CHAPTER II

KELADI RULE IN KANARA

BEGINNING OF THE INFLUENCE OF KELADI IN KANARA

The disintegration of the Vijayanagara empire consequent to the battle of Rakkas-Tangadi gave scope to the rise of the new ruling families. The extreme northern portions of the Vijayanagara empire were occupied by the Adilshahi rulers. In the southern region among the rulers, who rose to prominence, were the Nayakas of Keladi. They started their career as the feudatories of Vijayanagara and following the battle of Rakkas-Tangadi they assumed independence, though for some time, they nominally recognised the suzerainty of Vijayanagara. Among the rulers in Kanara of this period, the Nayakas of Keladi who occupied the major portion of Kanara and
and influenced its political and cultural activities. In fact, they can be regarded as the biggest Hindu rulers of the Post-Vijayanagara period and it is they who continued the traditions of Vijayanagara for a long time. Their prominence was felt by the foreigners, who were slowly gaining importance in the Kanara region. In fact they called the Nāyakas as the rulers of Kanara.

The first member of this family to be associated with Kanara was Sadāśivanāyaka. His predecessor, Chaudāgaunda was the founder of the family and his authority was restricted to the region around Keladi. But Sadāśivanāyaka appears to have impressed his master and secured for him the authority on wider regions including the Tulurājya. This event took place after 1551 A.D. We have a record dated in 1554 A.D. which clearly associates him with these regions. However, he seems to have had an association with Kanara even earlier. We have to take note here of an inscription at Uluvarē dated in 1550 A.D. According to this epigraph Sāluva Krishnadevarasa, who was ruling Naive, Tulu and Konkana from his capital at Gerasoppe, handed over Uluvarē village, which was under his control, to Sadāśivanāyaka of Keladi after receiving some amount for conducting worship in the Mahābalēśvara temple at Gokarna. In spite of its
damaged condition, the epigraph throws new light on the contact between Keladi Sadasiva and the Gerasoppe chief, Suluva Krishana. On the basis of this record, it can be said that the Keladi ruler had in possession Uluvare before his appointment as governor of Barakuru and Mangaluru rajyas. Earlier, Sadasivanayaka was governing nine maganis above the Ghats.6

The Sivatattvaratnakara describes the heroic deeds of Keladi Sadasivanayaka and subsequent events that led to his appointment as governor of Barakuru and Mangaluru rajyas. During the siege of Kalyan, Ramaraya summoned all generals before him and throwing the weapon called yamadātrika into the fort asked them to fetch it back. All generals except Sadasivanayaka kept silent. Sadasiva stormed the fort and brought back the weapon of his master. The sovereign was greatly pleased with this and bestowed upon him the titles of Kōtekolāhala and Rājanayaka together with the governorship of Barakuru and Mangaluru.7 The same work further informs us that Sadasivanayaka was asked to subdue the scheming chiefs of Kerala and Tuluva and that he not only carried out the orders but also took the defeated chiefs as prisoners to the imperial capital.8
The poet Linganna, however, simply tells us that Sadäśivanäyaka overran the entire south Kanara and established his pillar of victory at Kasargöd. It follows from this that Sadäśivanäyaka was a favourite subordinate of the Vijayanagara emperor and that he had earned his confidence by his valour. This is further clear from an inscription of 1554 A.D. from Basrūru noted above which states that Sadäśiva was then ruling Tūlurājya as loyal subordinate of the emperor. The epigraph also notes that he appointed Malappa Oḍeya as Governor of Bārakūru rājya.

In the same year a copper plate inscription from Kōṭēśvara records his purchase of a piece of land from a Brahmana and donating it to the temple there. It is quite likely that he got the governorship of this region before that date. An inscription of 1564 A.D. speaks of his getting his governorship from Venkatädri (Srimanmahā mandalēśvara Venkatädri Maṅga Arasugalu Sakala rājyavanu pratipālisuvalli Keladi Sadäśivarājanāyakarige Bārakūru rājyavanu pālisi).

Gradually, his influence and authority in Kanara increased. Within next two years he established his full authority over Bārakūru and Mangalūru rājyas. This is confirmed by an inscription from Śankaranaṅgāyana (Coondapur taluk, South Kanara) dated in 1562 A.D., which
states that Sadaśivanāyaka got from the emperor Sadasivarāya the authority over this region. 13 It is also interesting to note that the same inscription gives his high sounding titles like Kōtekōlāhala and Paduvana Samudra-Śēvara. These titles indicate his increasing authority in the region. Other inscriptions of the same date (1562 A.D.) from Kōṭēśvara and Kumbasi 14 not only associate this Nāyaka with this region as governor but also inform us that he appointed his own officers for administering this region.

This sort of increasing hold of the Keladi Nāyaka did affect the political situation in that region. There is reason to believe that some local chiefs like those of Kalasa-Kārkala and others who were enjoying considerable independence did not like the intrusion of a new power and it is likely that some of them revolted against the Nāyaka. 15 Discussing this point, Dr.Kamath S.U. and Dr.Ramesh K.V. hold that the freedom loving princes of Tuluva found the control of Keladi irksome and rose in revolt as they were Jaina, while the Keladi Nāyakas were Saivites. 16 Though it may be conceded that some of the Tuluva chiefs revolted against the Nāyakas, the reason given by these authors does not seem to be correct. The Tuluva chiefs were not averse to Śaiva faith, nor did the
Nāyakas dislike Jaina religion. These chiefs not only made liberal grants to Śiva temples but called themselves devotees of Śiva. Further, it is interesting to note that a local chief named Madda Heggade of Kāpu, who was under Keḷadi Sadāśivanāyaka, made certain grants to Dharma-nātha Basadi at Kāpu in 1556 A.D. An inscription of Sadāśivanāyaka also records the grant to Mallinātha Basadi in 1560 A.D. (Raudri Samvatsara). Thus, it is clear that the reason for the clash between the chiefs in South Kanara and the Keḷadi Nāyakas was not religious but it was mainly political. As remarked by Śrī Lakshminārayan Rao, the Vijayanagara emperor made Keḷadi Sadāśiva the governor of Bārakūru and Mangalūru to have effective control over the chiefs in the Kanara region.

Sadāśiva thus strengthened his position in this region. His authority was recognised by many local chiefs. An epigraph from Surāla dated 1563 A.D. tells us that the Tōkāha chief, Chenāyarasā was a subordinate of Sadāśivanāyaka. His authority in South Kanara is confirmed by a few other epigraphs also. There is reason to believe that he continued to enjoy that portion till 1565 A.D.
Thus it can be concluded that the Nāyakas of Kēladi entered Kanara region through the Vijayanagara Emperor Sadāśivarāya, who wanted to safeguard the position of Vijayanagara in that region. Sadāśivanāyaka, who thus became governor of this region, consolidated his power slowly and controlled many of the chiefs. He continued the policy of the Vijayanagara rulers by patronising all religious sects by making liberal grants.

