

CHAPTER XVI.

CHIKKADĒVARĀJA WODEYAR, 1673-1704—(contd.)

Domestic life: Queens, etc.—The Kalale Family—Death of Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar, November 16, 1704—His personality, accomplishments and character—Contemporary testimony as to his greatness—His insignias and titles—An estimate of Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar: As a political builder—As a politician—As a ruler—As a religious and social reformer—His conception of human equality—As a “Maker of Mysore”—Chikkadevaraja Wodeyar in the 18th century literature—His claim on posterity.

LIFE in the Royal household at Seringapatam during the reign of Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar was ordinarily one of peace and felicity. We have reference¹ to Chikkadēvarāja 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. Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar is further credited² with having improved the management of the Palace household by instituting twenty-two departments and organising their administration. Dēvājamma, daughter of Lingarājaiya of Yeḷandūr, was his principal queen (*p a t t a d a - r ā ṇ i*,

1. See *Haḍi. Dhar.*, I, 3-8 (pp. 2-3); also *Songs on Chikkadēvarāja and Kempadēvamma*, ff. 130, v. 2; *Chikkadēvendra-Vam.*, p. 30, and *Yād. Māhāt.*, ff. 32 (prose passage), etc.

2. *Annals*, I, 128. The departments, referred to, related among others to treasures (*bokkasa*), robes (*javalī*), swords (*kattī*), king's apartments (*sammukha*), beddings (*hāsige*), interior chambers (*oḷa-bāgilu*), *nāmatīrtha*, establishment of servants of the *Mysūru-hōbḷi* and *Paṭṭanadahōbḷi*, stables (*lāya*) of horses, elephants, camels and cattle, presents and benevolences (*kānikē*), jewels (*oḍave*), body-guards (*maigāvalu*), cavaliers (*rōvutaru*), urgent calls (*avasarada hōbḷi*), attendants, etc.

pattādarasi).³ She is identical with “Kempadēvamamma,” “Dēvāmbā,” “Dēvamāmbā” and “Dēvamamma” of Yeḷandūr, prominently mentioned in literary and other sources.⁴ She was an ideal lady,⁵ pious and ever devoted to her husband.⁶ Among other queens of Chikkadēvarāja were⁷ Dēvamamma (daughter of Daḷavāi Kumāraiya of Kaḷale), Kempamma (daughter of Sōmarājaiya of Mūgūr), Chikka-Muddamma (daughter of Chāmarājaiya or Chāmaiya of Yeḷandūr), Doḍḍa-Dēpamma (another daughter of Daḷavāi Kumāraiya), Doḍḍa-Muddamma (daughter of Dēvaiya-Arasu of Kaḷale), Kempananjamma and Gauramma (daughters of Vīrarājaiya of Hullahaḷḷi),

3. *Annals*, I. 104; *I.M.C.*, No. 18-15-20, p. 55; *E. C., Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol.*, Sr. 305 (referring to Dēvājamma of Yeḷandūr); see also *Hadī. Dhar.*, cited in f.n. 4 *infra*. Dēvājamma (*Dēvamāmbā*) is referred to in the *Dēvanagara Plate* (c. 1686-1690) as the daughter of Lakshma-Varma of Bālēndu-nagara or Yeḷandūr (see *E. C., Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol.*, My. 115, ll. 101-102). Perhaps Lakshma-Varma, mentioned here, was the surname of Lingarājaiya of Yeḷandūr.
4. See *Songs on Chikkadēvarāja and Kempadēvamamma*, ff. 131; *Śrī. Māhāt.*, cited in Ch. V, f.n. 156; *E. C., Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol.*, My. 115, ll. 98, 101, 103-104; *Hadī. Dhar.*, I, 3, 11, 16 (pp. 2-4); also *Mys. Dho. Pūr.*, I. 63.
5. *Hadī. Dhar.*, l.c.; see also Ch. XIII, f.n. 134
6. See *E. C., Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol.*, My. 115, ll. 95-96, 98, where Rāmāyaṇam-Tirumalārya refers to her thus :

Satīshu mānyāsu satīshu chāsya
Śrī-Dēvamāmbā mahishī nṛpasya |
Pativratānām gaṇanā prasangē
Śrī-Dēvamāmbā prathamābhīdhēyā ||

See also *E. C.*, III (1) Sr. 64 (1722), ll. 96-98, repeating the above.

