CHAPTER III

CHAUTAS

The chiefs who ruled over Puttige, Ullala and Mudabidre regions are known as the Chautas. According to local tradition these chiefs had their capitals at Ullala, Puttige and Mudabidre. But as will be seen below a branch of this family started ruling from Ullala while the Puttige continued to be the capital of the original family till the middle of the seventeenth century. The line of the Uallala branch of this family was noticed by the Portuguese historians and Della Valle, an Italian traveller. These chiefs followed the 'Aliya Santana' in the line of succession.
There are different views regarding the origin of this family. Francis Buchanan, who visited Kanara in the early part of the nineteenth century remarks in his diary that they were descendants of the king of Vijayanagara by a Jaina woman. But this view is not true as we have no evidence to support this. According to Aigal, Tirumalarāya I who ruled from 1160-1179 A.D. was the first chief of this family. Strangely enough, we never come across this chief in any of the epigraphical and other contemporary sources. The earliest known Chauta chief is Vikru Chauta, and his name is referred to in an epigraph dated in 1390 A.D. from Müdabidre.

His capital must have been at Puttige, as it is near to Müdabidre. Thus we can say that Vikru Chauta was the first chief of this dynasty. From this date onwards till the battle of Rakkasa-Tangadi the following chiefs of this family ruled over the principality with headquarter at Puttige:

Vikru Chauta 1390 A.D.
Shāntayya Chauta 1431 A.D.
Jögi Oḍeya 1436 A.D.

Allappa Sekhara (1465 A.D.) Devā Sekhara Bemmanna Sekhara 1465 A.D. 1465 A.D.
Tirumalarasa Chauta 1508-12 A.D.
Tuḷuvarasa Chauta 1528 A.D.
Tirumalarāya Chauta 1543 A.D.
A few inscriptions of these chiefs tell us that they assisted the governor of Vijayanagara at Mangalore. The names of the Vijayanagara emperors are mentioned by these chiefs in their epigraphs which speak of their political agreements with the neighbouring chiefs. All these indicate that these chiefs enjoyed local autonomy. Under the Chautas, Mūdahidre became the centre of Jainism. The famous Tribhuvana Tilaka Chaudāmani Basadi was constructed by the Jaina preceptor Abhinava Chārikārī Pāṇḍita with the assistance of the Chautas and Shettim. The construction of this Basadi began from 1429 A.D. and it was completed in 1462 A.D.

By the middle of the 16th century, two important events took place, one was the division of the family and the other was the confrontation of the Uḷḷāla branch of the Chautas with the Portuguese. The former is known from epigraphical sources and the latter is culled out from the Portuguese writers' accounts.

An inscription of 1571 A.D. from Mūdahidre refers to Lokaḍēvi as the Chauta queen of Puṭṭige and at the same time another copper plate inscription of the same place and of the same date mentions another Chauta queen Abbakkadēvi I. Both the inscriptions say that the grant made by the queen should not be destroyed by the
chief of Puttige. These two inscriptions indicate that the Chauṭa family had come to be divided into two principalities and that two queens were ruling Puttige and Ullāla respectively.

As regards the relationship of Ullāla chiefs with the Portuguese, one of the Portuguese sources of 1555 A.D. tells us that the Portuguese governor demanded tributes from the queen of Ullāla. On her refusal the Portuguese commander Dom Alvares De Silva plundered Mangalore (Ullāla) and forced her to the tribute. This event took place in 1556 A.D. We have however no corroborative evidence to substantiate this statement.

In 1569 A.D. the same queen had violent quarrell with the Banga chief Vīra Narasimha III. As we mentioned earlier this quarrel was settled by the Portuguese viceroy. We do not get definite record regarding the end of her rule. However, by 1589 A.D. her rule came to an end as one of the Portuguese records of that year refers to the king of Ullāla and his violent clash with the Banga chief (Vīra Narasimha Śankaradevi, alias Bangarāja Vadiya).

The clash between the two chiefs led to war. On this aspect a Portuguese account gives the following information. The king of Ullāla, in the course of the war
gained an upper hand in such a way that he had deprived the Banga chief of almost the whole of his kingdom. In the critical situation the Chauta chief built a fort on the opposite side of the river Netravati. Further the same chief employed 3000 men to defend the fort. In this context the Portuguese intervened on behalf of the Banga Chief. They seem to have intruded into the territory of the Chauta principality of Ullala. The above mentioned source further says that the Portuguese governor ordered the captain Major of the Malabar fleet to go personally to Mangalore and he should endeavour to make peace between the king of Ullala and the king of Banga. If the king of Ullala did not come to terms, the captain was to wage war on him.

