal System of administration. It is possible that the famous Prime Minister of Mysore at this time, the Jaina Viéâláksha-Pâi^dita, might have introduced the System of minting the regnal years on the copper coins, to commemorate the accession to the throne of his friend and pupil Chikkadêvarâja. However, the attribution cannot be beyond doubt as no corroborative evidence has yet been available. On the other hand, a fact which somewhat disturbs this conclusion is found in the existence of a smaller coin in the collection of this department, with chequered reverse bearing on the obverse the numeral 40. Jackson mentions types with the numerals 31 and 32. The other numbers after 31 are not to be seen anywhere now. We can only assume that the reckoning introduced by Chikkadêvarâja was possibly continued by his successors."

As regards the Krishna type referred to above, there is little doubt that Chikkadêvarâja Wodeyar himself issued it, since his name appears clearly mentioned on its
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reverse. But it seems certain that the figure on the obverse is that of Krishñia represented in the dancing posture on the hoods of a cobra (Kâlinga-mardana), for it symbolises Chikkadëvarâja's sports over his enemies, and the coin itself was actually known as Tândoava-Krishna-Mûrti-Dëva-Râya (vide under Goinage and Currency in Ch. XII). In regard to the Kannada Numéral type, there is no evidence in favour of the view that Chikkadëvarâja Woďeyar could have issued it, nor in support of the position that the 32, or 31, numerals represent the period of Chikkadëvarâja's rule. The possibility of Visâlaksha-Pândit having under the Mughal influence minted "the régnai years on the copper coins, to commemorate the accession to the throne" of Chikka-dëvarâja, appears untenable because Mughal influence at the court of Mysore is discernible only during the latter part of Chikkadëvarâja's reign, i.e., c. 1700-1704, long after Visâlaksha-Pâçdit's death (1686). The copper coins may as well have been issued by Krishnarâja Wodeyar II who also ruled for 32 years (1734-1766). Again, since the latest available numéral figure is 40, the numerals may merely indicate the number of times the coin was minted during some period in the history of Mysore when copper coins were in great demand.

(3) ON THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE Chikkadëvëndra-Vaméåvali.

The Chikkadëvëndra-Vaméåvali, as distinct from the Chikkadëvarâya-Vamsâvali of Tirumalârya, is, as it has come down to us, conspicuous by the absence of the name of its author. It is a champu in 137 verses, occasionally interspersed by prose passages (vachana). The Editors of the Karnâtaka-Kâvya Kalânidhi Series, when they first published the work in 1901, referred to it as an anonymous one (see Introduction). Subsequently, however, the author of the Karnâka-
Kavi-Charite (IL 506-507), on the authority of a manuscript of the poem from the Madras Oriental Mss. Library, attempted to assign its authorship to one Vēṇugōpāla-Varaprasāda, without citing the relevant text. He was, at the same time, inclined to doubt if Timma-Kavi could not have written the Chikkadēvēndra-Vamēâvali, on grounds of the latter’s references to God ērī-Vēṇugōpāla in his own works and the occurrence in the poem of some verses from his Yādavagiri-Māhâtmya (see Kar. Ka. Cha., I. 507). But he refrained from deciding the point in favour of Timma-Kavi, in the specific absence of the name of the author of the Chikkadēvēndra-Vamēâvali.

The manuscript of the work above referred to, now examined by us (No. 18-18-4, ff. 1-25—P.L.; Mad. Or. Lib.), agrees in the main with the published text, ending only, however, with a passage as follows: Srīmad Vēṇugōpālana vara-prasâdēṇa kṛta Chigadēvarāya-Mahārâyara-Vamēâvalige ēōbhana mastu. This passage merely indicates the conclusion of the work entitled Chikkadēvā-Mahārâyara-Vamsâvali (acolloquial form of Chikkadēvēndra-Vamsâvali), written under the favour or bénédiction of God Srī-Vēṇugōpāla. Obviously the author was a de votée of that God. The ascription of the work to a person of the name of Vēṇugopāla-Varaprasāda, as has been done in the Karnātaka-Kavi-Charite, becomes accordingly meaningless—a position due evidently to a misreading of the relevant passage in question, i.e., Vēṇugōpāla-varaprasādēṇa for Vēṇugōpālana varaprasādēṇa. This apart, a detailed examination of the text, side by aide with the works of Timma-Kavi, would enable us to regard the latter alone as the probable author of it (i.e. Chikkadēvēndra-Vamsâvali), on the following grounds: Firstly, Timma-Kavi directly refers to himself both in ‘im Yādavagiri-Māhâtmya (I, 21) and Paschimmmmg—a Mâhâtmya (I, 11)
as a devotee of God Śrī-Varṇagōpāla, which tallies with the statement of the manuscript of the *Chikkadēvēndra-Vamsāvali* that its author was one who wrote by the favour of that Deity. Secondly, in the *Yādavagiri-Māhātmya* (I, 26), Timma-Kavi refers to Gōpāla as his preceptor (*guru*), in almost the same language and spirit as he does in the *Chikkadēvēndra-Varnsāvali* (vv. 10 and 56). Thirdly, the *Chikkadēvēndra-Vamsāvali* évidences a free borrowing of a large number of verses and prose passages from the *Yādavagiri-Māhātmya* [compare, for instance, vv. 10, 79-87, 89-90, 88, 91-105, 107-108, 110-111, 113-117, 118, 119-134, and prose passages on pp. 26-30 (after v. 134), of the *Chikkadēvēndra-Vam.*, with I, 26, II, 26-34, 35-37, 38-52, 53-63, 64-81, and III, 3 (including prose passages after II, 81), of the *Yād.-Māhāt*]. Perhaps the only arguments militating against the above, would be: some of the verses in the *Chikkadēvēndra-Vamsāvali*—particularly verses 1 to 9 and 11 to 78—are not to be seen in the *Yādavagiri-Māhātmya*; and even the verses borrowed from the latter work are found composed in a modified and highly polished style in the former. But the weight of internai évidence would only tend to support the view that Timma-Kavi was at full liberty to enlarge upon, and write in an improved style, the subject-matter of the *Chikkadēvēndra-Vam-ēāvali*, this being by far the most important portion of his *Yādavagiri-Māhātmya* testifying to his abilities and skill as a poet.

(4) WHAT IS TRADITION?

Some years ago, a writer in the *Nineteenth Century*, writing on the value of oral tradition in history, remarked that the study of tradition was still worth much inasmuch as it afforded dues for tracing missing links in the life-history of a king or even of a country. In India, tradition has had considérable vogue, as much
vogue, in fact, as in the several countries of Europe, whose earlier history is largely shrouded in mystery. In using and in interpreting tradition, modern critics, however, have adopted a new mode of approach. The modern school may be said to be represented by Lord Raglan who, delivering his address as Président of the Anthropological Section, at the meeting of the British Association held at Leicester in September 1933, developed the theory propounded by it in a manner which bears répétition hère. Though his illustrations are drawn from English History, there is no doubt that his reasoning is capable of a wider application in the historical field. He said:

"Those writers who have tried to establish the historicity of tradition have invariably, so far as I can learn, adopted the method of taking some period the history of which is totally unknown, examining the traditions which they assume to belong to that period, striking out all miraculous or otherwise improbable incidents, and then dilating upon the verisimilitude of the residue. I shall follow a totalement différent method. I shall take a period the history of which is known, the feudal âge in England, and see what tradition has had to say about that. According to the usually accepted théories, outstanding personalities in the history of a country never fail to leave their mark on tradition. Now, who were the outstanding personalities of the period in question? No one, I suppose, will object to the inclusion of William the Conqueror and Edward I. The Norman conquest in one case and the conquest by Simon de Montfort of Wales and Scotland in the other, cannot have failed to create a tremendous impression at the time, and this impression, according to the theory which has been repeatedly applied to the Iliad, for

example, should have perpetuated itself in tradition. Yet what traditions do we find? Of William the Conqueror, that he fell on landing, and that he destroyed a number of towns and villages to make the New Forest. Of Edward I, that his life was saved by his queen, and that he created his newly-born son Prince of Wales. All these traditions are completely devoid of historical foundation. Of the real achievements of these two great monarchs tradition had nothing to say whatever.

"Similarly the only traditions of Henry II and Richard I are the fabulous tales of Queen Eleanor and Fair Bosamond, and of Blondel outside the castle.

"With the traditional accounts of Henry V, those that have been made famous by Shakespeare, I shall deal at greater length. They tell us that he spent his youth in drinking debauchery, in and about London, in company with highwaymen, pickpockets and other disreputable persons; that he was imprisoned by Chief Justice Gascoigne, whom after his succession he pardoned and continued in office; and that on his accession his character, or at any rate his conduct, changed suddenly and completely. The authorities for these stories are Sir Thomas Elyot's *The Governor* (1531) and Edward Hall's *Union of the Noble and Illustrious Houses of Lancaster and York* (1542). These two highly respectable authors seem to have relied largely on matters already in print, some of it dating within fifty years of Henry V's death. I know no argument for the historicity of any traditional narrative which cannot be applied to these stories, yet there is not a word of truth in any of them.

"The facts are these. In 1400, at the age of thirteen, Henry became his father's representative in Wales, made his head-quarters at Chester, and spent the next seven years in almost continuous warfare with Owen Glendower and his allies. In 1407 he led a successful invasion
of Scotland. In 1408 he was employed as Warden of the Cinque Ports, and at Calais. In the following year, owing to his father's illness, he became régent and continued as such until 1412. During this period his character as a ruler was marred only by his religious bigotry, and what seems to be the only authentic anecdote of the time describes the part he played at the burning of John Badby the Lollard. In 1412 an attempt was made to induce Henry IV, whose ill-health continued to unfit him for his duties, to abdicate, but his refusal to do so, together with differences on foreign policy, led to the withdrawal of the future Henry V from court, probably to Wales, till his father's death a year later. He did not re-appoint Sir William Gascoigne as Chief Justice, and there is no truth in the story that the latter committed him to prison.

"Thèse facts are drawn from the Dictionary of National Biography, which sums up the question by saying that 'his youth was spent on the battlefield and in the Council chamber, and the popular tradition (immortalised by Shakespeare) of his riotous and dissolute conduct is not supported by contemporary authority.' According to Sir Charles Oman, 'his wife was sober and orderly . . . He was grave and earnest in speech, courteous in ail his dealings, and an enemy of flatterers and favourites. His sincère piety bordered on asceticism.'

"Even had there been no contemporary records of the youth of Henry V, there are points in the accounts adopted by Shakespeare which might lead the sober critic to doubt its veracity. The first is that it would be, to say the least, surprising that a man should be an idle and dissolute scapegrace one day, and the first soldier and statesman of his âge the next. The second is that the stories belong to an ancient and widespread class of folk-tales. Had, however, our critic ventured to express his doubts, with what scorn would he not hâve
been assailed by believers in the historicity of tradition! * Here/ they would have said, 'is an impudent fellow who pretends to know more about the fifteenth century than those who lived in it. The facts which he dares to dispute were placed on record by educated and respectable persons, the first historians of their day. Could anything be more absurd than to suppose that they would invent discreditable stories about a national hero, at a time when all the facts of his career must have been widely known? No reasonable person can doubt that Falstaff was as real as Piers Gaveston.' As we have seen, however, the only evidence for Falstaff's existence is tradition, and tradition can never be evidence for an historical fact. He is a purely mythical character, who plays Silenus to Henry's Dionysus, as does Abu Nawas to the Dionysus of Harun-al-Eashid.

"The assimilation of the king to Dionysus no doubt goes back to a time when an aspirant to the throne had to perform various rites and undergo various ordeals, but whether these stories had previously been told of other English princes, and became permanently attached to Henry V through the invention of printing, or whether they were recently introduced from classical sources, I have no idea.

"It may be objected that Henry V, an historical character, appears in tradition, and that tradition is therefore to that extent historical; but this is not so. The characters in a traditional narrative are often anonymous. When named they may be supernatural beings, or persons for whose existence there is no real evidence. When the names of real persons are mentioned, these names form no part of the tradition, but merely part of the machinery by which the tradition is transmitted. Just as the same smart saying may be attributed to half a dozen wits in succession, so the same feat may be attributed to half a dozen heroes in succession; but it is the
anecdote or feat which, if it is transmitted from age to age, becomes a tradition, and not the ephemeral name. The name selected is that of some prominent person whose memory is fading; who has been dead, that is to say, for about a hundred years, or less, if the real facts have never been widely known. His name remains attached to the tradition till some other suitable person has been dead for a suitable length of time.

"This explains certain facts which have puzzled Professor Gilbert Murray, who asks: 'Why do they (se. the Homeric poets) refer not to any warfare that was going on at the time of their composition, but to warfare of forgotten peoples under forgotten conditions in the past? . . . What shall one say of this? Merely that there is no cause for surprise. It seems to be the normal instinct of a poet, at least of an epic poet. The earliest version of the Song of Eoland which we possess was written by an Anglo-Norman scribe some thirty years after the conquest of England. If the Normans of that age wanted an epic sung to them, surely a good subject lay ready to hand. Yet as a matter of fact their great epic is all about Roland, dead three hundred years before, not about William the Conqueror. The fugitive Britons of Wales made no epic to tell of their conquest by the Saxons; they turned to a dim-shining Arthur belonging to the vaguest past. Neither did the Saxons who were conquering them make epics about that conquest. They sang how at some unknown time a legendary and mythical Beowulf had conquered a legendary Grendel."

"The true explanation has nothing to do with instinct; it is that epic poetry, like other forms of traditional narrative, deals with ritual drama, and not with historical fact. Beal people and events can only be identified with ritual drama when their memory has become vague."

Roland could not have been made to fall at Hastings before about 1166, and by that time the form of the epic was fixed in writing. What we learn from the Song of Roland are old traditional tales which were probably attached to Charlemagne about a hundred years after his death.

"The real facts of his career, like all historical facts, have been, and could only be, ascertained from contemporary written records."

"In this connection Dr. Leaf remarks: 'When they (the Normans) crossed the Channel to invade England, they seem to have lost all sense of their Teutonic kinship with the Saxons, and it is doubtful if they even knew that their name meant Northmen. The war-song which Taillefer chanted as they marched to battle was not a Viking Saga, but the song of Roland.'¹ He realised that a people can completely forget its origin within a hundred and sixty years—yet still believed in the continuity of historical tradition!"

As the reasoning is too close and the argument too recondite, a long extract has been given, especially as it is fully exemplified by facts taken from history.

Lord Raglan's suggestion that when the names of real persons are mentioned in a traditional tale—i.e., a tale handed down from age to age by oral communication—these names form no part of the tradition, but merely part of the machinery by which the tradition is transmitted, seems well justified from the numerous instances quoted by him, to which parallel from Indian traditionary tales can be easily adduced. "Just as¹ as he says, "the same smart saying may be attributed to half a dozen wits in succession, so the same anecdote or feat... which, if it is transmitted from age to age becomes a tradition, and not the ephemeral name. The name selected is that of some prominent person

8. W. Leaf, Borner and History, p. 46.
whose memory is fading; who has been dead, that is to say, for about a hundred years, or less if the real facts have never been widely known. His name remains attached to the tradition till some other suitable person has been dead for a suitable length of time." The truth underlying this remark may be verified from countless tales occurring in the Indian Epics—the Rāmayana and the Mahābhārata—and from the eighteen Purāṇas which, indeed, enshrine the old traditions—orally handed down to posterity from ancient times. Tradition may be of the elders but it wears a snowy beard, and is slippery to a degree to base an argument upon or build an historical account with its aid. Something very similar has occurred in the case of the traditionary tales connected with the name of Chikkadēvarāja, as a comparison of the versions current during the time of Wilks and Dēvachandra goes to show. They had been growing for long and when they were first committed to writing by Wilks—a hundred and twenty-five years after the events to which they relate are said to have occurred—they had already become highly exaggerated by embellishments and, in Dēvachandra, we find them assume proportions which even to Wilks, if he had had an opportunity to read them as they appear in Dēvachandra, would have seemed strange. Apart from this, there is reason to fear that in this particular instance, even as early as the time of Chikkadēvarāja, there was evidently much confusion of thought as to what actually took place in connection with the disturbances which followed the imposition of a war-levy that was resorted to by either Chikkadēva or his minister Viēālāksha. The news that reached the Jesuit Pathers—and they committed to writing what they had heard almostcontemporaneously—was that the people had been impaled on sword-sticks. This evidently was a phrase of the time as it is to-day for describing unspeakable harshness in punishment. It
could not be that they were actually impaled as the Jains had been by the Pâṇḍyan king of old. The story of this notorious impalement had been current for ages—nearly 400 years or so—by then and the suggestion that such an impalement was practised in the time of Chikkadēva stands uncorroborated even in Wilks and Dēvachandra. The inference seems inévitable that news spread that the harshness of the punishment inflicted was so much spoken of that it was only capable of being described in terms of the cruelty practised on the Jains by the Pâṇḍyan king, a phrase—Kazhuvikkēttaradu—with which the Jesuit Fathers, who had learnt Tamil, the dominant language of the Madura country, were evidently familiar. And what they seem to have done is to simply pass on the euphemism in their letter as describing a fact that had actually occurred in the "Eastern dominions" of Chikkadēva. If a loose or wrong description can thus pass into History, what is there to prevent tradition—a mère oral communication from mouth to mouth through the générations, ever subject to the incident of mutation in the very process of handing down—from becoming something entirely différent from what it started with? In the case of Chikkadēva, there were at least three good reasons why he should look harsher to posterity as a ruler than he actually was: (1) He was a vigorous ruler; (2) he was the builder of a new kingdom and had to carry through things; and (3) he undertook a thorough reformation of the administrative and social foundations on which his kingdom was built. Added to these causes, his minister Viēâlāksha was one who lacked prudential restraint in giving effect to the measures decided upon by the king. What he did not only recoiled on him but also on his Sovereign, to whom undoubtedly he was deeply attached. With him evidently action was greater than the reaction to which it was necessarily subject. Posterity has been.
kind to him in forgetting him absolutely, éveil in his own native village. Only it has been unjust to his master in making him responsible for very much more than his share in the results that followed his acts.

(5) Kazhuvikkèttaradu.

The story of the impaiement of 8,000 Jains by a Pârîdyan king is told in the Madura Sthala-Purâna and is reflected in the other local chronicles as well in the neighbourhood. Tradition current in Madura refers to the contest that occurred between the Jains and éaivites in the days of Tirugnâna-Sambandar. If the Periya-Purânam, a Tamil work treating of the sixty-three devotees of êiva, is to be believed, this king should be identified with Neûmâran who was converted to êaivism from the Jain faith by the famous saint Tirugnâna-Sambandar (c. 7th cent. A.D.). According to the Madura Sthala-Purâna, this king was also known as Kubja-Pârîdya, because he was a hunchback. He was, it would seem, originally a êaiva but was converted to Jainism and from the date he became a Jain, he, it is added, persecuted his êaivite subjects. His queen Mangaikkarasi, however, remained a êaivite in secret and induced Tirugnâna to visit the king. He cured the king not only of the incurable fever which the Jain priests could not subdue but also of his hunchback. The king was reconverted to êaivism and changea his name to Sundara-Pârîdya, or the beautiful Pândya, and decreed the death of all Jains who refused to embrace êaivism. Those who did not join the êaivite faith—and they were some 8,000 in number—he ordered to be impaled on the point of a sword! As if to remind this great deed of his, at one of the festivals connected with the famous temple at Madura, an image representing a Jain impaled on a stake is carried in the procession! This festival is known, after the alleged event, as-
Kazhuvikkëttaradu, the act of impaling on the point of the sword.

The king Sundara-Pâṇḍya of this taie has been identified with Mâravarman Arikësari, who boasts of having won the battle of Nellvëli. If the impaling had been a fact—it is obviously much exaggerated in the èaiva Purânas—it would have been referred to in the Chinna-manur copper-plates and the Velvikkudi grant which throw considerable light on the early Pâṇḍyan kings up to the beginning of the 7th century A.D. The omission to do so is the more remarkable because Nedunjaďaiyan Parântaka, who issued the Velvikkudi grant, ascended the Pâṇḍyan throne next after the son of Nedumâran.

Nedumâran, for the services he rendered to the èaiva cause, was translated to the position of a saint and became thus one of the famous sixty-three celebrated in the Periya-Purânam. The period of his rule has been fixed by some scholars between 650-680 A.D. (K. V. Çlubrahmanya Aiyar, Historical Sketches of Anàient Dekhan, 127; see also The Tamilian Antiquary, No. 3). Internal evidence afforded by one of his hymns—in which Tirugnâna refers to Sirûttoďdan who fought at the battle of Vâtâpi (modern Bâdâmi) which took place in 642 A.D.—seems to confirm this date, which fixes him to a period later than that event (i.e., to the latter half of the 7th century A.D.). For the date of Tirugnâna-Sambandar, see E. I., I I I . 277-278; L A., X X V . 113, 116; 8.I.1., I I I . 152. For references to the traditionary tales connected with him, see W. Francis, Madura Dist. Gaz., 29 and 74; South Arcot Dist. Gaz., 97.

In one of his verses, Tirugnâna-Sambandar prays for èiva's grâce to deliver him from fear. Treacherous Jains, he says, have lit for him a fire, which, he implores, may go to the Pâṇḍyan king (as fever), so that he might know the torture of slow flame (Padigam 112; Periya-Purânam, 701, 715), The référence here is to the
traditionary tale that the Jains, out of enmity, set fire to Sambandar's house and that he sent up an appeal to Ôiva that the fire might be transformed into a slow consuming fever and go in that form to the Pâ^dyan ruler, then a Jain. The king got the fever, and Sambandar relieved him of it. That is the miracle which subsequently became converted into the impaiement of 8,000 Jains, in the manner described above. Tradition has been busy here as elsewhere. If the evidence afforded by Tirugnâna's own hymns is to be believed, then the following facts are vouched for by him: that he was devoted to Mangaikkarasi, the daughter of a Chôla king who had been married to a Pâçdyan king; that this queen was an ardent êaivite; that the king's ministèi Kulachchirai was also a êaivite; that the queen took a Personal interest in the welfare of Tirugnâna who was contending against the Jains who had won over her husband, the Pâridyan king, to their faith; and that the Jains had set fire to Tirugnâna's house and Tirugnâne prayed that that fire, transformed into a fever, might go to the Pândyan king, then a Jain. This happened and the king was re-converted with Tirugnâna's aid. Conceptions of popular justice required that the Jains should be punished for their supposed iniquities, and the impaiement of 8,000 Jains was the result. Tradition cannot be other than tradition.

Kingsbury and Phillips render the verse of Sambandar referred to above thus:

O, Thou whose form is fiery red,
In holy Àlavây, our Sire,
In grâce deliver me from dread.
False Jains hâve lit me a fire:
O, let it to the Pândyan ruler go,
That he the torture of slow flame may know.

(See Hymns of Tamil Saivite Saints, 32-33, by F. Kingsbury and G. E. Phillips, in the Héritage of India Séries)
The legend of the impaling of "eight thousand of the stubborn Jains" is mentioned by them at page 11 of their book. They add the remark later: "Legends make him (Tirugnâna) a wonder-worker, but we must draw our knowledge of the man from his poems themselves." It is much to be regretted that except for the effort of Messrs. Kingsbury and Phillips, no translations of the hymns of Appar, Tirugnâna-Sambandar and Sundarar are yet available on the lines on which the late Kev. Dr.-G. U. Pope brought out the hymns of Mânîkya-vâchakar (Tiruvâchakam, Oxford University Press).

(6) ON THE ARKA MARRIAGE.