The next Keladi ruler Immadi Sadāśivanāyaka continued his hold on South Kanara. We have only one inscription of this ruler. This is from Sampgi Kōte (Nagar taluk, Shivamoga District) and is dated in 1566 A.D. The epigraph says that the chief of Honneyakambali was a subordinate of this Nāyaka. Sadāśivarāya of Vijayanagara continued to be the overlord of Immadi Sadāśiva Nāyaka. In the present state of knowledge we are not in a position to state anything beyond this about this Nāyaka.

Dodda Sankaṇṇa succeeded his father Immadi Sadāśiva. An epigraph found at Mosakēri, near Bārakūru, dated in 1570 A.D. (Saka 1491 Vaiśāka) refers to him as the governor of Bārakūru rājya under the overlordship of emperor Sadāśivarāya of Vijayanagara. This is the latest date we have for this ruler. He seems to have
been succeeded by his son Rāmarājaṇāyaka about whom we have an inscription dated in 1571 A.D. (Prajōtpati Sansatrā), which records hisUMBali to Hārāya Kaliya Timma. As suggested in the Keladi Rāyara Vamsavali, this king was deposed by the Vijayanagara emperor, probably because of his incompetence.

However, it is certain that Keladi power was gradually consolidating in Kanara during the short period of Dodda Sankanna’s rule. He checked the inroads of the Muslims in Kanara, subdued the Kaḷasa-Kārkaḷa and Gorasoppe chiefs and carried on his march of victory up to Goa. The campaign against Bhairarasa Odēya (Kaḷasa-Kārkaḷa chief) by Dodda Sankanna appears to have resulted in the former’s accepting the overlordship of Vijayanagara rule as indicated by an inscription dated in 1573 A.D. found at Harīharapura. In view of this the remarks of Dr. Chitnis that this campaign indicated the gradual losing of the Vijayanagara hold on the Keladi chiefs can not be correct.

According to the Śivatattvaratākara and the Keladinripaviyam the next ruler was Chikka Sankanna, the brother of Dodda Sankanna. But there is some difficulty here. Inscriptions following the rule of Dodda Sankanna mention his son Rāmarājaṇāyaka as the ruler.
For instance, the latter is mentioned in 1571 A.D.\(^3\)\(^8\) as well as 1573 A.D.\(^3\)\(^9\) as the ruler of Araga, Gutti, Bārakūru and Mangalūru rājyas. In addition to this, there is one more epigraphical evidence to show that Rāmarājanāyaka continued in this position at least till 1586 A.D.\(^4\)\(^0\) It is interesting to note that there are inscriptions during this period (1571–1586 A.D.) which mention Sankaṇṇa also as the ruler. For instance a stone inscription dated in 1581 A.D.\(^4\)\(^1\) (Saka 1503) found at Bārakūru refers to Chikka Sankaṇṇa's rule. Thus it looks as though both Rāmarāja and Keḻadi Sankaṇṇa were exercising their authority on the region. This riddle is explained to some extent by an epigraph from Bārakūru, dated in 1577 A.D. (Saka 1500 Maṅgasīra) which mentions that both Sankaṇṇa and Rāmarājanāyaka were together ruling over Araga, Gutti, Bārakūru and Mangalūru.\(^4\)\(^2\) Thus it is possible to think as has been done by Shri Lakshminarayana Rao that Rāmarāja and Sankaṇṇanāyaka were ruling jointly up to 1580 A.D.\(^4\)\(^3\) But it is indeed difficult to know when this joint rule commenced. As pointed out just now, only one inscription dated in 1577 A.D. refers to the joint rule and there is only one of a later date which mentions only Sankaṇṇa as a ruler. In this context Dr. Chitnis remarks that Chikka Sankaṇṇa ruled over the whole kingdom some time with his nephew Rāmarāja Nāyaka.\(^4\)\(^4\) But looking
to the epigraphical evidence, the position seems to be reverse. There are at least as many as four inscriptions between 1571 and 1586 A.D. which mention Rāmarāja as the ruler, whereas only one inscription eight years after the end of Dudda Sankanna, associates Chikka Sankanna with the administration jointly with Rāmarāja.

There is an inscription of 1581 A.D., which mentions Chikka Sankanna only as ruling. Taking all these points into consideration it is possible to surmise that Rāmarājanāyaka succeeded his father some time before 1571 A.D. and continued in the position at least till 1586 A.D. Sometime, for a couple of years in between, Chikka Sankanna came to be associated with administration for reasons not known so far. This position can be easily understood when we notice the succession devolves on son rather brother. Strangely enough, neither Keladintipa Vijayam nor Sivatattvaratnākara makes any useful reference to Rāmarāja Nāyaka.

So far as the position of Keladi in Kanara is concerned, it can be said that during the period of these rulers, its power was further consolidated. Inscriptions mentioned above speak of the appointment of Achappa Oḍeyar to administer Sārakuru rājya. One of the inscriptions found at Haṭṭiyangadi (South Kanara) belonging to the year
1575 A.D. informs us about control of the Keladi Nāyakas over the Honneyakambali and Toḷaha chiefs. Both the Śivatattvaratnākara and the Keladi Nripa Vijayam in a conventional way narrate that Chikka Sankanna crushed the army of Gerasoppe and forced the queen to pay tribute. But the real achievement of Chikka Sankanna appears to be his victory over the Svādi chief, Arasappa II. An epigraph from Morab of 1585 A.D. refers to the defeat of Arasappa of Sōde in the hands of Chikka Sankanna. Poet Linganna adds that Sōde Arasappa took the help of Salbat Khan, one of the generals of Bijapur, in his campaign against Chikka Sankanna. But the last one smashed the forces of his opponents. One of the Mackenzie collections also states that the Keladi chief (Chikka Sankanna) captured the fort of Udugani by defeating the chief of Sōde (Svādi).

It is, however, to be noted that inspite of growing strength of the Nāyakas, they continued to call themselves loyal subordinates of the Vijayanagara rulers. But as will be seen below, they slowly changed their stand and in course of time claimed themselves to be independent.

CONSOLIDATION OF KELADI RULE IN KANARA

An era of expansion and consolidation of the Keladi authority commenced in Kanara with the accession of Keladi Venkaṭappa. He was the brother of Rāmarāja and succeeded
the latter some time between 1586 and 1592 A.D.\textsuperscript{53} the former being the latest known date of Rāmarāja, while the latter the earliest one of Venkaṭappa. However, the \textit{Keladinripavijayam} places this event in 1582 A.D. (1505 Mārgaśīra).\textsuperscript{54}

An ambitious ruler and valiant fighter, Venkaṭappa put down all the adversaries and established the Keladi authority on the whole of south Kanara and a major portion of North Kanara. His real achievement is that he shook off the authority of Vijayanagara and became an independent ruler. He began his career as a subordinate of Vijayanagara king\textsuperscript{55} but by rapid campaign and conquest he put down the opposing elements in the region and forced them to accept his authority. Thus establishing himself firmly, Venkaṭappa discontinued to recognise the suzerainty of Vijayanagara after 1614 A.D.\textsuperscript{56}

His first major campaign was against Chenna-bhairādēvi, the queen of Gerasoppe, who was holding sway over Bhatkal and round about that area.\textsuperscript{57} As seen earlier, the early Nāyakas also attacked the territory of this queen but they could not establish their authority over that region. Venkaṭappa made decisive attack whereby the queen was thoroughly subdued and her territory became a part of the Keladi kingdom. A contemporary Portuguese account
of 1598 describes this campaign thus: "the queen of Baticala (Bhatkab) has not paid the tribute due for many years, and that she is now in great distress on account of one Naique (Venkatappa Nayaka) formerly a subject of the king of Narasingue (Vijayanagara) but now risen to power, and who gives clear proofs of his ambition to become the paramount lord over all those neighbouring kings."