7. *Annals*, I. 104-105; *Mys. Dho. Pūr.*, I. 63-64 (compared). According to the *Annals* (l.c.), the first two queens of Chikkadēvarāja (*i.e.*, Dēvājamma of Yeḷandūr and Dēvamamma of Kaḷale) were married to him in February 1662, and the next eight (*aṣṭa-mahishiyaru*) in June 1679. All his queens, it is interesting to note, came from Arasu families which were either in friendly alliance with or closely related to the Royal Family. The *Hadī. Dhar.* (I, 4, p. 2) also refers to the eight queens (*iṣṭaguneyarenbaru, rāṇiyaru*). Further, we learn (*Annals*, l.c.), these eight queens were married to Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar with the *Arka* rite (*arka vivāha purassaravāgi vivāha māḍikonḍa aṣṭa-mahishiyaru*). *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 VI—(6), for a detailed notice of *Arka* and the ritualism of the *Arka* marriage.

Dēvīramma (daughter of Basavarājaiya of Hullahalli) and Kāntamma (daughter of Krishṇaiya of Kottāgāla). Dēvājamma of Yeḷandūr, the principal queen, was, it would seem, the most favourite consort of Chikkadēvarāja. Her memory is perpetuated by a votive *maṅṭapa* (of nine *ankanams*), to the north-east of the principal pond (*kalyāṇi*) at Mēlkōṭe, with her name inscribed thereon (*arasi ammanavaru Yaḷavandūra Dēvājammanavara sēve-maṅṭapa*).⁸ Of the junior queens of Chikkadēvarāja, Gauramma appears mentioned in a lithic inscription dated November 3, 1690,⁹ recording her gift of the *Gōpāla-sarasu* pond for the Goddess (*Amma*) of Talaku, south of the town of Maddagiri. By his senior queen Dēvājamma, Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar had a son (b. 1672) by name Kaṅṭhīrava (afterwards Kaṅṭhīrava-Narasarāja Woḍeyar II).¹⁰ He is also said¹¹ to have had a daughter by name Dēvājamma (b. 1680) by Doḍḍa-Muddamma of Kaḷale, one of his junior queens. Among other members of the Royal Family, Kaṅṭhīravaiya (Kaṅṭhīrava-Arasu), younger brother of Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar, appears to have stayed¹² in Seringapatam holding a subordinate position during the reign. A lithic record, dated June 17, 1676,¹³ registers the consecration by him of the image of Paṭṭābhīrāma in Sōmanāthapur and his grant of the village of Ukḷagere for its maintenance.

8. *E. C.*, *Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol.*, Sr. 305 (*M. A. R.*, 1908, p. 23, para 76); *I. M. C.*, No. 18-15-20, p. 55; see also *Annals*, I. 141.

9. *Ibid.*, XII Mi. 15: s. 1612, *Pramōdāta*, *Kārtika śu.* 12; see also Ch. XIII, f.n. 83.

10. *Annals*, I. 105, 155 (compared); *Mys. Dho. Pūr.*, I. 58, II. 56 (compared); also *E. C.*, *Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol.*, Nj. 295 (1716), v. 49:

Tasmāchchri Chikkadēva-ṛpa makuṭamaṅṭarē Dēvamāmbōdarābdhau |
Vishṇōramśēna jātaḥ . . . Kaṅṭhīravēndrah ||;

and III (1) Sr. 64 (1722), ll. 103-104.

11. *Annals*, I. 105.

12. See *Annals* (I. 137), according to which Chikkadēvarāja is said to have specially got constructed a miniature palace (*Chikkaramane*) in Seringapatam for the residence of Kaṅṭhīrava-Arasu with his family.

13. *E. C.*, III (1) TN. 96: s. 1598, *Naḷa*, *Ashāḍha ba.* 2.

From the domestic, no less from the political, point of view, it is of interest to note that the Kalale Family. the Kalale Family came into greater prominence and into increasing contact with the Mysore Royal House during this period. Mallarāja III, eldest son of Mallarāja Wodeyar *alias* Kempē-Arasu and grandson of Karikāla-Mallarāja II, continued to be the chief of Kalale till December 1679 when, having no issue, he was succeeded by Doḍḍa-Mallarājaiya or Mallarāja IV (1679-1719), a nephew of his and eldest son of Daḷavāi Kumāraiya of Kalale.¹⁴ Kumāraiya 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 Kalale, he also sought to cement the bond of relationship between the Mysore and Kalale families and paved the way for opportunities to promising members of the Kalale House to serve as Daḷavāis of Mysore. Indeed, as we have seen,¹⁵ Kumāraiya was himself the father-in-law of Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar, having given two of his daughters (Dēvamma and Doḍḍa-Dēpamma) in marriage to him. His brother Dēvaiya-Arasu likewise married his daughter (Doḍḍa-Muddamma) to Chikkadēvarāja. Further, on the retirement of Kumāraiya in May 1682, he was succeeded in the office of Daḷavāi of Mysore by Doḍḍaiya, a nephew of his and second son of Muppina-Kāntaiya of Kalale.¹⁶ Doḍḍaiya held the office with conspicuous ability, during 1682-1690. Again, Mallarājaiya, younger brother of Doḍḍaiya and last son of Muppina-Kāntaiya,¹⁷ was the Daḷavāi of Mysore between 1696-1698. The foundations of greatness of the House of Kalale in the history of

14. *K. A. V.*, ff. 16, 33; see also Table XIII.