Arka is the Sun-plant Calotropis gigantea, a small tree with medicinal sap and rind, the larger leaves of which are used for sacrificial cérémonies (&at. JBr.; Br» Âr. Up.). Arka means also the membrum virile (A. V., V I. 72-1). Manu enumerates eight kinds of marriage (III. 21), which are: Brâhma, Daiva, Àrsha, Prâjâpatya, Àsura, Gândharva, Eâkshasa and Paiéâcha. Cf. Yâjnavalkya, I. 58-61. Marriage with the Arka plant (Bandhuka) is enjoined to be performed before a man marries a third wife, who thus becomes his fourth (chaturthâdi vivâhârtham tritiyôrka samudvahêt—Kâéyapa). Gârga thus says as to a third marriage:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Grihavyad } \text{eka patnika } sa \text{ kami } chôdvahêt \text{ param } | \\
\text{Tritiyam } \text{nôdvahêt } \text{kanyam } \text{chaturthimapi } \text{chôdvahêt } | \\
\text{Tritiyam } \text{udvahêt } \text{kanyam } \text{mohâdajnânatôpi } \text{yêt } | \\
\text{Dhana-dhânyâyushân } \text{hâni } \text{rógi } \text{syàd } \text{yadi jivati } | \\
\text{Tritiyôdvâha } \text{siddhyarthha } \text{marka-vriksham samudvahêt } | \\
\text{Grâmât prâchimudichim } \text{và } \text{gachehèd } \text{yatraya } \text{tièthati } | \\
\text{Yathârkar } \text{sôbhanam } \text{kritvâ } \text{kritvà } \text{bhûmincha } \text{lôbkitam } | 
\end{align*}
\]
An householder should generally be possessed of one wife; if he is very carnal, he may also marry a second time. But he should not marry a third damsel. If it is necessary, he may marry a fourth (damsel). As regards the third marriage, if he wishes to get married through ignorance, he will become reduced in wealth, corn and lifetime, and will become (further) sickly. Accordingly, in the case of a third marriage, in order to be free from sickness, etc., he should get married to the Arka plant. To perform such a marriage, he should go towards the east in search of a tree wherever it is and there he should perform the marriage rite as between himself and that tree in every détail (as in a marriage). He should invest the mângalya-sûtra to that plant agreeably to the ritual and to the éâkhâ to which he belongs, and should (then) perform the hôma (by raising the sacrificial fire). This done with due solemnity, he will be free from all other obstacles and then he can marry (the third) damsel without further doubt, which should accordingly be considered as the fourth (marriage)—see Smriti-Muktâvalu, Sôdaiakarma prakaranam, 139-140, in the Madhva-Siddhânta Granthamâlâ Séries, Ed. by Krish^âchârya, êrî Krishna Mudrâ Press, Udipi. According to the Trivarnikâchâra of the Svëtàmbara Jains (XI, 104), "a third marriage is to be performed in the Arka form, otherwise the bride will be like a widow; thus should the wise act" (Akptvârka-vivâhantu tptiyâm yadi chôdavahêt | Vidhava sâ bhavêt kanyâ tasmât kûryam vichakshaṇâ||)—quoted in The Jain Law (p. 216) by C. R. Jaina, Madras, 1927.
HISTORY OF MYSORE

(7) ON THE RELATIVE CLAIMS OF MYSORE, THE MAHBATTAS AND THE MUGHALS TO EMPIRE IN THE SOUTH.

There is overwhelming evidence in support of the position that Mysore under Chikkadévarâja Woñeyar based her claims to Empire in South India as the immediate political heir of Vijayanagar. This position was the natural outcome of the following circumstances:—Since the fall of Penukoñđa and Vellore, and the flight of êrî-Ranga VI (1647), the decline of the Vijayanagar Empire became rapid. During êrî-Kanga's long sojourn in the south (1647-1663), he had no recognised capital, although he formally claimed to rule from Penukoñđa, Chandragiri or Bëlûr. While the Deccani powers of Bijâpur and Gôlkonda were in quick succession occupying his imperial possessions in South India (1647-1656), the kingdom of Mysore under Kanþhiravâ-Narasarâja Woñeyar I (1638-1659), by remaining loyal to the Empire, strove hard to maintain her integrity and independence against the encroachments of these States. In 1656, however, the activities of these powers in the Karnàṭak ceased, and they retired home dividing their spoils. During the next three decades they were so thoroughly absorbed in their struggle with the Mughals in the Deccan that they could hardly devote their attention to Karnàṭak affairs, beyond leaving its administration in the hands of their gênerais (like Shâhji the Mahratta, in Bangalore). This made it possible for the growing kingdom of Mysore gradually to extend her warlike activities in the direction of the Bijapur-belt of territory in the north, while her attempts to maintain the status quo ante in the direction of Ikkeri and M ad ara in the north-west and the south-east tended to rouse the persistent opposition and hostility of those neighbours. An immediate result of this policy of Mysore is reflected in the futile invasion of Seringapatam—in the very first year of accession of
Dëvarâja Wodeyar (1659-1673)—by Sivappa Nâyaka I of Ikkëri (1645-1660) who, on the plea of restoring the suzerainty of érî-Ranga in the Karnâṭak, won him over from the allegiance of Mysore, only to make him pursue an hostile attitude towards her from Bëlûr. érî-Ranga, however, met with little success owing to the weakness of the successors of Sivappa Nâyaka and the steady advance of Mysore on Ikkëri, so that in 1663 he had to leave Bëlûr for the far South, again to seek the protection of his erstwhile hostile feudatories who were fighting in their own interests. Meanwhile the kingdom of Mysore was fast becoming a first-rate power in Southern India. The political centre of gravity was shifting from Penukonda to Seringapatam, this being facilitated to some extent by the migration of the érî-Vaishnava family of Eoyal preceptors of the Âravîçlu Dynasty to the court of Dëvarâja (1663). At the same time impérial ideas and ideals began to take root in the congenial soil of Seringapatam. Srî-Banga, in view of these developments, made one more, and last, effort to recover his position from Mysore by allying himself with Chokkanâtha Nâyaka of Madura (1659-1682) and other feudatories, and laying siège to the fort of Brode belonging to her (1667). Mysore, however, ultimately came out successful in the siège and Srî-Ranga, sorely disappointed, disappeared from the vortex of South Indian politics. In Seringapatam, Dëvarâja Wodeyar, far from severing his connection with the Vijayanagar Empire, gradually stepped into the impérial status itself (as is significantly borne out by the assumption of impérial titles by him), and paved the way for the independence of the kingdom and her future political development. With Madura, Gingee and Ikkëri struggling for their existence under the troubled conditions of the times, Mysore, alone among her contemporaries, emerged into the political arena of South India as the strongest, and sole, représentative of
Vijayanagar (1673). She soon found herself placed in an eminently advantageous position to extend, preserve and unite, in the true imperial spirit of the times, what was still left of the deteclict Empire in the south as a bulwark against further aggressions from any powers (like the Mahrattas and the Mughals) from the north. No wonder, after the short-lived success of Kôdanaḍa-Râma I, the then Vijayanagar king, against Dalavâi Kumâraiya (of Mysore) in the battle of Hassan (1674), Chikkadēvarâja Wodeyar (1673-1704) began his untiring activities in all directions. And his assumption of the titles Kamâṭaka-Chakravarti (Emperor of the Karnâṭaka country) and Dakshinadik-Chakravarti (Emperor of the South), as is amply borne out by the records of his own period, from this time onward, acquires suprême significance in South Indian History (for a fuller treatment of this course of affairs, vide Chs. VIII, X and XI, with documentary détails in f.n.).

The claims of the Mahrattas and the Mughàls to Empire in the South appear to be less strong. Much has been said and written in récent years in favour of the view that the Mahratta State in the South owed its existence to the genius of Shàhji under Vijayanagar influence, and that his son êivâji was the political heir and successor of the Vijayanagar Empire (see, for instance, the latest articles on the subject in Vij. Com. Vol., pp. 119-138). This is, however, negatived by the well-known facts recorded of their careers during the period of political transition in the South(1647-1674), sketched above. Indeed there is no direct évidence,\(^4\) to lend support to thèse suggestions, although the trend of ail.

\(^4\) Sivâji's coronation (1674) and his Karnâṭak expédition (1677) hâve been held by scholars like Dr. S. K. Aiyangar as having " had in it the idea of reviving the Hindu Empire of the South," while his supposed grant to the sons of Ôrl-Banga VI and his issue of the gold hun after the Vijayanagar model hâve been taken to be proofs in support of the position that it might hâve been his ambition " to stand before Anrang-zib as the acknowledged successor of the emperors of Vijayanagar."
the available data goes to show that whatever influence Vijayanāgar exerted on the Mahrattas (under Shâhji and ēivâji) was only of an indirect character, their rise to power in the South being mainly rooted in, and conditioned by, the Shàhi state of Bijàpur in the Deccan. Accordingly, the extension of Mahratta power and influence in South India under ēivâji and his immediate successors was more in the footsteps of Bijàpur than of Vijayanagar (whose sphere of influence in the 17th century lay farther away from the Mahratta country), while their claims to Empire in the South were derived more from their right—real or supposed—to establish footholds in it which would eventually enable them to collect chauth and sardēémukhi from the feudatories of the old Vijayanagar Empire, than from an instinctive desire to unīté the heterogenous éléments into an autonomous whole and evolve a bénéficiai system of government over the length and breadth of the land. Again, even as regards their united résistance to Mughal advance on the South, they were treading more in the footsteps of Bijàpur and Gŏlkoçda than of Vijayanagar, which explains why, during 1677 and 1680-1686, they actually came into conflict with Mysore which, on this issue, was clearly following the Vijayanagar policy. Mughal pressure on South India after the fall of Bijàpur and Gŏlkoçda (1686-1687) was in the nature of a military conquest of an alien power, by way of continuaiion of the policy of the early Sultans of Delhi. Mughal

(see Editorial Notes in Nayakas of Madura, pp. 27, 134, 177, etc.). It is hard to accept this as a literal statement of facts when we bear in mind the actual course of political évolution of Mysore during 1647-1674. Mahratta sovereignty in the South was itself a matter of graduai development in the wake of ēivâji's Karnātak expédition of 1677, when he himself found that he had been anticipated by Chikkadēvarāja Wolleyar of Mysore as the sole, and natural, représentative of Vijayanagar in the Karnātaka country (see supra ; also Ch. XI, for détails). And we hâve definite evidence of Sambhâji, son and successor of Sivâji, assuming the title of Emperor (sambhôji-Chakraverti) for the first time in July 1680 (see M. Cf, X Mb. 117).
claim to Empire in the South was, further, derived from the principle that might is right and hardly carried with it schemes of settlement and orderly administration applicable to the conquered tracts as a whole, whatever measure of success their rule might have been attended with in Northern India. This accounts largely for the harassing raids of Mughal lieutenants in South India under Aurangzib and his successors in the latter part of the 17th century and the first part of the 18th, which left her a prey to anarchy and confusion until British rule at the end of the 18th century brought the blessings of peace and order into the land. Happily for Mysore, however, it is to the credit of Chikkadëvarâja Woçeyar that in contesting the claims to supremacy in the South of the Mahrattas and the Mughals in the 17th century, he so manœuvred as to keep them at arms' length and not only saved the country from their attacks but also, in advancing his claims to absolute sovereignty of the South of India, gave Mysore an individuality all her own.
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A

Abdollâ Qutb Shah of Gôlkonda: contemporary of Kanthîrava I, 151; see also under Gôlkopda.

Âchâra: Chikkadêvarâja’s conception of, 403 (n. 154).

Adhâta-Bâya: a général of Jagadêva-Bâya; Râja Wodeyar’s campaign against (1600), 56.

Adil Shah of Bijâpur: Chikkadêvarâja’s success over (1678), 289 (n. 64); referred to, 278, 540.

Afzal Khân: a Bijâpur général, 119, 121 (n. 28), 126, 128.

Agrahdra: Brâhmanical settlement; prosperity of under Chikkadêvarâja, 397.

Aigûr: see under Krishnappa Nâyaka.

Ajitanatha-Purana of Banna: manuscript copy of, made in 1663, 251 (n. 173).

Akbar: Mughal advance on the south during the reign of, 117.

Akkâ Beggi: chief of Èrôde; Chikkadêvarâja’s subjugation of (1678), 228-229.

Akkihebbâju: acquisition of by Bâja Wodeyar (1584), 47; referred to, 67, 128.

Aktharamâlika-‘Sângatya, etc: see under Chikkupadhyaya.

Àladûr: a rent-free village granted by Venkata I to Raja Wodeyar (c. 1609), 67; referred to, 100.

Alagîna-chdvadi: see under Armoury.

Alagîri Nâyaka: foster-brother of Chokkanâtha Nâyaka of Madnra, 277-278.

Âlambâgi: a possession of Mysore (1642), 199; note on, 180 (n. 60); referred to, 66, 163.

Alasingarârya: see under Sînçardrya II.
Ankué Khan: a Bijâpur general, 121 (n. 28), 186.

Ankuéa: an insignia of Châmarâja V, 95.

Ankuéa-Râya: brother and Frime Minister of Jagadêva-Râya; Châma­râja V's campaign against (1618), 83 (n. 9)-84.

Annaiya: mint-master under Chikka"dëvarâja, 338; his construction of the pond at Sravana-Belagola in the latter's name, 334.

Annâjaiya of Sâratavalji: Dëvarâja's campaign against (1666), 226.

Annals of the Mysore Royal Family (Palace History), edited by B. Rama­kriehna Rao: a secondary source of Mysore History, 8 (n. 13); on the tradi­tiohal origin and foundation of the Wofleyar Dynasty, 221-22, 26-30; referred to or noticed, 2 (n. 2), 31, 36 (n. 42), 39 (n. 58), 42 (n. 86), 45, 49 (n. 19), 69 (n. 92), 98-99 (n.. 71,74, 76), 109 (n. 1-2), 115 (n. 10), 116 (n. 14), 117 (n. 15), 125 (n. 42), 139 (n. 87), 148 (n. 121), 160 (n. 8), 161 (n. 12), 200 (n. 161), 201 (n. 168), 209 (n. 190), 212 (n. 5), 256 (n. 192), 272 (n. 12), 278 (w. 33), 292 (n. 75), 296 (n. 96), 311 (n. 148), 519, 526-527, 545, etc.

Antembara-ganda (Birud-antembara¬ganda): a distinctive title of the Wodeyar Dynasty of Mysore, 34 (n. 25-26); story of the acquisition of, 34-86, referred to, 39, 52, 94, 95, 184 (w. 105), 202, 261, 507, etc.

Appâjaiya: Gurikdr of Chikkadëvarâja, entrusted with the working of the légis­lation relating to Arasu families, 865, 866, 408; referred to 367,393 (n. 117).

Aparatima-Vîra: a title ascribed to Châmârâja V, 94-95.

Aparatima-Vîra: a distinctive title of Chikkadëvarâja, 284, 286 (n. 58); referred to, 822, 608.

Aparatima-Vîra-Charitam : a literary work (see under Tirumalarya II) ; as a primary source of Mysore History, 3; referred to or noticed, 274 (n. 19), 285 (n. 68), 810, 822, etc.

Arakere: acquisition of by Râja Wofleyar (1600), 66; assigned to the sons of Muppina-Dëvarâja (e. 1617), 76; • scene of action' during the Bijâpur siege of Seringapatam (1639), 122; referred to, 67, 106, 524.

Araoravâphi: acquisition of by Chikka¬dëvarâja (1688), 809.

Arasu families in Mysore: their adoption of Orr-Vaishnavism under the decree of Chikkadëvarâja, 365-366; Chikka­dëva's classification of and législation relating to (c. 1690), 365, 407-408 (n. 166); referred to, 448.

Arâivflu Dynasty: see under Vijaya­nagar.


Arcot, Nawâbs of: history of the, 5.

Arikuthâra: acquisition of by Châmârâja V (1623), 87.

Ariyalûr: réduction of the chief of by Chikkadëvarâja (1678), 275.

Arka marriage: referred to, 200 (n. 161), 497 (n. 7); note on the ritualism, etc., of, 568-569.

Arkalgûfl: siège of (c. 1638), 110; chief of, 140, 156; assista Ikkiëri against Mysore (1674), 276; taken by Dalavâi Kumâraiya, 277; besieged by Ikkiëri (1694), 314; retaken by Chikka¬dëvarâja (1695), 315; restored, 321; referred to, 334, 435, etc.

Armoury (Alagma-chavadi): see under Ohdmardja Wodeyar V.

Artha-Panchaka: see under Chikkupa­dhyeya.

Asva-Sastra: a treatise on horses, by Râmachandra, a protégé of Châmârâja V, 103.

Athdrâ-cuchêri: oonception of, with reference to the eighteen departments introduced by Chikkadëvarâja, 358.

Aurangzib: his struggle with Bijâpur and Gôlkonda, 151, 214, 273; his relations with Orrâji and Sambhâji, 281,283,286,290; his offered assistance to Chikkadëvarâja against the Mahrattas (1682), 301 (n. 110)-302; his réduction of Bijâpur (1686), and advance on the south (1687-1690), 304-809; his renewed activities in the south and struggles with the Mahrattas (1690-1698), 310, 311-318, 316-319; embassy of Chikka¬dëvarâja to (o. 1699-1700), 819-821 (n. 178), 328; position of (1704), 828-321; referred to, 882, 356, 609-511,514,661,553,672 (n. 1), 574, etc.
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Aurangeîb, by J. Sarkar; noticed, 293 (n. 82), 806 (w. 126), 308 (n. 184).

Ávaniperûr: acquisition of by Chikka-dêvarâja (1688), 309.

Ayakattina-chavadi: one of the eighteen departments introduced by Chikka-dêvarâja, 355.

Áyamma: one of the principal queens of Kaňthîrava I, 200.

B

Bâdarâyana: his Apasûdrâdhikarana referred to, 406 (n. 163).

Bâgagi: annexation of by Chikka-dêvarâja (1690), 311.

Bâgila-Kanddcharada-Chavadi: one of the eighteen departments introduced by Chikkadêvarâja, 366.

Babûl Khân: Bijâpur général who assisted in the defence of Seringapatam (1659), 217 (n. 21).

Bâjalôchana Nâyaka: chief of Mûgûr; Râja Wodeyar's encounter with (1608). 67.

Balbal Khân: a Bijâpur général, 276.

Bâgûr (Âne-Bâgûr): taken by Kanfliîrava I from Bijâpur (1640), 126; lost but retaken by him (1642), 133.

Bairanetta: acquisition of by Chikkadêvarâja (c. 1690), 309.

Basavaiya: treasury officer under Kaňthîrava I, 1159.

Basavaiya of Channarâyapatna: son of Doddâiîa, and feudatory of Dêvarâja, 234, 238, 244, 245.

Basavâpatua (Hassan district): acquisition of by Kanthîrava I (1647), 130-140.

Basavâpatna (Shimoga district): (see under Kenge-Hanumappa Ndyaka), chief of, 96; referred to, 18, 625.

Bangaradoddi-kalve: a monument of KaňthîravâI's rule in Mysore, 168, 209.

Bangaráadoddi-kalve: a monument of KaňthîravâI’srule in Mysore, 168, 209.

Bandarâyana: his Apasûdrâdhikarana referred to, 406 (n. 163).


Bârûbalùtiî: ancient system of rural economy, revived by Chikkadêvarâja, 340.

Baramahal Records: Capt. Alexander Read in; referred to or noticed, 809 (n. 140), 316 (n. 164), 837 (n. 48), 855 (w. 74).

Bednûr: capital of Ikkêri (1639-1768), 88 (n. 33); referred to, 124, 187, 160 (n. 180), 151, 217, 221, 310, 550, etc.

Bëhma-chavadi: one of the eighteen departments introduced by Chikka-dêvarâja, 356.

Belgolada-Gommatësvara-Charitre (c. 1780) of Ananta-Kavi: referred to, 827-828 (n. 4-7), 388-884 (n. 88-89), 486.

Bellavatta: a parade ground during Râja Wogeyar's defence of Kesare (1696), 55.
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Bëlûr (VèHpura): chief of, 92, 96; acquisition of (1657), 156 (n. 146)-156; north-western limit of Mysore (1659), 166; Òrî-Banga VI in (1669-1668), 216, 216, 219, 221,222, 228 (n. 45-46); assista Ikkêri against Mysore (1674), 276; taken by Mysore, 277, 279; retaken by Ikkêri, (c. 1680-1681), 291; referred to, 18, 57, 121 (n. 28), 145, 163, 188, 224, 227 (w. 68), 528, 525, 670, 671,672, etc.

BeJJûr : acquisition of by Chàmarâja V (1681), 91; referred to, 127.

Benne-Honnî-Vithauna : Chàmarâja V's campaign against (1619), 86.

Bentieya-chavadi : one of the eighteen departments introduced by Chikka-dëvarâja, 866.

Benteraya: name of the Mysore éléphant which took part in the action at Hebbaje (1695), 814.

Bëfta Wodeyar : third son of Ràja Wodeyar, 74-76.

Bettada-Arasu : Dalavâi of Mysore during the last year of Ràja Wodeyar's reign and the minority of Chàmarâja V (1617-1621), 70, 82; his identity, 82(n. 6); plays a prominent part in the events of 1618-1620, 88-85; fall of (1620-1621), 85-86 (n. 17); his gift (1620), 96; referred to, 87,108, 584.

Bëftada-Châmarâja "Wbfleyar: younger brother of Ràja Wodeyar, and father of Kanthîrava I, 42; assista Ràja Wodeyar during the events of 1596-1596, and 1608-1610, 49, 58-56, 66 (n. 79), 59; his joint mie with Ràja Wodeyar, 62 (n. 106), 74; his differences with him, etc., 75-76; his last days in Gunflflu-Terakanâmbi, 106, 114,124; his death (March 1689), 200-201 (n. 168, 166); his Vaishnava prédlections, etc., 72-73 (n. 166-157), 86,168-164,860; referred to, 42-48 (n.86) .113,116 (n. 14), 169, 211, 688, 684, etc.

Bëftada-Châmarija IV, 42; his identity, character of his raie, and his deposition, 42 (n. 86)-48.

Bëttadapnra : scene of action during Kanthîrava l's campaigns of 1646-1646, 186,186.

Bëvuhalli: acquisition of by Chikkâ dëvarâja (1690), 809.

Bhadrappa Nâyaka of Ikkêri (166-1664): successor of Venkatappa Nâyaka I l, and contemporary of Dëvarâja' Wodeyar of Mysore, 218; his hostile relations with Mysore (1662-1663), 219-221.

Bhagavad-Gîta : on the duties of a Ôûdra (see under Sachchûdrachâra-Nirnaya); referred to, 613.

Bhagavad-Gîtâ-Tîku : see under Çhikku-pâdhîyaya.

Bhaktîdhikya-Batnâvali : see under Shaâaksharadêva.

Bhaktânanda-Dayini : a gloss on Shadakshari's Bhaktîdhikya-Ratnavali by Guru-Siddha-Yati, 466.

Bharatâchârya : his Natya-Sastra referred to, 179 (n. 90), 199 (n. 160).

Bhåra-Vaehana : see under Çhikka-dëvaraja Wodeyar.

Bhårati-Nanja : court poet of Kant-hîrava 1,182, 196 (n. 148-149), 197 (n. 158).

Bhåskara : see under Bëhara-Oanita.


Bhîma-Kavi : his Basava-Putdana (1369) referred to, 482 (n. 17).

Bhôja-simMaana : see under Mysore Thrwie.

Bhôjarâja; name of the éléphant captured during Chàmarâja V's campaign of 1618, 84.