The Keladinripavijayam concerns with this event when it says that king Venkatappa routed the queen and captured her territory.

Venkatappa appears to have planned this campaign since 1595 A.D. Sensing the attack from the Keladi Nayaka, the queen Chennabhairadevi, sought the alliance of the Adilshahi ruler, and the Portuguese. But the alliance was no match for Venkatappa. The Portuguese and the Adilshahi forces had to retreat and the queen was thoroughly subdued. After a series of fights, Gerasoppe finally became a part of the Keladi kingdom by 1607 A.D.

This conquest put an end to the rule of Saluva chiefs of Gerasoppe who exercised their authority in this region for over two centuries and resisted the Keladi expansion for quite some time. It may also be noted that the fall of this dynasty marked the decline of Jainism in this region.
Another significant effect of this achievement was the setback received by the Portuguese who were dreaming to become the masters of Kanara coast. The supremacy of the Keladi and especially their control of the ports of Mirjan, Honnavar and Bhatkal, almost crushed the prospect of their trade in that region. Their supporting the queen of Gerasoppe became futile and now the Portuguese were almost at the mercy of Venkataappa. Consequently, they desired to seek the alliance of the latter. In the words of Alvares, "In the first place the Portuguese who had thought themselves entire masters of the coast found that an external power was building a powerful empire which was soon to be the cause of their losing practically all their trade. To the Nayakas it was the greatest acquisition for apart from the prestige they earned by defeating the Portuguese they were now the masters of entire pepper trade and added to their conquest they held the granary of western coast within their power. They became a power whose favour was courted by all the European trading companies on the coast".

With this spectacular achievement, Venkataappa now turned towards south. Here, he marched against the principalities of Honneyakambali chief, punished Sankaranarayana Bhatta, the prime minister of the Honneyakambali, scattered the forces of Honneyakambali and took possession of Hosangadi, Kadari, Bagawadi, Kollur, etc.
Venkatappa now turned against the Kalasa-Karkala chief, Bhairavaraya VII, crushed his forces and annexed the regions Koppa, Bellare, Kalasa and Karkala. Similarly the Tolaha chief also suffered defeat in the hands of Keladi Venkatappa. Mangaluru rajya was no doubt already under the Keladi chiefs but some of the local chiefs appear to have risen against their authority. Venkatappa, therefore marched against such chiefs as the Bangas, the Ajila, the Sāmanta and the Mūlas and these chiefs were humbled. Further Venkatappa marched as far as Kāsargōd. To have effective control over these chiefs, he constructed forts at strategic places like Mulki, Kodiyál (Mangalore), Mudabidre, Ullāla, Kumbala, Kāsargōd, Bellare, Puduvettu, Kānthamangala, Bandyañaka Kumdamkuli, Sisila, Chandaragiri, Paniyāla, Marakada, Holebailūru etc. A Portuguese record of 1629 A.D. also refers to Venkatappa's conquest over many chiefs in Kanara coast. The chiefs of Biligé and Svādi above the Ghāṭa, were also brought under his control. Rightly indeed, Venkatappa earned the title of Padugadaḷa-odeya. It seems that all these campaigns took place between 1608 A.D. and 1612 A.D. Thus he swept over the whole of South Kanara and extended his dominion in the North Kanara also beyond Honnāvar.
At this juncture, the subdued chiefs like the Banga, the queen of Karnadā (the sāmanta chief of Mulki) and so on decided to overthrow the authority of Venkaṭappa. The Banga chief seems to have taken the lead. He sought the help of the Portuguese who had now reason to help the enemies of Keśadi. They encouraged the Banga chief to form a military confederacy with the queen of Karnād and the king of Mountaṇa and themselves promised to help from outside.

But Venkaṭappa took prompt action against the confederacy and crushed all these chiefs. In this context a letter from the Portuguese viceroy, dated 16th December 1616 A.D. to the king of Portugal refers to this incident when it states that Venkaṭappa marched up to the gate of Mangalore and threatened to drive out the Banga chief. The crushing of the confederacy of the enemies of Keśadi including the Portuguese took place in 1618 A.D. Della Valle, an Italian traveller, avers that the Banga chief was driven out of his territory and was forced to pay a tribute of 7000 pagoda to Venkaṭappa, but he does not seem to have given up his efforts to recover his last territory. According to a Portuguese record the Banga chief took refuge at Kāsargōd and constantly appealed to the king of Cannanore for help in this direction.
But his attempts failed and disappointedly he met his end at Kasargod itself in 1629 A.D. The queen of Karnad was also thoroughly subdued. The queen of Ullala who sided with Venkatappa in his southern campaign, was also forced to surrender a part of her territory and to pay annual tribute. Likewise, the chief of Omanzur and the Jogi of Kadri also had to submit to him.

A copper plate inscription dated in 1622 A.D., from Mudabidre, states that Venkatappa wrested the Tulu-rajya. ("Keladi Venkatappanayakanu Tulu raja vannella Saktiyinda Kasidukoṇdu"). Another inscription dated in 1641 A.D. of course belonging to the reign of Virabhada the grand son of Venkatappa, narrates the achievements of Venkatappa as follows: "A diamond elephant goad to the lusty elephants of the group of the bounding Taulava rajas, a sun to disperse the thick darkness the numberless Kiratas, a boundary mountain to stop the great ocean of the Mlechchhas ever seeking to overflow the south in victorious expeditions, his arm of unequalled valour"............