15. *Supra*; see also under *Daḷavāis* in Ch. XII, for details about the periods of office of Daḷavāis from the Kalale Family.

16. *K. A. V.*, ff. 18; also Table XIII.

17. *Ibid.*

Mysore had thus been laid, and developed, already during 1660-1704.

The progress of Kaḷale 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 Kaṅṭhīrava 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,¹⁸ 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,

18. *Mys. Dho. Pūr.*, II. 31: *Tāraṇa, Kārtika ba.* 30. There was a solar eclipse on this date (see *Ind. Eph.*, VI. 211). See also *Mys. Rāj. Cha.*, 32; *Rāj. Kath.*, XII. 488, and *Annals*, I. 154. 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 education and training,²⁰ the personality, accomplishments and character of Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar attained, as his reign 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 (*Chenniḡa Chikadēvarāya*),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,²⁵ while on the field of

19. *Annals*, I, 155. This departure from the established usage perhaps points to the humanitarian influence of Śrī-Vaiṣṇavism during the period of Chikkadēvarāja's reign.

20. *Vide* section on *Early life of Chikkadēvarāja* in Ch. XI, for details.

21. See *Yād. Māhāt.* (of Chikkupādhyāya), I, 15; *Kamalā. Māhāt.*, I, 121; *Venkaṭa. Māhāt.*, I, 47-48, 51; *Paśc. Māhāt.*, I, 43-47; *Div. Sū. Cha.*, I, 86; *Mitra. Gō.*, I, 7; *Dōrbaḷa simha-vikramanum*; *unnata bāhu-parākramam*; *anupama parākramam*; *surādri hima-saila dhairyam uddhata śauryam*, etc.

22. *Hādī. Dhar.*, see *kanda* verse at the end of each chapter.

23. *C. Vam.*, 168: *Mahāpuruṣa lakṣhaṇa*; *anga-pratyanga cakravartī lakṣhaṇa*.

24. *Venkaṭa. Māhāt.*, I, 54; *Śrī. Māhāt.* (of Mallikārjuna), II, 32-33; *Chikka-dēvēndra-Vam.*, p. 29 (prose passage); *Yād. Māhāt.* (of Timma-Kavi), II, ff. 32 (prose passage); *C. Vam.*, 168; *C. Vi.*, IV, 69-72; *Muvivam.*, I, 9. Among the expressions found used in the texts are: *Rūpigoppuva javvāna*; *kendāvareyam pōlva muḍḍu moga*; *ānanamindu vendu*; *bagasegangaḷ*; *nayanam lasadutpala*; *nīḷḍu nasu bāḡida mūgu*; *naḷi tōḷ*; *erle baḷḷitāda*; *toḍe baḷeya kamba*; *melnaḍe*; *pādamam jānise pādamamendu*; *achcha bilpogeda maḡḡi*; *prasanna vadanāravinda*; *siridani*.

25. *Kamand. Nī.*, II, I; *Div. Sū. Cha.*, I, 81, 83; *C. Vi.*, V, 105; *Kamalā. Māhāt.*, I, 110; *Venkaṭa. Māhāt.*, I, 54: *Abhinava kandarpāvatāra*; *nūtana pushpabāṇa*; *bhāmini-hṛdaya-grāhi*; *mahā-saundaryādīm strīyaram . . . mannisi*.

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-chamatkṛtiyim*) 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 *Garuḍa-dhvaja*, as an emblem of victory (*jayaśrī vilasita naṭana*).²⁸ The accomplished person that he was,²⁹ Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar was celebrated as a distinguished scholar of his age.³⁰ He had a subtle