Bhujangaiya: chief of Toda-nâdu; Chikka-dëvarâja's campaign against (1677), 281.

Bhutipura: siege and capture of by Chikka-dëvarâja (1678), 289.

Bidar Bakht (Didar Bux): movements of in the Mysore oountry (1696-1898), 312, 318.

Bidare: acquisition of by Dëvarâja (1668), 220.

Bijâpur: campaign of in the Karânak, as recorded in the Muhammad-Namah, 6.

Bijâpur : relations of with the Karnatak (including Mysore), under Muhammad Adil Shah (1627-1666), during 1687-1664,118-128,188, 186,187-189,140-148 (n. 96), 146-161; her death-struggle with Aurangaib in the Deccan (1669),
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214; her interference in the local politics of the Karnâjak, 217 (n. 21); dwindling power of, 220; her generals participate in the siège of Érode (1667), 228; her continued struggle with Aurangzib, 278; Chikkadêvarâja's relations with (1676-1677), 277-280; retirement of from South India, 287; her renewed struggle with the Mughal, 302; fall of (1686), 804; Mughal advance on the possessions of, 804, 306; referred to, 82, 160, 174, 198, 204-206, 207, 265, 309, 324, 508-509, 621, 622, 541, 570, 678, etc.

Bijâpur Gâte: one of the principal gates of the Seringapatam Fort, 174.

Bijjavara: siège and capture of by Chikkadêvarâja (1678), 289; referred to, 290.

Bipgi: chief of; assists Sivappa Nâyaka during his expedition to Seringapatam (1659), 216.

Bijikere: acquisition of by Râja Wodeyar (1616), 66; its chief, a feudatory of Kanthïrava, 163; referred to, 46.

Boar seal: see under Varaha-mudre.

Bokkasada Xarasaiya: a treasury official under Chikkadêvarâja, 888,469.

Bôja-Châmârajâ Wofleyar IV (1672-1576): ruler of Mysore in succession to Timmarâja Wodeyar I, 39-42; his identity, and tradition relating to his baldness, 89 (n. 60)-40; his achievements, and political advance, 4041; his domestic life, gifts and death, 42; referred to, 87,113,168, 213, 260, etc.

Bôlamalla: name of the elephant captured during Chîmâraja V's siège of Piriyapatna (1626), 88.

Bommança-Kavi: Jain poet; contemporary of Châmârajâ V, 104.

Bommarasa: Jain poet; his Works referred to, 102.

Bommarasaiya: Niyôgi of Mysore, who took part in Châmârajâ V's siège of Piriyapatna (1626), 88.

Bommarasaiya of Kôlivâda, Sabnis one of the leading generals in the action of Îkkëri against Mysore (1696), 818; his alleged treachery on the occasion, 315; again leads the Îkkëri army (1696), 316.

Bommarasaiya of Piriyapatna: minister of Nanjurda-Râja, who defended his capital (1626), 88.

Bommasamudra: acquisition of by Chikkadêvarâja (1677), 281.

Boswell'a Life of Johnson: quoted, on the limitations of travellers' accounts as narratives, 469 (n. 8).

Brahmapuri: a suburb of Seringapatam, 62, 65, 68.

Brohmôttara-Khanda: a work ascribed to Châmârajâ V, 104.

Bûkankere: acquisition of by Râja Wofleyar (1608), 56; retaken by Châmârajâ V (1624), 87; chief of, who took part in the defence of Seringapatam (1639), 121.


Chakra: an insignia acquired by Râja Wodeyar, 66; referred to, 96.

Châmâiaiya - a protégé of Dëvarâja, 260; his Divaraja-Sangatyâ, 260-251.

Chama-sagara (or Ohamma-samuára): a village named after Châmârajâ V, 101.

Châmârajâ Wofleyar V (1617-1687): ruler of Mysore in succession to Râja Wodeyar, 81-108; birth, accession and identity, 81-82 (n. 4); period of his minority (1617-1620), 82-88; first aggression in the north (1618), 88-84; first aggression in the south (1618-1619), 84-86; local acquisitions (1619-1620), 86; begins indépendant rule on the fall of Dalavi Bettade-Arasu (1621), 86-86; his local campaigns (1621-1680), 87-89; his relations with Îkkëri (down to 1680), 89-91; his new aggressions in the north and the north-west (1680-1681), 91-92; more aggressions (1681-1684), 92-98; his relations with Vijaya-nagax (down to 1686), 98-94 (n. 67-68); his Royal titles, 94-95; political position of Mysore under him (1687), 95-96;
général features of his rule, 96; his ministère, Dalavāï and officers, 96-97; his administrative measures: (a) seullement of conquered tracts, (6) organisation of elephant-hunting, and (c) institution of the armoury (Alagina-chavadi), 97-98 (n. 71-72); his religious toleration, 98 (n. 73)-99; his gifts, grants, etc., 99-101; his court, 101-102; literary activity under him, 103-106; his domestic life, 105-106; his death, 106 (n. 109); his celebrity in history and tradition, 106-107; an estimate of him, 107-108; referred to, 109, 116 (n. 14), 163, 171 (n. 56), 534-686, etc.

Chûmaraja-scumudra: name of an agrahara after Châmârâja V, 100.

Chamarâjanagar Plate (1675): an inscription in Kavya style (see under Tirumalârya II); referred to, 279, 329, 361, 380, etc.

Chamarâjôkti-Vilasa: Kannada prose version of the Ramayana, ascribed to Châmarâja V, 104.

Champu: as a species of literary composition in Chikkadêvarâja's reign, 414.

Chàmunfiêsvarï (Bettada-Châmunfli), Srî: tutelary deity of the Mysore Royal Family; referred to, 21, 98,166, 168, 189, 198, 242, 264 (n. 236), 517, etc.

Châmundi Hills: a scene of action during the Bijâpur siège of Seringapatam (1639), 122; gifts of Dêvarâja at, 287, 267; referred to, 20, 38, 40, 49, 96,168, 377, 617, 619, etc.

Chandanahalli: action at (1640), 127 (n. 53).

Chandragiri: a possession of Sri-Ranga V I, left to him after the Bijâpur treaty of 1664, 146 (n. 107); referred to, 160, 670, etc.

Chandravalli: recent excavations at, in their bearing on Sâtavâhana rule in Mysore, 10.

Chandrasêkhara Wodeyar of Kalale: see under Kalale Family.

Channabasava Setti: Dalavāï of Ikkêri, 313; takes part in the action against Mysore at Hebbâle (1696), 814-816.

Channaiya of Hosaholalu: a feudatory of Kañthirava I,162.

Channaiya of Nâgâmangala: referred to, 83; slays Lihganna of Bannûr, Dalavâï of Châmârâja V (1626), 87 his intrigue with Bijâpur against Mysore (1638-1639), 120; attacked and slain by Kenge-Hanumappa Nâyaka (1640), 125.

Channammaji of Ikkêri (1672-1697): contemporary of Chikkadêvarâja Wodeyar, 273; assista Kôdana-Râma I of Vijayanagar against Mysore (1674), 276; her relations with the Mahrattas (1689-1690), 310; her wars and counter-wars with Mysore (1694-1696), 313-316; her death (1697), 317; referred to, 318.

Channapatna: Viceroyalty of (see under Jagadêva-Raya); extension of sphere of influence of Mysore up to (1620), 85; siège and acquisition of by Châmârâja V (1626,1630), 87, 91; advance of the Bijâpur army on (1638), 119; chief of, 121; northern frontier of Mysore (1659), 166; referred to, 96, 162 etc.

Channarâja Wodeyar: fourth son of Bôja-Châmârâja and half-brother of Râja Wodeyar, 42, 53-65, 74, 76.

Channarâjaiya (Channarâja Wodeyar) of Heggaddêvankôte: Râja Wodeyar's campaign against (1615), 66; Châmârâja V's campaign against (1625-1626), 87-89.

Channarâya-durga: siège and capture of by Chikkadêvarâja (1678), 289.

Channarayapatna (also called Kolatûr): acquisition of by Châmârâja V (1634), 92-98; north-wester limit of Mysore (1687), 95; chief of, 121, 143 (n. 96); north-western frontier of Mysore (1659), 166; referred to, 162,170-172.

Chûrukiirti-Pandita-Yôgïndra: Jain guru of the Sravana-Belagola math, 99; his relations with Châmârâja V, 99,101, 102; referred to, 242, 374, 457.

Chatussamudrddhisvara: one of the imperial titles assumed by Dêvarâja, 224.
Chaupadada-Pustaka: an anonymous poetical work of Dëvarâja's reign, 251; referred to, 236.

Chaupadi: name of a Kannada poetical metre, 251; as a form of poetical expression in Mysore in the works of Chikkadëvarâja's reign, 414.

Chêjûr: acquisition of by Dêvarâja (1663), 220.

Chêngodeya: name of the éléphant sent in as tribute by Ghatta-Mudaliar to Châmarâja V (1627), 89.

Chennàrya: Vïra-éaiva dialectician at the court of Châmarâja V, 102 (n. 89).

Chidânanda: Jain poet, 457; his Muniväméâbhyudaya, 457-458; referred to, 60 (n. 95), 99 (n. 76), 106, 210, 267, 373, 374, etc.

Chikkadëvarâja-Binnapam: (see under Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar); on the religio-philosophical convictions of Chikkadëvarâja, 367-370; referred to or noticed, 304 (n. 119), 322, etc.

Chikkadëvarâja-Dharanïrarnanâbhyudaya: an epic poem in Sanskrit on the rise and fortunes of the Mysore Royal House, 459; quoted from, 102 (n. 88), 103 (n. 94-95).

Chikkadëvarâja-Sûkti-Vilasa (Bhagavata); see under Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar.

Chikkadëvarâja - Wodeyar (1678-1704) ruler of Mysore in succession to his uncle Dëvarâja Wodeyar, 268-616; his lineal descent, 269; birth and early life, 269-271; accession, etc., 272-274; his relations with Madura (1673), 274-276; with Vijayanagar (1674), 276-277; and with Bijâpur (1675), 277-279; his political position about the close of 1676, 279; in 1676-1677, 280-281; Mahratta affairs (with special reference to Siváji's expédition to the Karnâtak, 1677), 281-283; his contact with Sivâji (1677), 283-285; South Indian politics (1677-1680), 286-287; his movements in the south-east (1678), 287-288; in the north (1678), 288-289; his position in 1679-1680, 289-290; général course of affairs (1680-1682), 290-291; his fight for supremacy in the South (down to 1682, with special reference to relations with the Nâyak of Madura, Da|avâi Kumâraiya's siège of Trichinopoly, his conflict with the Mahrattas, Mahratta invasion of Seringapatam, Kumâraiya's retreat from Trichinopoly, etc), 291-299; his renewed fight for supremacy in the South (down to 1686, with reference to his relations with Ikkëri, Gôlkonda, and the Mahrattas Under Sambhâji) 299-304; his political position in 1686, 304-306; his relations with the Mughals (1687), 305-306; his acquisition of Bangalore (1687), 306-308; his recovery of the lost ground (1687-1690), 308-810; his renewed relations with Ikkëri (1690), 310-811; Mahratta and Mughal affairs (1691-1698), 311-813; his friendly relations with the Mughals (1691-1694), 318; his further relations with Ikkëri (1694-1696), 313-316; other events, 316; his political position in 1698, 316-817; the period of consolidation (1698-1704), 817-819; his embassy to Aurangzïb (c. 1699-1700), 319-820; its implications, 820-321 (M. 178); other political activities (c. 1698-1700), 321*328; period of peace (1700-1704), with reference to the political position of Mysore under him (1704), 323-324; général features of his rule, 325-326; his Council of Ministers
INDEX

(1673-1686, 1686-1704), 826-832; bis DaJavSiś (1673-1704), 332-333; officers, officials, etc., 333-335; his administrative measures during 1678-1686, with reference to the strengthening of the army and the fort of Seringapatam, 335-336; coinage and currency, 336; reorganization and administration of local units (gadi), 886-340; fiscal reforms, 840-849; weights and measures, 348-849; industries, trade and commerce 349-861; miscellaneous measures, 361-352; and the working of the reforms, 352-364; his administrative measures during 1686-1704, 354-366; organization of the eighteen departments (chavadi) (c, 1700-1704), 366-367; reflections, 858; religion (with reference to general tendencies of Sri-Vaishnavism), 359-360; ārī-Vaishnavism, his personal faith, 360-368; principal stages in its development (1673-1680,1680-1696, 1696-1704), 363-367; his religio-philosophical convictions, 867-373; religious toleration, 373-375; gifts, etc., 3375-377; an irrigation scheme (c. 1700-1701), 377; contemporary Jesuit testimony, 377-379; grants and other records (1673-1704), 879-387; his statue, 387-388; social life under him, with reference to general features, 387-388; cities and towns, 388-389; the social order, 889; general culture, 389-391; court culture, 391-896; feasts and festivals,396-398; position of women, 398; social legislation relating to the Sūdras (the Sachchudrachara-Nirnaya) and the Ārasu familës, 399-408; and the other side of the shield, 408-411; literary activity under him (with reference to general tendencies and features), 412-414; authors and their contributions, with reference to Sri-Vaishnava literature, 414-454; Vira-Saiva literature, 454-466; Jaina Literature, 467-468; and Miscellaneous works, 469460; the nature of the Vaishnavite riceval, 460-461; his measures of war finance, with reference to the contemporary evidence of the Jesuit Fathers, and the narratives of Wilks and Devachandra, detailed, examined, compared and contrasted, and finally evaluated, 462-495; his domestic life (with reference to queens, etc., and the rise of the Kalale Family down to 1704), 496-500; his death, 500-501; his personality, accomplishments and character, 501-606; contemporary testimony on his greatness, 607; his insignias and titles, 507-608; an estimate of him as a political builder, as a politician, as a ruler, as a religious and social reformer, and as a "Maker of Mysore," 608-614; his celebrity in the eighteenth century literature, 514-615; his claim on posterity, 516-516.

Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar : as the guiding spirit of the literary movement and author, 414; his Bhaṛata-Vachana, Bhagavata (Chikkadēvarāja-Sūkti Vilasa), 440-441; Sachchudrachara-Nirnaya, 441-443; Chikkadēvarāya-Saptapadi and Tripadigala-Tatparya, 443; Chikkadēvarāja-Binnapam and Gita-Gūpalam, 444-445 (n. 137), 446-448.

Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar: evidence of his solicitude for the welfare of the agricultural population, 386 ( 96); note on his coinage, 552-564; his claims to the sovereignty of the South, 670-574; referred to, 4, 212, 228, 229 (n. 66), 246 (n. 148), 251, 263 (n. 181), 264 (n. 186), 265, 256, 530-532, 644-645, 647-549, 650-551, 563-564, etc.

Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar (Chikkadēvaiya): second son of Muppina-Dēvarāja Wodeyar and younger brother of Doddadēvarāja Wodeyar, 113, 212, 213 (n. 9), 537, 547,649, etc.

Chikkadēvarāya-durga : a name given to Jadakana-durga after its bombardment by Chikkadēvarāja (1675-1676), 279; referred to, 386.

Chikkadevaraya Saptapadi: see under Chikkadēvaraja Wodeyar.

Chikkadēvaraya-Vamsavali: a literary work (see under Tirumalaraya 11); as a primary source of Mysore History, 3; referred to or noticed, 17,18-19,26, 45 (n. 2), 48 (n. 8), 61,68 (n. 107), 77 (n. 180), 78,84 (n. 10),86,87 (n. 19), 96,98 (n. 72-78), 106,109 (n. 2), 129 (n. 60), 188 (n. 81), 151 (n. 186), 156 (n. 146), 165 (n. 84), 178 (n. 86), 216 (n. 18), 970 (n. 5), 628-526, 628, 647-649, etc.
Chikkādevēndra-Vamsavali: (see under Timma-Kavi); note on the authorship of, 554-556.

Chikka-totlagere: capture of the fort of by Chikkadēvarāja (1678), 288.

Chikkaiya: agent of Chikkadēvarāja at Sankhagiri, 309.

Chikkanna-Pandita: Jain Ayurvedic scholar; his Vaidya-Nīghantu-Sāra, 458; his Śrī-Vaishnava leanings according to Dēvachandra, 481.

Chikkappa-Gauda: Chikkadēvarāja's campaign against (1676), 280.

Chikkupādhyāya (also known as Lakshmīpati): a minister of Chikkadēvarāja, 272, 827; his ancestry, attainments, etc., 829, 830 (n. 19), 331, 833; as a Śrī-Vaishnava religious leader, 864; his literary school and authorship, 414-415; his Sangatyas (Akhşarandrīka'Sāngatyā, etc.), 415; Kamandaka-Niti and Sūka-Saptati, 416-417; Divya-Sūri-Gharite, 417; Mahatmyas (i.e., Kamalchala-Mahatmya, Hastigri-Mahatmya, Venkata-giri-Mahātmya, Sriranga-Mahatmya, Paschvmaranga-Mahatmya, and Yādavagiri-Mahatmya), 417-420; Bha-gavad-Gītā-Tīku and Rukmāngada-Charitre, 420-421; and other works (including Sēsha-Dharma, Satvika-Brahma-Vidya Vilasa, V ishn u-Purnda, Tīruvaimoli-Tīku, Padma-Purnda-Tīku, Amaruka-Ś a t a k a , Vaidydmīta-Tīku, Artha-Panchaka and Tatva-Trāya), 421-422; referred to, 60 (n. 96), 70 (n. 141), 72 (n. 165), 106, 214, 267, 285 (n. 53), 428, 424,425, 428, 429, etc.

Chikmagajùr: acquisition of by Chikkadēvarāja (1690), 311; north-western limit of Mysore (1704), 328; referred to, 448.

Chinnabasaveshwaranahal{i: chief of, 91, 96; acquisition of by Dēvarāja (1663), 220; northern frontier of Mysore (1673), 288, 237; re-acquisition of by Chikkadēvarāja (1675), 278; lost but retaken by him (1687), 806; referred to, 18, 108,127, 222, 525, etc.

Chinna-Gauda of Pālupare: a feudatory of Kanthirava I, 1,62.

Chintanakal: chief of, 90; assists Sivappa Nāyaka I during his expédition to Sēringapatam (1659), 216; assists Ikkeri against Mysore ($695), 813; referred to, 625.

Chokkalika (or Bokkalika): name of the éléphant captured during the Mysorean campaigns of 1618 and 1642,138.

Chokkanātha (or Chokkalinga) Nāyaka of Madura (1659-1682): contemporary of Dēvarāja Wodeyar of Mysore, 215; his hostile relations with Mysore (down to 1667), 226 (n. 60)-227; takes a leading part in the siège of Erōde (1667), 228-229; his submission to Mysore (1668), 230; contemporary of Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar, 273; his early encounter with Chikkadēvarāja (1678), 274-275; his relations with Tanjore (1673-1678), 277-278, 280, 286-288; and with Mysore and the Maha-rattas (1678-1682), 291-294; his death (1682), 300; referred to, 266, 306,336, 651 (n. 1), 571, etc.

Chōlēnahalli: action at (1631), 92.

Christian Settlements in Mysore (17th cent.): note on, 467 (n. 6).

Coimbatore: Dēvarāja's records from, 230 (n. 69); agent of Chikkadēvarāja at, 309; referred to, 828.

Coinage and Curreny: under'Kanthīrava I,160-162; under Chikkadēvarāja, 836.

Coinage, gold and copper: of Kanthīrava I, 541-543; of Chikkadēvarāja, 552-565.

Coins: a primary source of Mysore History, 1,2; value of as witnesses to contemporary history, 4; of Kanthirava I and Chikkadēvarāja (see under Coinage and Currency and Coulage, gold and copper).

Col lis, J. S.: his anecdote about George Bernard Shaw, on the ways of eyewitnesses of évèntes, 468-469 (n. 8).

Contemporary chronicles and memoirs: a primary source of Mysore History, 1, 2; value of, 5-6.

Coorg (Kodagu): western limit of expansion of Mysore under Kanthirava I, 137, 156; chief of, 174, 188; assists Sivappa Nāyaka I during nia expédition to Sēringapatam (1659), 916;
advance of Mysore arms on (c. 1698-1700), 821, 822; western frontier of Mysore (1701), 328; referred to, 458, 618.

Country Correspondance: E. I. Co's documents bearing on Mysore, contained in, 6 (n. 9)-7.

Court life and culture in Mysore: under Chàmarâja V, with référence to his avocations, 101; and religions disputations, 102; under Kanthirava I, 180-184 (see also under Kanthirava-Narasarâja Wodeyar I); under Dêvarâja, 248-249; under Chikkadevarâja, with référence to the Durbâr Hall, 391; the King, 392; the courtiers, 393 (n. 117)-894; and the programme of the Durbâr, 394-396.

Dâdaji: Mahratta gênerai of Sambhâji's army, 298; takes part, and is slain, in the Mahratta invasion of Seringapatam (1682), 296 (n. 94)-297 (n. 99), 301 (n. 110); referred to, 441, 650-561.

Dakshina-bhujaṇḍa: a distinctive claim to service of Kanthirava I as a loyal feudatory of Srî-Ranga VI of Vijayanagar, 132 (n. 67), 205.

Dakshinadik-Chakravarti: a distinctive title of Chikkadevarâja, 290, 429, 608, 572.

Dakshinarsimhâsana: see under Mysore Throne.

Dakshina-simhâsana-Sriranga-pattanakke karṭarâda: an earlier title of the Mysore Rulers (to the sovereignty of the Seringapatam throne), retained by Dêvarâja, 282.

Dâlâvai: institution of the office of in Mysore (see under Râja Wodeyar); dérivation, etc., of the word, 69 (n. 187).

Dalavdi Agrahdram Plates I (1628): referred to, 40, 67 (n. 81), 63,100.

Dalavâis of Mysore: note on early, 534-586; under Chàmarâja V and his successors (see under Chàmarâja Wodeyar V, Kanthirava-Narasarâja Wodeyar I, Dêvarâja Wodeyar and Chikkadevarâja Wodeyar)

Dâmarlaiyappa Nayaka of Poonamalli: brother of Dâmarla Venkâfâdri; takes part, and is slain, in the siège of Erode (1667), 228 (n. 64)-229.

Danakaru-mariddakke-sunka: an impost levied by Chikkadevarâja, 353.

Dâmarlaiyappa Nayaka of Poonamalli: brother of Dâmarla Venkâfâdri; takes part, and is slain, in the siège of Erode (1667), 228 (n. 64)-229.

Descriptive Catalogue of Mackenzie Manuscripts, by H; H. Wilson: noticed 197 (n. 168); referred to, 434 (n. 97).

Dëvachandra: author of the *Rajavâlî-Katha* (1888), 8; his version of Chikka-dëvarâja's administration, religion, etc., 464-466, 470, 471, 476-481; examined and evaluated, 481-496; referred to or noticed, 528:629, 645, 663-664, etc.; see also under Rajavâlî-Katha.

Dëva-Dëva-Mahârâya of Vijayanagar: son of Srî-Ranga VI; nominal suzerainty of, acknowledged by Dëvarâja (1664), 231.

Dëvaiya: a Dalavaï of Chikkadëvarâja, 298, 832.

Dêvamâjamma: a queen of Dëvarâja Wodeyar, 266, 270, 398, 461, 496-497; her gift, 498.

Dêvâmbudhi: a tank, being a gift of Dëvarâja to Mysore (1666), 238, 267.

Dëvanagara: a cultural unit under Chikkadëvarâja, 389-390; referred to, 380.