What Major Thome De Souza had done to the king of Ullala is mentioned in his account dated 22nd August 1591 A.D. and signed by Major himself. He departed from Goa on 1st December 1589, with three Galleys and thirty ships. Arriving at Mangalore, he informed the chief of Ullala that he had come there at the instance of the governor in order to bring the belligerent to peace on the basis of just terms, particularly the restitution of territories captured from each other. He invited the king of Ullala for a talk. After delay of many days the king met the captain and promised that he would destroy the fort of Ullala. However, the chief of Ullala did not keep up the promise. Then the Major declared
war on Ullāla on behalf of the Banga chief. In the course of the war it is said that the Portuguese inflicted heavy casualty on Ullāla and round about area and this forced the chief of Ullāla to come to terms with the Portuguese and the Banga chief. 15

It is to be noted that the name of the king of Ullāla who came to conflict with the Banga chief is not mentioned in any source. Della Valle, however mentions the king of Ullāla and states that on his death his wife succeeded and that the latter was succeeded by Abbakkadēvi. 16 But it is certain that the king mentioned here cannot be the one mentioned above as having fought with the Banga king. Further, Abbakkadēvi mentioned in this account is to be regarded as second queen of that line of the Ullāla branch of Chauṭā. At Puṭtige Chikkarāja Arasa was in power in 1578 A.D. 17 This queen appears to have come to power in 1594 A.D. 18

According to Aigal, Tirumalādevī succeeded Abbakkadēvi in 1582 A.D. and her reign came to an end in 1606 A.D. Further he tells us that this queen who waged a war against Bhairarasa Odeyaṭ of Kārkala and died on the battlefield. Then Chandrāśekhara Chikkarāja succeeded her and he ruled till 1628 A.D. At the request of this chief Keladi Venkatappanāyaka conducted military campaign against Bhairarasa Odeyaṭ and routed that chief. 19
The above view-points are questioned on the following grounds. Firstly, it is strange that the existing sources of the Chautas known to us so far do not mention Tirumaladēvi as a queen of Uḷḷāla between 1582 and 1606 A.D. On the other hand, we have earlier noticed the rule of a king at Uḷḷāla from 1587 to 1591 A.D. Secondly, the clash between the Chauta queen and the Kalasa-Kārkala chief and the subsequent approach of the Chauta king of Uḷḷāla for help from Venkatappa are not mentioned in the contemporary sources, such as literary works and epigraphs. Thirdly, if we accept Chandrasekhara as a king of Uḷḷāla from 1606 to 1628 A.D. he might have met Della Valle. But Della Valle tells of his interview with Abbakkadēvi at Uḷḷāla in 1623 A.D. Therefore with the existing sources it is difficult to accept the view points advanced by Algal. Heras remarks that the queen whom Della Valle met was the same queen Abbakkadēvi who is mentioned in a Portuguese record of 1556 A.D. But this version is untenable as he could not notice the existence of the king at Uḷḷāla from 1588 to 1594 A.D. Over and above, Della Valle clearly says that Abbakkadēvi whom he met was the younger sister of the former queen who had ruled at Uḷḷāla.

Abbakkadēvi II renewed her hostile attitude with the Banga king. The Portuguese government at Goa tried to settle this differences between these two hostile chiefs.
To them the existence of the fort at Ullāla was irksome. The king of Portugal instructed the viceroy in a letter dated in 1st March 1595 A.D. that no peace treaty should be concluded without a provision for the destruction of the fortress. The Portuguese insisted on her to destroy the fort but the queen was reluctant to do it. Then according to an instruction of the king, the viceroy of Goa sent Dom A Azeveda to Ullāla to raze the fortress to the ground. Finally, it was destroyed by Azeveda. In 1597 A.D. the queen was intending to help the king of Serra against the Banga chief. We have stated earlier that the Portuguese prevailed upon her not to assist the king of Serra.