26. *Div. Sū. Cha.*, I, 81-82; *Hasti. Māhāt.*, I, 88; *Paśch. Māhāt.*, I, 44; *Sāt. Br. Vi.*, I, 46; *Vairi-bhīkaran*; *Kaliyendu raṇarangadoḷ*; *arirāya mahā timirārka*; *madavat kunjara simha*; *raṇasphurana bhairavanendu*.
27. *C. Bi.*, pp. 58-59; *Gi. Gō.*, pp. 38-39, 69-70; *M bh. Śānti.*, ff. 3 (col.); *Sachchū. Nir.*, ff. 120-121 (prose passage): *Astravidyā Bhṛgurāmanum*; *āhavakalā svētāvahananum*; *āsvārōhaṇa kalādharikṛta rēvantanum*; *gajārōhaṇa kalādharikṛta jayanta, maghavantanum*, etc.
28. *Venkaṭa. Māhāt.*, I, 48; *Śrī. Māhāt.*, II, 31; *Kamalā. Māhāt.*, I, 113-121, also ff. 29 (prose passage); *Ruk. Cha.*, I, 79; *Bhag. Gi. Tī.*, I, 60; *Mbh. Śānti.*, l.c.; *Paśch. Māhāt.*, I, 46; *Chikkadēvendra-Vam.*, P. 22, vv. 115-116; *Yād. Māhāt.*, II, 59-60; *Sachchū. Nir.*, I, 37; *A. V. C.*, I, 21, 23, 30, 37-38, III, 20, 36, 43, 44, 68, IV, 13; *Mitra. Gō.*, I, 8; *E. C.*, III (1) Sr. 14, ll. 51-53; *Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol.*, My. 115, ll. 63-66; also III (1) Sr. 64 (1722), ll. 58-70. Among the expressions found used in the texts are: *Uttungāśva sanghāta sindhura brndādbhuta pattiyukta nijasēnāchakra sarvasvaḍim*; *suttalidīrchida ripugaḷa mottamanu sadedu*; *dhuradōḷ sainyamanoyyugaḷdu ripugaḷam geldu*; *Nandaka kṛpaṇābhīrāmanum*; *Nandaka rakta dhārā parishikta*; *Nandakamene meregumapratima-nṛpa khaḍgam*; *Nandakākhyā khaḍga khaḍḍitārāti nṛpa maṇḍala . . . sṛgāhārā sammārjita*; *poḷeva yuddha Garuḍa-dhvajam*. In the poetical language of most of the contemporary sources, the sword *Nandaka* is conceived as a woman, a stage-dancer in the hands of Chikkadēvarāja on the field of battle, clothed with the enemies (see, for instance, in *Kamalā. Māhāt.*, I, 113: *Raṇarangangadoḷ sunandaka kṛpaṇa nāṭyanāriṃmani rakta-vasanōpētam*).
29. *Paśch. Māhāt.*, I, 45; *C. Vi.*, V, 105; *Mitra. Gō.*, p. 3 (prose passage); *Munivam.*, I, 154; *Sarasam*; *supraudhi*; *alampugāra*; *kalānidhi*.
30. *Paśch. Māhāt.*, I, 43-44; *C. Vi.*, V, 105; *Śringāra-Śataka-Sāngatya*, ff. 183; *Mitra. Gō.*, I, 7; *Munivam.*, I, 157; *Songs on Chikkadēvarāja and Kempadēvamma*, ff. 130: *Chaḍuram, nipuṇam, kaḍuḷṇam kaleyoḷ*; *sāravichāra kōvida*; *mahāvīdēvisham*; *vidyāpravāṇa*. See also *Rāj. Kath.*, XII. 474, where Dēvachandra speaks of Chikkadēvarāja as having been the foremost among the learned celebrities of his age (*Chikkadēva-rājarasam kōvida-sikhāmani-yenisīdam*).

mind capable of grasping the learned arts,³¹ and quick in comprehending the sentiments of others (*chāru-rasajnam*).³² He was a brilliant conversationalist (*vāk-kōvidam*) and took a keen interest in debates and discussions among scholars in his court (*śāstrigaḷa vāda*).³³ 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?"³⁴ An expert in all arts and sciences,³⁵ Chikkadēvarāja had dived deep into their secrets (*sarva sukalegaḷagutṭa tiliḍu*).³⁶ In particular, as we learn from another contemporary,³⁷ he would personally test the weapons, diamonds, horses and elephants required for his use (*āyudha ratna vāji gajamam tānē parikshikkumām*). Well-trained in the study and appreciation of music and literature (*samantu kuśalam sangīta-sāhityadoḷ*),³⁸ he was an ardent lover of them and had a thorough knowledge of their fundamentals.³⁹ He was himself an expert among the lutists (*vainīkarōḷ pravīṇa nereyam*),⁴⁰ having

31. *Chikkadēvēndra-Vam.*, P. 20, v. 108; *Yād. Māhāt.*, II, 54; *Sale vidvat satkalā prauḍhiyanure tiliyal sūkshma mādantarangam nelegoḍḍirkum*.

32. *Kāmanā. Nī.*, I, 69.

33. *Ibid.*, II, 1; *Ruk. Cha.*, I, 97.