Dëvanagara Plate (c. 1686-1690): an inscription in Kâvya style (see under Bâmdyanam-Tirumalârya); referred to, 439, 442.

Dëvâmbudhi: a canal in Chikkadëvarâja's name, 356, 377, 514.

Dëvarâja Wodeyar *alias* Kempadëvarâja Wodeyar (Kempadêvaiya) (1659-1673): ruler of Mysore in succession to Kanthïrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar I, 211-267; his lineal descent, 211-212; birth, accession, identity, etc., 212-215 (n. 5-12); relations with Ikkëri (1659-1660), 215-218; renewed relations (1660-1664), 218-222; relations with Vijayanagar (down to 1664), 222-225; local conquests, etc. (down to 1667), 225-226; his southern movements (with special reference to the siege of Érôde, 1667), 226 229 (n. 66); acquisition of Érôde, etc. (1667-1668) 280; relations with Vijayanagar (down to 1673), 230-233; his local position (1668-1673), and political position of Mysore under him (1673), 233; general features of his rule, 288-284; ministers, officers, Daîavâïs, etc., 284; administrative measures, 284-286; his religion, 236-238; gifts, etc., 286-238; grants and other records (1659-1678), 238-246; his statue, 246; social life under him, 246-249; his patronage of learning and culture, 249-260; literary progress under him, 260-262; early European intercourse with Mysore (1671), 252; domestic life (with special reference to the rise of the Kalale Family, down to 1673), 252-264; his death, 264; an estimate of him as an apolitical builder, as a ruler and as a "Maker of Mysore," 264-267; his celebrity in tradition, 267; note on the identification of as the successor of Kanthirava-Narasa I in later writings and modern works, 644-647; referred to, 113, 269, 270, 360, 428, 430, 433, 537, 547-549, 571, etc.


Dëvarâja-Sangaiya: see under Chaînaiya.

Dëvardya-vatta: an impost levied by Chikkadëvarâja, 353.

Dëpasthana-‘chavadi: one of the eighteen departments introduced by Chikkadëvarâja, 357.

Dhanvôjaiya: jeweller to Kanthïrava I, 182; referred to, 241-242 (n. 121).

Dharanî-Varâha: one of the insignias acquired by Râja Wofleyar, 66; referred to, 95, 224, 319, 607.

Dhârâpuram: acquisition of by Dëvarâja (1667), 230; southern limit of Mysore (1678), 233, 237; reduction of the chief of by Chikkadëvarâja (1673), 275.


Dharmapuri: acquisition of by Kanthirava I (c. 1658), 147; its siege by the Mahrattas (c. 1680-1681), 293; province of, 301; retaken by Chikkadëvarâja (1689), 309.

Dhûîigôte: capture of by Chikkadëvarâja (1673), 274.


Diary of Ânanda Banga Pillai, The: a primary source of Mysore History, 1, 2; value of, 7-8.

Dindigal: Mysorean advance up to (c. 1668), 226 (n. 60); referred to, 6T (n. 182.
Divya-Sūri-Charite : see under Chikku-padhyāya.
Dodballāpur (Ballāpur) : referred to, 18, 136,127,150, 282, 526, etc.
Dodda-Bēlîr: inscription of Chikka-dēvarājā from (1673), 276,879.
Doddadēva-Gaganagirī : name of a peak taken by Chikkadēvarṇājā (1676), 280.
Doddadēvarājā Wodeyar (Doddadēvaiya) : eldest son of Muppina-Dēvarṇa Wodeyar by his second wife Kempaniāmbâ (Kempamma), elder brother of Dēvarṇa Wodeyar, and father of Chikkadēvarṇājā Wodeyar, 118; indications of his rule jointly with Kanthīrava I, 202 (n. 167-168); his identity, etc., 208 (n. 170, 173); his renunciation (c. 1659), last days and death (c. 1669), 253-254 (n. 186), 256; his Śrī-Vaishnava prēdhilections, 253, 360-361; referred to, 178 (n. 85), 201 (n. 166), 212, 213 (n. 9), 214 (n. 11), 256-258, 266, 267, 269, 280, 376, 380, 381, 430, 433, 537, 544 (n. 1)-546, 547-649 (n. 1), etc.
Do44a-Dēvarṇa Wodeyar: a prefix by which Dēvarṇa Wodeyar alias Kempadēvarṇa Wodeyar, the actual successor of Kanthīrava I and predecessor of Chikkadēvarṇājā Wodeyar, is generally mentioned in later writings, 214 (n. 11), 246, 267, 544 (n. 1)-646.
Dodda-Hebbāruva, chief of Kannambāḷī; Rājā "Wodeyar's campaign against (1608), 66.
Dodda-Pandita of Yelandūr: see under Visallaksha-Pāṇḍit.
Doddaya of Channāryapatanā : a feudatory of Kanthīrava I, 186 (n. 75), 143, 162,171-172 : referred to, 234, 239, 244, etc.
Doddaya of Haradana-ballī : a feudatory of Kanthīrava I,136 (n. 76), 162.
Doddaya of Kalale : nephew of Dajavāi Kumāraiya; repels the Mahratta invasion of Seringapatam (1682), 296 (n. 96); Dajavāi of Chikka-dēvarṇa during 1682-1690, 298,299 (n. 103), 311, 332, 333; referred to, 499, 650-551.
Doḍdaya of Piriypatana : Jain poet; his work referred to, 102.
Dudda: a village where Kenge-Hanumappa Nāyaka is said to have been slain (1640), 126.

Eastern Gâte of Seringapatam: one of the principal gates of the Seringapatam Fort, 174.
Ekadasi-Nirnaya : see under Tiruma* lārya 11.
Ekadasi-Vratam : observance of by Kanthīrava 1,164-165.
Ekōji (Venkōji) : half-brother of Sivāji; his conquest of Tanjore (1675) and after (down to 1687), 278, 280, 281-282, 286, 288, 289, 290, 293, 299, 300, 802, 303, 806; his sale of Bangalore to Chikka-dēvarṇa (1687), 306-807 (n. 130-131); his last year and death (c. 1688), 808 (n. 134); referred to, 273, 442.
Elephant-hunting : organisation of in Mysore (see under Chāmarājā Wodeyar V).

English Factories in India, by William Foster: E. I. Co's documents bearing on Mysore, contained in, 4; see also under Hague Transcripts.
Epies and Purāṇas: popularity of in Mysore under Kanthirava 1,179,183, 191.

_Epigraphia Carnatica_, edited by B. L. Bioe: inscriptions of the rulers of Mysore, contained in, 2; noticed, 20 (n. 4), 34 (n. 23), 60 (n. 96), 61 (n. 97), 62 (n. 101), 64 (n. 113,114), 78 (n. 182), 97 (n. 66), 100 (n. 82), 107 (n. 111), 116 (n. 14), 134 (n. 74), 136 (n. 76), 143 (n. 96), 247 (n. 151), 252 (n. 178), 383 (n. 79), 546, etc.

Feasts and festivals in Mysore: under Kautsiïrava I, 184-193; under Dēvārāja Wodeyar, 247; under Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar, 396-397.

_Ferishta: see under Masuru._

_Fort St. David Consultations: E. I. Co's documents bearing on Mysore, contained in, 6._

_Foster, William: see under English Factories in India._

_French Correspondence: E. I. Co's documents bearing on Mysore, contained in, 6._

_Fryer, Dr. John: see under Travels in India._

_Gaḍi: an administrative unit, 68, 97; reorganization and administration of under Chikkadēvarāja, 336-340._

_Gaja-Bēnʃekara: one of the titles of Chāmarāja V, 94-95, 98 (n. 71)._

_Gajārānya-Nysimha-Paurāṇika: composer of the Honnalagere Plate (1623), 104-105 (n. 103)._

_Gajēndra-Mōksha (also called Gajēndra-Tirundh Gajēndrôtsavam): a function observed annually during the car festival of Ranganātha in Seringapatam, 167, 185, 186,198; an annual festival at Mêlkō|e under Chikkadēvarāja, 863, 397._

_Gajjiganahalli Plate (1639): on the Yādava descent of the Wodeyar Dynasty, 25 (n. 17)-26, 28; referred to, 40,117,131,159,169,195,201 (n. 163)._

_Gambhīra-Rāya-Virupanua: a minister of Venkata I, sent to the court of Rāja Wodeyar(1612),63._

_Ganda-bherunda: one of the insignias adopted by Chāmarāja V, 94, 95; referred to, 819, 507._

_Gangadhara: name of the éléphant captured by Mysore from Ikkēri (1663), 221._

_Ærode: siège of by the southern confederacy (headed by Śrī-Ranga VI, Chokkanātha, etc.) (1667), 227-229; Mysorean advance on and acquisition of, 229-230 (n. 65-67); southern limit of Mysore (1673), 233; Chikkadēvarāja's march on (1678), 287; referred to, 266, 265, 270,434, 571, etc._

_Æru-sunka: an impost levied by Chikkadēvarāja, 363._

_Foster, William: see under English Factories in India._

_French Correspondence: E. I. Co's documents bearing on Mysore, contained in, 6._

_Fryer, Dr. John: see under Travels in India._

_Garojina-Basavappa-Dēvaru: Ikkēri général; his encounter with Mysore (c. 1698-1700), 321._

_Garāṇi Plates (1680): referred to, 290,382._

_Garuda: an insignia acquired by Rāja Wodeyar, 66; referred to, 95, 319._

_Garuda-dhvaja: standard of Chikkadēvarāja, 502._

_Garuda-Purāṇa: on the duty of the ēûdra, 399._

_Gauramma: a junior queen of Chikkadēvarāja, 497; gift of (1690), 498._

_Ghatta-Mudaliar of Sâmballi: a récalcitrant chieftain below the ghots, subdued by Chāmarāja V (1627), 89 (n. 39); opposes, and is defeated by, Dēvārāja (c. 1667), 227-228; loses his dependencies (1668), 230; acquisition of his forts by Chikkadēvarāja (1678), 287; referred to, 129 (n. 66, 57, 60)._
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(1691-1698), 811-812; referred to, 146, 148,150, 228, 278, 282, 288, 286, 290, 294, 801, 306, 810, 817, m8, 324, 551, 571, etc.

Gîta-Gôpdlam : (see under Chikka-dëvaraja Wodeyar); on the religio-philosophical convictions of Chikkadëvarâja, 870-373 ; referred to, 374,375.

Gîta-Rangèsvara : see under Singararya III.

Glosa on the Yadugiri-Narâyana-Stavah : see under Singararya III.

Gôlkonda : relations of with the Karnâtak, under Abdullâ Qutb Shab, 117, 118,188,140,141-142, 145-147, 149-151, 205 ; her death-struggle with Aurangzîb (1669), 214; dwindling of the power of in the Karnâtak, 220, 265 ; her renewed struggle with Aurangzîb, 273; relations with Sivâji (c. 1676-1677), 282; in league with Ikkëri and Sambhâji against Mysore (1682), 299, 301; fall of (1687), 308; referred to, 287, 809, 324, 508-509, 570, 573, etc.

Gôpâlaràjaiya of Kannambâdi : Châmarâja V's encounter with (1618, 1626), 84,88.

Gôpâlaràjaiya of Katfce-Majalavâlî : - Ràja Wodeyar's campaign against (1616), 66.

Gôvinda-Vaidya : poet; his attainments, 178,196 ; his Kanthîrava-Narasaraja-Vijayam (1648), 196-200; referred to or noticed, 3,45,60 (n. 95), 78,117 (n. 15), 121 (n. 28-29), 174 (n. 70), 187 (n. 128), 528, 624, etc. ; see also under Kanthirava'Narasaraja-Vijayam.

Gûlûr : acquisition of by Chikkadëvarâja (1675), 278.

Guluvina-pommu : an impost levied by Chikkadëvarâja, 363.

Gundlu-Terakanâmbi (or Gunflu) : south-west of Mysore ; place of retirement of Bettada-Châmarâja Wodeyar, 105 ; early life of Kanthîrava I in, 114; referred to, 124, 200-201, 212, 253, etc.

Gunflumale-durga : siège and capture of by Chikkadëvarâja (1678), 289.

Gurikdr: an officiai of the Kandachar service, 334, 337 ; referred to, 238.

Guruvâmbâ (Guruvâjamma) : wife of Bettada-Châmarâja Wodeyar and mother of Kanthîrava I, 74,113.

Guruvanna of Kannumbâdi : a feudatory of Kanthîrava I, 162,182.

Hâdya : acquisition of by Châmarâja V (1626), 88.

Hague Transcripts, The : referred to by William Foster in the English Factories in India; on sri-Ranga VI's asylum in Mysore (c. 1650-1653), etc., 146 (M. 101, 106), 146 (n. 107), 147 (n. 113,118), 151 (n. 136).

Haidar Alî (1717-1782) : Wilks's treatment of the course of affairs leading to the usurpation of, 2 ; life and times of as recorded in the Haidar-Namah (1784), 5-6 J referred to, 516, 580.

Haidar'Namdh (1784) : a primary source of Mysore History, 5 (n. 6-7); value of, 6.

Halagannada : as a médium of literary expression in Mysore (17th cent.), 194 ; Works in, 196, 418.
Mlagere Plates (1668) : on the Yâdava descent of the Wodeyar Dynasty, 26 ; referred to, 40, 218, 240 (n. 113), 249.

Halepaika : a military community serving in the local militia of Mysore, 24, 43, 65; Nâyaks take part in the sièges of Piriyâpatna (1645), 135; referred to, 260.

Hammick, Sir Murray : editor of the new édition of Wilks's History of Mysoor, 1 (n. 1) ; noticed, 289 (n. 63), 355 (n. 74).

Hampaiya of Maddûr: a feudatory of Kanthïrava I, 162.

Hampaiya of Turuvêkere : a feudatory of Kanthïrava I, 136 (n. 75), 162.

Hampâpura : acquisition of by Kanthïrava I (1644), 134 ; referred to, 128.

Hamparâjaiya (Hampaiya) of Kârugarahalli : a Dajavâi of Kanthïrava I, 146-147 ; takes part in the Mysorean invasion of Madura (c. 1655-1657), 152 (n. 139) ; leads the Mysore army against Ikkêri (1659), 215-218; his dismissal (April 1660), 234; referred to, 159, 218.

Hanasôge: acquisition of by Ohâmarâja V (1626), 88.

Hebbâle : sièges of by Mysore (1661), 219 ; action at, between Ikkêri and Mysore (c. 1695), 314.

Hémbâl : scène of opérations of the Mysore army against Ikkêri (1664), 221; referred to, 126.

Hegaddêvankôte (KÔte) : Râja Wodeyar's encounter with the chief of (1596), 54 ; his campaign against (1616), 66: acquisition of by Châmharâja V (1625), 87 ; chief of, 121, 162 ; referred to, 18, 36, 525, etc.

Hêmâdri: enumeration of the sixteen great gifts described by (and performed by Dëvarâja), 236-237.

Hemmanahalji : a patrimony of Timmarâja Wodeyar II, 86 ; referred to, 620.

Hemmaragâla : chief of, a feudatory of Kanthïrava I, 162-168.

Heras, Rev. H. (S. J.) : (see under Aravidu Dynasty) ; his article on The Expansion Wars of Venkatappa Nâyaka I of Ikkêri, referred to and noticed, 90-91 (n. 44-45).

Hindu-râya-suratrâna : one of the impérial titles assumed by Dëvarâja (1663), 224 ; a title of Chikkadêvarâja, 290, 508.
Hiriyà-Basappa Nàyaka x (Basappa Nłyafca) of Ikkêri (1697-1714) : adopted soti of Channammâji, 273; his relations with Mysore, as joint ruler with his mother (1674, 1682), 276, 299, 800 (n. 106), 301 (n. 108); accession of (697), 318; his peace with Mysore (c. 1700), 321; referred to, 306, 816.

Hiriyà-Bettada-Châmarâja Wofleyar I (1423-1459) : traditional ruler of Mysore in succession to Yadu-Râya, and founder of the Kenchalgud branch of the Mysore Royal Family, 33.

Hiriyà-Châmarâjarasa Wofleyar II, the Arborai (1478-1513): traditional ruler of Mysore in succession to Timmarâja Wodeyar, 33.

Hiriyà-Beftada-Châmarâja Wogeyar III (1618-1563) : first ruler of Mysore within the limits of authentic history, 33-38; his identity, 33-34; his acquisition of the title Antembara-ganda., 34-35; glimpses of Mysore under him, 35-36; political position of Mysore during his reign, 86; his domestic life, and his partition of territories, 36 (n. 42, 47)-38; his gifts, etc., and death, 38; referred to, 62,96,259,260,488,519, etc.

Hiriyà-Hanumappa Nàyaka of Tarikere: contemporary of Châmarâja V, 90.

Hiriyà-Sômaéëkhara Nâyaka I of Ikkêri (1664-1671): successor of Bhadrappa Nàyaka, and contemporary of Dêvarâja Wodeyar, 218; his hostile relations with Mysore (1664), 221; concludes peace with her (1664-1665), 221-222; referred to, 227, 278.

Hiriyà-Venkatappa Nâyaka I (Venkatappor Venkatâdri Nâyaka) of Ikkêri (1664-1671): successor of Bhadrappa Nàyaka, and contemporary of Dêvarâja Wodeyar, 218; his hostile relations with Mysore (1664), 221; concludes peace with her (1664-1665), 221-222; referred to, 227, 278.

Hiriyà-Venkatappa Nàyaka I (Venkatappaor Venkatâdri Nàyaka) of Ikkêri (1682-1629) : relations of with Châmarâja V, 88-90; referred to, 621-622.

Historical Fragments, by Robert Orme : E. I. Co's documents bearing on Mysore, contained in, 4; referred to or noticed, 146 (n. 106), 262 (n. 176), 305, 806 (n. 126), 808 (n. 184).

Historical Sketches of the South of India in an attempt to trace the History of Mysoor (1810), by Lt. Col. Mark Wilks : see under Wilto.

Hôbliâdr: an official of the Kandâchar service, 888; referred to, 68.

Hogesoppina-chavadi : one of the eighteen departments introduced by Chikkadevaràja, 867.

Hoje-Narasipur (Narasimhapura) : Râja Wodeyar's relations with the chief of (1684,1609), 47,56 (n. 79)-57; western frontier of Mysore (1617), 67; Châmarâja's campaign against (1681), 92; chief of, 96,134, 163, 188; relations of with Ikkêri and Mysore (1659, 1662), 216, 219; acquisition of by Dêvarâja (1666), 226; referred to, 18, 623, 624.

Honganûr : acquisition of by Châmarâja V (1626), 88.

Honmalagere : scène of action during the Mahrratta invasion of Seringapatam (1682), 295, 297 (n. 108).

Honnalagere Plate (1623) : referred to, 81 (M. 2), 96, 99,103,106 (n. 108).

Honnamma : poetess of Chikkadevaràja's court, 398, 414, 450; her Hadibadeya-Dharmam, 450-454.

Honnamâmbâ (Honnâjamma) : wife of Narasarâja and mother of Châmarâja V, 81 (n. 2).

Honnamma of Katte-Majalavâdi : a feudatory of Kanthirava I, 162.

Honnavalli : acquisition of by Dêvarâja (1663), 221; retaken and annexed by Chikkadevaràja (1676-1676), 278, 281; referred to, 220.

Homme-madu : a village ; scène of action (1618), 83-84.

Honnrû: scène of opérations of the Mysore army against Ikkêri (1664), 221.

Hosagannaça : as a médium of literary expression, 195; works in, 104, 197, 251; use of in the productions of Chikkadevaràja's reign, 418.

Hosahojalu : acquisition of by Râja Wofleyar (1615), 66; scène of action during the Bijâpur siège of Seringapatam (1689), 122; chief of, 162; referred to, 128.

Hosana-nadu : land of the Hoysajas; a geographical unit in Southern Karnä-tak, 12.

HosakSte (Mysore district): a fort belonging to Jagadéva-Râya; siège and capture of by Châmârâja V (1618), 84.
(Bangalore district): part of Shâhji’s jahgîr, 282, 291; acquisition of by Chikkadêvarâja (1688), 309; referred to, 121 (n. 28).

osûr (Salem district): acquisition of by Kanthirava (1654), 148; referred to, 121 (n. 28).

osûr (Tumkûr district): siège and capture of by Chikkadêvarâja (1678), 288-289 (w. 63-64).

ûdêvu: a terra applied to Mysore in the 14th and 16th centuries, denoting an irregular fort, 24, 36; note on, 618.

uliyûr-durga: scène of action between the Mysore and Bijâpur forces (1640), 126; acquisition of by Dëvarâja (1667).

Hullshalli: acquisition of by Râja Wodeyar (1616), 66; chief of, a feudatory of Kanthîrava 1,162; referred to, 46, 497, 498, etc.

Hullu-haça: an impost levied by Chikkadêvarâja, 863.

Human equality: Chikkadêvarâja’s conception of, 613-614.

Hura: acquisition of by Râja Wodeyar (1614), 66; chief of, who took part in the defence of Seringapatam (1689), 121; referred to, 86, 46, 74, 114, 117 (w. 16), 127,139, etc.

Husain Khân: a Bijâpur général, 276, 278, 281.

Hûvaiya: Niyôgi of Mysore, 126 (n. 39), 127.

Jagadêva-Râya: chief of the Channa-pafa 1 Viceroyalty, 46, 66, 66, 67, 88; relations of with Châmârâja V, 88 (n. 7) -86, 87, 91; referred to, 96, 166, 526, etc.
Jâgara : scène of opérations of the Mysore army against Ikkêri (1064), 221.
Jâhângîr Khân : a Bijâpur général, 278, 281.
Jaini-Bhûrata : see under Lakshmîsa.
Jaina literature : under Chikka-dêvaràja (see under Chikka-dêvaràja Wodeyar).
Jaina tradition : relating to the origin and founding of the Wodeyar Dynasty, 22-28 ; examined and evaluated, 26 (n. 19).
Jainism in Mysore : under Râja Wodeyar, 70 (n. 142) ; under Châma-râja Wodeyar V, 98-99 (n. 74, 76), 101, 102 (n. 92) ; under Kaâthinava-Narasaràja Wodeyar I, 167 (n. 44) ; under Dêvaràja Wodeyar, 236, 242, 246 (n. 148), etc ; under Chikka-dêvaràja Wodeyar, 363, 864, 373, 874 ; later accounts of by Wilks and Dêvachandra, 475, 480, 482-488.
Jaitaji : Maharra général of Sambhâjî's army, 293 ; takes part, and is slain, in the Maharra invasion of Seringapatam (1682), 295 (w. 94)-297 (n. 99), 301 (n. 110) ; referred to, 819, 441, 560-551.
Jakka ; a chief who assisted Tirumala II during the siège of Kesare (1596) ; Bâja Wodeyar's exploit against, 64 ; referred to, 526.
Jangamas : evidence of Chikkadêvaràja's respect for, 876 ; traditional tales of their revolt and massacre, during Chikkadêvaràja's reign, as narrated by Wilks and Dêvachandra, examined and evaluated, 470-495.
Jati-manya : as a secondary source of Mysore History, 8.