In spite of the pressure from the Portuguese, the hostilities between the Chautām and Bangas continued. It reached its climax in 1616 A.D. In that year the Banga chief, Vīra Narasimha Lakṣmappa IV with the help of the king of Mountain deprived the queen of her territory until at last she was left with only one fort which he boasted he could take easily. In this critical situation the queen was frightened and allied herself with Venkaṭapannaṅyaka. Petro Della Valle in his account refers to the clash between the Chautā queen and the Banga rāja and says that the queen’s seeking the help of Keladi Venkaṭappanāyaka forced the Banga chief to ask for the help of the Portuguese.
Further, the same traveller states that the queen with the help of the Keladi forces routed the Portuguese and the Banga chief. The defeat of the Portuguese at the hands of this queen grimmelled Della Valle. He desired to see the queen. He came to Ullāla in 1623 A.D. About this queen and her achievements we are indebted to the accounts of the same traveller. About this queen the same traveller remarks "perfectly gentle lady of high dignity, she was about forty years of age. Dark in complexion she carried with her stately head upon a delicate and alluring figure; her graceful voice, and her prudent and judicious speech bespoke her nobility". Then the same traveller praises her marvellous assiduity in public affairs, commends her energy which was that of the spirit of Shaih of Abbas; further the same traveller narrates her routine work and informs us about her son and grand son. The same queen built Bhūṭa Gudi. She gave her daughter in marriage to the king of Gumbia, Rama Nato, and his son Bale Rairu would succeed the queen. But this did not happen very soon. According to Della Valle, she had to pay heavily for her alliance with Venkaṭappa who is said to have forcibly annexed part of her territory to his own kingdom. The queen is said to have poisoned her son Ciōn Rāo.
It is reported in the Portuguese record of 1630 A.D. that the queen of Ullāla along with other chiefs revolted against the authority of the Keḻadi after the death of Venkaṭappa. She even appears to have sought the help of the Adilshahi of Bijapur against the Keḻadi ruler. But she was not successful in her attempt. It is probable that same queen lived till 1640 A.D.

On the basis of existing evidence, it is possible to presume that Ullāla branch continued to survive till 1666 A.D. In 1664 A.D. a king was ruler of Ullāla, says one of the Portuguese records. But we do not know the name of the king. According to the same record, the king of Ullāla in alliance with the Banga queen with the support of Nairs of Malabar besieged the fortress of Mangalore which was under the Nāyakas of Keḻadi. It is inferred from this record that the king mentioned here might be the same as Bale Rai, the grandson of Abbakkadēvi II, noticed by Della Valle in 1623 A.D. It is known that the rebellion of this king and other chiefs of Kanara was put down by Keḻadi Sōmaśekharanāyaka. Further history of the Ullāla branch of the Chautas we are not in a position to narrate on account of the dearth of source material.

It has been pointed out above that the Chauta family was branched off into two, when Lōkādēvi started ruling from Puttige and her sister Abbakkadēvi I commenced
her rule at Ullāla. An inscription of Lokādēvi dated in 1571 A.D. speaks of her making grant to the Pārśvanātha basadi at Mūdabidre in memory of her deceased sister Padumaladēvi. Further in another inscription of the same year speaks of Abbakkadēvi's grant of land at Marakata in Michar māgane for the feeding in the basadi at Bidre. In the light of these two epigraphs it is difficult to accept the statement of Aigal that Abbakkadēvi was a ruler of Puttige and Ullāla between 1544 A.D. and 1582 A.D. It is probable that Lokādēvi of the earlier epigraph noticed above succeeded Tirumalaraṇa Chauṭa after 1545 A.D.

The next chief of this family was Chikkarāja arasa. Two inscriptions dated in 1578 A.D. confirm his rule at Puttige. These tells us that he was a disciple of Chārukīrti Panditadhēva. At the instance of this Guru the chief made a grant to a basadi.

Poet Linganna says that Venkaṭappa defeated the Chauṭas and built a fort at Mūdabidre, which was with the principality of the Chauṭas of Puttige. According to Keladi Basavaraṇa when Venkaṭappaṇāyaṇa attacked Mūdabidre, it was defended by Sankaraṇārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa. Venkaṭappa defeated him but spared his life as he was a Brahmana.