Thus with these campaigns Venkatappa established the Keladi authority over practically the whole of Kanara. This is, indeed, a glorious chapter in the history of Keladi as well as Kanara. He also added to the economic prosperity of this region as has been remarked by Sturrock.
who says: "He (Venkaṭappa) was able to add 50% to the land assessment in great part of Kanara except on Mangalore Hobāli". 91

All these contemporary sources stated above convince us that Keladi Venkaṭappa, during the course of his military campaign was successful in dealing with those powers who helped the chiefs in Kanara in undermining his authority. His victory in Kanara made the Portuguese worry about their trade interest in Kanara. They were eager to secure the trade in pepper against the English and the Dutch. 91a They sent an embassy to Venkaṭappa and intended to conclude with him a favourable trade treaty. 92 Further, the Portuguese desired to act as mediators between the Banga rāja and Venkaṭappa. 93 The latter showed his diplomatic skill in negotiating with the Portuguese without losing ground. 94 He also dealt with the English very skillfully in commercial transaction. 95

In the light of all these achievements, it is worth while examining the remarks of B.S. Shastry who thinks "Venkaṭappa seems to have rejected the suzerainty of Vijayanagara emperor, but only to become tributary of the Adilshahi". Obviously, this idea of Shastry is based on a similar statement of Dell Valle. 97 Venkaṭappa had been able to put down all oppositions including the Adilshahi, 98
and therefore, the question of his paying tribute to the defeated party would not arise at all. Further the logic of a chief discarding the authority of a suzerainty only to accept the subordinate status under another master especially an alien like the Sultan of Bijapur itself is un understandable.

Thus Venkatappa succeeded in supressing most of the chiefs in Kanara and in establishing his firm hold in this region.

It is worthwhile examining here another statement made by Sturrock in relation to the attitude of Venkatappa towards Jaina religion. The author alleges that Venkatappa took vindicative attitude towards this religion and was instrument destroying the Jaina temples at Bārkuru. This allegation has not only basis but it is also contrary to the facts. As observed in an earlier context (Sadasiva-nāyaka), religion has not been the cause of conflict in early medieval history of our country. If Venkatappa attacked Gerasoppe, it was not because of his hatred towards Jainism, but because of his political ambition. There are instances to show that during his reign a Jaina basadi was repaired at Mēlīge by sons of Bommaṇna Śrī Meṭti in 1608 A.D. Further, a copper plate inscription from Mudabidre, dated in 1622 A.D, records
Venkatappa’s service to Jaina basadi there. Suffices to say that Venkatappa ruled with an eye towards spiritual and material welfare of his subjects.

**REACTIONS OF THE KANARA CHIEFS**

The next period of Keladi rule was a sort of anti-climax. Venkatappa had succeeded in suppressing many chiefs in Kanara and had established firm hold in this region. But the events that followed in Kanara during the reign of his successor show these chiefs were suppressed but not crushed completely. They felt uneasy and waited for an opportunity to overthrow the authority of Keladi.

Next ruler was Virabhadra, the grand son of Venkatappa. The latter’s son Bhadrappa predeceased his father. We have an inscription of this prince which records a grant to the Krishna temple at Udupi.

The reign of Virabhadra began in 1629 A.D. His rule of sixteen years is marked by incessant revolts of various chiefs of Kanara who had been subdued by his grand father.

We understand from one of the Portuguese records that these chiefs were "wishing to recover what he had taken from them". A letter from Basruru from the Portuguese...
Captain L.D. Menezes describes the situation in Kanara in 1629 A.D. as follows: "All these kings have now revolted against Virabhadra Naique and they have taken oath to fight and march on the kingdom of the said Vencatapp Naique". 108

As regards the political condition in Kanara as that result of this rebellion, we are indebted to one of the Portuguese records. It reports: 109 "Kings, queens and the balalas have conspired and formed an alliance against the said Virabhadra Naique and all harass him with war, that each one of them might recover and keep what was once his own and which had been unjustly wrested from them by the king Vencatappa Naique. And all these engage him on different sides, and have already blockaded the fortress of seruquo and taken and fortified all the passes of Ghatas to prevent help coming down; so that from Canhorot to Baticallo—everything is in revolt and king Virabadar Naique is no longer master of anything below the Ghatas, and is in such straits that he thinks that he will no more be able to recover his losses unless these people who are leagued against him should again be divided among themselves". 110

These accounts, though appear to be exaggerated, indicate clearly that the chiefs like those of the Banga, the Kalasa-Karkala and of the Chauta etc., revolted against
this ruler and tried to assert their independence. Besides forming their confederacy, these chiefs sought the help of the Portuguese against Keladi Virabhadra. For instance, a Portuguese record of 1631 A.D. tells us that the queen of Banga Shankaradévi, the queen of Karnad, and the king of Mountain appealed to the Portuguese for help in overcoming Keladi Virabhadra. There are still more instances to show that the chiefs sent repeated requests to the Viceroy of Goa to come to their request against the Keladi Nāyaka. For this, we have the evidence of a letter of the Banga queen addressed to the Viceroy of Goa in which she reminded the friendship that existed between the Portuguese and the Banga for a long time, and implored the Portuguese assistance. But the Portuguese had their own difficulties and were not willing to support the enemies of Keladi openly. Earlier they had suffered defeat, probably at the hands of the Keladi ruler, in Mangalore. They knew that their trade interests would be at stake in case they antagonised the Keladi ruler. Further the Portuguese had keen desire to retain their monopoly in pepper trade against the other European traders. Therefore, the Portuguese had to maintain friendly relationship with Keladi, though they did desire undermining the latter's position in Kanara. Some how, they refrained from supporting the rebelled chiefs openly. Realising that the Portuguese help was not forthcoming,
the Banga queen appears to have joined the queen of Uḷāla in requesting the Bijapur Sultan for help. But as has been indicated in one of the Portuguese records as well as the Keladinripaviṣṭayam, Virabhadra was able to resist all kinds of opposition and successfully put down the revolts in South Kanara by 1635 A.D. The latter work, for example, refers to his inflicting defeat on the Tuluva chiefs including Bhairarasa Odeya of Kālasa-Kārkala. The latter was even forced to pay heavy tribute.

In the meantime, a new development took place and that was the entry of Virappa Wayaka in the affairs of Keladi. This prince is said to be the son of Rāmarāja and there is an epigraph of 1630 A.D. which records his grant to Siddanna.

The Keladinripaviṣṭayam tells us that he was a rival contestant for the throne and received support from several ministers. But Virabhadra Wayaka took prompt action in putting him down. One of the letters written by Keladi Virabhadra to the Viceroy of Goa, dated in 1639 A.D. informs us that Virappa fought with Virabhadra for six months and that he was supported by the chiefs of Svādi and Bilige. He also seems to have sought the help of the Portuguese by entering into treaty with them by handing over to them the island of Cambolim and other
privileges.\textsuperscript{124} Inspite of these efforts, Vīrappa\textsuperscript{125} could not dislodge Vīrabhadra, who continued to rule till 1645 A.D.