Kalasa : scène of opérations of the Mysore army against Ikkêri (1664), 221.
Kalale: chief of, 46 ; Râja Wodeyar's conquest of (1615), 66 ; referred to, 69, 266, 497, etc.
Kalale-Family : rise of (down to 1673-1704), 258-263, 499 ; its origin and early traditional history, 258-269 ; under Kânta Wodeyar I (1605-1527), 259-260 ; Timmarâja Wodeyar I (1527-1546), 260-261 ; Nandinâtha Wodeyar (1546-1564), Mallarâja Wodeyar i' (1664-1691), Kânta Wodeyar II (1591-1605), Chandrasëkhara Wodeyar (1605-1615) and Mallarâja Wodeyar II (Karikâla-Mallarâja) (1615-1644), 261-262 ; Timmarâja Wodeyar II (1644-1660) and Mallarâja Wodeyar I I I (1660-1679), 262-263 (n. 227) ; and Mallarâja Wodeyar IV (1679-1719), 499 ; early relations of with the Mysore Royal Family (down to 1673), 88, 86, 42, 66, 69-70, 263-264, 266 ; (down to 1704), 499-600.
Kalåsa : scène of opérations of the Mysore army against Ikkêri (1664), 221.
Kallans (Thieves) : forest of, 142-144 ; their war of brigandage during the Mysorean crises of 1682-1686, 303.
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Kalve-Kottagdla: first political acquisition of Mysore under Bôla-Châmarâja IV (ç. 1574), 41.
Kamalûr: acquisition of by Dêvarâja (1668), 230.
Kamandaka-Niti: see under Chîckupâdhya.
Kântaiya of Kajale: a Dajavâi of Devarâja, 218, 219, 220, 284, 268.
Kanthîrava-Narasarâja-Wodeyar I (1638-1659): ruler of Mysore in succession to Immadi-Râja Wodeyar, 112-210; his lineal descent, 113; birth and early life, 114-116; accession, etc., 116-119; his relations with Bijâpur (1639-1641), 119-128; siège of Mârata-hajji, etc., (1641-1642), 128-130; acquisition of Sâmballi, etc., 181; relations with Vijayanagar (down to 1648), 131-182; relations with local powers (down to 1644), 132-134; annexation of Hampâpura (1644), 134; sièges of Pâlupare and Piriyâpa^na (1645), 184-136; annexation of Piriyâpatna, etc., (1645-1646), 136-137; renewed relations between Mysore and Bijâpur (1646-1647), 137-189; acquisition of Basavâpatna (1647), 139-140; relations with Ikkëri (1647), 140; his renewed relations with Vijayanagar (down to 1650), with référence to South Indian affairs, 140-143; acquisition of Hebbûr (1650), 143-144; further relations with Vijayanagar (c. 1660-1653), 144-146; his local position, minor acquisitions, etc. (1650-1652), 146-147; further relations between Mysore and Bijâpur (1652-1663), 147-148; Mysore and Madura (1654), 148-151; relations with Madura (1666-1659), 152-155; his further relations with Ikkëri (1657-1659), 155-156; political position of Mysore under him (1659), 166-167; his ministers, officers and Dajavâis, 168-160 (n. 8); administrative measures, with référence to (1) Defence (2) Coin âge and Currency (1645) and (3) Seulement of conquered tracts, 160-162; his feudatories (c. 1647-1650), 162-163; religion, 168-166; gifts, etc., 166-168; a scheme of public utility (c. 1645-1648), 168-169; his grants and other records (1639-1657), 169-173; authentic statues of his, 173; social life under him (1638-1648), with référence to cities and towns, 178-177; général culture, 177-179; daily life, amusements, etc., 179-180; court...
culture, costume and personal adornment, 180-182; his personal servants, 182; his daily Durbâr and local titles, 182-184; festivals (including the Mahânavami in Seringapatam, described), 184-198; and contemporary mariners and morals, etc., 194; learning and literary activity under him (with special reference to Gôvinda-Vaidya and his Kanthirava-Narasaraja-Vijayam, 1648), 194-200; domestic life, 200-203; his last days and death, 208; an estimate of him as a warrior, as a political builder, as a ruler, and as a "Maker of Mysore," 203-209; his celebrity in tradition, 209-210.

Kanthirava-Narasarâja Wodeyar I: evidence of his solicitude for the welfare of the rural folk, 171 (n. 60); note on the coinage of, 541-543; referred to, 4, 5, 211, 212, 214, 216, 264, 860, 430, 488, 638-549, 570, etc.

Kanthirava-Narasarâja Wodeyar II: only son of Chikkadêvarâja Wodeyar; birth of, 498; his physical disability, 600; reign of (1704-1714), referred to, 614.

Kâpphirîwaiya (Kauthirava-Arasu): younger son of Doddadêvarâja Wodeyar and younger brother of Chikkadêvarâja Wodeyar, 212, 255; his grant (1670) for the merit of his father, 265-266, 267; gift of (1676), 498.

Kanthiraya-hana: a gold coin issued by Kanthîrava I (1645), 161; referred to, 210, 641-642.

Kanthuraya-varaha: a gold coin issued by Kanthirava I, 161; referred to, 642.

Karanaika: designation of an official, 68, 162.

Karapika Lingannaiya: see under Lingannaiya.

Karikala-Mallarâja (Mallarâja Wodeyar II) of Kajale: (see under Kalale Family); Râja Wodeyar's relations with (1615), 66; first Dalavsi designate of Mysore under Râjâ Wodeyar, 69; referred to 499.

Karya-Vrittanta Kathe: a poetical work attributed to Pradhani Tirumalârya (Tirumalârya I or Tirumalâiyangar D, contemporary of Raja Wodeyar, 78; note on the authorship of, 529-688.

Karnata Empire, The throne of Chikkadêvarâja's claim to rule from (1676), 279, 286.


Karnâtak: derivation of, 10; political geography of its southern part (14th cent.), 1248; its administration under Vijayanagar (down to 1610), 18-19; relations of with Bijâpur (1687-1656) (see under Bijâpur); position of Bijâpur in (after 1659), 215, 217 (n. 21), 220, 266; its political position in 1673, 273, 276; Sivajî's expédition to (1677), 281-285; Mahratta sovereignty in, 290-291, 293; Chikkadêvarâja's claims to supremacy of, 306; Mughal advance on and Mahratta struggles in (1687-1698), 806, 808, 310, 311-312, 316; Chikkadêvarâja's position in (1698), 317; referred to, 5, 318, 328, 509, 570, 571, 578, etc.

Karnâtak-Bijâpur-Bâlaghat: formation of the Bijâpur, province of in the Karnâtak (1666), 160; northern frontier of Mysore (1659), 166; its position from 1656 onwards (down to 1704), 220, 278, 278-279, 284, 287, 289, 291, 304, 305, 308, etc.

Karnâtak-Bijâpur-Pâyanghat: formation of the Bijâpur province of in the Karnâtak (1666), 150; south-eastern frontier of Mysore (1659), 166.

Karnâtaka-Chakravarti: a distinctive title of Chikkadêvarâja, 290, 809 (n. 142), 310, 429, 508, 572.

Karnataka-Chakrësvara: a title ascribed to Kantchïrava I, 184.


Karnâtâaka-aka-Kavi-Charité by B. Naraśimhabhar: noticed, 72 (n. 156), 94 (n. 67), 196 (n. 149), 197 (n. 168), 250 (n. 170), 261 (n. 173), 417 (n. 12), 419 (n. 11), 420 (n. 28), 421 (n. 84), 445 (n. 137), 449 (n. 146), 460 (n. 155), 461 (n. 158), 564-565.

Karnataka Kuruvara-Chakra: a title ascribed to Dëvarâja, 261.
**Kartar (or Karta)**: a title of the Rulers of Mysore from Raja Wodeyar onwards, 64 (n. 114); its rétention in the records of Dêvarâja, 232-233.

Kârugarahalli: chief of (see under Vira-rajaiya); referred to, 23, 24, 32.

Kârya-karta: king's agent in the local parts of Mysore, 97, 334.

Kâsaragôdu Timmanna Nâyaka: Re under Timmanna Nâyaka of Kasa-ragôdu.

Kâśipati-Pañflita: 18th century Commentator; on Chikkaâëvarâja's sover­eignty of the Karnâtaka country, 299 (n. 103).

Kastûri-Ranga: chief of Sïra; slain during Ranadullâ Khân's march on Bangalore (1638), 119.

Kathâriya-Salva: a title of Châmarâja V, 94.

Katte-Majalavâdi: Râja Wodeyar's campaign against (1615), 66; acquisition of by Châmarâja V (1626), 88; chief of, a feudatory of Châmarâja V and Kanthïrava I, 97, 162.

Kâvëripattanam: taken by Bijâpur (1647), 141; action at, between Mysore and Bijâpur (1653), 148; south-eastern frontier of Mysore (1669), 166; lost but recovered by Chikkadêvarâja (1689), 309; referred to, 207.

Kâvëripuram: acquisition of by Kanthïrava I (c. 1642), 131; march of the Mysore army through the passes of (1682), 296.

Kavikarna-Rasayana: see under Shad* aksharadêva.


Kashuvikketaradu: traditional mode of impaling of people on the point of the sword as reflected, and uncritically shifted on to Chikkadêvarâja, in the Jesuit letter of 1686, 467-468; note on, 666-568; referred to, 664.

Keḷadi: see under Ikketi.

Keladi'Nripa'Vijayam by Linganu-Kavi: a secondary source of Mysore History, 8 (n. 12); on the successive capitals of the Ruling Chiefs of Ikkêri (1500-1763), 88 (n. 93); noticed, 137 (n. 81), 155 (n. 145-146)-156, 313 (n. 154), 522, etc.

Kembal: a patrimony of Krishnarâja Wodeyar, second son of Hiriya-Bottada-Châmarrâja Wodeyar I I I, 87; annexation of by Râja Wodeyar (1590), 48; referred to, 620.

Kempadêvamma: see under Dévdjamma of Yeândûr.

Kempadêvarâja Wodeyar (Kempe­dêvaiya): see under Dévarâja Wodeyar.

Kempaiya: a Dalavâi of Kanthïrava I, 144, 159.

Kempaiya of Satyâgâla: a feudatory of Kanthïrava I and father of Dalavâis Nanja-râjaiya and Lingarâjaiya, 114; referred to, 144 (n. 98).

Kenchalgûtf branch of the Mysore Royal Family: foundation of (see under Hiriya-Bottada-Châmarrâja Wodeyar I); referred to, 620.

Kenge-Hanumappa Nâyaka (Pûvala-Hanumappa Nâyaka or Kenge Nâyak): chief of Kenge or Basavâpatna, and contemporary of Kanthïrava I and father of Dalavâis Nânja-râjaiya and Lingarâjaiya, 114; referred to, 144 (n. 98).

Kërala: see under Malabar.

Kërala: see under Malabar.

Kereyûr: chief of, 18; Timma Nâyaka of, who took part in the siège of Kesare (1596), 524,526.
The siege of (1696): (see under Raja Wodeyar) note on poetical works bearing on, 628-526; referred to, 68 (n. 84), 60 (n. 96).

Kêtasamudra: acquisition of by Chikkadêvarâja (1676), 278.

Khân Muhammad (Khân-i-Khanan): Bijjipur general, 187; succeeds Mustaffi Khân to the chief command (1649), 142; takes part in the affaira of 1663-1664, 146-146, 147-160.

Khânfleya: scene of operations of the Mysore army against Ikkêri (1664), 221.

Khâsim Khân: Mughal general of Aurangzib; his march on the south (March 1687), 306; his occupation and final evacuation of Bangalore in favour of Chikkadêvarâja (July 10-14, 1687), 306-307 (n. 126-131); Faujdârof Sra, 807; his activities against the Mahrattas and death (1695), 812; referred to, 813, 318.

Kikkêri: acquisition of by Bâja Wodeyar (1615), 66; chief of, 121, 162, 182.

Killedar: an official of the Kandachar service, 338.

Kingdom of Mysore, The: beginnings of under the rulers of the Wodeyar Dynasty (down to 1578), 83-43; rise of under Râja Wodeyar (1678-1617), 46-67, 79-80; évolution of under Châmarâja Wodeyar V (1617-1637), 82-86, 87-93, 96-96, 106-108; political position of under Immadi-Râja Wodeyar (1687-1688), 111; political development of under Kauthïrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar I (1688-1659), 119-167, 204-208; and Dêvarâja Wodeyar (1669-1673), 216-288,264-266; political development and consolidation of under Chikkadêvarâja Wodeyar I (1678-1704), 288-824,608-611,515-616,670-574.

Kirangûr: a scene of action during the siege of Kesare (1596), 64.

Kirifitas: assist the chief bt Jafikahadurga during Chikkadeva's campaign against him (1676-1676), 279.

Kirtanegalu: see under Tirumalidyra II.

Kôdagu: see under Cooro.

Kôdanfla-Bâma I of Vijayanagar. nephew of érl-Ranga V I; leads a combination against Mysore, and wins a short-lived victory at the battle of Hassan (1674), 276-277, 279; referred to, 672.

Kôdi-Bhairava, temple of in Mysorean traditional resting place of Y ad u-Râya and Krishna, 21; referred to, 35; note on, 619.

Kodiyàla: place of retreat of Tirumala II's adherents during Râja Wodeyar's advance on Seringapatam (1610), 59.

Kollipet: acquisition of by Chikkadêvarâja (1695), 315.

Kôlâla: chief of, who takes part in the siege of Kesare (1596), 526; referred to, 18.

Koleya: chief of, who assists Nanjarâja of Hadinâd against Bâja "Wodeyar (1614), 65.

Konjanûr: fort of; taken by Mysore during the war with Ikfcëri (1662), 219.

Kongas: advance of Mysore against, before and during the siege of Éröde (1667), 228, 229.

Kongu, chief of: Kanthîrava I's campaign against (1641), 129; a feudatory of Kanthîrava, 174; referred to, 458, 648.

Kongu-nddu: Chikkadêvarâja's campaigns in (1676), 276.

Kônkañ: chief of: a feudatory of Kanthîrava I, 174, 188; assists éivappa Nâyaka I during his expédition to Seringapatam (1669), 216.

Korafcgere: acquisition of the fort of by Chikkadêvarâja (1678); 288.

Kôia: see under Yuktikalpataru.

Kôfere-kerev chief of a feudatory of Kanthîrava 1,162.

Kôte-Koldhala: one of the titles of Kanthîrava 1,184.

Kottegâla: acquisition of by Râja Wodeyar (1616), 66; re-acquisition of by Châmarâja V (1626), 89.

Kottatti: scene of action during the Mahratta invasion of Seringapatam (1682), 295, 297 (n. 99).

Kottûraiya,ôl Kikkêri: a feudatory of Kaotbirava J; and his agent at Bâligrâma, 169, 162 (n. 21), 171 f. m
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Krisna-jayatüi: & popular festival in Chikkadēvarāja's time, 396. *.

Hrishnā-ēarma: an official of Chikkadēvarāja; his Sarajā-Hanumtdra- Yaēō-Vilsa, 469.

Kriahmappa Nāyaka of Aigūr: Mysorean advance against (1674), 277; (1690), 311; assists Ikkeri against Mynaore, and dies (1694-1695), 813-316; referred to, 321, 435.

Kriahmappa Nāyaka of Arkalgūçl and Bélūr: Rāja Wofleyar's campaign against (1608), 67; subjugation of by Immafl-Rāja Wofleyar (c. 1638), 110; Kanthhirava I's oampaign against (1647), 140; a feudatory of Kaņṭhīrava, 156, 163.

Kriahmappaiya of Ikkeri, Sabnis: assists Kōdançla-Rāina I of Vijayanagar against Mysore (1674), 276.

Krishnarāja Wodeyar: second son of Hiriya-Bettada-Chāmarāja Wofleyar III, 36-37 (n. 47); see also under Kembal.

Krishnarāja Wofleyar I: reign of (1714-1732), referred to, 616.

Krishnarāja Wodeyar II: affairs of the reign of (1734-1766), as recorded in the Haidar-Nāmah, 6.

Kudūr: siège and capture of by Chikkadēvarāja (1678), 288.

Kulagāna, chief of; a feudatory of Kantbirava I, 162.

La Mission DM- Madurè (166&1686), edited by Father J. Bertrand (S. J.): Jesuit letters bearing on Mysore, contained in, 4.


Lakshamma: one of the principal "queens of Kaōthīrava I, 200.

Lakshmappa Nāyaka of Hoje-Narasipur: Rāja Wofleyar's exploit against (1609), 67; Chāmarāja V's campaign against (1631), 92; hostile; relations of with Dfyarājk (1669-1660), 216, 218.

Lakshmi-Narasimha-s-vāmī temple: its construction in Seringapatam by Kaṇṭhīravi I (c. 1646-1648), 185-166.

Kulaiēkhara) name of the elephant captured by the Mysore army during the siège of Érōde (1667), 229.

Kumarāiyai of Kaḷæle: last of the Daja- vāis of Dēvarāja (in succession to Nanjanăthaiya), 226; breaks up the confederacy at Érōde (1667) an4 advances up to Trichinopoly (1668), 229-230; continues as Dajaivāi of Chikkadēvarāja (during 1673-1682), 272; takes part, and is defeated, in the battle of Hassan (1674), 276-277; proceeds to the assistance of Chokkanātha Nāyaka of Madura (1680), 291-292; his claims to and siège of Trichinopoly (1682), 292 (n. 75)-298 (n. 82), 294-295; his retreat and retirement, 297-298 (n. 102); referred to, 234, 251, 256, 263, 266, 269, 270, 296, 332-333, 879, 497, 499, 560, 651, 672, etc.

Kunigal: acquisition of by Dēvarāja (1668), 280; referred to, 57, 126, 127, 163, 188, etc.

Kuntūr: siège and capture of by Chikkadēvarāja (1678), 287; lost but re-acquired (1689), 309.

Kuri-terige: an impost levied by Chikkadēvarāja, 363.

Kūtāçhara : an impost levied by Chikkadēvarāja, 853.

Kuthara: an insignia of Chāmarāja V, 95.

Land-tax: organisation and administration of under Chikkadēvarāja, 341-348; heaviness of, examined and explained, 843-344 (n. 54).


his gifts, etc., to it, 166-167; a monument of his raie, 209; referred to, 178, 176.

LakBhmïpati; see under chikkudpdhyaya.

Lakshmïpati, Rāyasada: royal scribe of Dēvarāja, 234 (n. 87), 249; his manuscript copy (1668) of Ranna's Ajitandtha-Purāna, 261 (n. 173).

Lakshmìa: his Jaimini Bhàrata, 459-460 (n.196).

Land-tax: organisation and administration of under Chikkadēvarāja, 341-348; heaviness of, examined and explained, 843-344 (n. 54).


Letters from TelUeherry: E. I. Co's documente bearing on Mysore, contained in, 6-7.

Letters to Fort St. George: E. I. Co's documents bearing on Mysore, contained in, 6; referred to, on the relations between Madura and Mysore (1680-1682), 288, 291, 292 (n. 76), 293 (n. 82), 660.

Lingama Nâyaka: artillery officer of Madura, who took part in the siège of Érófle (1667), 228.

Lingança-Kavi: see under Ke\adi-Nripa- Vijayam.

Lingança of Bannûr: a Dalavâi of Châmarâja V, 86 (n. 17), 87-88, 97, 98 (n. 74); referred to, 634, 635.

Lingançaiya, Karauika: one of the councillors of Chikkadêvarâ a, 272; leads the embassy to the court of Aurangzîb (1699-1700), 819; referred to, 827, 381, 832.

Madras Oriental Manuscripts Library: collections bearing on Mysore, in, 2, 8.

Madura, kingdom of: relations of with Mysore (c. 1619-1686) (see under Muttu-VirappaNayakaI, TirumalaNdyaka, Ghokkandtha Ndyaka and Muttu-VirappaNdyaka IIII); represented at the court of Kanthïrava I, 163, 188, 207; referred to, 65,67, 279, 817,824, 436, 608, 670, 671, etc.

Maduwe-terige: an impost levied by Chikkadêvarâja, 853.

Magaddagiya: an impost levied by Chikkadêvarâja, 858.

Mahdbhdrata: on the duties of a Ôûdra (see under Sachchildrdchdra-Nirnaya).

Mahdbhandêvra: a title of the Vijayanâgar provincial Vioeroy, 12 seq\ an earlier désignation of the Mysore Bulers, retardedin the records of Dêvarâja, 228,232, 288.
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Mahânavami (Navardtri): Râja Wofleyar's organization of the Durbdr during the festival of and his Ùrst célébration of it (1610), 68-69; in Seringapatam under Kanthirava I, 186-187 (n. 121); its célébration in 1647 (September 19-28), 187 (n. 123)-188; the eight days' Durbdr, 189-190; the detailed programme, 190-191; the ninth day, 191-192; the tenth day, 192-193; a popular festival under Dévarâja, 247; under Chikkadêvarâja, 388, 397; referred to, 61,140,198, 209, etc.

Mahârâjana-durga: acquisition of by Ohikkadêvarâja (1690), 311.


Mahratta invasion of Seringapatam (1682): note on the date of, 560-661.

Mahrattas: rise of under Sivâji, 273; activities of in the South (1675-1686), 278, 280, 281-283, 284-286, 287, 289, 298-298, 299-306; (1687-1698), 306-306, 308-310, 311-313; claims of to Empire in the South (see under Mysore, Mahrattas and the Mughals); referred to, 314, 318, 320, 323,324, 436, 608-611, etc.

Maisa-nddu: Mysore situated in, 21; referred to, 617, 618.

Makara: an insignia acquired by Kâja Wofleyar, 66; referred to, 95, 319.

Makuba\]li copper-plate grant (1635): referred to, 74, 78, 94,101.

Malabar (referred to as Maleydja, Maleydchala, Kerala, etc.): chief of, a feudatory of Kanthirava I, 174,188; assiats āivappa Nâyaka during his expédition to Seringapatam (1659), 216; Chikkadêvarâja's advance on, 281, 321, 322, 323, 468.

Majali: acquisition of by Chikkadêvarâja (1673), 274.

Malavajji: acquisition of by Châmâraja V (1623), 87; chief of, 121, 162, 182; a flourishing place under Chikkadêvarâja, 889, 390; referred to, 96.

Maleyâchala: see under Malabar, Maleyldla: see under Malabar, Malik Rahlm: a Bijâpur général, 186.

Målangi: a village near Talakâflî Tirumala'B retreat to (1610), 69; referred to, 626.

Mallarâja Wodeyar I of Kajale: see under Kajale Family.

Mallarâja Wodeyar II of Kajale: see under Kajale Family and Karikdla-Mallarâja.

Mallarâja Wofleyar I I I (MaUarajaiya) of Kajale: (see under Kajale Family); Dajavâi of Dévarâja in succession to Hamparâjaiya, 218, 234, 263; referred to, 499.

Mallarâja Wodeyar IV of Kalale: see under Kajale Family.

MaUarajaiya of Kajale: see under Mallarâja Wodeyar I I I.

Mangalmâl of Madura (1689-1706): dowager-queen of Chokkanâtha Nâyaka and contemporary of Chikkadêvarâja, 808, 818, 606 (n. 47), 661 (n. 1).

Mannârgudi: acquisition of by Chikka-dêvarâja (1688), 809.

Mangammâl of Mâlangi: acquisition of by Chikkadêvarâja (1688), 289.

Manuguondle-durga: acquisition of by Chikkadêvarâja (1689), 809.
Manu’smriti: on the duties of a Sûdra (see under SacheMdrchdra-Nirnaya).

Màraithajji : siège of by Kanthîrava I (1641), 128-129.

Maravas: assist Tirumala Nâyaka during the Mysorean invasion of Madura (c. 1665-1657), 152; part played by them in the Mysorean fight for Bupremacy in the South (1680-1686), 293, 294, 300, 302, 303.

Maridévarâja Wofleyar (or Mari-dëvaiya) : last son of Muppina-Dëvarâja Wofleyar and younger brother of Dëvarâja Wofeyar, 118, 212, 218 (n. 9); his grants, 258; referred to, 537, 648.