If the Portuguese record of 1629 A.D. is to be believed Venkaṭappa seized the land belonging to the Chauṭas of Puttige worth 10 ten thousand pagōdas. Another record of the
Portuguese dated in 1630 A.D. alludes the rebellion of the king of Chauḍa but his name is noted mentioned there.

A copper plate inscription dated in 1640 A.D. found at Mūḍabidre is of much importance for the political history of the Chautas. It records an agreement between Chikkarāja Odeya Chauta of Puttige branch and Abinava Chārūkīrti Pāṇḍitaḍēva and other merchant guilds of Bīḍrūru (i.e. Mūḍabidre) undertaking not to encroach in future, upon the civic rights enjoyed by the merchants. It is clear from the inscription that the contention of Aigal that Bhōja Rāja was the ruler of Puttige at this year is not correct. The same epigraph refers to Kēlāḍī Vīrabhadrānyaka’s rule over Māṅgalūru and Bārakūru and mentions Narasimha Odeya holding Mūdra of Māṅgalūru. It is possible to infer from this inscription that the Chauḍa chief acknowledged the authority of the Kēlāḍi. Poet Chandrama in his work Kārkala Gommatāyara Charitre refers to a grant by a Chauḍa king for daily worship of the Gommatā image in the year 1646 A.D. It is likely that this chief was the same as Chikkarāja Odeya since his rule commenced from 1640 A.D.

It is said that Kēlāḍī Śivappanāyaka conquered the Chauḍa chief and demanded payment of 3000 Varāhas as a tribute. But no contemporary sources evidence support this view.
Next we notice Chennammadevi in this family. Sewell noticed her grant to Viṭṭala Kāmatī. Aigal is of the opinion that this queen ruled from 1644 A.D. to 1687 A.D. But it is difficult to fix the date of the queen as the inscription is badly damaged and the date cannot be found. Further it is difficult to hold that this queen continued to rule till 1687 A.D. because we find a reference to another queen Abbakkadēvi, in the Puttige branch in the year 1667 A.D. It is likely that this queen was probably the daughter and successor of Chennammadēvi. The inscription stated above records a grant for basadi at Mūḍabidre for the maintenance of feeding houses and offering worship in the basadi. This is the last of the inscriptions mentioning any Chauta chiefs. The rest of the history of this family is known from literary sources.

The Keladinripavijayam refers to the revolt of the Chauta chief against the Keḻadi Chennammāji and states that the rebellion was put down by the latter's general, Daḷavēyi Bhadrappa. But it is not possible either to find out the name of the rebel chief or to examine the authenticity of the statement.

The next reference to a Chauta chief is in the Ratnaśekhara Charitre of Pattabhirma which states that
one Abbakkadēvi was ruling at Puttige in 1725 A.D. when
the work came to be written. But we have no means of
connecting her with the earlier chief of this family.
At best, she may be described as Abbakkadēvi II of the
Puttige branch. It is further stated by Standford Smith
that this queen was harassed by Keladi Sōmaśēkharanāyaka
to exact tribute from her. It is, however, difficult
to verify the statement in the absence of authentic evi-
dence.

Poet Sural mentions a Chandraśēkharā Chikkarāja
Chauṭa the son of Chennammadēvi as his contemporary in
1761 A.D. If this is accepted, it can be surmised that
Abbakkadēvi mentioned above was succeeded by Chennammadēvi
and that she was succeeded by her son Chandraśēkharā
Chikkarāja. It is, however, to be noted that there is no
corroborative evidence in this respect. Shortly after-
wards the Chauṭa family was overwhelmed by Haidar Ali and
the family ceased to rule though some of their desce-
dants do continue to live at Mūḍabidre till today.

RELATION WITH OTHER CHIEFS

The Chautas had contacts with the neighbouring
chiefs in Kanara. In 1543 A.D. the chief of the Chauṭa
of Puttige concluded an agreement with Kaḷasa Kārkala
chiefs. The later work of Buchanan refers to the clash
between the Chauta and the Kalasa-Karkala and the intervention of the Keladi Nayakas on behalf of Vijayanagara. However, its authenticity is doubtful.

The relationship between the Banga chiefs and the Chauta branch of Ullala was always hostile. Prior to the commencement of our period, the Puttige Chautas had hostile relations and these were settled by the good office of a third party. During our period of study the hostilities did continue and the Portuguese exploited this situation to their advantage. These activities have been detailed above.