On his part, Vīrabhadra appears to have realised that it was necessary for him to muster some support against the rising rebel chiefs and he perhaps thought that he could bank upon the Portuguese.\textsuperscript{126} In due course the latter, also very eager to have friendly relationship with the Kelādi rulers to safeguard their own interest in trade, agreed to sign a fresh treaty with the Kelādi ruler. One of the conditions of the treaty proposed by the Kelādi government was that the Portuguese were to help them against the Tuluva chiefs whenever necessary.\textsuperscript{127} It is, however, to be noted that Vīrabhadra did not allow complete freedom to the Portuguese. For instance, when the latter taking advantage of the treaty started building fort at Cambolim (Ganguli S.K), Vīrabhadra stopped it forthwith by issuing an order to dismantle it.\textsuperscript{128}

Vīrabhadranāyaka had to face a joint attack by the chiefs of Svādi and Bīliga.\textsuperscript{129} As indicated by poet Linganna this attack seems to be after effect of the subjugation of Vīrappa, the rival claimant for the Kelādi throne, and his exit from the political scene. It is even stated that these chiefs sought the help of the Adilshahi
ruler. But this did not affect the position of Virabhadra. On the other hand he seems to have thoroughly defeated the allied chiefs whereupon they desired to come to a compromise. Both the Keladimiripavijayam and the Biligi Vamsavali speak of the compromise. According to that Virabhadranaayaka was to return to the chiefs of Bilige and Svadi their respective territories and was to refrain from further attacking them.130

There are a few epigraphs (1630 to 1641 A.D.) which state that Virabhadra had also to face direct attack from the Sultan of Bijapur. One of these records, however, avers that Virabhadra protected Southern kingdom by averting it.132

Thus, it can be concluded that the period of Virabhadra was one of strife and turmoils. He faced opposition from all quarters. But it is to his credit that he successfully put down all these opposing elements. There are good number of epigraphs recording grants to religious institutions in this region.133 They describe him as an able ruler, competent in administration as well as warfare and liberal donee and supporters of all religions.134

One of the inscriptions describes him in these words: "Virabhadra wise, brave and enlightened king ...
possessed of fame and valour, devoted to object of human desire"\(^1\) thus indicating the further strengthening of his hold in Kanara.

The successor of Virabhadra was his uncle Sivappa, obviously because Virabhadra had no issue. According to the *Sivatattvaratnakara*\(^2\) Sivappa and his brother Venkataappa were entrusted with the affairs of the kingdom and the eldest i.e., Sivappa was crowned. The *Keladinripayijayam* gives the date of the commencement of his rule in 1645 A.D.\(^3\) The latest known date of his predecessor is also in 1645 A.D. However, V. Rangacharya opines that Virabhadra ruled till 1649 A.D. and in support of it he quotes an inscription\(^4\) which records Virabhadra's grant to Krishna temple at Udupi in that year. From epigraphical point of view, the reign of Sivappa commenced from 1652 A.D.\(^5\) The *Chikkadevaraya vamsavali*, however, mentions that Sivappa murdered Virabhadra and usurped the throne.\(^6\) At the same time one of the Portuguese records of 1644 A.D.\(^7\) also refers to the clash between these two. There is no evidence to disprove this. But strangely enough both the *Sivatattvaratnakara* and the *Keladinripayijayam* are silent over this.

Fifteen years of Sivappa's reign was a contrast to the earlier rule of Virabhadra. Both poet Linganna\(^8\) and Rice...
speak in a general way about 'Sivappa's crushing down the rebellions of different elements. But it is possible to think that there was hardly any rebellion, in view of the fact that Virabhadra had effectively put them down. The statement of these works implies that even the minor voices of dissent were silenced by 'Sivappa. Both the Keladinripavijayam and Sivatattvaratnakara ascribe him with a victory in Malabar region. They tell us that 'Sivappa carried on his arms deep into Malabar upto Nīlēśvara. 142

In the northern region the chiefs of Svādīma and Bīligē, who had got back their principalities from Virabhadra, continued to recognise the authority of 'Sivappa. The Bīligē Vamsāvalī states that the Bīlige could not face the attack of 'Sivappa and accepted his overlordship. 143

'Sivappa's another achievement was the control of the Portuguese activities in Kanara coast. He viewed with great concern the expansionist activities of the Portuguese who tried to strengthen their pockets by building forts at Honnāvar, Cambolim (Gangāli) and Mangalore. 'Sivappa took stern action against them and forced them to vacate these forts. 144

Thus 'Sivappa could rule in peace by bringing all sorts of opposing elements under his control. As a result of this, 'Sivappa got time to look to the internal affairs
and to bring in some reforms. He is especially credited with agrarian reforms to achieve. He introduced the system of assessment of land and collection of taxes. These steps yielded good results and the whole of Kanara is said to have become veritable granary. It is also said that the resultant and prosperous condition attracted other Europeans like the Dutch, and the English.

By his administrative reforms especially the revenue administration which has been popularly known as 'sīstu, Sivappa acquired legendary fame in Kanara. He took effective steps for the defence of the kingdom. He built forts in number of places which are known today as the forts of Sivappa and built huge army of his own. Leonardo paes, for example, says that Sivappa had a standing army of forty to fifty thousand men. This helped him in extending the kingdom also which stretched itself between Kāsargōḍ and Nīlēśvar, in the south and the Tādūry river in the north as commented by the same author.

About the condition in Kanara under this period, Baldaeus the Dutch traveller in 1660 A.D. remarks that Kanara was rich in rice and other products and had healthy strong people capable of any kind of work. Sivappa's brother Venkatappa succeeded him in 1660 A.D. but could rule only for one year. By the time he assumed power, the Dutch were slowly gaining and they were competing with the
Portuguese in establishing monopoly in pepper trade. Venkatappa followed a policy of maintaining good relations with the both. However, his relations with the Portuguese became strained. His inscription dated in 1660 A.D. found at Sirali (Bhatkala Taluk) recording grant of land to the temple of Venkatramana indicates that practically the major portion of Kanara coast continued to be under the Keladi Nāyakas.

The rule of the successor of Venkatappa II, i.e., Bhadrappa the son of 'Sivappa', was also a short one (1661–63). His inscriptions, a few in number, indicate the affluent and peaceful conditions in his kingdom. For instance, a stone inscription dated in 1662 A.D. found in the Mallyara Matha at Gangolli (South Kanara) records his umbali valued 120 varāhas in the Gangolli village of Muguvinā Śīme to Nārāyaṇa Mallya. Still a few more epigraphs and the 'Sivatattvatratnakara' speak of his liberal grants to Krishna temple at Udupi, Mukāmbika temple at Kollūru, Kōṭēśvara temple of Kōṭēśvara village and Sankaranārāyaṇa temple of the Sankaranārāyaṇa Village.

But in the Northern region he had to face some difficulties. The Svādi chiefs had continued their hostile attitude towards Keladi and Bhadrappa had to proceed against them to control the situation. This involved him in continuous warfare in the Ghāṭ region. The Keladinripaṇijayam tells us that he
could rout the Svādi chief, but the latter sought the help of Adilshahi ruler, who readily came for help obviously, due to his traditional enmity with the Keladi. Bhadrappa realising his difficult position seems to have preferred an wise peace to a futile war. This has been corroborated by the English factory record. As a result of this treaty Svādi chief got back his territory and once again Bhadrappa had to pay tribute to the Sultan of Bijapur.