Màsûru : siège of, and not Mysore, in 1593 ; note on, correcting Ferishta, 521' 523.

Mathsi endowments to, as recorded in inscriptions, 3; maintenance and upkeep of ander Dëvarâja, 236.

Mâlâ-Venkatapati : a feudatory of Kôdano!a-Râma I; takes part in the action against Mysore (1674), 276.

Matsya: an insignia of Châmarâja V, 95.

Mâyais: capture of by Chikka-dôvarâja (1678), 289.

Military Consultations: unpublished volumes of, containing E. I. Co's documents bearing on Mysore, 6 (n. 9); 7.

Military Country Correspondence : unpublished volumes of, containing E. I. Co's documents bearing on Mysore, 6 (n. 9), 7.

Mîr Jumla : Gûlkonda generalissimo, 141,146,147.

Mitravindd-Gûvindam : see under Singarârya 111.

Monegdra: a title ascribed to Timmarâja Wodeyar II, 89.

Mîr Jumla : Gûlkonda generalissimo, 12; referred to, 119, 525.

Morasas: take part in the Bijâpur siege of Seringapatam (1639), 121; assist the chief of Jadakana-durga against Chikkadêvarâja (1676), 279; overawed by him (c. 1700), 822, 323.

Muddaiya: Dajavâi of Dëvarâja in succession to Mallarâjaiya (Mallarâja III) of Kajale, 218, 234.

Muddaiya of Nâgamangala : a feudatory of Kanthîrava I, 162.

Muddaiya of Nàndu: land of the Kannafla-speaking Morasu Vokkaligas, 12; referred to, 119, 525.

Mughal Administration, by J. Sarkar: referred to, 338 (n. 50), 339 (n. 61), 341 (n. 58).

Mughal administration: influence of on Chikkadéva's administrative machinery, examined, 365, 358.

Mughals : advance of on the Deccan and the South, under Aurangzib (down to c. 1700), 278, 281, 288 287, 804-308, 310, 811-313, 318, 509; claims of to Empire in the South (see under Mysore, Mahrattas and the Mughals).

Mfigûr: chief of, 68, 67; acquisition of by Râja Wofleyar (1615), 66.
Muhammad Adil Shah of Bijâpur (1627-1666): contemporary of Kanthîrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar I, 117; his relations with the Karriâtak including Mysore (see under Bijapur); referred to, 10, 5.

Muhammad-Ndmdh, by Zahur bin Zahuri: as a primary source of Mysore History, 5; noticed, 120 (n. 19), 139 (n. 87), 145 (n. 106), 148 (n. 121); note on, as an authority on the siège of Seringapatam (1639), 539-541; see also under Sarkar, J.

Mullûr: acquisition of by Râja Woçleyar (1591), 49.

Mummadi-Kempe-Gaufla (or Chikka-Kempe-Gaudia) of Mâga (1658-1678): contemporary of Kanthîrava I, 143-144 (n. 97), 163 (n. 23); Dêvarâja's campaign against (1667-1668), 230; Chikkadëvarâja's campaign against (1678), 288.

MunivamBhyudaya: a literary work (see under Chidânanda),

Muppina-Dëvarâja Wodeyar: third son of Bôl-Châmarâja Wodeyar, half-brother of Râja Wodeyar and father to Doddadëvarâja Wodeyar, Kemptadëvarâja Wodeyar (Dêvaraja Wodeyar), etc., 42, 313; accompanies Râja Wodeyar to Seringapatam during his visit to Tirumala (c. 1696), 51, 52; takes part in the siège of Kesare (1596), 54; his gift (1625), 106-106; his death (c. 1656), 201 (n. 165); his Vaishoava prêdictions, 85, 164, 361; referred to, 74, 76, 202 (n. 167-168), 212, 213 (n. 9), 214 (n. 11), 255, 258, 269, etc.

Muppina-Dëvarâja Wodeyar and his sons: note on, 537.

Mûru-manneyara-ganda: one of the titles assumed by Dêvarâja (1663), 224.

Music: popularity of as an art under Kanthîrava I, 179; vocal and instrumental, including the guitar (Tumbura) and the lute (Vinâ), under him, 183, 191; including the lute (Vinâ) and the Panoha mahdevâda, under Chikkadëvarâja, 392, 894,395 (n. 120).

Mustafâ Khân: Bijâpur gêneralissimo in succession to Eanaduilâ Khân, 127; takes part in the aSairs of 1640-1641 and 1646-1647, 127-128, 133-139, 141; his death, 142; referred to, 147,198.

Mustânjafâ: a place taken by Chikka-dëvarâja' during the campaign of 1673,274.

Muttulinga Nâyaka: youngerbrother of Chokkanâtha Nâyaka of Madura, 286-287 (n. 66), 291.

Muttu-Vîrappa Nâyaka I of Madura (1609-c. 1623): his relations with Mysore under Châmârâja V (c. 1619), 83, 86.

Muttu-Virappa Nâyaka III of Madura (1682-1689): son and successor of Chokkanâtha Nâyaka and contemporary of Chikkadëvarâja, 300, 308.

Mysore: foreign relations of, as reflected chiefly in the external sources, 4-8; Pre-Wofleyar Dynasties in, 10-19; kingdom of under the Wodeyar Dynasty fee under Kingdom of Mysore).

Mysore: early référence to and forms of the word, 20-21; note on the dérivation of, 517-618.

Mysore: building of the fort of, and named Mahistûr-nagara (1524), by Hiriya-Betfcada-Châmarâja Wodeyar 111(1513-1553), 35-36; a patrimony of Bôja-Châmârâja Wodeyar IV (1572-1676), 87; absence of evidence for the siège of by Bijâpur (in 1693), 49 (n. 21) (see also under Mâsûr); description of the city of under Kanthîrava I, 176 (n. 75); state of society and culture in, under him, 177-178, 179, 180; description of the city under Chikkadëvarâja, 389 i referred to, 69, 70, 121, 122, 168, 185, 194,198, 202, 237, 238, 261, 255, 267, 525, etc.

Mysore: Chikkadëvarâja's fight for the supremacy of in the South (1680-1686) (see under Chikkadëvarâja, Wodeyar); claims of to Empire in the South (see under Mysore, Maharattas and the Mughals).

Mysore Archmological Report, The: inscriptions of the rulers of Mysore, contained in, 2; noticed, 201 (n. 165), 202 (n. 168), 203 (n. 170), 240 (n. 116), 255 (n. 191), 379 (n. 62), 541-643, 552-664, etc.

Mysore Gâte: one of the principal gâtes of the Seringapatam Fort, 174, 296; at Kuûîgal (1674), 880.
Mysore QaxeiÜtr (New édition): noticed, 161 (w. 186), 155 (n. 146), 229 (n. 66), 247 (n. 161), 276 (n. 80), 486 (n. 19), 646, 661 (n. 1), etc.

Mysore Gazetteer (Old édition): noticed, 2 (n. 2), 151 (n. 186), 264 (n. 186), 264 (n. 286), 272 (n. 12), 821 (n. 178), 484 (n. 19), 646, 661 (n. 1), etc.

Mysore History: sources of (see under Sources of Mysore History); Wilks's treatment of the early period of (see under Wilks), Mysore, Mahrattas and the Mughals: note on the relative claims of to Empire in the South, 670-674.

Mysore Palace: description of under Kanthirava 1, with référence to principal apartments (like the Durbār Hall, Council-chamber, etc.), 176 (n. 76).

Mysore Throne (known as Bhôja-simhâ-sana, Dakshinasimhdsana, Ratnasimhdsana, etc.): acquisition of by Râja Wooleyar (1610), 61; références to in the inscriptions of Mysore Bulers (from OhâmarajaV down to Chikkadëvarâja), 96-97, 168, 188, 190, 224 (n. 61), 282 (n. 81-82), 288, 246, 279, 285, 819, 821 (n. 178), 826 (n. 1), 392, etc.

Mysore Oriental Manuscripts Library: collections bearing on Mysore, in, 8.

Nagamangala: acquisition of by Châmarâja V (1618,1630), 88,84, 91; northern frontier of Mysore (1637), 95; chief of, 121,162,182.

Nallappa: manuscript of Haidar-Nmdh from the family of, 5 (n. 6).

Nafûr (or Na]ür): an assignaient of Râja Wooleyar (c. 1617), 76 i referred to, 67, 688.

Nâmakal: acquisition of by Chikkadëvarâja (1697), 816.

Ndmatritham: Örl-Vaishuava daily rite observed by Chikkadëvarâja, 845, 862, 365.

Ndna-varna-makuia -man d al i k ar a -gana: one of the titles adopted by Dëvarôja, 324.

Nandaka: sword of Chikkadëvarâja, 867, 602 (fl. 28).

Nandakô: one of the titles adopted by Dëvarôja, 324.

Nandakô: one of the titles adopted by Dëvarôja, 324.

Nandaka: sword of Chikkadëvarâja, 867, 602 (fl. 28).

My su ru-Dhoregala-Purvabhyudaya.

Vivara: a secondary source of Mysore History, 8 (n. 10); referred to or noticed, 24, 27, 31-84, 44, 47 (n. 13), 52 (n. 47), 109 (n. 1-2), 119 (n. 19), 139 (n. 87), 146 (n. 110), 148 (n. 121), 644, etc.

MysürU'Dhoregala'VamVmyâli': a secondary source of Mysore History, 8; referred to or noticed, 23, 27,109 (n. 2), 111 (n. 12), 117 (n. 15), 119 (n. 19), 126 (n. 42), 127 (n. 63), etc.

Mysüru-hôbali-ast agramada- hâvdâ: one of the eighteen departments introduced by Chikkadëvarâja, 366.

Mysüru-hObali-vichdrada-chdv ad qâdi: one of the eighteen departments introduced by Chikkadëvarâja, 355.

Mysuru-Nagarada-Pûrvôttara: a secondary source of Mysore History, 8 (n. 11); on the traditional origin and founding of the Wolleyar Dynasty, 23-24,27,28, 29, 30 ; referred to, 32, 45.

Mysùru-Râjara-Charitre, by Venkata-ramanaïya: a secondary source of Mysore History, 8; on the traditional origin and founding of the Wolleyar Dynasty, 23, 26-27; referred to or noticed, 45, 56 (n. 79), 106 (n. 109), 109 (n. 1-2), 115 (n. 12), 145, 292 (n. 75), 833, etc.

Nandarkô: one of the titles adopted by Dëvarôja, 324.

Nandaka: sword of Chikkadëvarâja, 867, 602 (fl. 28).

Nandakô: one of the titles adopted by Dëvarôja, 324.

Nandaka: sword of Chikkadëvarâja, 867, 602 (fl. 28).

Nandakô: one of the titles adopted by Dëvarôja, 324.

Nandaka: sword of Chikkadëvarâja, 867, 602 (fl. 28).

Nandakô: one of the titles adopted by Dëvarôja, 324.

Nandaka: sword of Chikkadëvarâja, 867, 602 (fl. 28).

Nandakô: one of the titles adopted by Dëvarôja, 324.

Nandaka: sword of Chikkadëvarâja, 867, 602 (fl. 28).

Nandakô: one of the titles adopted by Dëvarôja, 324.

Nandaka: sword of Chikkadëvarâja, 867, 602 (fl. 28).

Nandakô: one of the titles adopted by Dëvarôja, 324.

Nandaka: sword of Chikkadëvarâja, 867, 602 (fl. 28).

Nandakô: one of the titles adopted by Dëvarôja, 324.

Nandaka: sword of Chikkadëvarâja, 867, 602 (fl. 28).

Nandakô: one of the titles adopted by Dëvarôja, 324.
Nanjarâjâ of Hadinâçf: Bâja Wofleyar's exploit over (1614), 66; referred to, 69, 87, 88.

Nanjarâjâ "Wofleyar of Haradanahalji: Bâja Wofleyar's campaign against (1616), 66.

Nanjarâjaiya, Karâchûri: his struggle for Trichinopoly as narrated in the Haidar-Ndmdh, 6.

Nanjarâjaiya of Hura: son of Kemparâjaiya of Hura, 114; Dajavâî of Kanjhïrava in succession to Timmarâjaiya, 127 (n. 62); plays a prominent part in the affaira of 1640-1647, 127-130, 182, 184-186, 189; his death, 189; referred to, 117 (n. 15), 169, 160 (n. 8), 197, 198.

Nanjarâjaiya 1 of Kajale: the general entrusted with the southern campaigns of Dëvarâjaiya (c. 1669-1663), 226 (n. 60), 263.

Nanjarâjaiya of Talakâçl: Râja Wodeyar's campaign against (1607), 56; referred to, 85, 524.

Nanjarâyapatna: a town in Coorg, 187, 156; chief of, 163, 188.

Nanjunç-a-Arasu (or Nanjunç-a-Bâja): Changujaiya chief of Piriyâpatna; Râja Wodeyar's campaign against (1610, 1617), 65, 66, 70; Châmarâjaiya V's campaign against (1626), 88, 89; Kanjhîrava l'a campaign against (1645), 134-187; referred to, 140.

Narasappa Wodeyar (Narasa Nâyaka) of Ifalakana-durga: Chikkadêvarâjaiya's campaign against (1675-1676), 279, 280.

Narasarâjaiya : eldest son of Bâja Wodeyar and father of Châmarâjaiya V, 59, 62, 74-76, 81 (w. 2)-82 (n. 4), 100.

Narasimha Nâyaka of Hoje-Narasipur: Bâja Wodeyar's campaign against (1684), 47; Eanthîrava l's campaign against (1644), 134; Dëvarâjaiya's campaign against (1666), 226.

Narasimha-Suri: composer of the copper-plate grant from Tonflanûr (1647), 195.

OUkdr: an official of the Kanddchdr service, 888-899; referred to, 68, Naronelli (or NaranaJji): acquisition of by Bâja Wofleyar (1596), 49.


Navardri: see under Mahdnavaivami.

Navilûr: arent-free village granted by Venkata I to Bâja Wodeyar (c. 1609), 67; referred to, 100.

Ndyaks of Madura, by B. Satyanatha Aiyar and S. K. Aiyangar (Editor): noticed, 67 (n. 132), 93 (n. 54), 138 (n. 81), 160 (n. 130), 151 (n. 186), 155 (n. 146), 205-206 (n. 179-183), 215 (w. 13), 221 (n. 37), 229 (n. 66), 276 (n. 80), 280 (n. 41), 293 (n. 82), 821 (n. 178), 605 (n. 47), 651 (n. 1), 572-573 (n. 1), etc.

Nilusôge, chief of: a feudatory of Kanjhîrava I, 162.

Nimbâjî: Maharatta general of Sambhâjî's army; takes part, and is slain, in the Maharatta invasion of Seringapatam (1682), 295 (n. 94)-296, 301 (n. 110) referred to, 319, 550-651.

Nirûpasi included in inscriptions, 2 (n. 4).

Nirûpada-çdvadi: one of the eighteen departments introduced by Ohikkadêvarâjaiya, 855.

Niyôgi: derivation and meaning of, 50 (n. 35).

Nonavinkere: action at (1640), 127.

Nose-cutting: a feature of Mysorean warfare; earliest instance of in Mysore History (c. 1674), 41 (n. 74); during the siège of Kesare (1696), 64; during the Bijâpur siège of Seringapatam (1639), 122, 124; during the counter-invasion of Mysore by Madura (c. 1667-1669), 163-154; during éivappa Nâyaka I's retreat from Seringapatam (1660), 218; in the warfare of 1678, 1682 and 1696, 289, 296, 315.

Nhrâi: composer of the Oâjjiganaha\i Plate (1689), 195.

Nuggëhajli: taken by Dajavâî KumSrîaiya (1674), 277; referred to, 18, 626.

Nüronda: poet; see under Saundara-Kdvya.

Ordeals: persistence of belief in, 897-898.
Oriental Historical Majmœfifin, by William Taylor: noticeâ; 98 (n. 54), 226 (n.60).
Origin and foundation of the Wodeyar

Padma-Pûrâna- Tiku : see under Okikkupadhyaya.
Padmâoôa-Paôflita : see under Rayasdra-Satnuchehaya.
PadminH-Kalydôa : see under Eringûramma.


Palace History: see under Annals of the Mysore Royal Family

Palace Library, H. H. the Mahârâja's, Mysore: manuscript of Haidar-Ndmah from.

Pâlghât (Palakdd): chiefs of, protected by Chikkadévarâja (1703), 822.
Pâlupare: chief of, 90; sièe and capture of by Kanhirava I (1646), 134.
Pancha-mahâvadya: music of, under Chikkadévarâja (see under Music).
Parakala-Math: probable beginnings of in Mysore, in Dêvarâja's reign, 247 (n. 151).

Parama-râvuta Guruvaôna: Châma-râja V's campaign against (1631), 91 (n. 48).

Paramatti: taken by Chikkadévarâja (1673), 274-275 (n. 20); loot but retaken (1689), 309.

Para-rya-bhâyankara: one of the titles adopted by Dêvarâja, 224.

Paravâsudéva temple at G'unglupet: built by Chikkadévarâja, 375-376; his Bhakta-vigrahâ in, 387; referred to, 206.

Pdrupatyagdr: asubordinate executive officers, 238, 334, 337, 348, 349.
Pdiavdra: an impost levied by Chikkadévarâja, 853.

Paichîñnaranga-Mdhâtmya: see under Oihkkupadhyaya.

Paichîmaranga-Mdhâtmya: see under Timmu-Kavi.

Paichimarangardja-Stavah: see under Tirumaldryla II.
Pattalaya of Samballi: Kanhirara I's campaign against (1641), 129.

PAYASTHY: see: under Wodeyât' Dynasty.

Orme, Robert: see under Historical Fragments.

Paftanada-châvaôi: one of the eighteen departments introduced by Chikka-
dévarâja, 356.

Patanada-hôbali-açfaghrâmada-chhvadii one of the eighteen departments introduced by Chikka-
dévarâja, 356.

Patfandâ-aôbali-vichfîra', name of a department in Mysore under Kauthîr-

Pattanada-hîbâlirviharardâ-c+hvadâi: one of the eighteen departments introduced by Chikka-
dévarâja, 355.

Payment in kind: under Chikka-
dévarâja, 341-843; utility of, 344.

Penriâgara: acquisition of by Kanhî-
rava I (c. 1658), 147.

Penukôra (Ghânâgiri): jyost-Ilaksas-

Tagäl capital of the Vijayanagar Empire, 16; final sièe and acquisi-
tion of by Bijâpur (1653), 145-146 (n. 107), 147; referred to, 61 (n. 97), 82, 98-94 (n. 67), 107, 131, 140, 227, 231, 247, 305, 812, 515, 527, 570, 671, etc.

Piriyâpaôa: chief of, 121; sièe and annexation of by Kanhirava I (1645), 136-136, 138, 171 (n. 66), 198, 206; referred to, 18, 88, 89, 95, etc.

Political data in literary works and inscriptions of Chikka-
dévarâja's reign: treatment of, 274 (n. 18).

Pommîna-châvdâi: one of the eighteen departments introduced by Chikka-
dévarâja, 356.

Position of women in Mysore: under Kanhîrava I,179,182 (n. 100) ; under Chikka-
dévarâja, 398.

Prabhu-Channarâja Wofleyar (Prabhu-
dèva) of Kafte-Majalavâgi: Châma-
râja V's campaign against (1626), 88, 89, referred to, 97.

Pratâp Nâyaka: Kânhîrâva I'a campaign against (1646), 137.

Pre-hiatory: traces of in Mysore, 10.
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Pre-Wodeyar. Dynasties in Mysore: account of, 10-19; beginnings of history, 10; features of Vijayanagar provincial administration (1386-1610), 11-19.

Press List of Ancient Records in Fort St. George: a guide to Fort St. George Records, 6 (n. 8).

Proceedings of the Indian Historical Records Commission: documents bearing on Mysore, mentioned in, 4.

Proenza, Jesuit Father: his letter in La Mission Du Maduré referred to or quoted on the affairs of c. 1647-1669, 142 (w. 92), 144-145, 149-150, 162-163; criticism of, 154, 208.

Prostituition: as a social evil under Kanthirava I, 194; a deep-rooted evil

Quasi-historical works: a secondary source of Mysore History, 1, 2; value of, 8-9.

Bagale: a Kannada poetical mètre; use of in the works of Chikkadévaraja's reign, 414.

Raghavabhyudaya; see under Singararya 111.

Ragbunâth-Pant: confidential minister of Shâhji, 281; his rôle in Sivâji's expédition to the Karnâtak (1677), 282; referred to, 286.

Baghungâtha-Sètupati: the Marava chief who supported Madura against Mysore (c. 1655-1657), 152.

Raglan, Lord: see under Tradition.

Raja-mudi: a jewelled crown endowed by Râja Wodeyar to the shrine of Srî-Nârâyana at Mêlkôte, 70.

Râja Wodeyar (1578-1617): ruler of Mysore in succession to Bettada (Dévarâja) Wodeyar, 44-80; principal authorities for his reign, 44-45; birth, accession and early life, 45; his full name, 46 (n. 6)-46; his political position (in 1578), 46; first signa of aggression (1584), 46-47; his relations with Tirumala (c. 1688-1691), 47 (n. 18)-49; his further aggressions (1692-1696), 49-50; his designs on Seringapatam (c. 1596) 50-51; his proposed visit to Tirumala, 51; an attempt on his life 51-63; the siege of Kesare (belonging to Mysore) by Tirumala (1596), 63 (n. 62)-66; subsequent relations between him and Tirumala (1696-1607), 66-66; fresh attempt on his life (1607), 66; further relations (1608-1610), 56-69; his acquisition of Seringapatam (February 8, 1610), 59-60; the acquisition, a conquest, 60 (n. 96)-61; its effects, 61 (n. 97)-62 (n. 101); Seringapatam, the new capital of the kingdom, 62; his subsequent relations with Venkata I of Vijayanagar (during 1610*1614), 62-65 (w. 113-114); his further territorial acquisitions (1610-1617), 65-66; his political position and extent of his kingdom (1617), 66-67 (n. 132); his rule with reference to the ideal of Dhurma interpreted, 67-68; his administrative measures, 68; organization of the Mahânawmi Durbâr (1610), 68-69; institution of the office of Dalavâi (c. 1614), 69-70; his religion, gifts, grants,
etc., 70-71 (n 143.148); his statues, 71; his piety, 72; literary activity during his reign, 72-78; his domestic life, 73-76; his last days, 76; his death, 77 (n. 180); his celebrity in history and tradition, 77-78; an estimate of him, 78-80; referred to, 81 (n. 2), 106, 108, 109, 118, 115 (n. 10), 116 (n. 14), 168, 281, 262, 429, 431, 621, 628, 624, 526-532, 534, 535, 537, etc.

Raja- Chikkadêvarâj-Muhammad-Shâyi: inscription on the seal said to have been sent to Chikkadêvarâja by Aurangzïb (c. 1700), 819.

Râjâ Jagadev: a title said to have been conferred by Aurangzïb on Chikkadêvarâja (c. 1700), 319.

Râjâiaya: an agent of Châmarâja V, 97.

Râjaiya of Terakauâmbi: a feudatory of Kanthîrava 1, 162, 182.

KàjârSm: younger brother of Sambhâji; fortunes of, 810, 311-312.

Rajasëkhara-Vilasa: see under Shadak-sharadèva.