34. See *Chāṭupadyamanimanjari*, vv. 46-54 (Ed. by V. Prabhākara Śāstri), quoted in the *Mys. Gaz.*, II. iv. 2461.

35. *Kamalā. Māhāt.*, I, 110; *Śrī. Māhāt.*, II, 31; *C. Vi.*, V, 105; *Chikkadēvēndra-Vam.*, l.c.; *Yād. Māhāt.*, II, 54; *Mbh. Śānti.*, l.c.; *C. Bi. and Gī. Gō.*, l.c.; *A. V. C.*, I, 19; *Mitra. Gō.*, I, 7; *Sakala kalā nilayam*; . . . *pravīṇu*; . . . *dharanam*; *viḍḍha kalā pravīṇam*; *kalā kōvidam*; *śāstrōrusārjānbhāvam*; *akhīla śāstrangaḷoḷ*, etc.

36. *Muniyam.*, I, 7.

37. See Singarārya in *Mitra. Gō.*, l.c.

38. *Ibid.*; see also *C. Bi. and Gī., Gō.*, l.c.

39. *Chikkadēvēndra-Vam.*, pp. 22, 28 (prose passage); *Yād. Māhāt.*, II, 62, also ff. 29 (prose passage); *Paśch. Māhāt.*, I, 44; *C. Vi.*, V, 105; *Mbh. Śānti.*, l.c.; *Div. Sū. Cha.*, I, 81; *A. V. C.*, I, 10; *Sangīta-sāhitya rasapramōḍita hrdayanam*; . . . *kōvidam*; . . . *rasajnam*; . . . *anēka sāhiti*; *mādhuryatara sangīta-śravaṇa-tōla*; *sangītada sāhityadoḷpanāraydu*.

40. *Mitra. Gō.*, l.c.

been taught to play scientifically on the instrument (lute), to the extent of endowing it with life and enrapturing his audience.⁴¹ Reference has been made in an earlier chapter to Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar as the guiding spirit, nay as the creator, of the 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.⁴² Himself a connoisseur of literary merit,⁴³ 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).⁴⁴ Further, it seems to have been his desire that authors attempting literary productions in Kannaḍa prose and poetry should aim at popular understanding and appreciation (*ellar prēmāde tiliḍālipante; aśēsha janam tiliḍa terade; ellarariviniṃ*) while paying due regard to beauty of form, sentiments, verbal embellishments, modernity in the medium of expression, use of *kanda* and other

41. *C. Vi.*, IV, 111-116: *Biṇeyanī kumāra Chikkadēvam . . . nādam svāra prakramam . . . nuṇṇa chāra . . . chārigalondire tāna tānaḍoḷ pavaṇarītāntu bājisuvinaṃ . . . prāṇam bandudu jantra bijjege . . . kiviḍoḍe pokku . . . chētanavṛtti mottadoḷ . . . saividaniyindamē samedudemba vikalpade tōrpudu; see also C. Vam., 176-181.*
42. *Kāmand. Nī.*, I, 69; *Venkaṭa. Māhāt.*, I, 47; *Sāt. Br. Vi.*, I, 47; *Praudhāgrānyam; nūtana sāhitya vijnāna gishpati bhāsvanmati; pāṇḍiti mahimeyum.*
43. *Mbh. Śānti.*, *C. Bi.* and *Gī. Gō.*, 1.c.: *Sāhityarasaparīkshā-nikashā-prastaranum; sāhityavidyā-nikashā-prastaranum.*
44. *Chikkadēvēndra-Vam.*, p. 28 (prose passage); *Yād. Māhāt.*, ff. 29-30 (prose passage); *Kāmand. Nī.*, 1.c.: *Atimadhuratara-sāhityavidyā-vishayānūrakta-mānasa; vara-sāhitya-vinōḍi; rūpa-rasa-pāka-sayyārīti-varṇanōpamōtprēkshā-bhāvachitrādi-guṇa-samīśra-sudhā-rasayana.*

varieties of metres and melody of diction.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."⁴⁶ In this he reminds us of Rāja-Rāja, the great Chōla 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,⁴⁷ Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar was, as he is depicted to us by his contemporaries, an intensely human character. With a thorough control over his passions and with a

45. See *Hastī. Māhāt.*, I, 101, 105-108; *Kamalā. Māhāt.*, III, 73-75, 78-79; *Śu. Sap.*, I, 19; *Bhag. Gī. Tī.*, I, 67; *Śēsha-Dharma*, v. 2 (col.); *Śrī. Māhāt.*, col., etc.: *Esakam bettu . . . rasabhāvālanḅkṛti rīti sadārtha; posatādoḷ nuḍi; padabandham posatāge kanda tatiyim nānāvṛtta sandōhadim; kēḷva jana brīndakkellam śrāvya sampada munḅuttire*. For details about these productions, *vide* Ch. XIV of this work.

46. See Wilks's *Preface* to his *Mysoor*, I. pp. xxii-xxiii, where he obviously records a genuine tradition fresh in the memories of his contemporaries in Mysore.