Bhadrappa's rule came to an abrupt end by his sudden death in 1664 A.D. Neither the Keladinripavijayam nor the Sivatatvatnākara account for the event. But one of the Dutch records tells us that he was poisoned. We have no evidence either to support or deny this statement. It is, however, certain that his brother Sōmaśekharanāyaka commenced his rule in that year. His reign was marked by continuous disturbances in all parts of the kingdom. In South Kanara, the Tuluva chiefs rose against him. This is stated in the Keladinripavijayam as well as the foreign sources. One of them informs us that the queen of Banga and the Chauṭa chief (Ullāla) besiezed the fortress of Mangalore. Another development of this reign was interference of the Malabar chiefs who supported the rebel Tuluvas against Keladi. Sōmaśekhara, however, put down the revolts successfully and pursued the intruding Nayanmaras or Malabar chiefs upto Nilēśvara and affirmed his
authority uptime that area. In the northern region, Soma-
seekhara had face: a new development. In 1665 A.D. Sivāji
made sudden attack on the port of Bāsūru (South Kanara)
obviously, to punish the Portuguese and the Dutch, who had
hold on that port. However, this did not affect the posi­
tion of the Keladi Nayakas. A little later, when Sivāji
attacked Goa in November 1667 A.D. the Portuguese were
forced to withdraw their fleet to ports of Karwar for the
defence of Goa. Taking advantage of this situation, Soma-
seekhara Nayaka drove the Portuguese out of the fortress of
Gangolli and imprisoned several Christians who were indu­
lging in treacherous activities.

It is said that Soma'sekhara had to face an attack
from the Adilshahi ruler. But it had obviously little
consequence.

It is interesting to note that a copper plate
inscription from Bālehonnūru Mathā dated in 1672 A.D. calls
Soma'sekhara Rājādirāja. The epigraphical records depict
Soma'sekhara as a liberal donor to religious institutions
with catholic outlook. He made donation to Vīraśaiva Mathas
as well as the temples of Lord Kṛishṇa and Śyāri Mukāmbika
at Udupi and Kollūru respectively. An epigraph from
Savamoga district refers to his custom house at Chandavar
in North Kanara indicating that hold of Keladi region was
unaffected.
The end of Soma'sekhara appears to have been tragic. There have been conflicting reports about this. The Keladinripavijayam tells us that the Nayaka went mad and was finally killed by the local people. Buchanan repeats this. One of the letters of the English factory from Karwar dated 7th January 1672, says that the Nayaka was murdered as the result of conspiracy and connivance of an envoy from the Sultan of Bijapur. In view of the fact that he had no issue at the time of his death, it is possible to think that it came rather abruptly, though it is difficult to ascribe a cause of it. About the last date of his rule also, there is some difference of opinion. It is generally presumed on the basis of the Keladinripavijayam that it fell in 1671 A.D. On the basis of two epigraphs belonging to the years 1674 A.D. and 1677 A.D. Shri N. Lakshminarayana Rao places it in 1677 A.D. But in view of the fact that Chennammāji the queen of Soma'sekhara commenced her rule in 1672 A.D. and that the English record dated on January 7th 1672 A.D. refers to the murder of the Nayaka, it is rather difficult to accept the contention of N. Lakshminarayana Rao. The two records bearing the dates 1674 and 1677 A.D. can be regarded as referring to the Nayaka in nominal way while these actually belong to the rule of the queen.
The sudden death of Somaśekhara probably under suspicious circumstances created a void in the Keladi kingdom. There was no lawful successor to the throne since the deceased king had no issue. But queen Chennammājī rose to the occasion and took the reigns of administration in her own hands. She adopted a son who was named Basavappa and on his behalf she conducted the administration as has been suggested by poet Linganna. Dr. Fryer, an English doctor, who came to Karwar in 1675 A.D. corroborate this view. Further, this is also observed in one of the Portuguese records which is a treaty concluded by Chennammājī in the name of Basavappa in 1678 A.D. However, Chennammājī was a competent ruler and her regency was nominal. For all practical purposes, she was the ruler and a good number of inscriptions refer to her as such without making any reference to Basavappa. It is only in an epigraph dated in 1697 A.D. that Basavappanāyaka figures for the first time. This change over and unusual situation of a lady being at the helm of the affairs of kingdom naturally encouraged dissident elements in and outside the kingdom to rise against the authority of Keladi. Perhaps in an exaggerated way, one of the factory records describes the situation in the kingdom as really alarming and it says: "...the disturbance was so extensive that for some time it rendered the road in the whole Kannarese country impossible." It is also reported that a court merchant named
Narayana Mallya tried to take advantage of this situation by supporting one of the claimants, for the Keladi throne, whose name, however, is not clear in that source. The merchant even appears to have concluded an agreement with the Sultan of Bijapur. But the details are not known. Obviously Narayana Mallya did not succeed in his design.

The Keladinripavijayam mentions some rival claimants such as Basavalinga, the brother-in-law of Somaśekhara I, Immadi Śivappa (Kutsita), a member of the Keladi royal house, and Bhdrappa, a distant cousin of Somaśekhara I. Of them, Śivappa sought the help of the Portuguese and for that he promised to hand over some ports in Kanara to them. It seems that he was not successful in getting the help from the Portuguese. The last mentioned claimant (Bhdrappa) instigated the Tuḷu chiefs, like the Bangas, the Chautas, the Ajilas and the Sāmantas against the authority of Keladi. He hoped to secure the throne with the support of these chiefs. But Chennammāji took prompt action against the rebel chiefs by sending a powerful force under Dalavīyi Bhdrappa. The latter not only suppressed the opponents but also captured the ports of Kārkāla and Mallikārjunagiri.

A copper plate grant of 1674 A.D. indicates that Chennammāji was able to quell all other disturbances and rule peacefully having effective control over the region of Bhatkala and other places.
Chennammāji took steps to consolidate her power in the northern region. She skillfully warded off the Bijapur menace. In 1672 A.D. Ali Adil Shaha II of Bijapur died. Queen Chennammāji took this as an opportunity to expand her territory. She swiftly marched against the fort of Mirjan and captured it. Nārāyana Mallya, who worked against her in the initial stages of her rule, now sided with her and tried to capture Ankola on her behalf. He was, however, not successful in his effort for which he had to incur the displeasure of the queen.

At this juncture, Rāmachandranāyaka II of Svādi made an unexpected attack and besieged the fort of Mirjan which was now under the Kelādi authority. The queen acted promptly by sending a huge army under Subbanis Krishnappayya against the Svādi forces. He not only freed the fort of Mirjan from seizure, but marched upto the gate of Suddāpara (Svādi) and captured a number of strong holds of the Svādi ruler. However, on an appeal from the chief of Svādi, the queen restored to him the regions she had captured except Banavāsi. Later, however in 1679, the Svādi chief appears to have got back Banavāsi and Sirsi with the help of the Sultan of Bijapur.