Rajavali-Katha (1888), by Dêvachandra: a secondary source of Mysore History, 8; on the traditional o r i gin and founding of the Wodeyar Dynasty, 22-23, 26 (n. 19); noticed, 70 (n. 142), 77 (n. 180), 102 (n. 92), 105 (n. 105), 106 (n. 109), 109 (n. 1-2), 111 (n. 10), 116 (n. 10), 122 (w. 83), 130 (n. 60), 203 (n. 174), 212 (n. 5), 254 (n. 186), 270 (n. 5), 272 (n. 13), 806 (n. 125), 378 (n. 38), 408 (n. 165), 528-529, 645; see also under Dêvachandra.

Raksas'Tagdi (Râkshasa-Tangadi), battle of (1566): its general political effects in their bearings on Vijayanagar provincial administration, 15-19; referred to, 61, 278, 869, etc.

Bâmabùna: name of the Ikkêri éléphant which took part in the action at Hebbâje (1696), 314-315.

Rama-Dïkshita: a Brâhman dialectician at the court of Châmarâja V, 102 (n. 89).

Ramagiri-durga: taken by Bijâpur (1688), 119; acquisition of by Kaũthi­rava I (1640), 126.

Ramakrishnaiya: Niyôgi of Ikkêri, 125 (n. 89), 126, 133.

Ramalinga: name of the éléphant sent in as a present to Châmârâja V in 1618 and 1631, 88, 92.

Rama-navami: a popular festival under Dêvarâja, 247; and during the reign of Chikkadêvarâja, 396.

Râmânujaiya: Fradhâni and Dalâvai of Tirumala II in Seringapatam, 18; referred to, 47, 75.

Râmappa Guda of Maddagiri-sîme; Chikkadêvarâja's campaign against (1678), 288.

Râmarâjaiya (Râma III): Vijayanagar Viceroy in Seringapatam (c. 1669-1581) under Tirumala I and Sêri-Ranga I I, 17; his relations with Bôla-Châmârâja Wotfeyar IV of Mysore (1572-1676), 40-41; referred to, 46, 47 (n. 18), 529.

Ramarâjîyamu: on the battle of Hassan (1674), 277.

Râmasamudra: acquisition of by Râja Woodyar (1616), 66.

Râmâyânam-Tirumalârya: Ôrï-Vaishnava scholar and poet of Chikkadêvarâja's court, 414, 448; his composition of the Dêvanagara Plate and other inscriptions in Kavya style, 449-450.


Ranadullâ Ehân (Rustam-i-zamàn): Bijâpur generalissimo, 118; plays an active part in the Karnâtak affaire of Bijâpur (1637-1640), including the siège of Seringapatam (1639), 118-123, 126-127; referred to, 198, 278, 640, 641, etc.

Rangamma: queen of Tirumala I I , 59; referred to, 526.

Rangappa Nâyaka of Hole-Narasipur: a feudatory of Kanthîrava 1, 163.

Rangasamudra: a village granted by Tirumala II to Râja Wodeyar (c. 1698), 56; an assignaient of Râja Wofleyar (c. 1617), 76; chief of, a feudatory of Kanthîrava 1,163 referred to, 49,67.

Rânuve: an élément of the local militia in Mysore, 24, 238.

Bainaswthsana: see under Mysore Throne,
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Ratnagiri: acquisition of by Kaitthîrava I (c. 1653), 147; referred to, 141.
Ratnäkara-Varnî: Jain poet; his Bharatëévara-Gharite referred to, 102.
Ravuta: a cavalry official, 238.
Read, Capt. Alezander: see under Baramahal Records.
Records of Fort St. George, The: a primary source of Mysore History, 1, 2; value of the collections of, 6-7.
Religions toleration in Mysore: under Ràja Wofleyar, 70; under Châmarâja Wodeyar V, 98-99, 102, 108; under Kanthirava-Narasarâja Wodeyar I, 165-166, 209; under Dêvarâja Woâeyar, 235-236, 266; under Chikkadëvarâja Wofleyar, 878-375.
Rëmati-Venkataiya: Dajavâi of Râma-râjaiya in the Seringapatam Vioe-royalty, 16-17, 41, 46-47.
Roman Law: conception of property-, marriage, divorce, etc., in, as contrasted with the Hindu Code, 410 (n. 171).
Rukmangada Charitre: see under Çhikkupadhyaya.
Rustam Khân: the usurper-commander at Madura (1678-1680), 287, 291-292.

Sabaariankara - Vilasa: see under Shadakshharadêva,
Sabnis Bommarasaiya of Kôlivâda: see under Bommarasaiya of Kôlivada.
Sabnia Krishnapaiya of Ikkêri: see under Krishnapaiya.
Sachchudarachâra-Nirnaya: a work on législation relating to Sûdras (see under Chikkadëvarâja Wodeyar); exposition of with référence to the tenets of the Mahabharata, Vishnu-Purana, Manu-Smriti, Bhagavad-Gîta, etc., 399-404; referred to, 439, 449.
Sâdamangalam: Chikkadëvarâja’s campaign in the région of (1673), 275; lost but re-acquired (1697), 316.
Saivism in Mysore: under Châmarâja V, 98 (n. 73); under Kauthîrava I, 166; under Dêvarâja, 236; under Chikkadëvarâja, 374-375.
Saklêspur: taken by Dajavâi Kumâraiya (1674), 277; acquisition of by Chikkadëvarâja (1695), 315; restored to its chief (c. 1698-1700), 321.
Sâligrâma: acquisition of by Châma-râja V (1626), 88; Kanthirâva I’s agent at, 159, 162 (w. 21), 171.
Salva: an insignia of Châmarâja V, 95.
Samayachara: an impost levied by Chikkadëvarâja, 353.
Sambhajî: principality of, 128-129; its siege and acquisition by Kauthârava I (1642), 130-181; referred to, 198, 207; chief of, 227; re-acquisition of by Mysore (1668), 230.
Sambhajî: son of Sivâji; succeeds to the sovereignty of the Mahratta possessions in the Deccan and the Karnâtak (1680), 290, 298, 295 (w. 94); joins Ikkêri and Gôlkonda against Chikkadëvarâja (1682), 299 (n. 105)300 (w. 106); his fight with him for supremacy in the South (1682-1686), 300-301; his retirement (1686), 304 (n. 119); his capture and death (1689), 808; referred to, 306, 309, 310, 508, 561, 573 (n, 1), etc.
Sammukhada-chavadi: one of the eighteen departments introduced by Chikkadëvarâja, 357.
Sampige: acquisition of by Dêvarâja (1663), 220.
Samyaminipattanam: southern Dhar-madevi: a Mahratta outpost (c.1680-1681), 298.
Sangaiya of Ummattûr: a feudatory of Kanthirava 1,162.
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Sangatyā : a Kannada poetical mètre, 261; popularity of, 197; use of in the works of Chikkadēvarāja's reign, 414. Sangatyas : see under Chikkupadhyāya.

Sankha : an insignia: acquired by Rāja Wodeyar, 66; referred to, 95. Sankhadēvarāja's agent at, 309, 334.

Sanskrit learning : under Kanthïrava I, 194-195; under Dēvarāja, 249, 250; under Chikkadēvarāja, 889-891.

Sānta-Vïra-Dēéika : his Sivagana-Charitra referred to, 102 (n. 89).

Sāntaji-Ghōrpade : brother of Sivâji and Governor of Gingee (1677), 282; concludes Sivâji's treaty with Ëkôji, 286; Ghokkanâtha Nâyaka's dealings with him, 286, 291; his march on Bangalore (1695-1697) and death (1697), 312, referred to, 551.

Sātapadi : a Kannada poetical mètre; use of in the works of Chikkadēvarāja's reign, 414.

Sarasrha : an insignia of Châmarâja V, 95.

Sarasr : acquisition of by Rāja Wodeyar (1612), 65.

Sārja-Hanumendra-Yaso-Vilasa : see under Krishna-Sarma.

Śarajā-Nâgappaiya : Niyogi of Ikkêri, who concluded peace with Mysore - (c. 1700), 821.

Sarātavalli: acquisition of by Dēvarāja (1666), 226; taken by Chikkadēvarāja (1675), 278.

Sarkar, J : (see under Aurangzîb and Mughal Administration); referred to or noticed in connection with the Muhummad-Namah, 5, 145 (n. 106), 148 (n. 120), 639 (n. 1). Sarvadhikari : designation of Chief Minister or executive officer in Mysore, 69.

Sāttagahalli: a scène of action during the siege of Kessare (1696), 64.

Sati: observance of by the Mysore Royal Family, in 1687, 106; in 1638, 111; in 1659, 203; in 1678, 264; discontinuance of (in 1704) explained, 601 (n. 19).

Satra : feeding-house; maintenance, and upkeep of unfler Dēvarāja, 286; prosperity of during Chikkadēvarāja's reign, 897.

Satvika-Brahma-Vidyā-Vilasa : see under Chikkupadhyāya.

Satyâgâla : a scène of action during the siege of Kesarè (1596), 54; its chief assiste Nanjarâja of Hadinâçl against Kâja Wodeyär (1614), 65; acquisition of by Châmarâja V (1625), 87; chief of, a feudatory of Kanthïrava 1, 121, 162.

Satyamangalam: acquisition of by Kanfchïrava I (1654), 148; southeastern frontier of Mysore (1659), 156; referred to, 207.

Saundara-Kavya, by Nûronda : as a primary source of Mysore History, 8.

Sélections from Public Consultations, Letters, etc.: E. I. Co.'s documents bearing on Mysore, contained in, 6.

Sélections from the Peshwa Daftar : a primary source of Mysore History, 1, 2; value of, 7-8.

Sènabhôga : a local official, 172, 288.

Seringapatam: rise and fall of as the seat of the Vijayanagar Viceroyalty (c. 1400-1610), 13-19 (see also under Bdja Wodeyar and Tirumala II); note on some versions of Rāja Wodeyar's acquisition of (1610), 626-599.

Seringapatam: siege of by the Bijâpur army under Ranadullâ Khân (1639), 119:124; date of the event, and general causes, 119 (n. 19)-120; the demand for tribute and after, 120; composition of the Bijâpur and Mysore armies, 120-121 (n. 28-29); position of the besieging army, 121-122; the siege, 122 (n. 33)-123; the truce, and Ranadullâ Khân's return, 128; importance of the event, 124; siege of by Sivappa Nâyaka I of Ikkêri (1669-1660), 216 (n. 13), 217-218; Śivâji's advance on (1677), 283, 284; Mahratta invasion of (1682), 296, 296, 550-551.

Seringapatam: strengthening of the fort of by Kanthïrava I and Chikkadēvarāja, 160, 336-336; as a stronghold of Śrî:Vaishuavism in Mysore, 360; Chikkadēvarāja's gift ta, etc., in, 376-377, etc.

Seringapatam: description of the capital city of under Kanthïrava I, Dēvarāja
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and Chikkadēvarāja, 173-176 (n. 70-71), 246, 388, 390; state of society and culture in, under them, 177-194, 246-248, 266,890-898, 408-411 i referred to, 62, 64, 67, 69, 70, 76,160,198, 264, 281, 496,621, 523, 524, 525, 530, 532,538, 539-641, 647-549, 570, 571, etc.

Seringapatam Palace : description of under Kanfchîrava I, with référence to the principal apartments (like the Durbâr Hall or Hiriya-Hajara Lakshmi’Vilāsa, etc.), 175 (n. 71); under Chikkadēvarāja, described with référence to the Durbâr Hall (Saundarya-Vilasa), etc., 388, 391-392.


Sêsha-Dharma : see under Chikkupdhdh-ya.

Sewell, Robert : his A Forgotten Empire noticed, 522 ; his Historical Inscriptions of Southern India noticed, 646.

Shadaksharadëva (Shadakşaraiya) : Vïra-Saiva preceptor to the family of Mudda-Bhûpa of Yejandûr ; colleague-at-studies of Chikkadēvarāja (c. 1668-1673), 271 (n. 10) ; afterwards one of his councillors. 272, 326 ; his ancestry, attainments, etc., 329, 378 (n. 33), 464; h i s works (Rajasëkhara - Vilasa, Vrshabhânda-Vijaya or Basavarâja-Vijaya, Sabaraéankara-Vilasa, Kavi-Karna-Rasayana,Bhaktadhiky a-Ratadvali and Sîvadhikya-Ratnavali), 455-456.

Shaddarâana • dharma • sthapandchârya (or Shaddharma-chakrësvara) : a title attributed to Ohâmarâja V, 99.

Shah Jahân: Mughal Emperor; his partition treaty (of 1686) with Bijâpur and Gôlkonda, 118.

Shâhji ; father of Sivâji ; as a Bijâpur general, placed by Banadullâ Khân in charge of Bangalore (1638), 119; takes part in the siège of Basavâpatna (1640) and Vellore (1647), 126,141; his arrest, etc. (1649-1650), 142; continued in his charge of the Karnâtak-Bijâpur-Bâlaghât and Pâyanghât (1666-1664), 150; referred to, 127, 215, 273, 282, 307 (n. 180), 570, 572, 573, etc.

Shâhji II of Tanjore : son and successor of Ekôji; 308 (n. 134), Shaw, George Bernard: see under Colis, J. S.

Siddi Masaud: Bijâpur general under Khân Muhammad, 148,149.

Simeya-Kandâcharada-Chavadi : one of the eighteen departments introduced by Chikkadēvarāja, 356-366.

Simha : an insignia of Châmarâja V, 95.

Sindhuhtatâ : acquisition of by Châmâraja V (1623), 87 ; referred to, 128.

Singâ-Râya of Ikkëri: assiste the chief of Piriyâpatua during Ohâmarâja V’S siege of the place (1626), 88, 99,90.

Singánallûr : acquisition of by Kanfchîrava I (1642), 130-131; record of Dëvarâjà from (1659), 226, 238.

Singappa Wodeyar of Bejaguja: his futile attempt on Râja Wodeyar’s life (1607), 56.

Singarârya I (SingarâchâryaorSingaraiyangâr I) : teacher of Bettada-Châmâraja Wodeyar; his Srîranga-Mâhatmya, 72 (n. 156-167)-78; referred to, 360, 632, 533.

Singarârya II (Ajasingarârya or Singaraiyangâr II) : a typical ârî-Vaishnava scholar of the times of Kanfchîrava I, 178 (n. 85)-179; his popularity as Paurnika to Dëvarâjà, 247,249 ; his influence as a ârî-Vaishnava leader, on Chikkadēvarâja, 864; his titles, etc., 390; his gift, 397 (n. 127); referred to, 186, 250, 328, 360, 361, 364 (n. 14), 383, 428, 450-451 (n. 158), 453, 532.

Singarârya III (or Singaraiyangâr III) : younger brother of Tirumalârya II, 391,414, 426; his attainments, etc., 487; his Gloss on the Yadugiri-Nara-yana-Stavah (including the Srisail drya-Dinacharyd), 437-488; Mitra-vinda-Gôvindam, 438-440; other works (Bâghavâbhyudaya and Gîta-Rangêsvara), 440; referred to, 438, 461 (n. 168), 632, etc.

Sïra (Sîrya) : ohief of, 18, 90,119 ; part of ShahjâhÎ’s jahîr in Mysore, 160, 282, 283, 291; Mughal subdh of, 307, 318, 317,318; northern frontier ôf Mysore (1704), 323; referred to, 141, 147,289 (n. 63), 526, etc.
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Śrīəkkōḍävērājā, 807-811 (see also under Chikkōdēvērājā Wodeyar).

Śūrī: chief of, assisted Śrīvēṣṭa Nāyaka I during his expedition to Benēgaḷaputrum (1609), 216.

Śrūvādaṇēśu: author of Nīvatūṣyatūtā and Pasukēḷaṇa (1689); his definition of dharma examined in its bearings on Rāja Wodeyar's ideals of government, 60-63.

Śrūvalājaya: Guardian of Chikkōdēvērājā, entrusted with the working of the legislation relating to Amēt families, 885, 886, 868; referred to, 327, 393 (n. 117).

Śrūvalaḷaya of Talakōḷ: Rāja Wodeyar's campaign against (1611), 55; Chāmmāra V's campaign against (1621), 57.

Śōmale: acquisition of by Rāja Wodeyar (1606), 55; chief of, a feudatory of Kattīrāḷavar I, 153; referred to, 64.

Sources of Mysore History, The: indicated and discussed, 1-9; introductory, 1-9; primary sources (including inscriptions, literary works, cōḷaśāśtra, and tracts); contemporary chronicles and memoirs, the Records of Fort St. George, the Diary of Ananda Rāma Rūmēla and Selections from the Prakāṣa Daftār), 8-9; secondary sources (including quasi-historical works), 8-9.

Sources of Vijayanagara History, edited by S. R. Aiyangar: noticed, 139 (n. 81), 145 (n. 145), 315 (n. 13), 221 (n. 97), 329 (n. 66), 293 (n. 93).

South India: affairs of, as reflected in the primary sources of Mysore History, 4-7.

Śrūvājan-Belagula: relations of Chāmmāra V with the Jain Purtēṣaḷate of, 99 (n. 76), 101, 109; referred to, 246, 328, 884, 374, 467, etc.

Śrūvājana Wōdēyār: Rāja Wodeyar's campaign against (1612, 1615), 65, 89.

Śrūvaṭraḥēśu: a title ascribed to Chīsēlēḍēvērājā Wodeyar, second son of Śrīvēṣṭa Bēḷavēṣṭa Chāmmāra Wodeyar III, 57.

Śṛṣṭhrēṇā Chōḷēṣ: a distinctive title of Chikkōdēvērājā, 882, 886.
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by his nephew: Badawar-Bahadur I (1674), 978; referred to, 346, 350, 356, 370, 371, etc.


Sri-Vaishnava doctrines: of faith in God's grace (Naivyose) and self-surrender (Prapattis); 189 (n. 94), 385.

Sri-Vaishnava literature: under Chikka-

Sri-Vaishnava-mata-prabhaditya: a title ascribed to Chikkaśvarāja, 389.

Sri-Vaishnavism: evidence of numismatic on, as the religion of Chikka-

Sri-Kṣitigarbha-Stavaḥ: see under Tīrūmālārya II.


Sri-Pratikāṣha-Nānakāraṭa: see under Tīrūmālārya II.

Sri-Parāakṣadāsī-Stavaḥ: see under Tīrūmālārya II.

Sri-Rāma VI of Vilajyanāgar (1643-1664): 1891: contemporary of Kapilārāja I, 117; early reference to Kapilārāja's loyalty to, 158; his victories (1644-1653), 146-147; in Mysore (c. 1650-1659), 144-146; loses Vellore (1654), 146; his further troubles (1654-1664), 149-150 (n. 130), 151; in Ikkārī (c. 1655-1659), 161 (n. 196), 165 (n. 146-148), 196; contemporary of Divārāja, 215; established at Hassan and Bālīr by Śivapyañya Nāyaka I (1669), 215-218; supports Ikkārī against Mysore (1649), 219; in Bālīr (1653-1658), 222-225; leaves Bālīr for the south (1653), 223; Divārāja's position in relation to (down to 1654), 220 (n. 146-148, 225; his plan of imperial restoration, 227; leads the southern confederacy against Mysore at Erōda (1653), and retirals, 222-223; his last years, 220-221, 278; represented...
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Sūdras: Chikkadēvaraja's législation relating to, 399-407, 441-443.

Suguna-Gambhira: an insign is acquired by " Bōla-Chamarāja IV (c. 1674), 41.

Suka-Saptati : see under Chikku-pādhyaya.

Sunkada-chavadi: one of the eighteen departments introduced ' by Chikka-dēvarāja, 356.

Surprise night-attacks: a feature of Mysorean warfare; during Tirumala's siège of Kesare (1596), 54; during the Bijāpur siège of Seringapatam (1639), 122, 124; during the Maharatta invasion of Seringapatam (1662), 296.

T

Tagadūr : acquisition of by Chāmarāja V (1626), 69.

Talakad: acquisition of by Rāja Wodeyar (1615), 66; re-acquisition of by Chamarāja V (1621), 87; chief of, a feudatory of Kanthīrava I, 121, 168; referred to, 18, 56, 58, 59, 85, 524, 526, 526, 528, 629, etc.

Tammambatti : acquisition of by Chikkadēvarāja (1697), 316.

Tāndava-Krishna-Mūrti-Dēvarāya : a gold coin (varaha) issued by Chikkadēvaraja, 886, 654.

Tanjore : Nāyaka of, 140-142, 148-150; represented at the court of Kanthīrava 1,163,188; relations of Madura with, 278, 277; Maharatta conquest of (1675) and after (down to 1688), 277-278, 281 282, 286, 291, 301, 306, 306; Mughal advance on (1691-1694), 311, 313; referred to, 207, 317, 324.

Tarikere: chief of, assisted Sivāppa Nāyaka I during his expédition to Seringapatam (1659), 216; referred to, 90, 459.

Tātāchārya Family : influence of on the court of Mysore (1668) as ārī- Vaishnava royal preceptors of the Āravidu Dynasfy of Vijayanagar, 226, 247 (n. 151), 249-250, 265,571.

Tatva-Traya'. see under Chikkupādhyāya.

Tellicherry Consultation: E. I. Co.'s documents bearing on Mysore, contained in, 6-7.

Tenkana-Raya: a distinctive title of Chikkadēvaraja, 816,606.

Terakanāmbi : a Vijayanagar province. (14-16th oent.), 18-14,21; acquisition of by Kāja Woffeyar (1614), 65; a southern frontier of Mysore (1617) 67; chief of, 162; referred to, 169, 880, 625.

Thanadar: an officiai of the Kandāchar service, 337, 338; referred to, 68, 162.

Thirty-three Villages: an expression denoting the extent of the kingdom of Mysore under Bōla-Chamarāja Wodeyar IV (c. 1576), 41; note on, 619-520.

Tigula chiefs: overawed by Chikkadēvarāja (c. 1698-1700), 322, 323.

Tigula-nadu : scène of opérations of the Mysore army during the siège of Ërôde (1667), 229.

Timma-Kavi: poet of Chikkadēvaraja's court and a protégé of Chikku-pādhyāya, 414; his ancestry, etc., 422-423; his Māhātmyas(i.e., Yādavagiri-Māhātmya, Venkatagiri-Māhātmya and Paēchimaranga-Mahâtamya), 423-424; Chikkadēvendra-Vamsāvali, 424 (n. 63); referred to, 25, 28, 60 (n. 95), 70 (n. 141), 214, 267, 286 (n. 53), 428, 556, 566.

Timmanā Nāyaka of Kāsaragōdu : Ikkēri général, who took part in the action against Mysore (1674), 276.

Timmappa-Gauda of Maddagiri-sīme : Chikkadēvarāja's campaign against (1678), 288.

Timmappaiya of Kōlala: Dajavāi of Chikkadēvarāja in succession to Dod-gaiya; his activities against Ikkēri (1690,1695), 311 (n. 148), 314; his death (1696), 316; referred to, 332-333.

Timmarāja of Heggaddēvankōte : a feudatory of Kanthīrava I,162.


Timmarāja Wodeyar II (1668-1672) r ruler of Mysore in succession to Hiriya-Bēttada-Chāmarāja Wodeyar I1 I, 86;
- his identity, prowess, political position, etc., 38-39 (w.68) ; referred to, 36, 37.

Timmarîja Wodeyar I of Kaḷâle : see under Kaḷâle Family.

Timmarâjaiya : a Dalavâi of Kanthïrava 117 (n. 16), 127,169.


Timmarasa, poet: his Mârkandêya-Ramâyana, 196.

Tiruchangûd: a southern limit of advance of Mysore arms under Kanthïrava I (1642), 130.

Tirumakûdlu-Naranpur Plate (1663) : an inscription in Kavya style (see under Tirumalârya II); referred to, 240 (n. 112),249 (n. 161-162), 250 (w.169).