47. *Sāt. Br. Vi.*, I, 46-47; *Paśch. Māhāt.*, I, 43-44; *Kamalā. Māhāt.*, I, 110; *C. Vi.*, V, 105; *Chikkadēvēndra-Vam.*, pp. 22, 29 (prose passage); *Yād. Māhāt.*, II, 62, also ff. 32 (prose passage); *Venkaḅa. Māhāt.*, I, 54; *Yād. Māhāt.* (of Chikkupādhyāya), I, 15; *Munivam.*, I, 9, 148, 153; see also *E. C.*, III (1) Sr. 14 (1686), l. 46: *Vaibhavadolekalpasāla, atyantā sampadanum, abhyudayamam paḅedoppuva, bhāvukam; vinayōkti, madhurarāya bhāḅhaḅam, oḷvātugan, ānanda-dāyakanum, janānandukaram, utsavadoḷe Bāmanum; sāntam, nayaśīlam, gāmbhīrya; vivēkaśāli, uchitajnam; akalanka, vimala-manam; nēmagāram, dharmā-niḅḅha; sadayam, dayāpayōdhi; udārah, chāgi*. Cf. *Nāyaks of Madura* (p. 220) which refers to Chikkadēvarāja as "the niggardly king of Mysore," on the authority of Taylor (*Or. Hist. Mss.*, II. 224-226), by way of bringing out the greatness of Mangammā of Madura (1689-1706) 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,⁴⁸ he had a deep insight into the character of his councillors while remaining an enigma to them (*sakala sāmājika-roḷava tilidu nijaprakṛtiyanavarge kāṇisada*).⁴⁹ His government was that of a true Kshatriya, deeply rooted in the ancient ideal of *dharma* (*rājadharmam*), which had as its objectives punishment of the wicked and protection of the good (*duṣṭa-nigraha śiṣṭa-paripālanam*) and promotion of happiness of all his subjects in general and of Gods, Brāhmins and the dumb creation typified by the cow in particular.⁵⁰ Gifts to Brāhmins (implying the leisured class), reverence 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 devotion to Vishnu—these were the cardinal features of Chikkadēva's character as the ruler of a growing kingdom.⁵¹

48. *Munivam.*, I, 9, 11, 20; *Pasch. Māhāt.*, I, 44, 48; *Div. Sū. Cha.*, I, 81, 86; *Chikkadēvēndra-Vam.*, pp. 29-30 (prose passage); *Yād. Māhāt.*, ff. 32 (prose passage): *Arishaḍvargavaniradirisi*; *nīviritiguladhikōddi-panavāge*; *prabhū-mantrōtsāha-śaktitraya-vāvedu parama-saptāngarājyadolū*; *nīti-nīdhāna*, *nīti-vidyā-viśāradānu*, *nīti-prakāradim*, *sāma-dāna-bhēda-dānda-chaturōpāya-kuśala*, etc.

49. *Munivam.*, I, 148.

50. *Pasch. Māhāt.*, I, 48; *Chikkadēvēndra-Vam.* and *Yād. Māhāt.*, l.c.; *Mitra. Gō.*, I, 8; *C. Bi.*, p. 4, also col.; *Hadi. Dhar.*, IX, 60; *Gī. Gō.* and *Sachchā. Nir.*, col.; *A. V. C.*, III, 45, 151, IV, 17, 23; *E. C.*, III (1) Sr. 14, ll. 76-77. Among the textual expressions are: *Survajana*, *anibar prajegāl*, *sakala prajākāntanum*; *dēva-gō-vipra-santati santasādōlrke*, *dēva-brāhmaṇa paripālanam pradhānam gaidu*, *dēva-brāhmaṇa rakshaṇāya prithvi-sāmrājya-dīkshā-bhṛti*.

51. *Kamālā. Māhāt.*, I, 150; *Venkaṭa. Māhāt.*, I, 54; *Kāmand. Nī.*, I, 69; *Pasch. Māhāt.*, I, 44; *Div. Sū. Cha.*, I, 82; *Chikkadēvēndra-Vam.*, pp. 20-21, vv. 108-109, also pp. 28-30 (prose passage); *Yād. Māhāt.*, II, 54, also ff. 29 (prose passage); *Sāt. Br. Vi.*, I, 46-47: *Dānade vipraram*, *kavi-jana-hṛdayābhīṣṭamittu*, *piridu manṇaneyim budharām*, *āsritauḡhamanudattāudōryadim*, *arthi-jana chintōratna*, *pātravanivāham*; *ānata-prajeyam satkṛpeyim*, *abhayapradānadīndānataram*; *kaḍu kūrmeyim svakiyānuchararkaḷam*; *prajeyanādaradim*, *prajeyam lālaneyim*; *vīlasadim māniniyarkaḷam*, *saundaryadim striyaram*; *ramādhipanam bhaktiyim*, *haripādābja makaranda sanmadhukaram*; *sarvajānānu-pālana satpradhānam guṇam*.