A spectacular achievement on the part of Chennammāji was her repulsing of the Mughal army which attacked the Kelādi region, since she gave shelter to Rājarām, the
second son of Sivāji, whom they wanted to capture. The Keladînripavijayam says that the Mughals suffered a defeat and concluded a treaty with the same queen. 196

The rule of Chennammāji was an epoch making event not only in the history of Keladi, but also in the history of India. We have a few instances of women raising to the status of an administrator and valiant fighter. Chennammāji is a rare instance of the type who shouldered the responsibility of the kingdom at a critical situation and not only discharged the responsibility ably by putting down all the enemies in kingdom but also led the country to prosperity. Among the Keladi rulers, it was this queen who held complete authority practically on the whole of Kanara. Dr. Fryer speaks of her kingdom thus: "The people looked cheerful and live in a peace under quiet government. They have well constituted laws and observed them obediently and travelled without guide on broad roads". 197 Epigraphs corroborate this observation. For instance an epigraph from Kigga dated in 1678 A.D. 198 speaks of her as ruling the kingdom in peace and happiness. Other inscriptions record her munificent grants to various temples like those of Krishna at Udupi, Mukāmbikā at Kollūru and Venkatramana at Puttūru. 199 Further the same queen allowed the Portuguese to build churches at Mirjan, Chandavar, Honnavar Bhatkala (North Kanara) and Kalyanpur. But she issued them strict instructions not to adopt forceful conversion, not to take orphans and not to kill cows. 200
Keladi Chennammāji's reign came to an end in 1697 A.D. and her successor Basavappa ruled from that date till 1714 A.D. Although his reign in Kanara was free from internal trouble, his position in this region was constantly threatened by the Marathas, the Portuguese, and the Nayanmars of Malabar. In the early period, there were sporadic incursions of the Marathas in Kanara. But they appear to have concentrated their activities against this region especially in the coastal part.

Just as Basavappa was consolidating his authority as the new ruler, he learnt that in 1698 A.D. the Marathas were trying to fortify the island near Honnāvar, obviously to have permanent hold in that region. Keladi Basavappa sent powerful forces against the Marathas. Chennabasavappa, an officer under the Keladi government, assisted Basavappanāyaka in repulsing the Arakula forces. We know the details of the capture of the island from the Bombay factory record of 1699 A.D. It reports: "The island near Honor fortified by the Marottas was besieged by the Canarans with five ships, 18 Manchwas and 5000 men as the island was within gun shot from the main land. Later they increased their forces up to 10 ships and 14 high Munchwas. Morattas tried to land, but were repulsed each time with 30, 40 and 50 men and one day over 100 men killed".

Till now the Portuguese had not been able to exert much influence in Kanara, though they had some trade privileges in its ports. Now they appear to have tried to consolidate their position and even build forts. In 1698 A.D. they began to construct a fort at Basrūru and had occupied some areas of the Keḷadi kingdom. But Basavappa prevented their moves by stationing heavy troops in the ports and border. He even captured their fort at Mangalore. But the hostilities of the Portuguese continued. They captured two ships of the Keḷadi ruler in 1702 A.D. and in retaliation, Basavappa imposed restrictions on the movements of the Portuguese at Honnāvar and Mangalore. The Portuguese counteracted by imposing restrictions on the Keḷadi merchants at Goa. Such activities finally led to friction which, however, ended in a treaty of 1704 A.D. whereby the Portuguese agreed to hand over the ships that were captured. But the Portuguese renewed their hostilities again by capturing ships and finally by sending a naval expedition. The Portuguese record tells us that Commander Britto burnt the Keḷadi ships on the sea near Kumta and proceeded to Honnāvar intending to capture the fort there. But he could not succeed in his design, since the fort was well defended by the Keḷadi forces. He caused considerable damages to the Keḷadi property at Mirjan, Gōkarṇa Basrūru, Mulki, Mangalore, and other places. But he could not capture any of the areas. Finally a treaty was com-
cluded in 1714 A.D. as a result of which both parties stopped hostilities. The Portuguese restored the ships and agree to "pay for the goods that were sold." It is likely that Basavappa was persuaded to enter into a treaty with the Portuguese in 1704 A.D. just about the same time he was facing trouble on the southern border also. Here the Mayamars of Malabar who were earlier down by the Keladi forces, now again tried to capture the southern portions of the Keladi kingdom. This time they secured the alliance of the Mayavis (the Mysore rulers) with whose help they captured the fort Chandragiri. Hearing this, Basavappanayaka sent powerful forces under the command of his officer Garjina Basavappadēvaru. The Keladi forces under the latter drove the forces of Mysore, routed the overbearing forces of the Malayalees and recaptured that fort.

The Keladinripavijayam speaks of the Mughal attack on the fort Medji (Mīrjān) and its repulsion by Basavappa. But there is no detail of the attack nor does it seem to have been of any serious consequence. Likewise, it also appears that the trading Arabs on Kanara coast made an attempt to invade Honnāvar and Mangalore and caused some damages. But it is also reported that they were easily repulsed by the Keladi forces.
All these disturbances on the borders did not however, affect the Keladi authority in Kanara. Chandāvara and Mirjan continued to be under the Keladi rule in the northern region and this authority was unaffected to Chandragiri in the south. A Nirūpa dated in 1697 A.D. (an instruction sent to different officers by Basavappa) refers to different administrative units including Chandāvara sīme and Mogarnādu around Chandragiri.

Basavappa continued the traditional policy of catholic outlook towards different religions. He made donations to Vīraśaiva Mathas, patronised ascetics of different faiths including Christians. His love for literature is well known. A contemporary poet-saint called Appaiyya was honoured by him with the title Varakavi. Another poet Saraja Nāgappa the author of Sukasaptati was a contemporary of Sōmaśekhara. Basavappa's own work Sivatattvaratnakara is veritable encyclopaedia covering all topics. Herein he lays down the qualities of an ideal king. He says "Humility is the nurse of virtue, a virtuous king is a good ruler of the people and the love of his subjects is the abode of wealth." King Basavarāja considered the defence of kingdom as not in any way lesser than Yajna. His career as a ruler and defender of the kingdom amply justify the ideals he held before himself.
The next ruler, Sōmaśēkharaṇāyaka II, the son of Basavappa, ascended the throne in 1714 A.D. and ruled till 1739 A.D. Unlike the earlier period, Kanara enjoyed peaceful days during the reign of this Nāyaka. It is also marked by the establishment of friendly relationship with the chief of Svādi whose relations with the Keḷadi chiefs were hostile almost from the beginning. Sōmaśēkhara obviously thought it futile to indulge in mutual conflicts when all of them were faced by dangers from outside. Poet Linganna writes that Keḷadi Sōmaśēkhara took the lead in establishing this cordial relationship. He personally went to meet Svādi chief and the meeting took place at Guddanāpura (Probably Gudmāpura near Banavāsi), where he was given rousing reception. The tie of friendship continued till the end and there was no trouble from either side.

After this event, Sōmaśēkhara seems to have faced an attack from the Marathas under Kanhoje Angre who raided Mangalore with an intention to plunder the port. But he was forced to return empty handed on account of heavy defence of the port by the Keḷadi forces.