Tirumala II: Vijayanagar Viceroy at Seringapatam (c, 1585-1610) under Venkata I, 17; his records, 17-18 ; the extent of his jurisdiction and the character of his rule, 18 ; his treachery towards his uncle Venkata, 18-19 ; his relations with Râja Wodeyar of Mysore (down to 1608), 47-49, 50-66; seeks Imperial aid against him (1608), 56-57; his weakened political position (1609-1610), 67-58; his departure from Seringapatam (c. January 1610), 58-59 (see also under Râja Wodeyar); referred to, 60 (n. 95), 63, 76, 78, 80, 181, 429, 521, 523-529.

Tirumala Nâyaka of Madura (c. 1623-1659) : contemporary of Kanthïrava I, 117-118; incites and supports the chief of Śâmbaiḷi against Mysore (1641-1642) 128-130; proves disloyal to ari-Kanga VI (c. 1647), 141; his anti-imperial policy with special reference to Mysore (1654-1659), 148-159, 152,155; referred to, 160,174, 205-208, 215, 226 (n. 60).

Tirumalârya Family : genealogy of,632-533.

Tirumalârya I (or Tirumalaiyangâr I), Tradhâni (?) i alleged author of Karna-Vrittanta-Kathe, 73; referred to, 529-532.

Tirumalârya II (or Tirumalaiyangâr II) (1646-1706) : co-student and companion of Chikkadêvarâja (down to 1675), 249, 271 ; a minister of Chikkadêvarâja's cabinet (1673-1686), 272 ; his ancestry, attainments, etc., 325, 328-329; Prime Minister of Chikkadêvarâja (during 1686-1704), 331-332 ; as a ari-Vaishnava scholar and leader, 360,361,364 (n. 14), 378 (n. 33), 390; also known as ari-éalîrîya; his personality, 391; his literary school, 414 ; as a scholar and poet, 425-426 ; composer of the Tirumâkûḍaḷu-Narasipur Plate (1668) and the Chamaraḷanagar Plate (1676) in Kavya style, 260 (w.169), 426; his Stavahs (i.e., Śri-Yadugiri-Narayana-Stavah, Śri - Yadugiri - Nâyakî - Stavah, Śri-Laksñmî - Nrsimha - Stavâh, S ri-Manjula-Kësava-Stavah, Śri-Aparate-Râjagopala-Stavah and Drî-Gòpâla-Stavah), 427-428; Chikkadêvarâya-Vamsâvali, 428-431; ChikkadêvarâYa-Vijayam, 431-434; Apratima-Véra-Charitam, 434-436 (n. 101) ; other works (i.e., Paéchimarangardja-Stâvahy Èkadasî-Nirnaya, chikka-dêvaraja-èatakam and Kîrtanegalu), 436-437; referred to, 3, 25, 28, 45, 60 (n. 95), 78, 106, 129 (n. 60), 165 (n. 34), 210, 214 [n. 11], 267, 270, 285 (n. 58), 383, 397, 409 (n. 170), 438, 439, 445 (n. 137), 451 (n. 158), 523, 524, 530-532, 554, etc.

Tirumalârya II (or Tirumalaiyangâr II) : his Apratima-Véra-Charitam quoted from, on the greatness of Chikkadêvarâja, 507; note on the position of regarding the successor of Kanthïrava-Narasarâja Wodeyar I, 547-549.

Tirunakshatram of Śrî-Bàinànujà-châryar: a popular Śrî-Vaishnava festival at Mëlkôte under Kanthïrava I, 184-185 ; and in the reign of Chikkadêvarâja, 396-397.

Tiruvâimoli-Tîku: see under Chikku-pddhyàya.

Toda-nidu : ? land of the Todavas or Tôflas ; acquisition of by Chikkadêvarâja (1677), 281.

Toddyada-châvaḍi : one of the eighteen departments introduced by Chikka dêvarâja, 366.
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Toleya: acquisition of by Kanthirava I (1642), 130-181.

Tondanûr Plate (1722): referred to, 886.

Toreyôr: reduction of the chief of by Chikkadêvarâja (1673), 276.


Travels and tracts: a primary source of Mysore History, 1-2; value of, 4.

Travels in India, by Dr. John Fryer: notes bearing on Mysore, contained in, 4; referred to, 281.

Travels of the Jesuits, by John Lockman: Jesuit letters bearing on Mysore, contained in, 4.

Trichinopoly: a southern limit of advance of Mysore arms under Kanthirava I (1642), 180-181, 207; under Dêvarâja (1668), 230; objective of southern expansion of Mysore (1673), 266; Chokkanâtha's retirement to (1677), 280; southern limit of Mahratta activities (1676-1680), 280, 287; continued southern objective of Mysorean advance (1680), 291-292; siege of by Dalavâi Kumâraiyâ (1662), 292-293 (n. 82), 294-298; Haraji's advance on (1682), 300; Mughal advance on (1691-1694), 311, 318; renewed objective of Mysorean expansion (down to 1704), 316, 323; referred to, 5, 6, 229, 608.

Tripadi: name of a Kannaga poetical metre, 414.

Tripadigala-Tâtparya: see under Chikkadêvarâja Wodeyar.

Tuluva (or Tu]u): chief of, represented at the court of Kanthirava I, 188; assisted Śivappa Nâyaka I during his expedition to Seringapatham (1659), 216.

Tumbura: music of, under Kanthirava I (see under Music).

Tumkûr: Ranadullâ Khân's march on (1638), 119; acquisition of by Bijâpur (1640), 126; under Shâhji, 127; taken by Chikkadêvarâja (1675), 278; Mughal advance on (1687), 306; northern limit of Mysore (1704), 323.

Turuvêkere (Turugere): Ranadullâ Khân's march on (1638), 119; acquisition of by Kanthirava I (1640), 127; action at between Mysore and Bijâpur (c. 1647), 138-189, 141; northern frontier of Mysore (1669), 156; taken by Chikkadêvarâja (1675), 278; referred to, 121 (n. 29), 128.

Tuzak-i'Walajdhî (1781), by Burhanlbn Hasan: as a primary source of South Indian History (16th cent.), 5.

Tvâmagnîflu: lost but retaken by Chikkadêvarâja (1687), 305.

Ubbe-kânike: an impost levied by Chikkadêvarâja, 353.

Ummattûr: a Vijayanagar province (14-16th cent.), 13-14; chief of, combines against Râja Wodeyar (1596, 1606), 53, 57; impérial grantof to Raja Wodeyar (1612), 63; annexation of by him (1614), 65; southern frontier of Mysore (1617), 67; referred to, 239, 260, 281, 526, etc.

Uppina-môle: an impost levied by Chikkadêvarâja, 353.

Vâdhûla-Srinivâsârya: a Śrî-Vaishnava celebrity of the times of Chikkadêvarâja, 364 (n. 14), 391.

Vaidyamrita-Tiku: see under Chikku-pañähidyâ.

Vaidya-Nighantu-Sara: see under Chikkanna-Pandita.

Vaikuntha-mudi: a jewelled head-dreas presented by Kanthirava I to the shrine of Śrî-Ranganâtha of Seringapatham, 167.

Vairarmudi (or Vajra-makuti): festival of, 106; a popular festival at Mëlkôce under Chikkadêvarâja, oonducted for Śrî-Narâyana, 863, 897; referred to, 25.
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Vaishnava tradition: relating to the origin and founding of the Wodeyar Dynasty, 24-26, 27, 28, 29-30, 359, 429; influence of on the religion of the Dynasty, 114 (n. 5), 163.

Vaishnavite Revival in Kannada literature: nature of (see under Chikka-dëvaràja Wodeyar).

Vâmalûr (Omalûr): acquisition of by Dêvarâja (1668), 230; lost but retaken by Chikkadëvaràja (1689), 309; referred to, 334.

Vâmana-mudre: emblem of sovereignty of the world; use of in a lithio record of Kanthïrava 1,169 (n. 50).

Varâha-mudre (Boar seal): use of in the public documents of Kauthïrava I, 169 (n. 49), 170 (n. 54-56)-171; increasing evidence of its use in the records of Dêvarâja, 224, 232.

Varîha-Purâna: on the duty of the gûdra, 399-400.

Vântyérama-dharma: preservation of the ideal of under Kanthïrava I, 194; evidence of its active pursuit under Dêvarâja, 248; preservation and perpetuation of by Chikkadëvaràja, 387-898; referred to, 369, 401, 512.

Vastâre: acquisition of by Dêvarâja (1663), 221; north-western limit of Mysore (1665), 222; resumption of by Ikkëri (1674), 277; as preceptor of Dêvarâja, from the court of Vijayanagar, 247 (n. 151), 249,250,360.

Vellore: siege of by Bijâpur and Gol-konâ (1647), 141; final capture of by Khân Mubammad (1654), 146 (n. 107); referred to, 148, 149, 165 (n. 146), 205, 247, 282, 286, 810, 570.

Venkaiya-Sômayâji: envoy of Srî-Ranga V1, 141.

Venka-la I of Vijayanagar (1586/1614) treachery of his nephew Tirumala towards him, 18-19; contemporary of Râja Wodeyar, 47; his assistance sought for by Tirumala against Râja Wodeyar, 56-67; plays off Tirumala against Râja Wodeyar and forestalls the former's overthrow, 57, 58, 60; his view-point of Râja Wodeyar's conquest of Seringapatam, 62-63; his formal confirmation of the conquest, 63-64; the significance of the Imperial confirmation, 64-65 (see also under Raja Wodeyar and Tirumala II); referred to, 78, 80; 515, 522, 523, 528, 529.

Venkafa II of Vijayapagar (1683-1642) relations of with Châmarâja V of Mysore, 93-94 (n. 57-58); contemporary of Kauthïrava I, 117-118; evidence of Kanthïrava's loyalty to him, 181; referred to, 132, 205.

Venkata V of Vijayanagar: nephew of Srî-Ranga VI; nominal suzerainty of, acknowledged by Dêvarâja (1666,1668), 231.

Venkatâdri Nâyaka of Bêlûr: Chikka-dëvaràja's campaign against (1674), 277; referred to, 126.

Venkatâjamma: one of the queens of Immadi-Râja Wodeyar, 110.

Venkatakrishnama Nâyaka: Dalavâi of Chokkanâtha Nâyaka of Madura; Chikkadëvaràja's encounter with (1673), 275.

Venkatappa or Venkatâdri Nâyaka I of Ikkëri: see under Hiriya-Venkatappa Nayaka I.

Venkatappa Nâyaka II of Ikkëri (1660-1661): successor of Sivappa Nâyaka I, and contemporary of Dêvarâja Wodeyar, 218; hostile relations of with Mysore (1661), 219.

Venka-ta-Varadâchârya of Ettûr or Yëdûr: of the Tâtâohàrya Family; Dêvarâja's grant to (1663), 289-240; as preceptor of Dêvarâja, from the court of Vijayanagar, 247 (n. 151), 249,250,360.
Venkatagiri • Māhatmya: see under Chikkupūdhyaya.

Venkatagiri - Mahatmya: see under Timma-Kavi.

Vijayanagar: general features of provincial administration of in Mysore, 11-18; under the first and second dynasties, 13-14; under the third dynasty, 14-16; under the fourth or Aravidu dynasty (down to 1610), 16-19; relations of the later Aravidu sovereigns of, with the rülers of, Mysore (1610-1674) (see under Venkata I, Vīra-Ramādeva IV, Venkata I, ārī-Ranga V I, Dēga-Dēva-Mahdrāyā, Venkaja V and Kōḍandā-Rāma I); last days of, 278-274, 276-277, 279; Chikkadēvarāja as the political heir to the imperial traditions of, 508-509, 570-678 (n. 1), 574; referred to, 860, 510-511, 515, 522, 526, 527, 629, etc.

Vijayanagar traditions: evidences of influence of on Mysore, 95, 174 (» n. 70), 176 (n. 71), 176-177 (n. 76), 182 (n. 100), 1 (n. 104), 185 (» n. 108), 186-187 (n. 121), 223-226, 281-288, 246-247 (n. 151), 249, 250, 264-265, etc.


Vijayāpura: an assignment of Rāja Wofleyar (c. 1617), 76; referred to, 67.

Vijayarāghava Nāyaka of Tanjore: relations of Chokkanātha Nāyaka of Madura with (1678-1674), 277-278.

Vijayarājaiya: chief of Kārugahajji; Rāja Wodeyar's exploit over (1595), 49-50.

Vijayarājaiya of Grāma: Rāja Wodeyar's encounter with (1608), 67.

Vijayarājaiya of Nīla-Gôge: a Dalavāi of Chikkadēvarāja, 816, 333.

Vīrabhadra Nāyaka of Ikkêri (1629-1646): relations of with Chāmarāja V, 82, 93.

Vīra-Saiva literature: under Chikkadēvarāja (see under Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar).

Vīra-Saivism in Mysore: under Chāmarāja V, 166; Dēvarāja’s solicitude for (his grants, etc., to Vīra-aīvas), 236, 241, 243, etc.; under Chikkadēvarāja Wofleyar, 373-875.

Virupanna Nāyaka of Àlambâdi: a feudatory of Kanthîrava I, 163.

Virupanna Nāyaka of Âmbâdi: a feudatory of Kanthîrava I, 163.

Visālākṣa-Pandit: colleague-at-studies of Chikkadēvarāja during his stay in Hangaja (1668-1678), 270 (n. 6, 10) i Prime Minister of Chikkadēvarāja during 1673-1686, 272; his ancestry, attainments, etc., 826, 326-328; also known as Dodda-Pandita of Yelandûr, 328; Chikkădēvarāja’s grant to (1686), 888; his responsibility for the fiscal troubles of Chikkadēvarāja’s reign (c. 1682-1666), determined with reference
INDEX.

Vishnu-Purána: on the duties of *Súdra (see under Sachchurdhrachara-Nirnaya).

Vrishabhdendra-Vijaya (or Basavaraja-Vijaya): see under Shaḍakahara-dēva.

W

Wilks, Lt. Col. Mark (1760-1831): British Resident at the court of Mysore (1803-1808), and author of Historical Sketches of the South of India in an attempt to trace the History of Mysoor (1810), 1 (n. 1); his treatment of the early history of Mysore (1399-1761), 1-2; invariably followed by subsequent writers, 2 (n. 2); on the identification of Hafladana, Bōja-Chámarāja Wodeyar and Bettada Wofleyar, 27, 89 (n. 60), 42 «(86)-48; on the early life of Chikkadēvarāja, 254 (n. 186); on Chikkedēva's acquisition of Bangalore (1687), 307 (n. 131); on Chikkadēvarāja's embassy to Aurangzib (c. 1699-1730) and the Mysore Throne, 321 (n. 178); his account of Chikkadēvarāja's fiscal measures, religion, etc., examined and evaluated, 464-465, 470, 471-476, 481-495; on Puragēri, 518-519; on Rāja Wodeyar's acquisition of Seringapatam (1610), 527-528; on the early Dalavāis of Mysore, 534-536; on the identification of the successor of Kanthîrava I, 545-546; on the date of the Mahratta invasion of Seringapatam, 550-551; other references to or notices of, 8 (n. 10-11), 34 (nr 25), 37, 47 (n. 12-13), 52 (n. 47), 53 (n. 53), 69 (n. 187), 70 (n. 141), 82 (H. 8), 83 (n. 7), 87 (n. 19), 91 (n. 48), 106 (n. 109), 107, 109 (n. 1-2), 115 (n. 12), 120 (n. 19), 151 (n. 136), 183 (n. 104), 187 (n. 121), 208 (n. 189), 217 (n. 23), 220 (n. 36), 264 (n. 236), 265 (n. 238), 270 (n. 5), 271 (n. 10), 272 (n. 12-14), 284 (n. 52), 289 (n. 66), 292 (n. 81), 295 (n. 93-94), 296 (n. 96), 306 (n. 126, 128), 315 (n. 160), 316 (n. 164, 166), 838 (n. 50), 339 (n. 51), 344 (n. 54), 345 (n. 66), 353 (n. 68-69), 856 (n. 74), 476 (n. 13), 505 (n. 46), 530, 531, 539, 563, 564, etc.

Wilson, H. H.: see under Descriptive Catalogue of Mackenzie Manuscripts.

Wodeyar: designation of a feudal chieftain in mediaeval Southern Karnatak, 13; note on the derivation of, 517.

Wodeyar Dynasty of Mysore, The: sources of history of Mysore under, 1-9; inscriptions of the rulers of, 2-3; origin and foundation of, stated and discussed, 20-30; early references to Mysore, 20-21; traditional accounts of origin, in nineteenth century manuscripts, 21-23; in eighteenth century manuscripts and inscriptions, 23-25; in seventeenth century literary works and inscriptions, 25-26; examination of the accounts, 26-28; probable date of the founding of, 28-30.

Wodeyar Dynasty of Mysore: under the early rulers (down to 1678), 81-43; under Rāja Wodeyar, 44-80; under Chāmarāja Wodeyar V, 81-106 (under Immadī-Rāja Wodeyar, 109-111; under Kanthîrava-Narasarāja Wodeyar I, 112-210; under Dēvarāja Wodeyar, 211-267; under Chikkadēvarāja Wodejrar, 268-516.

Y

Yādavagiri-Māhātmya: see under Chikkupādhyāya.

Yādavagiri-Māhātmya: a literary work (see under Timma-Kavi), on the Yādava descent of the Wodeyar Dynasty, 25.

Yādavas of Devagiri (c. 1200-1812): probable connection of with the progenitors of the Wodeyar Dynasty, as echoed in the Gajjīganahalli Plate (1639), 28.
Yadu-Raya (or Vijaya) (1399-1426): first traditional ruler of the Wogeyar Dynasty of Mysore, 82.

Yadu-Kāya (or Vijaya) and Krishna: progenitors of the Wogeyar Dynasty of Mysore; traditional accounts of their exploits as narrated in the AnnaU, and in the Mysuru-Nagarada-Purvottara, 21-22, 28-24; the accounts examined, 26-27, 29-80.

Yākūb Khān: Muslim general who took part, and was slain, in the warfare of Ikkēri against Mysore (1695), 818-314.

Yasavanta Rao: Prime Minister of Ekoji; opposes Chikkadevaraja at Hosur (near Sir a) and loses his nose (1678), 289 (n. 64).

Yedadore: a frontier fort of Mysore under Raja Wodeyar (1614), 65.

Yeṇahanka-nadu: Kanthirava I's campaign in (c. 1650) 144 preferred to, 163 (n. 23).

Yejiṇḍur: chief of, assists Nanjaraja of Hadināḍ against Raja Wogeyar (1614), 65; referred to, 18, 57, 270, 271, 327, 328, 329, 388, 496, 497, 498, etc.

Yeleyūr: an assignment of Raja Wodeyar (c. 1617), 76; action at (1631), 92; referred to, 66, 67.

Yeleyur Deparaja Wodeyar: see under Dīparaja Wodeyar of Yeleyur.

Yuktikalpataru quoted from, on Kosa 346 (n. 57).

Yuvaṇa (Crown Prince): education and training given to Chikkadevaraja as, 270 (n. 5), 433.

Z

Zahur bin Zahir*: see under Muhammad'Namah.

Zamorin: referred to by Dr. Fryer (c. 1677), 281.

Zulfikar Khān: Mughal generalissimo, 310; his activities in the Karnatak (1691-1698), 311-313; first Nawab of the Karnatak-Payanghāt (c. 1690-1700), 318 (n. 174).
# ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>For &quot;Storic&quot; read &quot;Storia.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, n. 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>For &quot;Ch. XV and Appendix VII—(2)&quot; read &quot;Vol. II, Ch. I and Appendix I—(2).&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 (also 16, 61, 273, 859)</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>After &quot;Bakaas-Taghi&quot; add &quot;(Rākheṣa-Tangaḍi).&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>For &quot;dated in&quot; read &quot;dated.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34, n. 26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Add at the end:—In some of these records, the title Biraḍ-aṇṭombara-ganda also occurs as Aṇṭombara-kandaṇ and Aṇṭombara-ganda (see M. E. R., Nos. 673 of 1899 and 321 of 1883). The adoption of the title by the Wodeyar Dynasty of Mysore, under circumstances narrated above, has a special significance of its own attached to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>For &quot;dated in&quot; read &quot;dated.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55, n. 68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>For &quot;Appendix IX&quot; read &quot;Vol. II, Appendix III.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>For &quot;1607&quot; read &quot;1607.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Last line from the bottom of the text</td>
<td>For &quot;Praṣanna-Kriṣṇasvāmī&quot; read &quot;Laṅkhesvara (Laṅkhesvarāsvāmī).&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71, n. 156</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>For &quot;Ibid., 1900, p. 9, para 10&quot; read &quot;See Ibid., 1900, p. 9, para 10, where the statue is, perhaps by a slip, located in the Praṣanna-Kriṣṇasvāmī temple at Mysore.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72, n. 156</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>For &quot;ff. 21&quot; read &quot;ff. 191.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72, n. 156</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>For &quot;1655&quot; read &quot;1655.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72, n. 156</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>For &quot;Morasa-Nāḍu&quot; read &quot;Morasa-nāḍu.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144, n. 27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>For &quot;f.n. 176&quot; read &quot;Ch. IX, f.n. 28.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>For &quot;amisera&quot; read &quot;a miserable.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154, n. 144</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>For &quot;Appendix IX&quot; read &quot;Vol. II, Appendix III.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160, n. 9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174, n. 70</td>
<td>5 from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175, n. 71</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177, n. 75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200, n. 161</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Add at the end:—For details about the ceremony of Arka marriage, vide Appendix VI—(6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>5 from the bottom of the text</td>
<td>For &quot;Perhaps&quot; read &quot;Perhaps.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226, n. 60</td>
<td>3 from bottom</td>
<td>For &quot;Nanjarājaiya III&quot; read &quot;Nanjarājaiya IV.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241, n. 121</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Add at the end:—This position is confirmed by a copper-plate grant of his, dated March 17, 1867, which has recently come to light (see M. A. R., 1934, pp. 145-169, No. 39). We further learn from this Sanskrit inscription that Dhanojaiya (Dhanōjji) was a rich Gujarāt Brahmān who had settled for trade in Mysore with his dependents and associates, that he was successively patronised by the Mysore kings Chāmarāj V, Kauṭhirava-Nārāsa I and Devarāja, that he had a wife by name Rāmabhāyāmbā, and that he was well known for his gifts and charities. This is also one of the earlier records in Kānγa, style composed by Tirumalārya, afterwards Prime Minister of Chikkadevarāja Wodeyar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>7 from the bottom of the text</td>
<td>For &quot;Kasaragōdu (Kāsauragōdu)&quot; read &quot;Kasaragōdu.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281, n. 44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>For &quot;Appendix IX&quot; read &quot;Vol. II, Appendix III.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299, n. 106</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Add at the end:—For Sambhāji's claim to sovereignty of the South, vide Appendix VI—(7), n. 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>For &quot;Dharmapuri&quot; read &quot;Dharmapuri.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>For &quot;Kuntār-durga (Kuntārdurga)&quot; read &quot;Kuntār-durga.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336, n. 48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>For &quot;Appendix IX&quot; read &quot;Vol. II, Appendix III.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>For &quot;varāḍaśrama&quot; read &quot;varāḍaśrama.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552</td>
<td>Head line</td>
<td>For &quot;Chikkadevarāja's&quot; read &quot;Chikkadevarāja's.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572</td>
<td>2 from the bottom of the text</td>
<td>For &quot;evidence, 4&quot; read &quot;evidence l.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572, n. 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>For l.m. &quot;4&quot; read &quot;1.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>