Literary flourishes apart, contemporary testimony to the greatness of Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar is very weighty indeed. Contemporary testimony as to his greatness.

Mallikārjuna, in his *Śrīranga-Māhātmya* (1678), observes: ⁵² “There are no sovereigns who do not perform obeisance 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 Brāhmins not gratified by his gifts, no tract not impressed with the emblem of his sovereignty, and no venerable persons not duly honoured by him.” Tirumalārya, in his *Apratima-Vīra-Charitam* (c. 1695-1700), ⁵³ 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: *Dharaṇī-Varāha* (boar), *Gaṇḍa-bhērūṇḍa* (double-headed eagle), *Birudantembara-gaṇḍa* (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

52. II, 35:

Maṇiyāda rāyarilla besagaiyada manneyarilla
Śīranendenisada virarilla saraṇendenada sātravarilla |
Dānadim daṇiyāda viprarilla nijamudreya-nottada dēsamilla
Mannāṇegoḷadāryarilla Chikadēva-nrpam dharegāṇmanembinaṁ ||

Compare with this what Vijnānēśvara, the famous author of the *Mitākshara*, wrote of Chālukya Vikramāditya VI (1076-1112): “There has not been, there is not, and there will not be, on the surface of the earth, a city like Kalyāṇ; and never was a monarch like the prosperous Vikramānka seen or heard” (see *Mys. Gaz.*, II. ii. 803).

53. II, 2:

Jagadoḷ Śrī-Chikadēvanim piriyarillettānu-muṇṭādoḍam
Bagegoḷgum paḷavātinōḷ doreyumillettānu-muṇṭādoḍam |
Bagegoḷgum pratibimbadoḷ malevarillettānu-muṇṭādoḍam
Bagegoḷgum pranayāparādhavidhiyoḷ meydōradinnelliyum ||

prowess), *Sangara-Bhīma* (champion on the field of battle), *Hindurāya-Suratrāṇa* (Sultān of Hindu kings), *Āndhra-kshītindra-hṛdaya-śūla* (a trident to the heart of the Telugu chief, *i.e.*, Nāyak of Madura), *Dakshinadik-Chakravarti*, *Tenkāṇa-Rāya* (Emperor of the South), *Karnāṭaka-Bhūmaṇḍalādhiśvara*, *Karnāṭaka-Chakravarti*, *Śringāra-Karnāṭa-Chakri* (Emperor of the Karnāṭaka country), *Yādavakulōddhāraka* (establisher of the Yadu race), *Mahishapuravarādhiśvara* (Lord of the city of Mysore), *Paśchimarangapurī-simhāsanādhiṣṭhitam* (established on the throne, *i.e.*, sovereignty, of the city of Seringapatam), *Mahārājādhirājaparamēśvara* (Emperor of kings) and *Apratīma-Vīra* (unparalleled hero).⁵⁴ Some of these titles show unmistakably the high position Chikkadēva had attained to in Southern India as a ruler.

Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar lived and worked in times of exceptional difficulty and stress. From the beginning of his reign, it was his avowed ambition to maintain the territorial integrity and independence of the kingdom of Mysore on the one hand and, on the other, to advance further as a representative of or rather as the political heir to the imperial traditions of Vijayanagar in Southern India and the Karnāṭaka country. In seeking to realize that ambition, he successively came into conflict with numerous powers, the Nāyaks of Madura and Ikkēri, the local chiefs, the Muhammadans of Bijāpur and Gōlkoṇḍa and the Mahrattas under Śivāji and Sambhāji. Prospects of southern expansion of Mysore under him, as far as Madura and Trichinopoly, were bright up to 1682 but became gloomy and were definitely, though temporarily, arrested by the harassing wars of Sambhāji during

54. See, *C. Vi.*, col.; *Chikkadēvēndra-Vam.*, pp. 26-30 (prose passage); *Yād. Māhāt.*, ff. 27-32 (prose passage); *Mbh. Śānti.*, col., *C. Bi.*, *Gz. Gō.* and *Sachchā. Nir.*, col.; *E. C.*, III (1) Sr. 94, ll. 3-5; IV (2) Ch. 92, ll. 58-60; *Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol.*, My. 115, ll. 155-169, 430-440; also references cited in f.n. to Ch. XI of this work.

1682-1686 and the advance of Mughal arms 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 Karnāṭak at the expense of local chiefs (like those of Ikkēri and Maddagiri) and foreign powers (like Bijāpur and Gōlkoṇḍa 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 Aurangzīb was engaged in his ever-deepening struggle with the Mahrattas in the Deccan, Chikkadēvarāja 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 Karnāṭaka country, and was in fact at the zenith of his power, an achievement creditable in no small measure to his untiring personal exertions and the activities of his Daḷavāis.