The major event that took place during the rule of Sōmaśēkhara is his victorious expedition to Malabar. The reason for the expedition seems to be the invitation he
of

received from the chief Cannanore to support against the latter's fight with the chief of Colastine.\textsuperscript{225} (Kolathiri). The involvement of the Keladi Nayaka in Malabar campaign commenced in 1727 A.D. and continued nearly for a decade. The prolonged warfare attracted the attention of the Dutch, the English, the Portuguese and the Marathas\textsuperscript{226} to support one or the other rival parties at different periods. The English and the Portuguese records give considerable details regarding these fights, which, however, are quite confusing. It is also said that taking advantage of the involvement of the Keladi Nayakas in this war, the chief of Kumbala conspired with the Nayanmars, but was promptly arrested and kept in prison.\textsuperscript{227} The net result of the whole affair was a treaty concluded in 1740 A.D. between the Malabar chiefs and the Keladi Nayakas, through the mediation of the East India Company at Tellicherry.\textsuperscript{228} According to it the Keladi Nayaka got considerable territory in Malabar beyond the river Nīlēśvara upto Maddy.

This warfare did not in any way affect the situation in Kanara. Keladi Sōmaśēkharanāyaka II maintained a large army which was stationed in different parts of Kanara and on the borders to protect the territory.\textsuperscript{229}

Poet Linganna says that the ruler, in spite of his being busy in directing military expeditions fostered religious and cultural institutions by munificent grants.
He constructed Agrahāras for the promotion of educational activities and himself went on pilgrimage to various sacred places. His devotion to God Mūkāmbika at Kolūru is confirmed by an epigraph, dated in 1723 A.D. With regard to the condition of Kanara between 1718–1720 under Somaśekharanāyaka, an English commodore Hamilton remarks as follows: "The subjects of this country (Kanara) observe the law so well, that robbery or murder are hardly heard among them. And a stranger may pass through the country without being asked where he is going or what business he has ..... There is liberty and property ..... Mangalore is the greatest mart for trade in all the Kanara dominion".

Basavappanāyaka II, the nephew of Somaśekhara came to the throne in 1739 A.D. and ruled till 1754 A.D. The earliest record of his reign is in the form of Bhasapatra, found at Chitrāpura Matha (North Kanara). It records his gift of land to one Manevārtule Ananthaiyya for the construction of Matha, Bhavānīśankara at Gōkarna.

Another paper grant of the same Nayaka, found at Kalyānpura dated in 1744 A.D. records his grant of land to Mahālingēśvara temple at Kalyānpura. Besides, Keladi Basavappa II donated liberal grants to Pāṇḍuranga Svāmi of Udupi Matha. He also constructed Jangama Mathas.
and went on pilgrimage to sacred places in Kanara. Between 1741 and 1753 A.D. Basavappa was busy in the Malabar campaign. In the course of the military campaign the Keladi forces were stationed at Madday, south of the Nilëśvara. Perhaps in the course of the conflict, the Malabar chiefs tried to attack the fort Chandragiri, which, however, was foiled by the Keladi forces. The Kelalinripavijayam places this event in Śrīmukha Samvatsara (1754 A.D.).

At this juncture the Marātha forces under Tulāji Angre, Khema Sāmant seem to have attacked Mangalore and other ports and achieved some success, probably because of the indifference of the Keladi forces. However, the scuffle ended with a treaty resulting in no loss to the Keladi kingdom. Poet Linganna writes that Basavappa built strong forts at Mangalore, Kāpu, Malape and Thonse.

In spite of the disturbances on the border, peace and plenty ruled in Kanara. As observed by Jocobus Canten Visscher, a missionary who visited Kanara in the reign of Basavappa II, the kingdom of the latter was a granary of South India. He further observes about the conditions in the kingdom thus: "The Bednore prince is much more magnificent and powerful than those of Malabar. His kingdom
produces many peculiar commodities such as Sandal wood, which is found there in great abundance as well as rice.

...... The road is so secure that any stranger might go and sleep there with bags full of money and nobody would molest or rob him, for if such thing occured, the people in the neighbourhood would not only be severely punished but would be forced to make good money." It is interesting to note that this fact is confirmed by Marques de Castello, the Portuguese Viceroy of Goa (1744 to 1750 A.D.) in his diary. He notes there "The king of Kanara is more rich than powerful. The traffic in rice with the whole of Malabar and part of Muscat is the cause of great influx of money into his kingdom".

DECLINE OF THE KELADI RULE IN KANARA

Basavappanayaka was succeeded by his adopted son Chennabasavappa. Since he was a minor at the time of accession, the administration of the kingdom was managed by his adopted mother Viramma. From this period onwards the Keladi power began to decline. The minority of the ruler and conduct of the administration by a woman appear to have encouraged unruly elements in and outside the kingdom. Though we have no details, it is obvious that there were many family intrigues and plots against the throne. All these led to the dissolution of the kingdom itself.
There are records to show that Virammāji tried her best to tide over the opposition and succeeded to a considerable extent for quite some time. She boldly faced the attack of Aliraja of Cannanore who in league with the Marathas raided southern part of the Keḍadi kingdom and made him retreat. She also took effective steps to put down the chiefs of Nīleśvara who rose against her. When she was facing these difficulties, Chennabasavappa met sudden death, probably under suspicious circumstances.

Virammāji continued to rule by adopting another son by name Sōmāśēkharanāyaka III. But this seems to have worsened the troubles. The Marathas invaded Mirjan and Virammāji had to send an army to repulse the attack. Her general, Vīrabhadra, successfully fought back the enemy and retained the fort.

With all these the queen mother found it difficult to go ahead with the administration. Treachery and conspiracy and intrigues increased within the kingdom, so much so, that the defence of the kingdom was neglected. Just at this time Haidar Ali of Mysore planned an attack on Bednūr, the capital of the Keḍadi kingdom. Virammāji was wholly unprepared for this. Added to this, some of her officers appear to have sided the enemy. Consequently Haidar succeed in overrunning the whole kingdom on 16th January 1763 A.D. Thus the last Hindu kingdom in Kanara
continuing the tradition of Vijayanagara in Kanara came to sudden end. Kanara became part of Haidar's kingdom.

It is to be noted that when the Vijayanagara empire received the death blow and was on the brink of disintegration, the Keladi rulers came forth and aloft the banner of the former by conducting administration as their trusted feudatories. When the Vijayanagara authority faded out, these chiefs assumed independence and tried their best to establish peace and prosperity in the country. Then new forces were appearing on the political scene endangering the very foundation of the kingdom. They were the Adilshahis of Bijapur and the Marathas on the one hand and the Europeans like the Portuguese, the Dutch and the English on the other. The Europeans entered the region as traders acquiring privileges from the local rulers, but slowly interfered in local politics, thus contributed to the undermining of the prestige and power of the kingdom. As noted above, all the rulers of Keladi fought consistently against these forces. It is to their credit that practically the major portion of Kanara was held by them and the area enjoyed peace and prosperity over two centuries. The course of history was, of course destined to change with the advent of Haidar on the scene.

*********
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