Modern scholars like Heras and Kamath S.U. speak of a matrimonial alliances between the Banga raja and the Chauta queen in 1569 A.D. For example, Kamath holds that the Banga chief Kāmirāya married a Chauta queen and their daughter was Abbakkadēvi II of Ullala branch. This contention has no basis at all. The Banga contemporaries of Abbakkadēvi I were Vīra Nagasimha and Vīra Narasimha Sankaradēvi I. (Alias Banga raja vadiya). Kāmirāya II, however figures as late as in 1595 A.D.

The common boundary between these two chiefs (the Banga and the Chautas of Ullala) the mutual jealousy, and unhappy marriage of Vīra Lakshmappa Banga IV and Abbakkadēvi II of Ullala were probably the causes of the wars.
After 1630 A.D. the Chautas of Ullāla and Puttige and the Banga chief made unsuccessful attempts to undermine the Keladi authority in Kanara. But they were not successful.

It is thrilling to note that the Chauta branch of Ullāla persistently resisted the Portuguese expansion in their territory of Ullāla for nearly three decades. In the course of their wars with the Portuguese, the latter burnt Ullāla and destroyed the fortress and committed worst barbarous activities on her territory.

The political contacts of Abbakkadēvi II extended to the chiefs in Malabar. She desired to seek an alliance of Zamorin of Calicut against the Portuguese in 1594 A.D. Further the fame of the queen spread beyond India. While Della Valle was in Persia he was informed by king Shaih Abbas of Persia of the heroic deeds of Abbakkadēvi. The same king of Persia also informed the same traveller that Persia used to get annually rice, pepper and clothes from the land of this queen. It was from the king of Persia that Della Valle came to know the defeat of the Portuguese at hands.

She encouraged commercial activities in her principality. She had trade contact with Persia and Arbia. It is said that on one occasion the Portuguese captain imprudently captured a rich ship belonging to the queen, sailing from Mecca.
THE EXTENT OF TERRITORY

At the height of power, the Chauta principality extended over the regions of Ullāla, Puttige, Mejar Maganes Pūjāvara sīme and Mundkūru sīme including Kārkala and Mangalore Talukas of South Kanara. They lost much of their territory to the Keladi Nāyakas whose subordination they accepted.

RELIGION OF THE CHAUTAS

Before concluding this chapter, let us review the words of Heras and Dr. Saletore B.A. on the religion of the Chautas. According to these scholars the Chautas especially of the Ullāla branch, were devotees of Śiva. This remark of these scholars is based on the statement of Della Valle. Similar view has been expressed by Narasīmha Achar. But the study of various inscriptions convince us that they were Jain by religion. They built bāsās around about Mūdabidre and they claimed to be the disciples of Chārukīrti Pāṇḍita-dēva and Lakṣmanasēna Bhaṭṭāraka. Further they made munificent grants for the Jaina institutions. They were, however, Zealous patrons of Śaivism also. They made generous grants to Hindu institutions. Thus these chiefs maintained religious harmony among their subjects.
# GENEALOGY OF THE CHAUTAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ullāla Branch</th>
<th>Puttige Branch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Abbakkadēvi I**  
(1556-1588 A.D) | **Lōkādēvi**  
(1571 A.D) |
| **Unnamed king**  
(1588-1594 A.D)  
(brother of Abbakka?) | **Chikkarāja Arasa**  
(1578 A.D) |
| **Abbakkadēvi II**  
(1594-1640 A.D)  
(Daughter of Abbakkadēvi I) | **Chikkarrāja Odeya**  
(1640-46 A.D)  
(Nephew of Chikkarrāja Arasa) |
| **Cic Rao Chaluvarao**  
Unnamed daughter married to Kumbala Chief. | **Chennammadevi Chauta?**  
(1646-1666 A.D) |
| **Balleeraya**  
(1640-1666 A.D)  
(Grandson of Abbakkadēvi II) | **Abbakkadēvi I**  
(1667-1719 A.D)  
(Daughter of Chennammadevi?) |
| | **Abbakkadēvi II**  
(1720-1740 A.D) |
| | **Chennammadevi II**  
(1740-1759 A.D) |
| | **Chandraśekhara Chikkarāja Chauta**  
(1761 - 1763 A.D)  
(Son of Chennammadevi) |
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