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 Chikkadēva with complete 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 unfortunate check that Chikkadēvarāja received in that direction and in his attempt at the assertion of supremacy over

As a politician.

the 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 *sardēśmukhi* from its chiefs and princelings. The imperialism of Śivāji, Aurangzīb and their successors differed widely from that of Chikkadēva's ideal of an Empire.⁵⁵ 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 decades 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 Hindus 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

55. On the relative claims of Mysore, the Mahrattas and the Mughals to Empire in the South, *vide* Appendix VI—(7).

(in 1704) thus meant to the South something more than the loss of a Śivāji or an Aurangzīb. So long as Chikkadēva 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 Nawābs of Arcot and the Nizām) 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.

Chikkadēva 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

As a ruler.

and execution of new ideas and schemes. His fiscal regulations 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 Śivāji, refused to seek the aid of outsiders, though he maintained diplomatic relations with the Mughal. A devout Śrī-Vaishṇava 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 Brāhmanical 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, Chikkadēvarāja Wodeyar, in keeping with the ancient ideal of *Varnāśrama-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 Kannāḍa literature as the means of popular education, ushering in a new era in the literary history of Mysore. 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 Chikkadēvarāja, 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

As a religious and social reformer.

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 liberation from association with unhelpful society, a society that discards human sympathy and human good-will towards its own kind. Conduct is greater than mere profession of belief. Religion is, in this sense, the fountain-head of morality and that is morality which has its supreme sanction from religion. We can now appreciate why Chikkadēva stresses duty in one's own sphere in the true spirit of the *Bhagavad-Gītā*. He inculcates 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 sphere even to-day. It would seem that in the religious and social domain, as in the political and administrative, Chikkadēva realized the limits of human action. If it is the first duty of a reformer to prevent any future reformation, Chikkadēva splendidly succeeded in his attempt. To those who think that they can by a stroke of the pen remould society or remake religion, here is something to unlearn, if not to learn.

Monarchs have seldom condescended to become the preceptors of their subjects. If some praise is due to Aśōka 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 Rome as of Constantinople and Berytus, then some credit is also due to Chikkadēva for the diligence with which he attempted to teach those committed to his charge the solidarity of humanity. To him all human beings—the four orders of the Hindu social life—were one, each being indissolubly bound up with others and all being one single whole for the common good. His

His conception of human equality.

conception of equality transcended law. It was something 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.

A worthy contemporary of Śivāji and Aurangzīb, 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, Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar 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 *Chikkadēvarāja-sāgara-nālā* and the *Dēva-nālā* (*Chikkadēvarāja-nālā*), 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 Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar on the generation 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 Kaṅṭhīrava-Narasarāja Woḍeyar II (1704-1714), significantly echoes the memory of his greatness as a warrior-king of Mysore.⁵⁷ Another work,

Chikkadēvarāja
Woḍeyar in the 18th
century literature.

56. See, for instance, *E.C., Mys. Dist. Suppl. Vol.*, Nj. 295 (1716); III (1) Sr. 64 (1722) and 100 (1724), TN. 63 (1749), and IV (2) Yd. 17, 18 (1761); also *infra*.

57. *Anangavijaya-Bhāṇah*, pp. 2-3: *Nirantara-āuranta bhujā-kunta balākrānta sāmanta sīmanta nighāta nija-mudrānkita jaya-stambha Śrī-Chikkadēvarāja prithvī-ramaṇa*.

belonging to the reign of Krishnarāja Wodeyar I (1714-1732), vividly points to the glory of his reign.⁵⁸

Chikkadēvarāja 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 Penukoṇḍa, an interval of nearly a hundred and fifty years from the death of Venkaṭa I (1614), the last great ruler of that illustrious line, till the memorable reign of Chikkadēvarāja 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 Śrī-Ranga VII (1759)—who successively occupied the Imperial throne of Vijayanagar. During the same period, Mysore, as we have shown,⁵⁹ rose from the position of a mere viceroyalty to the proud status of a sovereign seat, which, under the capable rule of a discerning king, Chikkadēva, was fast taking the place of the old Imperial 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. Chikkadēva's kingdom suffered a temporary eclipse because, as

58. *Sakala-Vaid. Sam.*, pp. 2-4 (Introd. Ch.).

59. *Vide* Chs. V, VI, VIII, X and XI of this work, for the political evolution 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 ideal 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 devotion of trusted leaders who again and again asserted the principle of right over might and held aloft the high principles of service, devotion and loyalty, and amidst all kinds of difficulties owned no other duty to the Sovereign House of Mysore but that of duty done for the sake of duty.
